

University of Cincinnati

Date: 3/31/2014

I, Katherine H Paul , hereby submit this original work as part of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts in Germanic Languages & Literature.

It is entitled:

Engendered Portrayals of Women in Grimmelshausen's Courasche and Brecht's Mutter Courage und ihre Kinder

Student's name: Katherine H Paul

This work and its defense approved by:

Committee chair: Tanja Nusser, Ph.D.

Committee member: Richard Schade, Ph.D.



10382

Engendered Portrayals of Women in Grimmelshausen's *Courasche* and Brecht's
Mutter Courage und ihre Kinder

A thesis submitted to the
Graduate School
of the University of Cincinnati
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

in the Department of German Studies
of the College of Arts and Sciences

by

Katherine H. Paul

B.A. Northern Kentucky University

April 2014

Committee Chair: Dr. Tanja Nusser, Ph.D.

Abstract

Hans Jakob Christofell von Grimmelshausen personifies the unstable atmosphere of the Thirty Years War as the character Courasche, a chaotic, cross dressing woman, who, through multiple marriages and a “take no prisoners” attitude, traverses the physical landscape and social hierarchy of the war. Part of a trilogy of works, Courasche’s impetus for this autobiography is a slanderous description of her after her involvement with Simplicissimus. His accusations of her morally bankrupt existence, made in the first book of the trilogy, are not countered, rather accepted. By bending her gender and challenging the stereotypical gender roles of the seventeenth Century, Courasche’s untamed and destructive nature is a personification of the war and a critique of women’s lack of a stable place in society and lack of representative voice.

Nearly three hundred years later, Bertolt Brecht adapts the character of Courasche, transforming her into a mother of three and the personification of Capitalism as the character Mutter Courage. This is a transformation not only of genre, from prose to drama, but a change in narrative perspective, from a first person perspective to a third person perspective, creating a voice for women. Through this critique of Capitalism, Brecht connects the issues of the early twentieth century to those in the seventeenth century, pointing out congruent historical patterns and social circumstances. A closer look at these texts will highlight their similarities of perspective and differences in agenda, both working from the angle of gender dynamics and the Thirty Years War.

©Katherine H Paul 2014

Acknowledgements

I would like to extend my gratitude to everyone who has helped me throughout the completion of this project. First and foremost I would like to thank Dr. Tanja Nusser, my committee chair and advisor, for her unwavering confidence in my project and her attention to detail, without which this project would not have ever reached completion. I would like to thank Dr. Richard E. Schade for acting as the second member of my committee and for the bequest of his incredibly vast knowledge and expertise of the topic. I would like to thank Dr. Sigrun Haude for working so closely with me on the historical background of this piece, without which I would have been lost. Thank you to the members of the German Studies faculty for their support and insights, as well as my fellow graduate students for their continued understanding and support. Thank you to former German professors, specifically Dr. Carol Anne Costabile-Heming, without whom I would not be in graduate school. Without the love and support of my family and friends, I might not have survived the writing process. I would like to thank especially Benjamin Metz for keeping me on track and supporting me emotionally, even from halfway around the world. Thank you for reminding me to take breaks and enjoy my work.

List of Illustrations

1. Illustration1—Courasche Frontispiece	17
---	----

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	ii
Acknowledgements.....	iv
List of Illustrations.....	v
Introduction.....	1
Courasche as Grimmelshausen Intended Her To Be.....	15
Brecht's Courage.....	32
Conclusion.....	46
Bibliography.....	49

Introduction

Showtime, a premium cable network in the United States under the umbrella of *CBS*, aired Jenji Kohan's *Weeds* for the first time in the summer of 2005. The series follows the life of a housewife whose husband suddenly died, leaving her jobless, with two children, and a lifestyle that is only maintained with a six-figure income. Nancy Botwin, the main character and protagonist,¹ resorts to selling weed in her high-income, cookie-cutter, suburban town of Agrestic to "keep up with the Jones's." The show echoes thematic elements, such as the constellation of the family unit, women's gender roles, and a chaotic protagonist, found in Bertolt Brecht's play *Mutter Courage und ihre Kinder*, including many characteristics associated with the character Mutter Courage as well as Grimmelshausen's Courasche. The show often addresses touchy American social issues such as abortion, assisted suicide and illegal immigration, as well as obviously exposing the frequency of recreational drug use in the United States and its connection to the illegal importation of product from Mexico. Kohan's objective is to expose the many negative aspects of modern American society, while calling into question moral and social issues of gender, such as mothering and child birthing. Modern adaptations of the text have developed the characters and themes from the seventeenth century piece, embedding them in their own time and social atmosphere. Günter Grass is said to have taken Courage to another level, reinterpreting the character, as well as Grimmelshausen as an author, in his own works, thus it is not entirely untrue that *Weeds* can be seen as the post-modern

¹Nancy is the main character of this piece, but it is arguable whether or not her role is considered that of a protagonist. As the show develops her intentions and actions prove her to be a sort of anti-heroine, often subjecting her family to trouble because of her dirty dealings.

²The Defenestration of Prague (1618) happened on May 23 during a summit of Protestant and 1

interpretation of this character. *Weeds*'s Nancy Botwin roams chaotically through life, dragging her family and their close friends along with her, just as Brecht's Mutter Courage drags her children through the war often allowing them to get involved, while leaving unresolved situations, enemies and dead husbands in her wake, just as Grimmelshausen's Courasche leaves her own dead husbands and unresolved plundering behind her, in essence keeping the story and the character alive into the twenty-first century.

Weeds not only creates in Nancy Botwin a character with similar characterization to Courage, but also the show approaches the United States from a contemporary perspective, critiquing the socio-political atmosphere of American society. By addressing the issues common in modern American life, *Weeds*, like both Grimmelshausen and Brecht, uses the figure of a woman to personify and allegorize the issues of a time period, embedding not only questions of gender but also questions of economy in the social landscape of their respective contemporary societies, plagued with war. Grimmelshausen critiques gender stereotypes within the context of war, personifying the chaos of war with Courasche, a woman constantly transgressing the borders of gender stereotypes as well as challenging the social hierarchy. Brecht personifies Capitalism in the character of Courage, who bumbles through the war, making a living from it, exposing moral and ethical issues reflected in capitalistic economic growth.

Capitalism and economic social climbing, gender stereotypes and war, portrayed as social and ethical wars in the show, are all common themes which create a modern day platform for the thematic scheme of Hans Jakob Christoph von Grimmelshausen's *Die Landstürzlerin und Ertzbetrügerin Courasche* and Bertolt Brecht's *Mutter Courage und ihre Kinder*. Each author

embeds their critique, whether it is of gender stereotypes or Capitalist economic plots, in the setting of war. This chaotic setting brings survival into question because of dwindling resources and inherent social disturbances, whether created by changing figurative borders such as social hierarchy, or created by physical borders because of shifting political alliances. War is really a question of how these boundaries, figurative or physical, are challenged and how they function within all echelons of society.

In order to understand the common themes and issues within these two works, both embedded in their own historical times and social-cultural structures, whether overtly or implicitly, it is important to have a closer look at the background of the time period of the Thirty Years War.

The Thirty Years War of Religion....is that all?

The Thirty Years War, which took place from 1618 to 1648, was a consequence of the growing tension coursing through the bureaucratic and hierarchical structure of the late middle ages. The Peace of Augsburg (1555) had solved former tensions between emerging religious groups and conflicts between reigning bodies' elected religious affiliation, but only resolved some of the issues, leaving many more issues hanging in the balance. Although this decree solved short-term problems, the inevitability of future problems remained present. The war was the result of residual religious and social issues left unresolved within the ever expanding, constantly changing social and political landscape within the Holy Roman Empire. It is still considered one of the bloodiest wars to be fought in Europe throughout all of history. The

atmosphere of the war, starting with the violent actions of the Defenestration of Prague (1618)², created the feeling of a predestined longevity and violence. Because of the gravity of the issue of religion and its deep-seated grip on social conventions, a brutally arduous fight was sure to ensue. In his book *The Struggle for Stability in Early Modern Europe*, Theodore Rabb states, that “none of the wars of the previous centuries had been so persistent and so totally destructive of human life for so long a period and over so wide an area,” (Rabb, 121). With most of the fighting taking place in German-speaking territories and with the Holy Roman Empire being the center of much of the fighting, the agrarian societal structure was severely challenged. This hierarchical structure was a continuation of medieval feudal society, which emphasized agricultural farming and livestock herding as the main form of economic prosperity. The conditions of the war were extreme and tumultuous, often stretching the limited resources to the absolute limit. Shortage of food and extreme violence were common to everyday life. Putting up soldiers, who often had very little consideration for their hosts, was mandatory. The threat of pillaging and rape were also everyday fears. These war conditions affected huge parts of the population of Europe, this included parts of France, Italy, as well as parts of Poland, although the majority of the fighting took place in German-speaking territories, regarded today as Germany and parts of Austria.

²The Defenestration of Prague (1618) happened on May 23 during a summit of Protestant and Catholic leaders of Bohemia. This meeting was meant to resolve tensions between Protestant and Catholic based on Rudolf II's *Letter of Majesty* (1609), which allowed for Protestants to practice their religion within all lands of the Holy Roman Empire. Ferdinand, Matthias's named successor, convinced Matthias to order a cessation of all building of Protestant chapels on royal land. Thus the meeting in Prague was called and two of the four Catholic Lords Regent, admitting to their part in the ruling against Protestant groups, were thrown from the window of the third floor of the Bohemian Chancellery.

