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Abstract: The development of the early modern novel in the Netherlands and the German Empire traversed a similar course. Mindful of the ties between German and Dutch writers ca. 1620-1660, scholars have postulated a close relationship between Johan van Heemskerck’s Inleydinghe tot het ontwerp van een Batavische Arcadia (1637) and Philipp von Zesen’s Die adriatische Rosemund (1645). The essay demonstrates the complexity of this relationship through an analysis of their translations and critical reception of French Renaissance novels, and the role of history in shaping the composition of their original works. Van Heemskerck and Zesen each challenged and emended the tradition of French romance from which their own works derived by setting forth a patriotic program to educate readers about their respective nations. Through the subordination of romance to history, van Heemskerck and Zesen elucidated the responsibilities of Dutch and German readers to preserve the state through the cultivation of virtue and self-discipline.
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Early modern German literature matured under the tutelage of late sixteenth- and early seventeenth-century Dutch writers. The ‘father of German literature’, Martin Opitz, argued in his influential *Buch von der deutschen Poeterey* [‘Handbook of German Poetry’] (1624) that German-language writing would only be able to take its rightful place among other European literatures informed by Renaissance humanism through the careful study, translation, and imitation of Greco-Roman writers and of the many European authors whose vernacular works betrayed their indebtedness to classical models. Among foreign writers, Opitz and his contemporaries considered Dutch Renaissance poets such as Jan van der Noot, Daniel Heinsius, and Jacob Cats especially valuable because of their accomplished adaptations of Latin and modern Romance-language poetry into a Germanic tongue. German playwrights such as the young Andreas Gryphius and Daniel Caspar von Lohenstein likewise acquired the art of writing neo-classical tragedy from the Dutch, and their dramas contain several reminiscences of Golden Age playwrights such as Guilielm van Nieuwelandt, P. C. Hooft, and Joost van den Vondel.\(^2\)

In the case of the seventeenth-century novel, however, an upstart genre that arose outside the prescriptive neo-classical poetics of the Renaissance, the Dutch-German connections, frequently unstated, are much less apparent. Indeed, it is difficult to speak of German and Dutch seventeenth-century fictional prose beyond the ever-popular folk books (e.g. *Dil Uilenspiegel*, *Fortunatus*, et al.) and translations of ancient Greek romances and Renaissance narratives until the mid-1630s, when German and Dutch works inspired by French, Italian, and Spanish courtly, pastoral, and picaresque novels were first being produced. Among the fictional prose of the early seventeenth century, the narratives of the Dutch lawyer Johan van Heemskerck (1597-1656) and the emerging Saxon poet and linguistic reformer Philipp von Zesen (1619-1689) hold a unique place for their idiosyncratic combination of history and fiction. Van Heemskerck’s extraordinarily popular *Inleydinghe tot het ontwerp van een Batavische Arcadia* [‘Introduction to the Description of a Batavian Arcadia’] (1637; hereafter BA), and Zesen’s *Adriatische Rosemund* [‘Rosemund of the Adriatic’] (1645; hereafter AR), both acclaimed as the first early modern novels in their respective vernaculars, have a much deeper connection than has hitherto been supposed.\(^3\) Both writers were deeply involved in fashioning a literary language in their

---


3 Johan van Heemskerck, *Inleydinghe tot het ontwerp van een Batavische Arcadia*, ed. P. E. L. Verkuyil (Deventer: Uitgeverij Sub Rosa, 1982); unless otherwise noted, all references below will be made to this reprint of the 1637 edition. The BA was printed again in 1647, ostensibly without van Heemskerck’s final review, with extensive footnotes and commentary in Latin, French, Italian, English, German and Dutch on the many historical references in the text, and a new introduction possibly assembled by Coenraad van Beuningen, van Heemskerk’s brother-in-law. An even more expansive BA, which identified van Heemskerck posthumously as the author, was reprinted in 1657; seven additional printings followed before 1800; in 1935 an abridgement of the BA was made for use in public schools: *Inleydinghe tot het ontwerp van een Batavische Arcadia*, ed. D. H. Smit, Nederlandse schrijvers 29 (Zwolle: W. E. J. Tjeenk Willink, 1935). Ferdinand van Ingen was the first to allude to connections between van Heemskerck’s novel and Zesen’s, and this
respective vernaculars for poetry and prose, and both honed their skills through translations and critical adaptations of Latin and French models. Both championed the glorious past of their respective peoples, the Batavians (van Heemskerck) and the Germans (Zesen), and adapted that past to shape a national literature and national identity for their readers. In composing their novels, both were committed to creating a vernacular prose work that not only rivaled but surpassed their foreign models in patriotic fervor and moral superiority.

Van Heemskerck and Zesen were contemporaries but there is no evidence that they were ever acquainted with each other. After almost six years as a lawyer for the Dutch East Indian Company in England, van Heemskerck returned to the Netherlands in 1634, and remained in service to his native city of Amsterdam (1640-1645), and as a counselor to the High Court (Hoge Raad) in the Hague until his death in 1656. His literary career began in 1622, and almost all of his works were published anonymously. Even if Zesen, who arrived in Amsterdam for the first time in 1642, was an enthusiastic reader of van Heemskerck, he would not necessarily have identified him as the unknown author.

Van Heemskerck and Zesen read widely among classical authors and their late Renaissance contemporaries, and each developed his own literary skills in the vernacular through translation. Van Heemskerck was initially attracted to amatory poetry and prose during his years as a law student at Leiden from 1617-1621 and this affection continued into the mid-1630s. He was only in his mid-twenties when he started working on the BA, most likely before 1627 after returning from an extensive grand tour to England, France, and Italy. He was exceptionally proud of his background as the scion of a prosperous Amsterdam family whose international connections had given him the opportunity to spend his early years in France (Bayonne), and acquire several modern languages (English, French, Italian and Spanish) in addition to Latin and ancient Greek. He started translating Ovid’s Ars amatoria ['Art of Love'] while still a student, and having devoured the first three parts of Honoré d’Urfé’s L’Astrée, he translated selected passages from that work into Dutch. Van Heemskerck’s interest in the pastoral increased further during his residency in England (1628-1634) when he translated episodes from Sidney’s New Arcadia. Upon his return to the Netherlands, several versions of his d’Urfé and Sidney translations appeared between 1635 and 1638, alongside his own introductory draft to the BA (1637), and a
Dutch version of Pierre Corneille’s *Le Cid* (1639), but after his marriage in 1640 and appointment as a town councilor (*scheepen*) in Amsterdam, he refrained from literary composition.7

