

A Pox on All Wars: Friedrich Dürrenmatt's Grotesque Comedy *Die Wiedertäufer*

Lauren Friesen, *University of Michigan-Flint*

Friedrich Dürrenmatt's history play *Die Wiedertäufer*¹ examines the religious rebellion and subsequent catastrophe that enveloped the city of Münster, Westphalia from January, 1534 to June 24, 1535. The gruesome events that occurred within the city walls provide the narrative and serve as the context for Dürrenmatt's play. The critical happenings of the Münster insurgency are hardly in dispute and can be summarized as follows: Spiritualists from the Netherlands traveled to North Germany in an effort to find co-religionists who were interested in withdrawal from the Roman Catholic Church. In their zeal for religious truth, they refused to join the Lutheran reform movement because it fell short of an authentic biblical faith that should, in their eyes, permit only adult baptism and establish communitarianism. Therefore, they contended that Luther was too selective in applying his principle of *sola scriptura*. And, they postulated, if Luther had been selective with those passages, how else might he compromise the faith in order to gain political expediency?

Eventually, the united armies of protestant princes, the emperor and Catholic bishops amassed a sizable army and quelled the Münster revolution. Once inside the city, the victors discovered a populace that in the name of religion had endured horrific deprivation and physical suffering. In response, the conquerors were equally ruthless in punishing the leaders of the revolt. The ringleaders were tortured, killed and their bodies, as carrion for birds, were placed in large cages that hung from the spire of the St. Lambert Church.²

These historical facts are seldom disputed but their interpretations vary. Many historians have assumed that the revolt in Münster was symptomatic of the terrorism that lurked in the heart of every Anabaptist. Therefore, Emperor Charles V, the German princes and bishops were justified in using their blanket policy of intolerance and suppression of this movement. Inadvertently, the Münsterites united the Lutherans and Catholics in a common cause: to stop fighting each other for the sake of destroying the Anabaptists. If Anabaptists taught nonviolence elsewhere (the Netherlands, South Germany and

Switzerland) that was only because they had no alternative: nowhere else did they control an army or a city. Münster served as a warning to everyone that in the event the Anabaptists gained control of a city or state, horrific acts of violence would follow. This view of Anabaptism became a symbol across Europe for religious fanaticism and irrational acts of terror.³ From that time onward, the visual spectacle of Münster was served as a call to arms that justified official torture and the mass killings of innocents in the name of order and justice.

Dürrenmatt was 26 years old when he began this, his first play, in the middle of World War II.⁴ At the time, he was studying for a Doctor of Philosophy degree in Reformation history at the University of Zurich. The initial version, entitled *Es steht geschrieben*, opened at the Züricher Schauspielhaus on April 19, 1947.⁵ As Martin Esslin observes, with this script the grotesque comedy character type would emerge and eventually become the signature style for Dürrenmatt. According to Arrigo Subiotto, Dürrenmatt wrote “black comedies that pull out all the stops of the grotesque, attack injustice, whether individual or collective, through laughter and wit.”⁶ The play opened to considerable controversy. Members of the audience walked out and subsequent debates in the lobby led to fisticuffs. And the play’s weaknesses appeared to have cast a shadow over subsequent attempts to stage it, with the result that Dürrenmatt’s first play was relatively ignored for nearly three decades. However, in the years that followed his reputation was enhanced by other works.

By the mid-1960s Dürrenmatt had emerged as a prominent German-language playwright. His best-known play – *The Visit* – received many awards and has been performed in numerous languages. The movie version, with Ingrid Bergman, was awarded an Oscar. His other provocative plays, such as *The Physicists*, *Meteor* and *Romulus the Great*, won considerable public acclaim and favorable critical attention. Given his successes with other works, Dürrenmatt might easily have let his first play fade even further into obscurity, but the events of the 1960s spurred the playwright to re-examine the work.