Europe was undergoing severe social and ethical changes, with much reconstructing coming from the top down, affecting the lower classes profoundly. That is, many government officials and clerical entities were in charge of changing the meaning of common social constructs, including religion and gender, including the stereotypical roles of women in and outside of the home. These changes conversely were brought on by lower classes, affecting specifically constructs in the social hierarchy of the nuclear family. This meant change higher up in social structures, which left diverging viewpoints at odds with one another, were often without a clear resolution. The structure of the political hierarchy, much of which remained the same as medieval structure, began ever so slightly to shift as trades such as printing and publishing became more and more prevalent. Although this shift meant a more informed population, the majority of the population was left to complete the field labor, while higher social “*Stände*” were left to be educated and wealthy. This was the cause of major social uprising within the mistreated and misrepresented lower class, such as the German Peasants’ War (1524), as well as the emerging middle class. Though this middle class was at its mere inception, this would later carry on to influence other major social uprisings into the 18th and 19th centuries, such as the French Revolution (1789) and the Revolution of 1848, for reasons related to social, religious and political injustices, creating deeper divisions between the social stations. The religious division that was rocking the social structure of Europe began with the growing prominence of non-Catholic religions, including Calvinism and Lutheranism.

The development of the middle class and the spread of Lutheranism were largely seen through the engagement with texts associated with the church and a more enlightened public, a

direct result of the invention of Gutenberg's printing press³. Texts became more accessible and were more widely dispersed, spreading knowledge at incredibly fast rates from one side of Europe to the other. The speed at which works were transmitted across Europe because of printing is a major contributor to the Protestant Reformation, thus directly affecting the tense atmosphere of pre-war Holy Roman Empire by adding to the tension between higher social stations and lower, uneducated classes. By personally engaging texts, members of the community could decide their affiliation for themselves. Although the printing press and acquisition of knowledge gave more power to lower societal classes, these vast changes in the social structures created a chaotic, albeit productive, atmosphere for the Early Modern period. Theodore Rabb in his book comments on these atmosphere saying, "[T]he two centuries very roughly between Reformation and Enlightenment have traditionally been the most shapeless in European history," (Rabb, vii). This shapelessness is a result of the changes of societal structures, mentioned above as that of the growing strength in the lower classes brought on by a shift toward a more enlightened population. This enlightened population, as described above, was brought on due to the shift of Protestant religions, particularly Lutheranism, emphasizing a personal connection with god and scripture, an extreme shift from the Catholic belief in a relationship with a priest who has the connection with god.

The destabilizing forces, specifically the growing unhappiness of the lower social stations and changes of power within the upper echelons of governmental structures, disrupted the hierarchical structure of the Holy Roman Empire, shaken by the Reformation, which forced

³ The spreading of information was a direct result of Gutenberg's creation of movable type, allowing for faster and easier printing, thus books were printed at a much faster rate.

many of the religious and social issues. Theodore Rabb qualifies the disruption of structures saying, “We thus have ‘crisis’ as cleanser—the broom that swept away the old and made way for the new,” (Rabb, 18). That is, retrospectively the war, while only solving the problem of religious representation and regardless of the destruction and devastation brought with the fighting, shifted social and political structures, ultimately stabilizing them once again. For example, questions of including certain religions in a predominantly Catholic social setting challenged political and religious beliefs at their very cores, forcing the recognition of other groups that needed to be included in the social structure. These groups were not going to stop growing and spreading their information, so the importance of their incorporation was imperative to the growth of the Empire. If this was seen from a purely power perspective, then incorporating these groups in a harmonious way was the only way to continue maintaining control over the lands included under the Holy Roman Empire without creating a deeper religious division, thus consolidating the power.

The growing tension between reformed groups and Catholic groups was hashed out largely within the boundary of the Holy Roman Empire, although other groups not controlled within this political structure entered the war. This meant the resolution of the war only affected the lands under the control of the Holy Roman Empire, leaving some places not under this control, including France, Sweden, and England, with similar issues to sort out on their own terms, often resulting in later wars and civil disturbances, such as those mentioned above. The resolution of the war was sealed with the Peace of Westphalia (1648), which essentially secured that each of the Imperial States could decide their religious affiliation. This also recognized Calvinism as a religion and stated that both Catholics and Protestants (Lutherans) were equal in

the eyes of the law, a major step toward a harmonious existence for the governing bodies within the Empire.

Because of the complexity of the issues being fought over during the war, the destruction was vast and “normalcy,” or a return to an everyday life that was uninterrupted by violence and destruction, would take a long time to achieve. Rabb qualifies the destruction brought on by the Thirty Years War by saying, “[d]isorder, division, and commitment were by no means absent from the 1690’s; but their menace was less than it had been in the 1630’s or 1640’s, and, most important, they were *considered* less menacing by contemporaries,” (Rabb, 4). That is, the time after the resolution of the war was still a very unsettled atmosphere, albeit much less hectic than that of wartime. Additionally, this unrest was a result of the destruction of the war as well as very slight changes in the social a political landscape of the Empire.

The question that remains is how this affected civilians living within these conditions and what their response was to the extremely difficult living conditions of the thirty years it took to come to these agreements. The perspectives that are commonly researched are that of men, clergymen, and those men that are in a position of power and influence. Although these may be the perspectives that effected change in the largest way, it is important to consider those, who until recently had no voice, but were forced to change and shift the most in order to survive: women.

The Perspective of Women

Merry E. Wiesner-Hanks’s book *Women and Gender in Early Modern Europe* explains the experiences of women in closer detail, offering deeper insights into the day-to-day life of

women, something often not addressed in past scholarship. This approach creates a new space in Early Modern Studies for women and their perspective, considering their contributions to society equal to that of men. The notion of women playing equally as important a role in the creation of history opens the discussion of women as contributors to history and what exactly their role meant during the Thirty Years War. Wiesner-Hanks states, “[s]uch questions often center on women’s physical experiences—menstruation, pregnancy, motherhood—and the ways in which women gave meaning to these experiences, and on private or domestic matters, such as friendship networks, family devotional practices, or unpaid household labor” (Women and Gender, 11). These experiences, though seemingly mundane, are the basis for familial structures, including the reproductive responsibilities, such as childbirth and motherhood, often at the center of women’s experiences.

As discussed briefly above, war creates a suspension in the expectations of general social constructions, especially with regard to gender roles. Women as care-takers of children and keepers of the home generally care for the wellbeing of their family through cooking, cleaning and general maintenance of the home, often stereotyped in literary portrayals of women, such as women as maids or caretakers. These roles have been typical of women and mothers for centuries up to the point of, and beyond, the Thirty Years War, even into the 21st century. Merry Wiesner-Hanks in her article “Women’s History and Social History: Are Structures Necessary?” discusses the social structures that surrounded women during the Early Modern period. Wiesner-Hanks discusses Alice Clark’s work, which focuses on women’s roles in working society during the 17th century, stating, “[a]s Clark noted so long ago, women were excluded or stepped back from certain areas of production, but, more importantly, their productive tasks were increasingly

defined as reproductive (as housekeeping) or as assisting (as helping out),” (Wiesner-Hanks, 5). By defining women’s work as that which is taking place inside the home, this creates, or rather cements, the gender division between men and women as far as societal production is concerned.

Wiesner-Hanks continues stating that the “division between production and reproduction was reinforced in the early modern period by parish, city and state governments,” which allowed women to perform these tasks with the understanding that they were not actual “work”, rather “support,” or caretaking of their family (Wiesner-Hanks, 6). To be more specific, women were performing these tasks because they were expected to do them, thus not rendering any other compensation for their work beside the room and board they received from their husbands. This disqualification of women’s work, a mindset that carries beyond this time period and into modern society through the First, Second and Third Waves of Feminism⁴, continues to be a norm even in today’s society. Although this division was strong during the normal everyday life, the shift in social expectations, that is the shift from living to surviving, brought on during a time of war facilitated new understandings of women’s roles as caretakers and providers within in the home, making survival a top priority.

Personal experiences from the time of the Thirty Years War highlight the importance of survival over adhering to specific gender roles. Peter Hagendorf, a soldier, describes many aspects of the war⁵, such as the fighting, living far from loved ones, and staying with strangers.

⁴ The First Wave happened during the 19th and into the early 20th century. The Second Wave began in the United States in the 1960’s and continued into the early 1980’s. The Third Wave started in the 1990’s and continues today.

⁵ Much of Hagendorf’s diary is included in the Medick and Marschke’s collection. His other accounts include descriptions of robberies, dealing with women, the everyday life of soldiers, and the destruction of Magdeburg.

He tells of his wife entering Magdeburg, after he sustained serious injuries, to procure necessary linens for his recovery (Medick and Marschke, 134). Though it was common for women to participate in raids and to steal booty simply based on the need for survival, the act Hagendorf's wife performs is that which a man would be commonly expected to do. By acting during a time when war was still raging, she places herself in imminent danger, going forth as her husband would have done had he not have been wounded, thus switching roles with him. Heroism and bravery, both generally reserved for men, are characteristics of Hagendorf's wife, crossing the strict boundary of gender dynamics. Hagendorf is appreciative of his wife's initiative although he states: "So I was more worried about my wife because of the sick child than because of my own injuries," emphasizing that her focus should be the care-taking of the children instead of caring for him. (Medick and Marschke, 134). His comments reinforce his belief that women should be at home caring for children rather than venturing into the danger of war to be valiant for the sake of men. Hagendorf's wife, an example of a woman risking herself for the sake of her family, continues providing the usual support for her family that is expected. At the same time her duties have shifted, making the definition of a good mother in times of war different than the general expectations of mothers.