Philipp von Zesen was even more deeply engaged with European literature throughout his long career.8 A northern *uomo universale*, his extensive writings range across literature, linguistics, history, the sciences, religion and moral philosophy. After university study at Wittenberg and a brief sojourn in Hamburg, Zesen moved to Amsterdam in 1642, the first of his many extended residencies there and in Leiden and Utrecht. He acquired a strong knowledge of Dutch, cultivated friendships with many leading Dutch poets and scholars of the mid-century including Hugo Grotius, Gerardus and Isaac Vossius, Claudius Salmasius, Nicolaas Fonteyn, and Anna Maria van Schurman, and by the 1650s was publishing poetry in Dutch as well as German, French, and Latin. He nurtured his passion for linguistic history and the orthographic reform of German by founding a new language society, *Die Teutschgesinnete Genossenschaft* [*The German-Minded Sodality*], which he populated with many of his Dutch acquaintances. He produced German translations of the medical treatises of the Dordrecht physician Johan van Beverwijck, *Schat der gesonthijt* [*A Treasury of Health*] (1636) and *Schat der ongesonthijt* [*A Treasury of Illness*] (1641-1642), and at the prompting of the Moravian humanist Jan Amos Comenius, a resident of Amsterdam since 1656, he composed an educational treatise in Dutch for young women, *Het geestlike Wierookvat der Vrouwen* [*The Women’s Spiritual Censer*] (1658; German translation 1665). During this same period (1656-1667), Zesen also published two major historical works about his adopted homeland, the *Leo Belgicus* (printed in Latin in 1660, but completed 1655/56; German translation 1677), a panegyric of the Dutch Republic and its people from the origins of the Batavi through the Eighty Years War, and in 1664, his chorographic *Beschreibung der Stadt Amsterdam* [*A Description of the City of Amsterdam*], replete with stunning copperplates of the city’s most prominent buildings, a gift from the author to the city fathers of Amsterdam for granting him citizenship in 1662.

Zesen’s extensive residency in the Netherlands, totaling almost forty years, and the publication of these historical works, have led Dutch scholars to regard him as a Dutch writer in their accounts of the Golden Age. Karel Porteman and Mieke Smits-Veldt recently proclaimed the *AR* a ‘Dutch book’ (‘een Hollands boek’) because of its Amsterdam setting and putative relationship to the *BA*.9 But neither that connection nor the comparative literary praxis of van Heemskerck and Zesen has ever been fully investigated. Several formal similarities between the *AR* and *BA* suggest that Zesen most likely knew van Heemskerck’s work. Both texts were thought to recount the romantic adventures of their authors; both took place in an accurately detailed landscape of seventeenth-century Holland rather than in distant antiquity; both discussed historical events, past and present; both featured characters whose names revealed their

---

7 The two main collections of d’Urfé and Sidney translations are: *Den ongestadigen Hylas. De veranderlijke Stella, De lichtevoerige Pamphilus. / Verduyst uyt de Fransche Astrea en d’Engelsche Arcadia* (Amsterdam: Nicolaes van Ravensteijn, 1635), reprinted again in 1636 and 1638; and *De volstandighe Eudoxe. De deftighe Diana. De deughdelycke Parthenia. / Verduyst uyt de Fransche Astrea en d’Engelsche Arcadia* (Amsterdam: Nicolaes van Ravensteijn, 1636), which was reprinted in 1640.


characters (e.g. Reynhert, the lover [BA]; Eiferich, the hot-head [AR]); both retained traces of the Renaissance pastoral novel, chiefly d’Urfé’s L’Astrée; and both contained many of the tropes of the Greek novel of Heliodorus and of seventeenth-century French romances such as Vital d’Audiguier’s Histoire tragè-comique de nostre temps sous les noms de Lysandre et de Caliste (1616), and Madeline de Scudéry’s Ibrahim ou l’illustre Bassa (1641), which Zesen had translated into German and published at Elzevier’s in 1644 and 1645 respectively. BA and AR also featured a certain Rosemond/Rosemund as the female object of male desire, though that name was common in the amatory poetry of many Dutch writers well known to van Heemskerck and Zesen (P.C. Hooft; Justus de Harduwijn; Jacob Cats; Jacob Westerbaen), and both women were worshipped through Petrarchian verses by their respective lovers.¹⁰

Upon closer examination, the differences between the two narratives suggest a more complex relationship. The BA has been called a novel and even a pastoral, but it is more accurately described as a prose account of conversations, some flirtatious, others grave, between three gentlemen and two ladies, while traveling to and from The Hague to Katwijk on a single day.¹¹ Interspersed amidst the amorous banter, extemporaneous lyrics, and elaborate meals of the young patricians are extended digressions on Dutch history from ancient times through the Middle Ages, and on contemporary legal and juridical practices. There is no sustained plot, no idyllic pastoral setting, no probing of the characters’ romantic inclinations, and few parallels to the Arcadias of the French and English courtly-pastoral novels. In contrast, Zesen’s work is centered around the exemplary romance between the German poet Markhold and the virtuous Venetian beauty Rosemund that unfolds in the patrician milieu of contemporary Amsterdam, and is tested during Markhold’s travels in France by the seductive women of the aristocratic salons. Several digressions concerning friends in Markhold’s circle prolong the narrative, and the work culminates in an extensive account of Venetian political history, and of the origins and character of the Germans. These historical digressions, seemingly tangential to the main narrative, are in fact at the centre of Zesen’s intellectual and artistic interests, and provide an important connection to van Heemskerck.¹² What Zesen admired in the BA was the way in which

¹⁰ Van Ingen, Zesen 1619-1969, p. 119 where he mistakenly calls the BA author ‘Jacob’ rather than ‘Johan’, an understandable oversight given Johan’s near contemporary, the distinguished Arctic explorer Admiral Jacob van Heemskerck (1567-1607). In his 2013 study on Zesen’s writings, van Ingen does not recast his earlier discussion of the relationship and surprisingly omits any reference to van Heemskerck and the BA.