The student and labor rebellions that swept across Western Europe in the 1960s inspired him to revisit the script. What had been a long and ponderous play was now revised, shortened, re-titled, and published in 1967 as *Die Wiedertäufer*. What did not change was his use of the major events in Münster that began in 1533 as the structure for the plot and the means by which he critiqued contemporary events.

Dürrenmatt begins the play with Bockelson’s arrival in Münster.⁷ He had fallen into a drunken sleep in a manure wagon, and when arrested for vagrancy he built his defense around the supernatural: he claimed that an angel had picked him up in Leiden and flown him to Münster to rescue the city. He should not be blamed for the fact that the

angel had missed the target, and instead of dropping him at a place of prominence had landed him in a manure spreader. His oratory and the fantastic details of his story cowed his audience. From that moment on, this failed actor turned baker began an ascent to power that eventually led the entire population into apocalyptic destruction.

Dürrenmatt portrays how inside the walls of Münster a servile public longed for a courageous and decisive leader. In short order they anointed Jan Bockelson from Leiden as King and he ruled with absolute authority. He beheaded his critics, forced starvation on the recalcitrant, and rewarded obedience with houses, wives and the bank accounts of the executed. Polygamy, a communism of goods and obedience to his absolute authority were at the core of his tyrannical rule.

The armies of the presiding Catholic Bishop Waldek (who, incidentally, was married, kept a few mistresses and had never been ordained), the Protestant Prince Philip of Hesse, the primary supporter of Martin Luther, and the Emperor Charles V, all surrounded the city. With a shortage of food and heating supplies, people became desperate and many began to question the leadership of the former tailor, baker and failed actor from Leiden. But his response even to soft-spoken criticism was always swift: public flogging or beheading. Frequently, he presided personally over these gory events. Even two of his wives met their deaths in this manner.

During the early months when the city was surrounded, Bockelson ordered the killing of many horses so that people would not be able to defect with a quick dash through the city gates. Later he ordered the killing of the remaining horses because they were the only remaining source of food. Jan, with the touch of a modern dictator, staged events that always turned out to glorify him and vilify his opponents. He would dance nude, like the biblical David, and hold mass marriages for women who had lost husbands due to his capricious acts. The specter of mass starvation kept many in a subservient posture and hardly anyone attempted to dethrone or harm Bockelson.

Dürrenmatt does not dispute the chronology of events in Münster. And except for a surprise ending, the play remains faithful to the established historical account. In an effort to portray his fidelity to the historical records, he uses character names from the roster of characters who were central figures in the historical situation. A short list of historical figures that appear in his play includes Jan Bockelson, Bernhard Rothmann, Bishop Waldeck, Charles V, Philipp of Hesse, Bernhard Krechting, Jan Matthison, his wife Divara (who would later become Bockelson's wife), Heinrich Gresbeck, the Mayor Knipperdollinck and his daughter Judith. Dürrenmatt developed these characters in a manner consistent with their historical roles. The

author, though, was not content just to write the well-known history in a theatrical format. The play builds on the historical narrative with a character that looms larger than his historical context and thereby becomes symbolic of a greater narrative.

With Jan Bockelson, history had provided Dürrenmatt with a grotesque hero. His dramaturgy required that the play invent new perceptions in the telling of the story. However, in order to achieve that end he also accepted the dictum that the historic Münster remain a symbolic referent in German history. For Dürrenmatt, the failed tailor became a failed actor who was denied admission into the profession. He accentuates this theme with a scene where Charles V is talking to his Chancellor about the difficulty of deciding who would get into the Academy of Art in Vienna. He goes through the litany of names that became well-known artists and then comes across a mediocre one and nearly decides to deny him admission. But, after hesitating, this dialogue occurs between the Chancellor and the Emperor:

CHANCELLOR: The painter Hagelmeier is crossed off the list of Academy members, your Majesty.

EMPEROR: An error, Chancellor. Accept him with grace, since he, as a member of the Imperial Academy can harm no one, except the art of painting!