Other daily fears, such as acts of violence like rape, were used against women to assert dominance. This dominance stems from social hierarchical structures, in which men were at the top. During the period of the Thirty Years War, this was a common occurrence for women, who were subjected to strikes from armies passing through stealing from them not only their food and supplies, but also their dignity through raping them and destroying their homes. That is, sexual violence often occurred as an assertion of power over women, often powerless to protect

themselves. This struggle for power and control spread into their private lives, where many women feared rape and other forms of violence against them (Medick and Marschke, 87). The account of nun Maria Anna Junius, included in Medick and Marschke's first-hand accounts of the war, describes the burning of Bamberg, when all lives were at stake. She alludes to the fear of rape saying, "[...] every hour the moment of death seemed to be upon us, which we didn't fear so much as something else," (Medick and Marshke, 87-88).⁶ Although the threat of death was ever-present, rape was sometimes a much worse consequence of staying put, depending on the circumstances. The difference between rape and death emphasizes a fear so powerful that fleeing and staying were both not an option for women, depending on their path in life, also suggesting a dependency of women on men.⁷ Women living in convents were much less dependent on men in a direct way, living within the safety of a convent, whereas women living in a household were more vulnerable to the effects of the war. Although this dependence is suggested, Junius's description of the event contradicts this notion by portraying the women with solidarity and self-assured security.

Literary Interpretations

The question then remains: how do we interpret these gender roles within the context of a literary portrayal? Grimmelshausen, a contemporary of the Thirty Years War, brings into the picture his own experiences, and develops the trilogy that is known as the *Simplician novels*. Considered a chronicling of Thirty Years War, he not only maps out the geography of Europe,

⁶ In this text, it is inserted as a footnote that Junius is alluding to the nuns' fear of rape.

but also creates the character Courasche, a women who challenges the stereotypes of Early Modern gender constructs, to point out and question the experience of women and its impact on society, especially gender constellations. Grimmelshausen's purpose for creating this character will be shown in a discussion of the portrayals of Courasche, especially focusing on her physical representations and the specific elements of her characterization. A discussion of the structure of *Trutz Simplex oder Lebensbeschreibung der Ertzbetrügerin und Landstörtzerin Courasche*, especially the elements of organization, offers a closer look at the different phases of Courasche's life and the implications of these divisions. Through a close reading of the phases of her life, gender roles and stereotypes to which she adheres will be explored in more detail.

This discussion will lead into an interpretation of Bertolt Brecht's *Mutter Courage und ihre Kinder* and a closer look at Brecht's portrayal of the character and the circumstances of her life will include an investigation of his characterization of Courage, the structure of the piece as a work of theater as well as a chronicling of her life within a specific timeframe, and what implications her characterization has on her ascribed gender roles. Through a close reading of Brecht's play, his adaptation of Mutter Courage as a platform for the critique of the social and political structure of the early twentieth century will be discussed, taking into account the agenda of Grimmelshausen's work as an exposé of stereotypical Early Modern gender roles. This will clarify the tension that exists between the two, both of which chronicle their own time period while exposing two completely different issues within their respective socio-political atmospheres. This tension, created by the perspective of the narration and the use of the

⁷ Though rape is only mentioned briefly in Junius's account of the war, this is also an important theme in *Courasche*, which I will investigate.

character, emphasizes the expansive developments in rhetoric and literary style between the two pieces.

Courasche as Grimmelshausen Intended Her To Be

Trutz Simplex oder Die Landstürzterin und Ertzbetrügerin Courasche, written in 1669, is a novel set in the time period of the Thirty Years War. The novel, written after the war had ended, is contemporaneous with the fallout of the turmoil that ensued during this period in time. Although a work of fiction, the piece offers a non-fiction perspective as Italo Michele Battarano and Hildegard Eilert explain in their book *Courage: Die starke Frau der deutschen Literatur* : “Manches von dem, was Grimmelshausen in seinen Romanen erzählt, hat er selbst erlebt oder gesehen, von anderem nur gehört, vieles hat er sich aus Chroniken und Büchern angeeignet, alles jedoch in einer eigenwilligen, packenden Prosa vereint,” (Starke Frau, Battarano, 13). This perspective is imperative to the understanding of the characterization of Courasche. The conglomerations of the perspective make this work pivotal as a gateway text to actual experiences of the Thirty Year War. Grimmelshausen takes his own perspective, that of others and hearsay and combines them to create an experience to which his contemporaries could relate. Thus making *Courasche* universally acceptable not only as an authoritative text as far as experience is concerned, but also as a fictional tale that is both cathartic and memorable. Battarano and Eilert comment this piece as not only as a retelling through an inclusion of multiple perspectives, but also a chronicling of events throughout the war stating, “[k]ein anderer Autor der deutschen Literatur hat den Dreißigjährigen Krieg so eingehend tematisiert wie Grimmelshausen” (Starke Frau, Battarano, 12). As mentioned above with the experiences of Peter Hagendorf’s wife and Maria Anna Junius, these experiences are also highlighted in personal accounts of specific events during the war and are often found in journals of those serving as soldiers or those at the heart of the conflicts.

Because of the personal nature of Grimmelshausen's perspective of the war, the text becomes more tangible as a direct critique of the war. That is, its perspective becomes more an interpretation of reality and a construction of the perspective of women to emphasize a perspective that is often left unconsidered. This is problematic because the gender of the author and the person described in the work is not the same. Grimmelshausen's works come directly after a long tradition of engaged criticism of contemporary culture, often seen in works of contemporaneous authors like Andreas Gryphius. Gryphius's works, for example *Absurda Comica oder Herr Peter Squenz*, engage the absolutist structure that existed and critique the dramatic and social constellations of the time (Gryphius). Much to the same effect, Grimmelshausen critiques the facets of life that effect him directly; namely the war.

Grimmelshausen manifests his perspective of the war in the three main characters of his trilogy: Simplicius Simplicissimus, Courasche, and Springinsfeld, choosing to focus on the perspectives of women in *Courasche*. Each piece in Grimmelshausen's trilogy contains its own separate message, though each piece works individually as well. They then offer a complete spectrum of the events of the Thirty Years War from different societal perspectives and gender perspectives. This shift in perspective, more specifically the shift from the perspective of men to that of women, creates a tension with the normal portrayal of life during the Thirty Years War, giving women a place, and more importantly a voice, during the tumult of wartime. War, a shift from typical day-to-day life with a focus on survival, forces the extremities of the human condition to be present.

To emphasize the importance of Courasche's gender identity, a discussion of the her departure from typical gender identifiers, the impetus of this behavior, and the themes and

characters surrounding her shows the intent of choosing a woman's perspective as opposed to a man's, especially during the extremities of wartime. By discussing the headings of each chapter, which summarize the actions that follow, the dimensions of narration that communicate Courasche's life are set up very distinctly by the author. They are written from Grimmelshausen's perspective rather than Courasche's, accentuating her portrayal through differences in narrative voice. This point is made clearer when looking at the narrative techniques of Grimmelshausen, including writing both from a first-person and a third-person perspective. These narrative techniques, with regard to Courasche's characterization, carry immense weight when looking at the implications of her constructed gender identity because of the difference in biological gender between the author and the character, both of which are performing a gender at one time or another. The implications of cross-dressing will also be discussed with regard to the importance of gender roles as a signifier of stereotypical constructs of society, particularly the role of women.

Structure and Form

From the very cover of the work, readers are given a sense of what to expect from the novel that follows. With words like "Ertzbetrügerin" and "Landstürzerin," Courasche is set up to carry a bad connotation, which, as readers continue through the work, is true to her character and portrayed identity. Although these words leave a certain picture in the minds of readers, it is the depiction on the first pages that sets readers up with a concrete image of Courasche.



Illustration 1 The frontispiece⁸ precedes the novel.

Although very realistic, the frontispiece, the only physical depiction of Courasche readers see, illustrates from today's standpoint a cartoon-like version of Courasche, leaving the interpretation of her actual existence open for debate. Siegfried Streller states that she, "ist die trotzige Verkörperung der Sünde, die sich weigert, irgend etwas zu bereuen, [...] Verführung zur Welt- und Sinnenfreude, die babylonische Hure, worauf auch mit ihrem Lebensalter angespielt wird" (Streller, 67). This becomes an important point, when a comparison of her existence is made to that of the actual gender stereotypes she embodies. Richard E. Schade compares the rendering of Courasche in this frontispiece to depictions of women in similar literary traditions, stating that it "corresponds in style and detail to 17th-century illustrations of gypsies," as well as "leads to a description of the heroine's persona in terms of gypsy, mule and *acedia* (Trägheit)" (Schade,

⁸ Courasche frontispiece. www.landesbibliothek-coburg.de/geschichte_17_jh.htm

75).⁹ Schade points out that Courasche's depiction in this etching corresponds neither to her description in *Springinsfeld*, nor to the description she herself gives. Springinsfeld describes her as "Dame von Babylon," where her self-description is one of accepting how others must perceive her and resolved to the fact that her allure and tempting nature is not unwanted, although generally seen in a negative context (Springinsfeld, 26-29). Though the frontispiece is very important to the interpretation of Courasche's portrayal, because it gives the first impression after the title, already portraying her in a certain way, it is the text, told from multiple perspectives, that does the bulk of describing Courasche.

Structured Chaos

Courasche, the personification of war, is a chaotic woman in constant motion and transition, transgressing the borders of social hierarchy and gender stereotypes. This is reflected through the narrative structure, a tension common in all of Grimmelshausen's *Simplician Novels*¹⁰. The work, written mainly from the first person perspective, has many layers of narration working at the same time. These layers create different perspectives, each offering important insights and creating a somewhat panoramic view of Courasche's life. The point is to hear the true story of her life, yet it is difficult to decipher Grimmelshausen's meaning of embedding this text in such a strong foundation, the story of *Simplicissimus* having already preceded Courasche's life's story,

⁹Sloth, or idleness, is the translation for this term and is to be thought of in a religious sense, or as one of the Seven Deadly Sins.