¹¹ Generally recent scholars have underscored the inappropriateness of the term ‘novel’ in regard to van Heemskerck’s prose work, e.g. Thijs Weststeijn, ‘Samuel van Hoogstraten, the First Dutch Novelist?’, in T. Weststeijn, ed., The Universal Art of Samuel van Hoogstraten (1627-1678): Painter, Writer, and Courtier (Amsterdam: University of Amsterdam Press, 2013), pp. 183-207. Weststeijn is echoing reservations concerning the BA that extend back almost a century to the literary historian Jan te Winkel and reappear in Porteman and Smit-Veldt’s 2008 history of Dutch literature. The latter note elsewhere in their history (pp. 633-34) the variety of prose forms that combine fictional narratives with antiquarian details, a common practice as the novel developed as a distinct genre during the seventeenth century. Arguments about the BA as a ‘novel’ are based more on later definitions of the genre in the 1700s rather than on actual seventeenth-century practice. Van Heemskerck’s inclusion of anecdotes on diverse subjects alongside his main narrative characterized many subsequent Dutch pastorals and German galant romances, and as a narrative technique, reached its apogee in the gossipy novels of the Hamburg writer Eberhard Werner Happel (1647-1690). The generic hybridity of the BA may have well ensured its popularity through the nineteenth century.

¹² Van Ingen (Philipp von Zesen in seiner Zeit, p. 96) underlines the importance of the historical digressions for the education of readers in contemporary European, especially German, affairs. The Venetian digression and its connection...
van Heemskerck had commingled his ‘minne-praetjes’ with a historical message to stoke the national sentiments of his readers. Throughout this atypical mixture of history and romance, van Heemskerck and Zesen each aimed to challenge and emend the tradition of the French romances from which their own works derived as they set forth a patriotic program to educate the citizens of their respective nations.

**Translation and the Language of Love**

Van Heemskerck and Zesen developed their skills as prose writers through their translations of early seventeenth-century French fiction, and in the case of van Heemskerck, of Sir Philip Sidney as well. Inspired by Renaissance poetics, both writers were committed to enriching the literary expressiveness of the vernacular through their translations and imitation of classical and Renaissance texts. In the early 1620s, van Heemskerck had filled his leisure moments by adapting Ovid’s racy *Ars amatoria*, a favourite of male readers in the Latin classroom since the Middle Ages, for contemporary Dutch audiences by transforming the Roman’s accomplished verses into amatory counsel for young men in search of love in seventeenth-century Amsterdam. In his verse adaptation, van Heemskerck changed the topography from early imperial Rome to Amsterdam in the 1620s, extolling his hometown as a fitting heir to Rome and her empire. In the new Dutch Rome, there is no place for Ovid’s pagan imagery, and van Heemskerck tempers the Roman’s erotic language to accord with the Christian, though not prudish, values of the seventeenth-century: ‘ick hebse nu opsen Hollands hersmeedt, de-selvige, so veel de stoffe heeft willen lyden, op de zeden van onse Eewe passende, ende nae ’s lands wyse buyghende’ (‘I have recast that book (i.e. *Ars amatoria*) into Dutch as much as the material allows, adapting it to the customs of our century and adjusting it to the manners of our country’). Mindful of the future responsibilities awaiting the young burghers of the emerging

to Zesen’s political ideas have been ably discussed in Danielle Laforge, ‘Theorien über Hof, Staat und Gesellschaft in Philipp von Zesens “Adriatischer Rosemund”’, *Daphnis* 11 (1982), pp. 253-76.


16 Van Heemskerck, *Minne-kunst*, sig. 73.
Republic, van Heemskerck links the private aspirations of his male and female readers for love and marriage to their public interest in contributing to the new cultural center on the IJ.\textsuperscript{17}

Van Heemskerck also connected his translations of d’Urfé and Sidney in the 1630s with the emergence of the northern Netherlands, and especially of the county of Holland, as a global power. In the preface to his 1636 version of an episode from Sidney’s \textit{Arcadia}, ‘The Virtuous Parthenia’ (‘De Deughdelycke Parthenia’), he represents Amsterdam as political and economic successor to the Roman Empire and the equal to Spain and England. He praises the sea nymphs of the IJ and the Amstel for challenging the economic hegemony of England and Spain (the Thames and the Tagus): Amsterdam has become ‘a world in a city, the warehouse of the earth, a pearl of the sea, a secure haven, the terror of its enemies, the protector of its allies, a model of good government, and foster-mother of the poor’\textsuperscript{18}. The Dutch empire has engendered a surplus of wealth, and this surplus has in turn created a leased class in need of worthwhile reading material to fill their increasingly idle hours. His translations of d’Urfé and Sidney are designed as tasteful entertainment for these new patricians, and elegant replacements for the enduringly popular scatological adventures of Dil Uilenspiegel, the magical tricks of Fortunatus and the fantasy adventures of Malgris. In reminding his readers that the works of d’Urfé and Sidney have often found their way into the courts and bedrooms of kings and queens, he flatters them into imagining themselves the new political and economic royalty of the Netherlands and Europe.

Van Heemskerck’s early translation projects are intended to instruct his young, mostly female readers in the contemporary art of love. Inspired by selected episodes from the first three volumes of d’Urfé’s \textit{L’Astrée} and Sidney’s \textit{New Arcadia}, van Heemskerck seeks to honor the virtue and beauty of his Dutch ‘nimphjes’ and ‘soetertjes’ by providing them with exemplary narratives about the obligations and risks of romantic entanglements. For his four collections translated between 1625 and 1638, he selected five stories from d’Urfé and two from Sidney, about the travails that may befall virtuous beauties when they fall in love. One collection represents d’Urfé’s Eudoxe (part II, book 12) and Diane (part I, book 6), and Sidney’s Parthenia (book I), as models of perseverance and loyalty despite the hardships they willingly endure for the sake of their lovers.\textsuperscript{19} A second collection featuring d’Urfé’s libidinous Hylas and inconstant

\f\textsuperscript{17}Van Heemskerck broadens the earlier intent of translators of Ovid’s \textit{Ars amatoria}, such as Andries Nuts, whose prose adaptation of ca. 1587 simplified and clarified the 1564 verse translation of the redrijker Marius Laurier. In his prefatory remarks, Nuts fashioned a practical domestic goal for his project ‘om de Jongers te instrueren ende te leeren een vriendinne te krijgen / ende haer in alles getrou te zijn / om int eynde te comen totten Houwelicken staet / ende hen leuen ouer te brengen ter eeren Gods / ende tot grootmaking zijns H. Naems’. As quoted in J. C. Arens, ‘Ovide Puritanisé. De Conste der Minnen bewerkt door Andries Nuts,’ \textit{NTg} 51 (1958), p. 257.