In *The Anabaptists* it is a failed actor who becomes a noted orator and leader. Had he been successful as an actor, it is implied, he might never have foisted his sadistic personality onto history. Der Führer, Adolph Hitler, was after all a failed painter who was denied admission to the Art Academy in Vienna. Dürrenmatt could hardly have made the parallel between Münster and modern Germany any more vivid than that!

As with the modern account, the wheels of tyranny turned rapidly for Bockelson and he became the sole authority within the city on all matters such as marriage, divorce, art, military strategy, dance, architecture, economics and faith. When he wants to test the loyalty of an influential city leader he leads him in a moonlight dance. His wives must also learn to dance to demonstrate their unity of purpose and willingness to follow his “divine” orders. When his wives have trouble learning a specific dance, Bockelson orders them to go offstage and re-enter in “goose-step.” With that stage device, Dürrenmatt’s grotesque allusion is complete: Bockelson is both historical and contemporary; a deranged leader will bring destruction to a prosperous and admired city. The rebellion of Münster, formerly despised as the historic symbol of isolated religious fanaticism, has with Dürrenmatt’s play become the symbol of self-destruction and quasi-religious fanaticism.

The Münsterites began their movement with a non-violent credo that quickly shifted towards violence when pacifism proved to be ineffective in calling on God's wrath to defeat their enemies. Dürrenmatt effectively portrays the historical incident when this change occurred by having Matthison, the leader of the Anabaptists, march out of the city to face his attackers with a non-violent protest against them. Instead of fearing his presence, the army that surrounds Münster quickly and without any religious qualms hacks him to death. This quick end to Matthison brought about an abrupt change in tactics by the remaining leaders inside the city. They abruptly abandoned Jesus as their model for a new ethic and instead adopted the biblical King David, who was known for his brilliant military strategies in defense of cities and his assaults against the enemies of God. The cause of God, they argued, could now be advanced by the sword.⁸ However, these swords were also used inside the city to execute any who dared to utter criticism of the city's regime.

With the war outside the city walls and violent oppression inside, Dürrenmatt explores the commonly held assumption that Münster was an aberration within German history, and that the powers of the princes and the church were wholly justified in suppressing this insurgency. Early in the war when Bishop Waldeck attempted to solicit the aide of the princes, they were unmoved by his reports that the rebels should be suppressed because they had misinterpreted the Bible by practicing beheading and by taking mistresses or committing polygamy. The princes reminded him that they also, including the Bishop, had their moral failings. But when they were told that the city had begun the practice of "communion of goods," they all became alarmed and were quick to commit troops to the cause of defeating this economic heresy.

With an ironic twist, when Bockelson is finally defeated the princes gather to congratulate him for playing the greatest role that history had to offer. Because of his acting skills, which they had originally doubted, he is allowed to live and to play on the "stage of history."

Apart from this surprise ending, major studies on Münster substantiate many of the historical references in the play. Two recent studies⁹ basically agree on the events in Münster and provide a general outline of the plot that Dürrenmatt followed. Both authors, Anthony Arthur and Sigrun Haude, accept the interpretation these events were given in George H. Williams's *The Radical Reformation*.¹⁰ Where they go into greater detail, it is to augment the argument rather than to alter or refute Williams. Anthony Arthur's narrative approach reconstructs significant events within the walls of Münster. His work is much more detailed than previous work on the subject, although he doesn't provide new interpretations. The horrors of Bockelson's oppression with his willing henchmen form the core of Arthur's litany of depravity.