¹⁰ The *Simplician Novels* are considered: *Simplicissimus*, *Courasche* and *Springinsfeld* because they are within the same time frame and carry over elements of *Simplicissimus*.

and his inclusion of multiple narrative perspectives. The foundation of the story, the Thirty Years War creates a chaotic background for Courasche to exist in and combat.

In order to fully appreciate the portrayals of Courasche within Grimmelshausen's work, it is first necessary to understand the many perspectives from which Courasche's story is told. The first perspective, the perspective of Courasche, offers emotional insights, thoughts and reflections on what is taking place. Courasche's perspective, though told from a different narrative level, offers deeper understanding of the perspective of women, recounting experiences that only women have, such as finding a husband, the inability to maintain social stations without the affiliation of men, and discrimination based on stereotypical gender expectations. It is problematic for this perspective to be written by a man trying to write from a woman's perspective because of the inauthenticity of experience. That is, Grimmelshausen would never have experienced discrimination based on gender roles, for example, thus rendering his perspective skewed.

As fiction it creates a reality within which the characters live. This reality is based on the world in which the Thirty Years War took place. Though this world is based on reality and accounts of the time period are highly regarded in historical scholarship¹¹, we as readers must understand certain circumstances, such as the ability to marry seven times, as well as Courasche's survival for so long after so many difficult and extreme experiences, like taking part in combat, in this context to be also fictitious in nature (Rabb, 120).

¹¹Grimmelshausen's account of the Destruction of Magdeburg is often referred to in other historical accounts of the time period, which Rabb contextualizes with regard to the brutality of the Thirty Years War.

Included with each chapter of the text, headings, a second layer of narration, remind readers of the fictitious lens through which these accounts are told, each giving a brief summary of events to follow. Grimmelshausen's headings are a constant reminder of a constructed perspective and are carefully created so that each piece of the work benefits the overarching story told in the trilogy to which Courasche's story belongs. The headings also contribute to the perception of Courasche's character traits, particularly the first chapter heading which labels Courasche as "die alte Ertzbetrügerin / Landstürzterin und Zigeunerin *Courage*," reinforcing her identifiers given in the frontispiece and the title (Grimmelshausen, 19). By setting the scene prior to a "personal" retelling, the notion that the piece is meant to fictitiously construct the perspective of women is placed within the minds of readers, pre-constructing their interpretation of the tale.

By separating the narration of Courasche's story and a summary of what is to come, namely Grimmelshausen's chapter headings from the actual text, this places Courasche in a disadvantaged narrative perspective. That is, her words are secondary to those of Grimmelshausen's headings that frame the following story in an anticipatory way. It is also important to point out that, if Courasche's words are received as her own, then we are taking them to be true. However, if we see them for what they really are, Grimmelshausen's portrayal of a woman, then we have to understand that Courasche actually has no voice, making her identity unreliable for readers. As mentioned above, a man trying to write from the perspective of women is an untrue perspective, or a skewed perspective that can only relay certain details of experiences reserved for women. The words that she speaks are constructed carefully by Grimmelshausen and are not even her own. This point seems to be of no consequence, but when

the question of identity is called forward, it is, perhaps, the most important part of her identity as a woman because without a voice, Courasche has no self-identity, thus no existence. If it is assumed that Courasche's voice is that of Grimmelshausen's, it must also be assumed that Grimmelshausen, indeed a man, is constructing her gender identity based on pre-constructed notions of femininity.

The ensuing retelling of the events is performed from a first-person perspective, which, according to Hildegard Eilert, empowers Courasche. Eilert reinforces this notion by stating that, "durch Grimmelshausen erstmals in der deutschen Literatur die Welt aus der Sicht einer sich selbst thematisierenden Frau erzählt wird und diese Berechtigung ihrer Sichtweise mit Entschiedenheit verteidigt," (Eilert, 167). Not only does Eilert comment explain that this first-person perspective is one of the first in the German literary tradition to be told from the perspective as a woman, but her claims of female empowerment are entirely true because of Courasche's ability to break down gender barriers, such as traversing social strata and fighting as a soldier even as a woman (Eilert, 167).

The character Courasche describes the events of her life, hoping to refute claims of her alluring and tempting nature, while only reinforcing this notion. For example, the very last sentence of the work emphasizes Courasche's self-identification as a whore by stating, "[e]r habe eines schönen Frauen-Zimmers genossen / mit dergleichen Frantzasischen Huren: oder wohl gar mit Gabel-Reüterinnen betrogen: und gar des Teuffels Schwager worden sey," (Grimmelshausen, 150). Courasche illustrates how her social station and her actions with Simplicissimus have hindered both of their reputations. Courasche's words appear with the first-person signifier, "I," and it becomes clear, based not only on the headings of each chapter, but also through

suspending belief in Courasche's reality that Grimmelshausen is simply providing a voice and context through which his character's perspective acts as a platform for describing a larger experience that actually incorporates other perspectives. By using first-person narration, Grimmelshausen makes the story tangible to the reader, giving a believable voice to women. The story is supposed to be persuasive and to challenge misrepresentations of her character as denoted by Simplicissimus, hence the need for tangibility as reinforcement for her argument. This tangibility, rather the reader's ability to relate to this character, is crucial to the understanding of her position as a woman trying to survive during the gruesome setting of war. Before discussing other implications of Courasche's survival, a discussion of Grimmelshausen's works and the context into which *Courasche* fits must be undergone.

Intertextual Implications

As noted above, Courasche's "personal" account is first mentioned in a companion work, *Der abenteuerliche Simplicissimus Teutsch*, in which Simplicissimus tells of Courasche as a harlot out to steal the hearts of men and bring ruin upon them. This is the basis for Courasche's rebuttal. Eilert points out in her discussion of Simplicissimus, that the description of the relationship between the two, Courasche and Simplicissimus, is abruptly ended (Eilert, 168-169). The first paragraph of Courasche's story begins with a thesis stating who she is and her upbringing. This part could be considered the impetus of her later actions as well as her purpose for writing her story. She states, "[w]oraus aber die gantze erbare Welt abzunehmen / daß gemininglich Gaul als Gurr: Hurn und Buben eins Gelichters: und keins umb ein Haar besser als das ander sey," (Grimmelshausen, 22). This statement underscores her wish to compare herself to

those who find themselves condescending to her, which is made clearer through her retelling of experiences. She is constantly comparing herself to others, stating that they find themselves not only in a higher social station, but that their values are much nobler than hers.

Although her intentions come from a place of revenge and refusal to accept the portrayal of her life by others, it is important to look at these more closely. The portrayal of her life as told by Simplicissimus as well as her own portrayal reinforce the necessity of Courasche's changes in gender and defiance of gender stereotypes, as women took the circumstances of war into their own hands, entering the fight either in place of their husbands and taking on their roles. By breaking through these stereotypes, women created for themselves a new place in society, one that did not just include the up-keep of the family and the maintenance of a home, but gave them the power to stand up for themselves against other societal constraints. As is the case for Courasche, she had little chance to portray herself because her words were not even her own. This is also true for Peter Hagendorf's wife, as mentioned above, whose courageous acts were retold by her husband and not her. Andreas Solbach discusses the implications of Courasche as the narrator of her story, calling into question the reliability of her position, claiming that the many different men that appear in her story are constantly creating her identity for her, though not entirely addressing the issue of her words actually being her own (Solbach, 150-151). The reliability of narrator is problematic, but when pieced apart the difference between narrative instance and authorship becomes clearer.

Courasche's Character

Another layer of complexity comes from the gender changes through which she goes in the text, the first of which from Mistress Libuschka to Janco. Ulrike Zeuch points out that, “Lebuschka alias Courasche weiß, Attribute des biologischen wie sozialen Geschlechts wirkungsvoll einzusetzen, und das Ziel zu erreichen,” meaning that from the very beginning Courasche’s self-awareness of her biological gender as a way for her to manipulate the people surrounding her is clear (Zeuch, 147). Her guardian, later her adoptive mother and former wet nurse, impressed upon her the necessity of changing her gender saying, “wann ihr eine Jungfrau bleiben wolt / so müst ihr euch scheeren lassen / und Manns-Kleider anlegen / wo nicht / so wolte ich euch keine Schnalle umb euer Ehre geben / die mir doch so hoch befohlen worden zu beobachten,” (Grimmelshausen, 24). It is clear, then, that Courasche simply has to choose this change in order to survive. Vern L. Bullough and Bonnie Bullough write in *Cross Dressing, Sex and Gender*, that the “actual change of gender was not usually any sudden inspiration but took planning, since the poor seldom had more than one set of clothes, and they had to somehow find clothes that would allow them to pass as men,” (Bullough and Bullough, 98). Courasche receives this help from her guardian, who, at the time, has the means to facilitate such a transformation with minimal effort.