\f\textsuperscript{18}Van Heemskerck, \textit{Eudoxe, Diana, Parthenia}, sig. N4-N4: ‘een werelt in een Stadt, een Packhuys vanden Aerd-bodem, een Peel in een poel, een bosch binnens wals, een schrick voor den Vyand, een scherm vande Bondghenen, een voorbeeld van goed beleyt, een Voedster-vrouwe voor de Armen...’.

\f\textsuperscript{19}In the preface to \textit{Minne-plicht}, van Heemskerck offered his ‘Diana’ to the young ladies (‘nimphjes’; ‘soetertjes’) whose favor he wished to acquire, and whose exemplary graces were reflected in d’Urfé’s character (pp. 7-9). His 1636 d’Urfé/Sidney collection, likewise addressed to ‘Nederlandsche Jonckvrouwen’—likening them to ‘levende tulpen van onze Nederlandschen tuin’—was similarly intended to portray all three fictional women as ‘rechte voorbeelden van uwe egen volmaecktheden’ (\textit{Eudoxe, Diana, Parthenia}, sig. A2-A2). The Parthenia narrative only recounts the wooing and winning of her by Argalus in book I and not her self-sacrifice in battle after learning of Argalus’s death in book III. For a brief discussion of the Sidney translations, see R. W. Zandvoort, ‘Johan van Heemskerck als vertaler en navolger van Sidney’, \textit{NTg} 37 (1943), pp. 17-24.
Stella, and Sidney’s rakish Pamphilus addresses the faithlessness and betrayal of male and female lovers who devote themselves to the fulfilment of their sexual desires rather than respecting the earnestness of their besmitten admirers. He warns his virtuous readers of the deceptiveness of passion, the differences between a trustworthy lover and a rogue, the harmfulness of a jealous and scorned partner, and the importance of reason and loyalty in matters of the heart.20 As a young man, van Heemskerck was well aware of the insatiable curiosity that his educated, urbane readers brought to romantic narratives, and he took pains to restrain them from enervation by an overabundance of desire. While working on his adaptations of d’Urfé and Sidney, he conceived of his own Arcadian romance, the BA, as a way to balance the flirtatious conversations and poetry of his young protagonists – the ‘minne-praetjes’ that he well knew his burgher audience had come to expect from him—with the education of those same youths in loftier subjects such as history and moral philosophy that they would need for leading the new republic.21

Zesen was equally enthralled with matters of the heart in his early translations of French novels, and like van Heemskerck, he was especially eager to represent the various emotions engendered by romantic love. He developed the AR during a period of feverish activity after arriving in the Netherlands in 1642 when he was busily occupied with translating French courtly novels by Vital d’Audiguier, Madeleine de Scudéry (whom Zesen believed was a man), and François du Soucy, Sieur de Gerzan.22 His first translation of d’Audiguier’s widely admired Histoire tragique-comique de nostre temps sous les noms de Lysandre et de Caliste appeared under his pseudonym ‘Ritterhold von Blauen’, i.e. ‘Philipp (‘lover of horses’) von Zesen (Caesius [blue])’ at Elsevier in 1644 in Amsterdam and shortly thereafter in Leiden (1644), and was reprinted three more times until the early eighteenth century. In 1645, his translation of Scudéry’s Ibrahim ou l’Illustre Bassa was published, also by Elsevier, followed quickly by the AR. In the prefatory remarks to these first two translations, Zesen engaged critically with the tradition of the early seventeenth-century French novel, choosing selectively which elements to retain or discard in his own efforts to surpass his French models in the AR. In his preface to the Liebes-beschreibung Lysanders und Kalisten, which he addressed to his beloved Rosemund, his Muse for both translations and his semi-autobiographical AR, he confesses that the story of Lysander and Kaliste appealed because of its popularity—a significant incentive for his publisher—but more importantly because it was situated in the near contemporary France of the late Henri IV. This story of the passion of the talented courtier Lysander for the ravishingly beautiful but married Kaliste unfolded against the backdrop of the religious controversies in France of the late sixteenth

20 Van Heemskerck once again addresses his preface to ‘Nederlantsche jonckvrouwen’, the same ‘soeterties’ of his earlier translations—‘een name die u mijns oordeels, boven al wat soet geheeten wort met volkomen recht toekomt’—and reminds them of the importance of constancy, both for their male lovers and themselves (Hylas, Stella, Pamphilus, sig. A2-A2v).


22 For a brief discussion of these translations, see v. Ingen, Philipp von Zesen in seiner Zeit, pp. 76-87, and Florian Gelzer, ‘Der Einfluss der französischen Romanpraxis des 17. Jahrhunderts auf die Romane Philipp von Zesens’ in Philipp von Zesen: Wissen, Sprache, Literatur, ed. Maximilian Bergengruen and Dieter Martin (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 2008), pp. 119-39, esp., 124-31. Zesen’s confusion about the gender of Scudéry most likely arose from his reading of the royal privilege granting permission to her brother ‘le sieur de Scudéry’ for the work to be published, [Madeleine de Scudéry], Ibrahim ou l’Illustre Bassa (Paris: Antoine de Sommaville, 1641), sig. oijv. His translation of Sieur de Gerzan’s Sophonisbe did not appear until 1647, two years after the AR, though most likely begun earlier.
century, a circumstance well familiar to Zesen as a refugee from the continual conflicts in the German Empire. The historicity of the novel was especially important for him, and he adduced factual details and documentary evidence to support the verity of the narrative lest his translation be criticized for its fanciful relationship to the truth (‘lügenhaftig’). He may have been further attracted by d’Audiugiers’s exploration of the emotional quandary besetting his lovers because of Kaliste’s loyalty to her husband, a conceit that serves to prolong and heighten the sexual tension between them. Constrained passion would similarly bind the actions of the protagonists in his AR, ultimately leading to an unfortunate outcome, but here Vital/Zesen effects a morally acceptable conclusion by bringing about the long-delayed union of the lovers after the unexpected death of Kaliste’s husband.

Zesen further explores the representation of love in the seventeenth-century French novel in the preface to his second published translation, Madeleine de Scudéry’s *Ibrahim ou l’Illustre Bassa*, which was first published in Paris just a few years earlier in 1641. The work included an introductory essay attributed to Madeleine’s brother George in which he explicates the connection between the contemporary novel and Greco-Roman epic, the manner in which plot elements should be arranged, and the importance of verisimilitude in overcoming the weaknesses of Greek novels, chiefly Heliodorus’s *Aithiopika*, and the chivalric narratives of the *Amadis de Gaul*, to which many seventeenth-century French novels were indebted. Zesen dispenses with translating George’s theoretical preface and instead supplies his own programmatic dedicatory letter, an apologia addressed to Germania, the guardian of the German language (‘Schutzräde. An die unüberwändlichste Deutschinne’). He excuses himself for borrowing from a French work when he could have produced a novel himself, but he argues that the Germans, who are adept in so many scholarly fields already, still lack knowledge about love and amatory language. The current war afflicting the German Empire has stoked the Germans’ natural strengths in military matters, but romance has been necessarily subordinated to more pressing religious and political concerns. As he has learned from the French, however, manliness may be manifested through gallantry towards ladies as well as through violent conflict (‘nicht weniger tapfer und mänlich als der Degen’ [‘not less valiant and manly than the sword’]). Writing about love, moreover, will heighten the expressiveness and reputation of literary German, and will also, as Martin Opitz stated in his *Buch von der deutschen Poeterey*, serve as an exercise to sharpen the wits of both the poet and his readers.

The notion of love as a whetstone, as a training mechanism to prepare young men and women for polite society and the rituals of decorous courtship, had been adopted by an anonymous translator, possibly van Heemskerck, a few years earlier in his *Toet-steen der liefde* (1638) in which the story of Célidée and her persistent admirers Thamire and Calidon (L’Astrée, part II,

---


book 11) was recounted. Zesen was an ardent admirer of L’Astrée—he borrows from it without attribution in his AR—and he may well have known of van Heemskerck’s adaptations from that work, as well as the German translations which appeared between 1619 and 1635. He ranks Scudéry’s Ibrahim alongside L’Astrée as the most accomplished French novel of the time, and especially values its inventive representation of the language of love in which Scudéry surpasses the Greek romance. Zesen appreciates his avoidance of the improbable plot devices of earlier French novels and of the excessively ornate descriptions and apostrophes of the female body whose blatant erotic metaphors might embarrass his often unmarried women readers. Rather, Scudéry’s careful delineation of proper modes of behavior for characters of the various estates from the aristocracy to the commoner particularly impressed Zesen, and he populates his AR with similar characterizations drawn from the contemporary world.

Both van Heemskerck and Zesen worked to ensure that the discourse of love did not exceed the bounds of decorum. They appealed to the interest that their readers brought to artful declarations of love and the flirtatious banter of burghers searching for a sexual tryst or marital partner. But having mastered amatory discourse through translation, they represented the romantic exchanges in the BA and AR as entertaining frivolities that must be overcome in order for the young, mostly male lovers to assume a social identity that accords with their religious, civic, and personal obligations. As will be seen, van Heemskerck’s youthful travelers are enjoined to dispense with their amorous games and acquire practical knowledge about themselves as the Dutch elite by learning about their nation’s illustrious past, and the legal and political challenges confronting the new republic. Similarly, despite the intensity of his passion for Rosemund, the Protestant Markhold is constrained to suppress his love and ultimately renounce their relationship when her father demands his conversion to Catholicism as a condition of marriage. In remaining loyal to his evangelical beliefs, Markhold manifests the discipline, integrity, loyalty, and courage that have defined Germans as a people since Roman times. Having enlivened the vernacular with wit and verve through their translations, van Heemskerck and Zesen would reveal in their original writings the superficiality of accomplished galanterie and subordinate the discourse of love to the higher moral imperatives of their still emerging nations.

---

26 Toet-steen der liefde, verthoont in de historie van Celidea, Thamire ende Calidon, over-gheset, wt de onwaerdeerlijcke Astrea (Amsterdam, Jacob Kintz, 1636). Smit (Heemskerck, pp. 162-63; 166-69) echoes the earlier attribution of Toet-steen to van Heemskerck by the bookseller R. W. P. de Vries without further explanation: de Vries, Nederlandsche letterkunde, populaire prozaschrijvers der XVIIe en XVIIIe eeuw (Amsterdam, 1907), p. 21. The language of the dedicatory letter to ‘ioffr. T. N.T.’ recalls sentiments expressed in van Heemskerck’s other d’Urfé translations from the mid-1630s and advises his dedicatee to manage the vicissitudes of love by imitating Célidée’s constancy.


29 Ibrahim, p. 10: ‘Hier fündet ein Wält-weiser/ was er sucht; hier schauet ein Frauen-zimmer/ was in seinem Krahm dienet; hier sihet ein Höhfling/ wie er bey großen Herren und den Frauen-bildern höhflen sol; hier lärnet ein-ieder/ wie er sich in seinem Glückke verhalten sol’.

---
Love and the Nation

The BA was published anonymously in 1637—the author’s name did not appear until the third edition of 1657—and the tentativeness of the title, an *Inleydinghe tot het ontwerp* (‘Introduction to the Description’) suggested that the work was rushed into print at the instigation of van Heemskerck’s anxious friends before the book was fully complete. This slim volume quickly sold out, but a second greatly expanded version appeared in 1647, two years after the publication of the AR. Much of what we know today from the later editions of the BA beyond the identity of the author may have been unfamiliar to Zesen. But if Zesen did indeed have access to the BA, as the many small parallels between the BA and AR indicate, or to van Heemskerck’s translations of d’Urfé and Sidney published in 1635-1638, he would have known that the same writer had penned them all. The prefaces to the BA and the two translation collections are signed with van Heemskerck’s distinctive motto ‘veniam pro laude’, a plea for indulgence rather than praise. Even if Zesen was unaware of the author’s identity behind the signature, van Heemskerck’s fresh approach to romance and history in the BA, and his attempt to provide a more edifying alternative to the discourses of love in contemporary French and English novels would have especially appealed to the aspiring German writer.