Because Courasche changes gender by changing clothes, outward appearance and an adherence to specific mannerisms specific to either female or male gender identity can be interpreted as altering gender, or gender crossing without a biological change, a form of change that was not successful until the twentieth century. Bullough and Bullough argue that, “[t]hough some have argued that there was only one biological sex and that it remained theoretically

possible for females to become males, there was a real concern that the biological differences between the sexes be clearly delineated,” (Bullough and Bullough, 90). That is to say, Courasche’s cross-dressing is cause for concern that she may eventually turn into a man if she does not adhere to the ascribed characteristics of her gender. It is an act of resistance and a conscious decision to change the perception others have because Courasche not just choosing to changer her clothing and mannerisms, but also choosing to take a risk and stepping outside of the normal habit of her social station. Clothing, hairstyle and mannerisms contribute to gender and are perceived as attributes that contribute to the assumption of what biological gender of a person is. She describes the changes her guardian helps her make saying, “und als sie mir auch Hosen und Wambst angezogen / lernte sie mich weitere Schritte thun / und wie ich mich in den übrigen Geberden verhalten solte,” (Grimmelshausen, 24). She continues her description, this time taking her own portrayal as a man into her own hands saying, “darneben war ich zart / schön und Adelicher Geberden / und wer mir solches jetzt nicht glauben will / dem wolte ich wünschen / daß er mich vor 50. Jahren gesehen hätte,” (Grimmelshausen, 25). It is notably that Simplicissimus engages in his own gender bending, cross-dressing as a woman, and thus becoming the attention of the men around him. Grimmelshausen examines this issues from both the perspective of women and of men, showing that both biological genders could get away with this conscious change in their appearance.

Bullough and Bullough mention in *Cross Dressing, Sex and Gender*, “[t]here were limits on how much gender-crossing a woman could do, and everything supposedly remained right in the world if the women, after some play with role reversal, contentedly resumed their subordinated status,” (Bullough and Bullough, 90). For example, a women wearing a skirt with long flowing

hair and delicate actions is generally considered very feminine, but a woman wearing slacks, a button-down shirt and harsh mannerisms could be easily confused with a man, which is the case with Courasche. Her cross-dressing disguise becomes more difficult to maintain because of her burning love for her captain. Eventually she must confess to being a woman after being involved in combat and someone tried to grab her “courage” (Grimmelshausen, 30). She, after being found out to be a woman then returns to her ascribed feminine gender roles. Simplicissimus, found out to be a man after cross-dressing as a woman, suffers rape as a consequence of his actions. Courasche only retains her new nickname Courage and she must change back into acting like a woman.

This extreme difference in her actions then becomes somewhat of a masquerade. She begins luring men in with her body and using them to gain influence and power over officers in the army and princes, as opposed to common men of little monetary means and social influence, thus facilitating her monetary and social gains. Courasche’s ability to maintain her social status through three marriages, using her money as a way to control others and not fall down through the social strata is pertinent to her role throughout the work. Brecht later takes this need for propriety and reinterprets Courasche as a character whose sole purpose is the maintenance of economic standing. The importance of social standing is clear with the reception men have of Courasche. Her monetary holdings and social standing save her, based simply on the limited resources available during the war. Often the fight for these resources meant endangering oneself for the sake of others. These instances are included in Medick and Marschke’s *Experiencing the Thirty Years War*, as mentioned above. The autobiographical account in which Hagendorf’s wife enters the city of Bamberg to recover resources, mentioned above, emphasizes the importance of

acquiring as many resources as possible not only for survival on a banal level, such as eating and drinking, but also as leverage when bargaining and maintaining social status (Medick and Marschke, 133-134).¹² Women, such as Hagendorf's wife, transgressed the border of gender roles, entering dangerous situations in order to retrieve materials imperative to survival, or to obtain items with which to barter or trade. These switches in gender roles brought about fear that women would forget their "true," rather ascribed, gender roles and position in the constellation of the nuclear family. Bullough and Bullough comment saying, "Regardless of biology, however, gender was not immutable, and there was a real fear that too much masculine behavior might actually transform a female into a male, at least during the onset of puberty," (Bullough and Bullough, 90). Courasche dresses as a boy at a very young age, responding to the need for surviving the war, as well as climbing the social strata for monetary gain, however dangerous this switch may be. Courasche switches gender during a formative time in her life, as a young adult, when she is transitioning from a girl to a woman, making it questionable whether she actually ever returns to her biological gender role after changing so early on. Courasche recalls the instance when this switch becomes necessary, noticed by her guardian, saying, "da nun meine Kostfrau schmeckte / wo die Sach hinaus wolte / sagte sie zeitlich zu mir / Jungfrau Libuschka / wann ihr eine Jungfrau bleiben wolt / so müst ihr euch scheeren lassen / und Manns-Kleider anlegen," (Grimmelshausen, 24). Because of biological gender it is of the utmost importance to Courasche as she relates her many relationships with men, not only because her impetus for switching her gender was to remain purely a virgin, but also so that she can maintain

¹² Peter Hagendorf's personal account in Hans Medick and Benjamin Marschke, *Experiencing the Thirty Years War: A Brief History with Documents*.

a social position above the men surrounding her. Without the ability to buy their love or to seem alluring to them based on her holdings, Courasche resorts to using her body and femininity to catch their eye.

Gender Dynamics

Throughout the course of the work, Courasche's gender creates questions of the dynamics of the sexes during the war. She takes on many different roles, such as temptress, soldier, lover, and wife, as described above, even dressing as a man in order to survive the war. Although this is a significant instance in Courasche's gender performance because of its inherent transgression of gender borders, other moments contribute to the misunderstanding of the social dynamics surrounding her, such as her many marriages to men at different hierarchical levels in the army or when she joins the gypsies. For instance, in the first chapter of the work Courasche mentions bearing children stating, "dann nach dem dieser schlimme *Vocativus* mich im Saurbrunnen geschwängert *scilicet*, und hernach duch einen spöttlichen Possen von sich geschafft," implying that she has tricked Simplicissimus while at a spa in Saurbrunnen into believing that she was pregnant at one point in time, although she later is found to be incapable of conceiving and bearing children.

Women, the keepers of the home and the bearers of children, were often, as part of their marriage contracts, expected to fulfill the wifely duty of producing children. Courasche, however, never bears children and, worse, has sexual relations with men outside of wedlock. Waltraud Maierhofer in *Hexen—Huren—Heldenweiber* writes that Courasche presents herself as "sexuell freizügig" who "mithilfe zahlreicher Ehemänner dem Leben und der Zeit die besten

Seiten abgewinnt,” (Maierhofer, 56). Her sexual freedom is not only a signifier of her freedom from the constraints of stereotypical gender constructions, but also her freedom from the socially constructed necessity of a connection to a man creates her gender identity. Her many marriages, seven to be exact, offer her the stability of social standing through the acquisition of property, but her constant change in husbands means that she not only can ascend social strata but also have the social freedom to choose a husband and marry again and again. This freedom allows her to change her social status and maintain it after her husband has died. Bullough and Bullough state that, “[t]he medieval idea of masculinity having a higher status than femininity remained strongly in force in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries,” which explains why Courasche can move through the social hierarchy not only by marrying men of prominence, but also by switching her gender (Bullough and Bullough, 90). These gender constraints limited women’s ability to choose a partner as well as live without a partner, as maintaining a comfortable living was only procured through prostitution or through meager jobs within the home, generally regarded as support of the family and not compensated other than by the earnings of husband.

The Contemporary Courasche?

War, as Waltraude Maierhofer explains is an ever-present theme throughout history, saying, “Krieg ist auch eines der ältesten Themen der Literatur,” adding that, “[t]raditionell gilt Geschichtsschreibung der Geschichte der Macht und der Sieger und damit den ‚großen Männern,“ (Maierhofer, 1). It is important to consider not only the perspective of “den großen Männern,” but also the perspective of women as history progresses and the power shifts and

becomes more balanced between the two sexes. The question remains: how do these gender stereotypes carry on into modern works, which interpret women's gender during war?

Men and women alike depart from these generally stereotypical gender roles for the simple sake of survival. This departure creates a certain freedom, obvious in Grimmelshausen's character Courasche, a temptress who takes on the roles of both men and women, creating a new identity with every shifting gender role, name, and social status she creates for herself. As a transient character throughout the entirety of the work Courasche embodies chaos, and through her deconstruction of common expectations of women she demonstrates that biology is not the determiner of gender. Bertolt Brecht, the next author in the literary spectrum to directly reinterpret Courasche, creating his own version of her, uses gender for his own critique of his surroundings.

Brecht's Courage

Bertolt Brecht's *Mutter Courage und ihre Kinder*, written in 1939, tells the story of Mother Courage, a woman trying to make a living during the Thirty Years War. Throughout the play readers are introduced to her children and the circumstances surrounding her life. Brecht makes the shift from focusing on the female image, as a creature of chaos, which is, as mentioned above, the focus of Grimmelshausen's text, to that of a figure of economy, personifying Capitalism. This shift is not only important for the interpretation of the characterization of Courage as a figure in literature, but also as a criticism of war.

The World Wars and the Thirty Years War occur roughly four centuries apart from one another, creating a great difference between the perspectives of war presented in each of the pieces. This difference is created not only by the great distance between Grimmelshausen's *Courasche* and Brecht's *Mutter Courage* with regard to their publication date, but the agenda of each author. Grimmelshausen, as addressed above, critiques the circumstances of the Thirty Years War from a contemporaneous perspective, adding in his own experiences, using them as a way to connect the readers with a common thread of experience: war. Brecht, essentially using the developing economic power of Capitalism allegorically, addresses the issues of the twentieth century through the lens of the seventeenth century to ironically point out the extremely negative aspects of wartime, totalitarian governmental systems, and Capitalism. Yes, each author is addressing the issues of his respective time periods, but each uses the Thirty Years War as a time and space in which to point out issues of their present day; each is using the figure of Courasche/Courage as a means to a different end. For Grimmelshausen this is a critique of women's gender roles during wartime, while for Brecht this is a critique of Capitalism. Both use

the Thirty Years War because of its chaotic and transitional nature to point out specific issues related to gender dynamics during wartime, which makes exceptions to normal conventions associated with gender.