Zesen shared van Heemskerck’s desire to alter the form of French romances by embedding moral instruction within the love story. In the preface to the AR, addressed to the judicious reader (‘dem vernünftigen Leser’), he voices his concern that the amorous narratives that had been produced in Spain, Italy, and France, have made such inroads in the German Empire that unless an alternative is offered, German readers will fall prey to their seductive charms. German translations of works such as the French romances that Zesen himself produced in the 1640s should not discourage German attempts to create original works in their own language to counteract the weaknesses of those foreign narratives. German authors need to preserve their readers from the absence of ‘vim and vigor’ (‘weder kraft noch saft’) in the foreign romances that for the most part consist of ‘diffuse and rambling babble’ (‘ein weitschweifiges, unabgemässenes geplauder’) that is excessively ‘lustful and effete’ (‘alzu geil und alzu weichlich’). In contrast, Germans should embrace chaste tales of love intermixed with a ‘pleasant gravity’ (‘lihblich[e] ernsthaftigkeit’) so that they will not be tempted to deviate from their innate virtuousness and moral well-being.

Given these intentions, it is not surprising that Zesen would be drawn to van Heemskerck’s critique of the French courtly romance. He may also have been attracted to van Heemskerck’s ironic representation of Reynhert, his overheated male protagonist whose outbursts of undying love are repeatedly undercut by his more sensible companions, and the historical digressions van Heemskerck introduces. The poet Reynhert repeatedly attempts through lengthy declarations of his affections and exceedingly courteous behaviour to capture the attention of his beloved

---

30 ‘nam veniam pro laude peto, laudatus abunde/Non fastiditus si tibi lector ero’ (‘I seek your goodwill instead of praise/I will be praised enough, reader, if I am not snubbed by you’). Van Heemskerck is quoting Ovid, *Tristia*, I.7.31-32. The full quotation appears after his brief afterword on the challenge of translation from different languages in the 1635 edition of *Hylas, Stella, Pamphilus*, p. 288.

Rosemond. But unlike his male companions, who are content merely to play the role of gallant lovers, Reynhert is so deeply immersed in the self-indulgent world of Petrarch’s love poetry—his constant vade mecum—and his own Petrarchian verses that the others laugh and tease him because of his over-brimming passion. Even the narrator mocks his clumsy attempt to write love poetry in the sand while oblivious to the rising tide, or his jealousy of the crab that has been so skilfully dismembered by the fingers of his beloved. The reasonable and tolerant Rosemond is the perfect foil for her fervid admirer whose advances she appreciates but does not necessarily welcome. Her affections lie not with the melancholic Reynhert but with the handsome, fun-loving joker Diederick. Though Rosemond is disturbed by Diederick’s excessive exuberance during the day-trip, and rewards loyal Reynhert with a brief kiss for his courteous devotion, the incompatibility between his passion and her polite, decorous behaviour hints at the unlikelihood of any sustained romantic relationship and their unsuitability as marital partners.

Van Heemskerck’s ironic approach toward the pastoral romance is reflected further by the male characters’ insouciant adoption of its traditions. The young gentlemen speak variously of their affection for the ladies, calling each other ‘shepherd’ and ‘shepherdess’, and they compose amatory verses, interspersed through the prose, reminding them of the fleetingness of their beauty. But the two ladies to whom they are addressed, Rosemond and her even more practical friend Radegond are suspicious of the intensity with which such sentiments are expressed. They courteously respond with accusations that men are inevitably fickle and even disrespectful to women who acquiesce to their desires. Such claims are confirmed by the gentlemen’s behaviour. When not praising the beauty and the character of the two women, all the men save Reynhert are easily distracted by the opportunity to hunt rabbits in the adjacent forest, and later by two unknown beauties (so-called ‘shepherdesses’) from the Hague with whom they are eager to become better acquainted. In the eyes of Rosemond and Radegond, the men are playing at love without necessarily longing for a more permanent union. Radegond in fact complains of the shallowness of their behavior, for in the present age, women are demanding a greater role in running the household and respect and constancy from their male partners. Men should no longer expect that women will be innocently unaware of their infidelities or vulnerable to their whims, for all customs change with time (‘andere tyden, andere zeden’). In the present era,

---

32 The narrator ironically observes ‘En Reynhert, de naelde vande jonghe Ermgaerd gekregen hebbende, had nu by-naest volttoyt een langh gheschrift, als d’op-lopende Zee (al te nieugierigh om te sien wat hy schreef, eer hy ’t noch te deegh volschreven hadde) met een over-reyckende golf zijn vruchteloozen arbeydt quam uytwisschen; dies hy half ghestoort, tot weer-wraeck daer van, dese veersen wat hooger aen wel diep in ’t sant indruekte’, Inleydinghe, pp. 47-8. See p. 130 for Reynhert’s erotically charged observation of Rosemond dining.

33 Many commentators (e.g. most recently Weststeijn, Hoogstraten, p.185) have noted that van Heemskerck retains few traces of the Renaissance pastoral in his narrative beyond the young patricians’ predilection for imagining themselves as shepherds. Van Heemskerck, however, was less interested in writing a pastoral than he was in exposing the theatrical behavior of his privileged young people, the artificiality of their discourse, and the imminent need for them to cast off the trappings of flirtatious romantic play.

34 The fickleness of young men is underscored by the ease with which they alternately hunt for rabbits or new female partners. The episode of the unknown beauties from the Hague was added to the 1647 edition: Batavische Arcadia (Amsterdam: Gerrit Janssen, 1647), pp. 22-9.
amorous games must eventually yield to sobriety, self-discipline, and wisdom to ensure conjugal stability and prosperity.\textsuperscript{35}