Each author uses a different genre to communicate his respective criticism: Brecht with drama and Grimmelshausen with prose. Brecht's *Mutter Courage und ihre Kinder*, a departure from Grimmelshausen's Simplician novels, mentioned above, does not fall within a trilogy of works, offering a more contained message. Instead Brecht uses the personification of Courage as the embodiment of capitalism and leaves out much of the characterization that is evident in Grimmelshausen's work. For example, Courage is not presented as a sexual object and is also not a participant of the war, aiding in the creation of chaos, rather a user of the war, someone who earns a living from it, and a person who is on the outside of fighting. This becomes obvious because of the lack of action in the play. That is, as opposed to Mutter Courage's gender roles and her relationships with other characters, including her children, the deaths, the battles and other expected circumstances are not explicit.

Important to the understanding of this piece's agenda is its connection with the Thirty Years War. Brecht does not use the setting of the Thirty Years War explicitly, as mentioned above, he leaves a lot of action out of the piece and focuses on the dialogue, which makes the connection of the war to the early twentieth century. His use of the Thirty Years War is to point out the structures that occur again and again historically, structures that have to shift in times of instability, such as the Thirty Years War, or during the First and Second World Wars in the early twentieth century.

Structurally Speaking

To speak about Brecht's *Mutter Courage und ihre Kinder*, we must first approach the text from the standpoint of structure. This text, a completely different genre than that of Grimmelshausen's text, offers a new interpretation of Courage's figure. Italo Michele Battarafano in *Courage: Die starke Frau der deutschen Literatur* writes,

“[d]erartige Aussagen sind in ihrer Selbstverständigkeit beinahe überflüssig, da Roman und Drama zwei per se differente literarische Formen darstellen, welche unterschiedliche Figuren und Handlungen aufweisen, die nicht beliebig von Gattung zu Gattung auswandern oder austauschbar sind,” (Battarafano, 179).

This is in reference to Claude Hill, Edgar Hein und Anna Kugli's comments, cited in Battarafano's book, on the differences between Brecht's reinterpretation of the character Courage, as opposed to Grimmelshausen's initial portrayal. Grimmelshausen's text is meant to be autobiographical, and often sounds as though it could be interpreted as Courasche's journal of the events of her life. In contrast, Brecht's play, by inherent design, is distanced from the thoughts, emotions, and monologue that Grimmelshausen's text offers. This distance, in alignment with Brecht's *Verfremdungseffekt*, creates moments in the text that force readers to disconnect from any emotional response that might be warranted. This disconnect comes directly from a change in perspective from a first person “I” to a multiple perspective format, shown through dialogues among the characters. The switch in genre from drama to prose, allows for a new portrayal of women by giving them a voice with which to communicate their experiences.

The structure of the play, one act with twelve scenes, departs from the traditional five act dramatic structure cemented by Gustav Freytag in his book *Die Technik des Dramas* (1863).

This structure, originally the departure of drama from the Aristotelian form of a play in three parts (protasis, epitasis, catastrophe), first came about with Horace's *Ars Poetica*, his advocacy for the proper structure of writing drama and poetry, in which he emphasizes the use of a five act structure that includes an exposition, rising action, climax, falling action and a resolution. Brecht's departure from these structures is in direct alignment with his study of dramatic theory and experimental style.

It then becomes more difficult to ascribe Brecht to any specific dramatic structure of his own solely based on this work because of the complicated structure. His experimentations with structure and characterization do not easily fit into standard dramatic structures, like the five act play, thus making his style a unique combination of isolationism and irony. There are small developments throughout *Mutter Courage und ihre Kinder*, with very little action of which to speak. That is, although much time passes and there is action outside of what takes place on stage, what is presented to the audience is simply dialogue between characters and the portrayal of a woman. None of the deaths and none of the fighting are witnessed on stage, which makes the dialogue a substitute for the action. The absence of these actions, a seemingly important part of Brecht's agenda, points all of the attention to what is said by Courage and her children. Because the dialogue is the main focus of the play, the setting becomes less overtly important, making the message more easily associated with the twentieth century, the time period Brecht is actually trying to critique. The two-part title, similar in form to that of *Grimmelshausen* connects two separate entities with the conjunction "und," meant to show an equal importance for both parts. *Grimmelshausen's* title *Trutz Simplex oder die Landstötzerin und Ertzbetrügerin Courasche* not only makes the connection between Courasche and Simplicissimus, pointing to

the novel's main agenda, but also describes what sort of character Courasche is. Brecht's title *Mutter Courage und ihre Kinder* connects Mutter Courage with her children, pointing out that the experiences of Mutter Courage and the experiences of her children are of equal importance. This connection is important because of the relationship Mutter Courage has to her children, one that is in constant connection.

This equality is evident in the circumstances of Courage and her children throughout the play. Courage often seems to be in an advantaged state, often in control of what her children and other characters do, but she is not any longer in control of the circumstances around her than they are of her authority over them. By trying to control the other characters, Courage only guides them to their demise. Courage's intent is never for them to die, and she tries at all cost to keep everyone alive, but because of her economic mindset, she thinks of doing what benefits her the most and not what would benefit the society around her. For example, Courage in the third scene Courage talks of her children Katrin und Schweizerkas as if there are a burden on her saying, "[i]hr bringt mich noch unter den Boden. Lieber einen Sack Flöh hüten," (Brecht, 42). This shows her disdain for having to constantly care for them, what she considers to be a strain on her economic interests.

The Character: Courage

By carrying over common elements of Grimmelshausen's text, like the war and the setting, Brecht associates his character with a known literary figure. This establishes a basis for his criticism of the early twentieth century and of the rise of Capitalism by using an allusion to give context to his character while simultaneously inserting his own ideology. He incorporates the

character of Courasche, Grimmelshausen's embodiment of his critique of gender roles and social conditions surrounding the Thirty Years War. Brecht, however, departs from the original character of Courasche, giving her a new identity entirely. The first act begins similarly to Grimmelshausen's text with a chapter heading. These chapter headings carry throughout the work, giving pertinent background information and time and location details just as Grimmelshausen has done. This contextualizes Brecht's drama not only as taking place in the Thirty Years War, but also establishes the departure from Grimmelshausen's character, explicitly stating Mutter Courage's identity in the first words of the play (Brecht, 7). Brecht does create an ambiguous background for Mutter Courage first saying her name is "Anna Fierling," but that she is "bekannt unter dem Namen Mutter Courage," (Brecht, 7). She explains what her name is and that she comes from Bamberg, but does not. Similar to Grimmelshausen's characterization of Courasche, Mutter Courage herself uses this name in the first act when she interacts with der Feldwebel and der Werber, establishing her identity through the use of her name.

By cementing her identity on her own terms, it becomes real not only to her, but to the reader as well. She explains the origin of her name in the first scene stating,

"Courage hieß ich, weil ich den Ruin gefürchtet hab, Feldwebel, und bin durch
das Geschützfeuer von Riga gefahrn mit fünfzig Brotlaib im Wagen. Sie waren
schon angeschimmelt, es war höchste Zeit, ich habe keine Wahl gehabt,"
(Brecht, 9).

This does not explain how this escape was a courageous act, rather that her main goal while in this predicament was to maintain her product to ensure the sale of it, describing her need for economic gain. Throughout the play she continues to define what courage is, also saying that

other people need courage to survive their circumstances. For example she says, “Die armen Leute brauchen Courage,” when discussing the plight of the people also saying, “[d]aß sie einen Kaiser und einen Papst dulden, das beweist eine unheimliche Courage, den die kosten ihnen das Leben,” (Brecht, 69). These statements not only make her sound irreplaceable and inevitably necessary, but also conceal a political statement on Brecht’s part. Here it is meant that people without money will always need economy, especially a free market economic situation like capitalism to sustain a life. It is later mentioned by der Feldprediger, “Wie Sie so Ihren Handel führen und immer durchkommen, das hab ich oft bewundert. Ich verstehe, daß man Sie Courage geheißen hat,” clarifying that because Courage runs such a successful business that her name is synonymous with economy and propriety (Brecht, 69).

She, at this time, also explains the ambiguous rendering of her children’s names, stating that they each have different fathers and that their names are associated with them, not with her (Brecht, 10-11). Mutter Courage is then characterized as not being directly associated with her children in an intimate way. That is, she considers her children to possess more characteristics of their fathers than her own qualities. These qualities are seen negatively in her eyes, repelling her from them. For example, she is constantly putting them down, even going so far as to say, “[s]ie haben schreckliche Eigenschaften, alle drei,” (Brecht, 16). This lack of intimacy is part of Brecht’s irony, placing the children and Mutter Courage in a symbiotic relationship, constantly depending on one another to survive, but giving them no explicitly emotional relationship.

Throughout the play, Mutter Courage’s main overt function is to engage in enterprise with the war around her. That is, she sells goods to the soldier engaged in the war, thus making her living from the war. In a conversation with Mutter Courage in the first scene, der Feldwebel says

to her, “Vorher hast du eingestanden, du lebst vom Krieg, denn wie willst du sonst leben, von was?” (Brecht, 13). Courage is always engaged in some sort of commerce or other, contradicting the circumstances of the seventeenth century. Women had very little to absolutely no involvement in commerce or trade, something that was only an option to them through the selling of their bodies. Brecht plays on this lack of involvement in economic endeavors, obviously pointing to Courage, the embodiment of capitalistic economic gain, as the contradiction to women’s actual experience during the seventeenth century. Merry Wiesner-Hanks explains in *Women and Gender in Early Modern Europe*, “Women rarely controlled enough financial resources to enter occupations which required large initial capital outlay, and social norms or outright prohibitions kept them from occupations with political functions,” (Women’s History, 5). Brecht takes these social norms of the seventeenth century and contradicts them, just as Grimmelshausen allows Courasche to earn money and gain influence because of her monetary holdings, Courage has the function of capital outlay as well as a political function.