Van Heemskerck’s inclusion of historical digressions further distances his narrative from his foreign models. Following the Greek practice of expanding a simple plot line through the addition of a seemingly unlimited number of secondary episodes, d’Urfé and Sidney primarily provided many diverse accounts of amatory relationships among the friends of their works’ main romantic couples. In contrast, van Heemskerck uses digressions to delineate the historical development of the Dutch nation, and inculcate his readers with the political and social values that they, as heirs to the new republic, must acquire. Each of the digressions serves a particular purpose: the revolt of the Batavi against Rome demonstrates the Dutch love of freedom, their martial prowess, and their inimitable courage, all qualities that were vividly on display during the Spanish Troubles, and that must be upheld today as the conflict continues. The digression on the senselessness of witch-hunting, and especially on the forced confessions extracted from those unfortunate and often bewildered men and women, teaches the avoidance of superstition and the need for carefully sifting out the truth behind criminal accusations. Premature claims on the goods of exiles or executed prisoners, or on cargo buried within the many shipwrecks scattered along the Dutch coast, may not be made without due legal process. The use of torture to force confessions from suspected criminals, a concern arising from van Heemskerck’s involvement in the notorious Amboyna case between the VOC and the English East Indian Company, should be avoided because of its unreliability, and sanctioned only in rare instances when the state’s security is at stake. Finally, the bloody civil wars of the Dutch Middle Ages concerning dynastic rivalries between Holland, Brabant, and Utrecht, and the senseless conflict between the Hooks and Cods, replete with a series of frequent betrayals confusing to all parties involved, serve as a warning of the changing whims of rulers and the fragility of all political unions. The lessons from all of these episodes should be known to every Dutch citizen—from the cradle onwards, van Heemskerck adds—for they exemplify who the Dutch have been and are today, and the values they should espouse to maintain their current prosperity long into the future: love of freedom, courage, fairness, tolerance, prudence, and a fierce commitment, if necessary, to destroy the country rather than witness its loss to any enemy.\textsuperscript{36}

Van Heemskerck’s tempered account of the romance between Reynhert and Rosemond, and his inclusion of several historical digressions provided an exemplum of the edifying seriousness that Zesen aimed to incorporate into the AR. Zesen in fact assumes an even more conservative

\textsuperscript{35}Van Heemskerck, \textit{Inleydinghe}, p. 34: ‘want gelyck wy te vergeefs inde Herders van onse eeuwe souden soecken de voorgaende Hollandtsche oprechtigheyt, so moet ghy oock wel weten dat ghy in ons niet meer sult vinden de oude onnooselheyt: ’t zijn andere tyden andere zeden, en u bedroch-plegen heeft ons geleert ons selven voor ’t bedroch te wachten’.

\textsuperscript{36}The patriotic Waermond, a zealous student of Dutch antiquity, reminds his companions that their future children must learn about ‘de Vaderlandsche Vryheid…vande wiegh aen, als in haer pap te eten, en in haer pijkkan te drinken’; traditional children’s tales should be replaced with narratives about the shaping of the new nation: ‘[e]n Moeders, en Minnens, mosten ’t haere Queekelingen, in plaetse vande souteloose sproockjes, van ’t Root-kousje, van ’t Smeer-bolletje, van Singhende springende Lovertjes, en diergelijke, sonder op-houden vertellen, en in-scherpen, om die teere gemoeeden’, \textit{Inleydinghe}, pp. 125-26. Radegond’s uncle Eerrijck later explains the obligations awaiting the young aristocrats as future leaders: ‘wanneer ’t u beurt werdt de goede handt aen ’t Roer vande Vaderlantsche bestieringhe te helpen houden, dat ghy dan niet alleen de verkreghene vryheydt volstandelijck handt-haeft, maer oock, terwijl ghy de macht daer toe hebt, alle d’ongevallige overblijfselen der voorleden verdruckinge, vande halsen der vrye ingesetenen uwer Landen wijselijck af-werpt’, \textit{Inleydinghe}, p. 182.
posture toward his lovers than van Heemskerck. Reynhert and his friends are so self-absorbed in their own emotional lives, or in their quest for pleasurable diversions, that they need to be reminded on several occasions of the continuing threat from Spain and the emerging economic challenge to Dutch prosperity from England. Zesen’s lovers require no such reminders. As befits two characters living in self-imposed exile in Amsterdam because of the marauding armies traversing the German Empire, Markhold and Rosemund possess a heightened awareness of the external constraints to their happiness. Their romance unfolds against the background of a war that has forced many of their contemporaries into protracted separations, and heightened their anxiety about their faithfulness to each other. This perpetual state of uncertainty is intensified by Zesen’s casting of their relationship as a religious conflict between the Lutheran Markhold and the Catholic Rosemund whose allegiance to their faith and the wishes of Rosemund’s father that their children be raised Catholic makes the realization of marital happiness impossible. The Thirty Years War has driven them to the relative safety of Amsterdam, but their religious differences mirror the continued intractability of the conflicts that ravish the Empire.

The earnestness with which Zesen presents the Markhold–Rosemund relationship differs markedly from van Heemskerck’s erotically charged descriptions of the physical attributes and elaborate gowns of his patrician ladies.37 The corporeality of Zesen’s lovers is virtually non-existent. They are rarely in the same place, choose to endure long absences from each other, and when together in the same room, they maintain a respectful distance from the other. Although Markhold was thunderstruck with Rosemund’s beauty upon their first meeting and quite literally stumbled over his words, his subsequent declarations of affection are much more reserved; he speaks more of her virtue than of her beauty and is unable to express the presumably deep affection he holds for her in his correspondence.

Markhold’s decorum is linked to his moral exemplarity as a German; Rosemund’s customary reserve reflects the self-abnegation of a pious Catholic. Both are exceedingly loyal, pious, and self-disciplined lovers, but as a woman, Rosemund is prone to distrust, melancholy, and despair, traits that are heightened because of her foreign origin as a Venetian surrounded by the stormy and ever changeable Adriatic.38 In contrast, Markhold possesses the ethnic superiority of the early Germans whose history he narrates at great length.39 He is valiant, loyal, and charismatic, and capable of holding the typical German weaknesses of drunkenness and sloth in check; as a German, he is also morally, intellectually, and artistically superior to other peoples. Being German is chiefly associated with being male, and the ideal German is shown to be he who disciplines himself both emotionally and sexually in order to protect himself, and, by extension,

37 E.g. Reynhert is so besmitten with passion for his beloved that he looks beyond her elegant costume, undressing her with his eyes: ‘vanden hals glee sijn gesicht langs de Marmer-gelijke borst tot op den schoonen boesem, die met een nydighe neusdoek overdecydijck die met een nydighe neusdoek overdekt zijnde, verschool twee wonderijes, waer ’t aenghenaemstte van alle aenghenaemheyt niet by halen en mocht, en doch niet soo geheel, of dat somtijds door een swellende beweginghe een weynigh gapende, een keurigh oogh niet al vry diep ingelaten wiert, om door de vlugge nadruck van een heftige inbeeldinghe, d’overige verburgentheytjes van soo volmaeckten lichaem aende graege sinnelijckheyt te vertoenen’. Inleydinghe, p. 14. In her study of seventeenth-century pastoral paintings, Alison Kettering regards the appearance of well-dressed ladies in beautifully landscaped gardens and bowers as a component of the early modern pastoral as essential as tending sheep and carrying a crook. The Dutch Arcadia: Pastoral Art and its Audience in the Golden Age (Montclair, NJ: Allanheld and Schram, 1983), pp. 72-3.