Mutter Courage is engaged in commerce in one way or another, calling into question the ethics of her establishment. She is often seen guiding her children with a practical, of the moment advice that does not stem from an ethical or reflective place, rather a constructive one that guides them to use the values which they possess. Mothering her children from this distance begs the question of Mother Courage as an actual mother and what guides her to make the decisions about her children she does.

The Gender Issue: Children

With Brecht's adaptation of the *Courasche*, new questions come with it. A major question that comes to mind is that of gender dynamics and stereotypes in the play. As I have discussed above, Grimmelshausen critiques the dynamics of gender during the Early Modern period. Brecht steers completely away from critiquing gender dynamics in his play in a direct way, instead focusing on the dynamics of Capitalism. There are minimal instances when gender is actually brought up in the text making each mention of motherhood, gender roles, or stereotypes a subtle criticism of capitalism through the mention of these. Grimmelshausen chooses to exaggerate the experiences *Courasche* has as a woman and what parts of her gender and gender identity are challenged within the time frame of the Thirty Years War. Brecht exaggerates the circumstances of *Mutter Courage's* life as Grimmelshausen does, but by exaggerating her experiences as a mother, his focus then becomes how her gender dynamics function as a critique of Capitalism.

Brecht brings attention to *Mutter Courage's* gender by giving her children. This feature of *Courage* is not only to highlight her maternal qualities, but also to draw attention to her productive qualities. Producing children is stereotypically the business of mothers, as is the upbringing of these children. She warns her children, "Klug ist es, wenn du bei deiner Mutter bleibst," emphasizing the importance of her maternal instincts to guide her children (Brecht, 16). Her children all have different fathers and possess characteristics attributed to them, at least attributed to them by *Courage's* explanation of her children's origins. For instance, *Schweizerkas* is said to be honest, though much of the scene before his death he lies about the whereabouts of the cashbox he is to be guarding. These dichotomous descriptions exist for all three of her

children. Her son Eilif, sent away to fight the war at the end of the first scene, is brave once away from his mother, but follows her instructions while still with her. Katrin, said to be stupid because of her lack of verbal communication, can communicate with her mother only, but once away from her finds a way to be understood.

If seen through a religious lens, these contrasting characteristics of each child are in line with the seven Catholic virtues and vices¹³. Each child possesses a virtuous characteristic, but becomes envious of the vices of others as the war carries on. For example, Katrin, though seemingly virtuous, is envious of Yvette, a beautiful woman with a sexual flare. By swaying in their virtuous nature, the children are predisposed to death. The fate of her children is sealed with the final two lines of the first scene, “Wer vom Krieg leben will/ Wird ihm wohl müssen auch was geben,” (Brecht, 19). This foreshadowing of the death of her children is only the beginning of the discussion of the fate of her children. Der Feldprediger, in scene six, says to Mutter Courage, “...und hat der Krieg deine Sprößlinge und kann mit ihnen weiterkommen,” thus making it evident that the Krieg will take all of her children from her at some point or another (Brecht, 68).

If looking at the function of the children from a gender perspective, then it is to be assumed Courage is a desexualized woman after having had children. Merry Wiesner-Hanks in *Women and Gender in Early Modern Europe* writes on the standards of motherhood in Early Modern Europe and states, “[t]he deaths or illnesses of their children often led women into depression or

¹³ These Catholic virtues include the four cardinal virtues from ancient Greek philosophy (prudence, justice, temperance and courage) and the three theological virtues of St. Paul of Taurus (faith, hope and charity). Each virtue is contradicted by a sin. For example, charity versus greed or prudence versus lust.

even suicidal despair, and those who showed no attachment to their children were viewed as mentally disturbed” (Women and Gender, 93). What does this mean for Brecht’s *Courage*? She is indeed unfeeling and cold at times with her children, often trying to keep them on the straight and narrow by guiding them to fulfill their moral duty based on their own characteristic values. Cara M. Horwich address this notion in *Survival in Simplicissimus and Mutter Courage* stating, “What she advocates is intelligence—not the repetitious intelligence of Eilif which puts people in danger, but the intelligence of the rogue which takes them out of it [...],” (Horwich, 36). *Courage*’s children all die because of their departure from the values inherent in their personalities, values that are given to them by their fathers not by *Courage*.

Courage passes her own negative qualities to her children. She is only focused on economic interests and treats her children with a slight disdain. She refers to her daughter saying, “Die Tochter ist nix,” not only addressing her as “Die Tochter,” not even using her name, but also putting her down because she is female (Brecht, 23). This is clear when in the same breath she talks of her son who is, “mein kühner und kluger Sohn,” (Brecht, 23). She is constantly addressing Eilif with possessive adjectives, “mein Sohn,” connecting him to her by showing her possessive connection to him, and only addressing Katrin with “die Tochter,” showing no possession of her or emotional connection (Brecht, 23). Although she defends her children in the first act saying, “Meine Kinder sind nicht für das Kriegshandwerk,” this is meant ironically by Brecht because the children all end up participating in the war by the end of the play, and it is his intent to point out different parts of the war that contribute to each child’s death. Although the children make up a lot of who *Courage* is as a woman, a bargaining, economically driven woman, there are other characters who make this evident as well.

The Women

A second pivotal aspect of Courage is the lack of sexuality in her characterization. Instead of evidently ascribing Courage as a sexual vehicle, as Grimmelshausen's Courasche is characterized, Brecht creates an emotionally and sexually vacant vehicle for Capitalism. Although many of the characteristics discussed above describe Courage's gender as well as the tension created between Courage and her children because of the war, there are other women in the play that are included in a discussion of the gender dynamics of Brecht's play. Mutter Courage has children who signify her gender, if only because she has given birth to them. Their existence constitutes her existence as woman, capable of reproducing, or producing, children. Katrin Haupt, Courage's daughter, and her counterpart, Yvette, call more direct attention to gender dynamics in the play than any other characters. Katrin, characterized as being mute and dumb, communicates only through gestures and pantomime. On a very basic level she represents the lack of voice of women. This inability to speak is coupled with a lack of real communication with "others.":, she cannot speak to anyone except her mother. Mutter Courage addresses her saying, "Erzähls ordentlich, Katrin. Deine Mutter versteht dich," (Brecht, 43-44). This reinforces the notion that a mother knows best, but also shows that only a woman has the ability to communicate with Katrin. Her mother reassures her that this is not a curse but a blessing saying, "Sei froh, daß du stumm bist, da widersprichst du dir nie oder willst dir nie die Zunge abbeißen, weil du die Wahrheit gesagt hast, das ist ein Gottesgeschenk, Stummsein," (Brecht, 33). Katrin, perhaps the most virtuous of all the characters, including der Feldprediger, is the

last of her mother's children to die because of her dependence upon her mother's ability to interpret her gestures.

The only other exception to her speech-based obscurity is Yvette, a woman who embodies many negative aspects of the traditional portrayal of women. Although her appearance is very brief in the piece, it brings to the forefront an important dynamic between women. She represents the woman who uses her femininity to stay alive during wartime. Prostitution was a common means of making a living for women who did not wish to marry as well as women who maintained a lower station in life. Although Yvette is not directly referred to as a prostitute, she is flirtatious with the officers and she mentions, "[b]eim Zweiten Finnischen kennen mich alle," insinuating that she has been intimately acquainted with the men of this regiment (Brecht, 31).

Yvette's first appearance in the play is in the third scene, sewing a colorful hat, with only stockings on her feet and her boots near her (Brecht, 29). Her red boots, the defining article of clothing she owns, are the envy of Katrin, who is constantly finding a way to have them for herself, though never really quite getting them. Yvette's brightly colored clothing call attention to her, separating her from the other characters not only because she is the only character described as wearing particular articles of clothing, but also because her clothing has notable colors. A flirtatious and loose woman, Yvette is the exact opposite of Katrin. This interplay of innocence and corruption strikes right at the heart of the moral message of the play.

Only at one other instance in the play does another woman appear. This woman with no name, only speaks one line, "Da ist auch nix. Komm!" (Brecht, 77). Her son, who is trying to sell Mutter Courage feathers, accompanies her. This woman acts as a counterpart of Mutter Courage, selling to her just as peace comes about. She is not described physically and says almost nothing.

This juxtaposition to Mutter Courage's very detailed existence shows how women of propriety can also be seen as nothing.

These portrayals of women as two dichotomous figures calls upon Grimmelshausen's original portrayal of Courasche, who is the embodiment of two different biological genders as well as a representation of two opposing social classes. Brecht takes these opposing characteristics to the next level, still maintaining the conversation of women and their role in society, but he creates characters that have these differing characteristics, either within themselves or shared with another character, to critique the rise of Capitalism in the early twentieth century. By depicting these characters in the seventeenth century and critiquing the twentieth century from this angle, Brecht calls on political and social congruencies, pointing out similarities between them, just as he points out similar characteristics of each character by giving them either dichotomous characteristics within themselves, or a counterpart played by another character. His goal with this construction, as mentioned before, is to show how history can repeat over time and how these structures will continue to repeat in the future.

Conclusion

Grimmelshausen, embedding Courasche in the atmosphere of the Thirty Years War, personifies war by creating not only a chaotic backdrop for the novel, but also by creating a constantly changing, ephemeral characterization of Courasche. As the war moves forward and changes, so does Courasche, affecting all levels of society. Her constant movement through the physical landscape of the war is coupled with her figurative movement through social strata as she sees financial gain as well as loss in her lifetime. These changes in her social station challenge the stereotypical societal boundaries women experienced, and continue to experience. Grimmelshausen's example of women's gender stereotypes, although from the narrative perspective of a man, addresses many of the specific hardships, such as lack of voice, inability to maintain a stable place in society, and a general subjugated station with regard to power structures women of the Early Modern experienced in their daily lives, ideas which remain constant in modern society. This representation of women's societal standings have since been reinterpreted and manipulated to critique not just gender roles and stereotypes, but also economic and governmental structures, which continuously impose these, now arguably antiquated, views of roles in society.

Brecht, borrowing the image already established by Grimmelshausen, reinterprets the character, personifying Capitalism as the figure of a woman making a living from war. By embedding this character in the standards of seventeenth century culture, Brecht not only reinvents the character to include a more modern perspective of women, but also critiques gender through the lens of the Thirty Years War, but from a different angle, exposing congruent issues of economy and incorporation in social structures. Women's gender roles, since both

Grimmelshausen's and Brecht's text have been published, although challenged, remain ultimately unchanged, though representation of women's power began to change at the beginning of the twentieth century, as women were depicted as active members of the workforce and were free to take jobs outside the household. Brecht's narrative distance, or his portrayal of characters from a third person perspective, is accomplished inherently through dialogue and lack of omniscience, as well as through an agenda of ironic distance to make an overt point. He thus, directs the question of gender to include motherhood, childbirth, and what the consequences of these roles mean for women.

As investigated here, portrayals of women, construct a perceived hierarchy within gender structures, with men being at the top, divided by their respective social stations with women below them. These hierarchical structures as they are depicted in the personifications of war, Courasche as the personification of war for example, are forced to shift with the changing boundaries of society. Modern reinterpretations of these gender roles and constellations within the nuclear family unit, such as those depicted in the television show *Weeds*, include critiques of social issues present within twenty-first century communal and societal constructions and carry on the tradition of social critique through a discursive medium. Even if only implicitly included in the plot, these instances of critique, as seen in television shows, films and literary depictions of women, keep seventeenth century images of women alive, although in constant critical dialogue with them.

Although these critiques strike at the very core of gender constructions and issues associated with gender equality, these issues, newly created as well as those carried over from centuries passed still have not fully been resolved. Representations of women, even as women continue to

fight for more and more social equality, capture an image of social inequality. These representations continue to address the subtext of modern gender constellations. As these portrayals, such as those carried out by both Grimmelshausen and Brecht, are reinterpreted and reworked, constantly reinventing the role women have in modern society, it leaves room for discussion and investigation of the texts that continue to influence society's future and past struggles.

Bibliography

- Arnold, Heinz Ludwig. Hans Jacob Christoffel Von Grimmelshausen. München: ET K, Edition Text Kritik, 2008. Print.
- Battafarano, Italo Michele, and Hildegard Eilert. *Courage: Die Starke Frau Der Deutschen Literatur: Von Grimmelshausen Erfunden, Von Brecht Und Grass Variiert*. Bern: P. Lang, 2003. Print.
- Battafarano, Italo Michele. "Brechts Maternisierung von Grimmelshausens Courasche." *Simpliciana: Schriften Der Grimmelshausen-Gesellschaft* 23, (2001): 127-158. *MLA International Bibliography*, EBSCOhost (accessed September 9, 2013).
- Bauer, Matthias. "Ausgleichende Gewalt? Der Kampf der Geschlechter und die Liebe zur Gerechtigkeit in Grimmelshausens Simplicissimus, Courasche und Springinsfeld." *Simpliciana: Schriften Der Grimmelshausen-Gesellschaft* 31, (2009): 99-126. *MLA International Bibliography*, EBSCOhost (accessed September 9, 2013).
- Brecht, Bertolt. *Mutter Courage Und Ihre Kinder: Eine Chronik Aus Dem Dreissigjährigen Krieg*. Berlin: Suhrkamp Verlag, 1963. Print.
- Brecht, Bertolt. *Mother Courage and Her Children: A Chronicle of the Thirty Years' War*. New York: Grove Weidenfeld, 1991. Print.
- Bullough, Vern L., and Bonnie Bullough. *Cross Dressing, Sex, and Gender*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 1993. Print.
- Eilert, Hildegard. "Courasche, von anderen Figuren erzählt." *Simpliciana: Schriften Der Grimmelshausen-Gesellschaft* 24, (2002): 165-186. *MLA International Bibliography*, EBSCOhost (accessed December 6, 2013).
- Gillett, Robert, and Godela Weiss-Sussex. "Verwisch Die Spuren!": Bertolt Brecht's Work and Legacy: A Reassessment. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2008. Print.
- Grimmelshausen, Hans Jakob Christoffel Von, and Dieter Breuer. *Courasche*. Frankfurt, M.: Dt. Klassiker-Verl., 2007. Print.
- Gryphius, Andreas, Gerhard Dünnhaupt, and Karl-Heinz Habersetzer. *Absurda Comica, Oder, Herr Peter Squentz: Schimpfspiel*. Stuttgart: P. Reclam, 1983. Print.
- Hillen, Gerd. "'Warumb das, Courasche?' Grimmelshausens Mysognie in Text, Kontext und Kritik." In *'Der Buchstab tödt-der Geist macht lebendig', I & II*, 849-861. Bern: Peter Lang, 1992. *MLA International Bibliography*, EBSCOhost (accessed September 9, 2013).

- Hillenbrand, Rainer. "Courasche als emanzipierte Frau: Einige erstaunliche Modernitäten bei Grimmelshausen." *Daphnis: Zeitschrift Für Mittlere Deutsche Literatur* 27, no. 1 (1998): 185-199. *MLA International Bibliography*, EBSCOhost (accessed September 9, 2013).
- Horwich, Cara M. *Survival in Simplicissimus and Mutter Courage*. New York: P. Lang, 1997. Print.
- Kaiser, Michael. "Gewaltspezialistin und Gewaltopfer: Historische Beobachtungen zu Grimmelshausens Courasche." *Simpliciana: Schriften Der Grimmelshausen-Gesellschaft* 31, (2009): 183-208. *MLA International Bibliography*, EBSCOhost (accessed September 9, 2013).
- Kaminski, Nicola. "Gender-Crossing: Narrative Versuchsanordnungen zwischen Eros und Krieg in Grimmelshausens Courasche und Lohensteins Arminius." *Simpliciana: Schriften Der Grimmelshausen-Gesellschaft* 31, (2009): 227-244. *MLA International Bibliography*, EBSCOhost (accessed September 9, 2013).
- Maierhofer, Waltraud. *Hexen, Huren, Heldenweiber: Bilder Des Weiblichen in Erzähltexten Über Den Dreissigjährigen Krieg*. Köln: Böhlau, 2005. Print.
- Medick, Hans, and Benjamin Marschke. *Experiencing the Thirty Years War: A Brief History with Documents*. S.l.: Bedford, 2013. Print.
- Otto, Karl F. *A Companion to the Works of Grimmelshausen*. Rochester, NY: Camden House, 2003. Print.
- Rabb, Theodore K. *The Struggle for Stability in Early Modern Europe*. New York: Oxford UP, 1975. Print.
- Rublack, Ulinka. *Reformation Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2005. Print.
- Schade, Richard E. *The Courasche-Frontispiece: Gypsy, Mule and Acedia*. *Simpliciana: Schriften der Grimmelshausen-Gesellschaft* 3, (1981): 73-93. Print.
- Schutte, Anne Jacobson., Thomas Kuehn, and Silvana Menchi Seidel. *Time, Space, and Women's Lives in Early Modern Europe*. Kirksville, MO: Truman State UP, 2001. Print.
- Solbach, Andreas. "Grimmelshausens Courasche als unzuverlässige Erzählerin." *Simpliciana: Schriften Der Grimmelshausen-Gesellschaft* 24, (2002): 141-164. *MLA International Bibliography*, EBSCOhost (accessed December 6, 2013).
- Speier, Hans. *Courage, the Adventuress*. Princeton University Press, (1964): 224. Print.

- Streller, Siegfried. "Ambivalentes Frauenbild in Grimmelshausens Courasche." *Simpliciana: Schriften Der Grimmelshausen-Gesellschaft* 24, (2002): 67-77. *MLA International Bibliography*, EBSCOhost (accessed December 6, 2013).
- Tallett, Frank. *War and Society in Early-Modern Europe: 1495-1715*. London: Routledge, 1992. Print.
- Van Ornam, Vanessa. "No Time for Mothers: Courasche's Infertility as Grimmelshausen's Criticism of War." *Women In German Yearbook: Feminist Studies In German Literature And Culture* 8, (1992): 21-45. *MLA International Bibliography*, EBSCOhost (accessed September 9, 2013).
- Wagener, Hans. "Simplicissimo zu Trutz! Zur Struktur von Grimmelshausens Courasche." *German Quarterly* 43, no. 2 (March 1970): 177-187. *MLA International Bibliography*, EBSCOhost (accessed September 9, 2013).
- Wedgwood, C. V. *The Thirty Years War*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1961. Print.
- Wiesner, Merry E. *Women and Gender in Early Modern Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2008. Print.
- Wunder, Heide. *He Is the Sun, She Is the Moon: Women in Early Modern Germany*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1998. Print.
- Zeuch, Ulrike. "Verführung als die wahre Gewalt? Weibliche Macht und Ohnmacht in Grimmelshausens Courasche und Simplicissimus." *Simpliciana: Schriften Der Grimmelshausen-Gesellschaft* 31, (2009): 143-160. *MLA International Bibliography*, EBSCOhost (accessed September 9, 2013).