38 Zesen, Adriatische Rosemund, p. 112.

39 Ibid., pp. 241-59.
the German Empire from foreign, feminine wiles. The chaste love between Markhold and Rosemund serves as an occasion to heighten the enamoured German lover's traditional honesty, loyalty and fidelity, and to demonstrate his self-discipline in the face of this alluring Venetian beauty.

Zesen's idealization of the chaste German can help explain the peculiar circumstance that in a novel ostensibly about romantic affairs, the lovers Markhold and Rosemund spend a great deal of time away from each other. Markhold, in fact, seems particularly concerned to subject himself to the torment of being separated from his beloved Rosemund, shortly after meeting her for the first time in Amsterdam, by betaking himself to France where he does everything but hurry back to the arms of his beloved. This extensive period of separation could arguably be attributed to Zesen's predilection for Greek and Renaissance romance where the absence of the lovers frequently served to retard the action and force the erotically charged relationships of several enamoured pairs to flourish more in their memories than in reality. But there is more to Markhold's apparent diffidence than literary tropes, for, as he writes his mother upon his departure for France, his virtue can only flourish through suffering. Any suppression of the pangs of separation will considerably weaken his manhood: without risking the perils of travel, he will remain ‘effeminate and timid’ (‘weibisch und verzagt’). Though overcome with melancholy for his family and for Rosemund, Markhold must avoid any relationships that endanger his ability to display his disciplined manliness, his virtù.

The civilising of Markhold and the consolidation of his Germanness through foreign encounters is especially evident in the numerous episodes recounting his adventures in France. He spends ten months frequenting the salons of aristocratic grandes dames where he dazzles them with his charm, wit, and playful erotic lyrics in a variety of languages. He quickly emerges as a much-desired guest, and his stay abroad is prolonged by his willingness to avoid offense and reside with any of the great ladies for as long as they wish. Zesen takes pains to mention frequently the sorrow for Rosemund that the absent Markhold always feels, even while exchanging witticisms with these French beauties. But sexual contact with the French women, even the so-called ‘Heldinne’, who keeps Markhold a virtual prisoner on her country estate, never proceeds beyond the level of flirtatious galanterie. Through his extensive stay in France, Markhold shows himself an accomplished honnête homme, whose courteous and refined deportment distinguishes him markedly from the virtuous but rustic early Germans in his later account of German history. By his grace and wit, Markhold has ascended into the ranks of the skilled cosmopolitans whose proficiency in the transnational discourse of courtesy frees them from any of the debilitating traits of their ethnic backgrounds. With the French episodes, Zesen is able to demonstrate through Markhold that the Germans have at last arrived in the ‘civilised’ fora of aristocratic Europe without imperilling their innate moral superiority.

In following van Heemskerck’s ambition to overcome the frivolity of translated French novels, Zesen composed a romantic narrative that surpassed his Dutch model in sobriety and urgency. Van Heemskerck’s patrician youths enjoyed idyllic lives in which they could indulge in their passions for travel, hunting, and romance; the narrative serves as a reminder about the fragility of the current Republic, the sacrifices that were made on its behalf, and the responsibilities that await the coming generation to defend its political and economic strength.

40 ‘Es mus ihm Se und wind kein schräkkjen jagen ein/ wo anders sein gemüht und härz wül tapfer sein/ nicht weibisch und verzahgt’, ibid., p. 41.
In contrast, Zesen’s novel evinces an anxiety about the future of an empire in which Christians have been battling for political and military advantage for almost three decades. Zesen came of age during an era of near perpetual war from which he has fled as an exile to the relative tolerance of the Netherlands, longing to return home but uncertain when the journey might be possible. Markhold represents the new cosmopolitan German, true to the innate virtues of his people, proud of the Germans’ intellectual achievements and martial prowess—a trait which has, unfortunately, intensified the severity of the military conflict—and an ardent defender of morality and chastity. He has little occasion for the carefree amorous rituals of van Heemskerck’s ‘shepherds’, for Markhold is constantly aware of the peril besetting his homeland, and the need to preserve the Empire for the future. Rosemund and her father’s extensive history of Venice establish that economic entrepôt and its fair-minded government as an idealized southern European analogue to the equally idealized sound administration of Zesen’s Amsterdam. Germans may have lost their way through the collapse of legal and political processes in many corners of the Empire, but they can learn through the examples of Venice and Amsterdam how to imagine the reconstruction of their cities and principalities, reaffirm their innate Germanic virtuousness, and revivify their culture after the conflict ends.

In adapting the amatory discourse of d’Urfé and Sidney, van Heemskerck crafted a uniquely Dutch educational program for future generations: knowledge of the past and the ability to interpret it wisely; a commitment to rational political, social, and economic practices; self-discipline and the ability to administer others for the common good, and the civility and decorum appropriate for a wise, cosmopolitan leader. Building on van Heemskerck’s revision of French romances, and especially of the pastoral world of d’Urfé, Zesen improves upon both his French and Dutch models in fashioning a narrative of German ethnic, moral, and literary superiority. His novel delineates the complex process in which German intellectuals learned to control their own anxiety about being Germans by redirecting this energy into the creation of the image of an ethnically pure, virtuous, and self-disciplined German male, capable of negotiating between personal inclination and the future well-being of his homeland. As early modern Germania lay ravaged by internal religious dissent, political friction between its territories, and ongoing foreign intervention in its local affairs, Zesen crafted a utopian cosmopolitan German, equally at home in Paris or Amsterdam, upon which later generations could build in their attempt to transform that image into social and political reality.

41 Zesen generally presents the Dutch favorably except for occasional references to their greediness and excessive love of profit; ibid., p. 273.
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