Sigrun Haude focuses his study on the responses to the rebellion. His study seeks to balance the responses from all the critics and interpret them in light of subsequent approaches to the historical development of nonviolent Anabaptists and other incidents of revolt among Germanic people. He demonstrates that the mobilization to crush the rebellion was organized and financed throughout Germany and not just by local officials. The hypothesis he pursues is that Anabaptism was an underground movement throughout most of German and Dutch-speaking Europe and all the leaders in those areas sought to defeat the Münsterites as a symbolic show of force and suppression of rebellion. This massive effort against the rebel group helped it to become a myth that has impacted succeeding generations.¹¹ Anthony Arthur views the Anabaptists of Münster as “progenitors of the political and religious violence that have become so much a part of our world today.”¹² They have also, in the eyes of many, become a symbol for religious radicalism that had a proclivity to use the sword.¹³

The playwright must invent, according to Dürrenmatt, and not simply retell a story or view the stage as a museum for past events and characters.¹⁴ His approach to dramaturgy requires that the writer demonstrate freedom in the face of tyrants who have little respect for the poets. In that realm, he states, it is not enough to provide lamentations for human suffering that evoke mere yawns, or epic tales that put the powerful to sleep. Theatre must grab the attention of the political tyrant through mockery. The powerful ones fear parodies and so, in this age of political and religious tyranny, the poet must mock those in authority. On stage only the grotesque hero can achieve that. When a poet achieves that, the dramatic work is an invention and not merely a corpse that causes some to wail and others to applaud.

The despised rebellion of Münster, once considered only as the historic symbol of religious fanaticism has become, with Dürrenmatt’s play, the despised nation that elected to follow political fanaticism. As already stated, in the play Bockelson does not die and by implication reappears within history and on German soil as the greatest despot of all time. Germany has become what it vilified: the tyranny of Münster, which was condemned for centuries as an abhorrent expression of religious fanaticism, has now become the legacy of a twentieth-century nation. What Germany sought to avoid, a city’s nihilistic revolt led by a crazed religious fanatic, four centuries later became an international cataclysm led by a crazed secular tyrant. In this play, the grotesque hero walks off the pages of religious history onto a modern stage. Will Dürrenmatt’s mockery force modern tyrants to take notice and transform? That question, along with the plea at the end of the play remains unanswered.

Prior references to Münster in dramatic literature also made allusions to issues in their own time. Generally, the Münsterite Anabaptists were frequently portrayed as fanatical characters who were ridiculed for their heretical beliefs and condemned for their licentious and audacious actions. In Ben Jonson's *The Alchemist* a key figure, Ananias from Holland, is subjected to ridicule throughout the play. In one reference Jonson goes beyond derision and accuses Ananias of Knipper-Doling¹⁵ his listeners. With this statement Jonson links Ananias with the Münsterites and makes this character into a repulsive hypocrite who advocated rebellion, deception and polygamy. Jonson is making a mocking reference to Bernard Knipperdollinck who, as the Mayor of Münster, switched his allegiance from the Bishop to the Anabaptists and watched helplessly as the city descended into chaos. His name was a warning to all who were tempted to adopt his naive piety while bringing destruction to a society. Later in the play, Jonson accuses Ananias of posing a threat to English society in the same manner that Harry Nicolas (Henrick Niclaes) had stirred public sentiment against the Queen. Nicolas was a Dutch Anabaptist who came to England and was hanged by Queen Elizabeth for uttering heresies. With this reference it is apparent that even English audiences were aware of and feared Anabaptism and its adherents due to the legacy of the Münsterites. Even though Jonson's references are only a sub-theme in the play, they form an important component in the plot.

Two centuries later the composer Giacomo Meyerbeer made the Anabaptists of Münster the sole subject of a dramatic opera. Meyerbeer was born into a prominent Jewish family in Berlin but resided in Paris during most of his professional career. His opera on the Münster catastrophe – *Le Prophete* – was first staged in 1849. The opera was immediately popular and appeared to condemn the excesses of the 1848 revolutions against the nobility in France and Germany. In subsequent years it fell into obscurity until recent decades. With the ascendancy of religious zealotry in the 1980s, the opera was re-introduced as part of the repertoire of many European and American opera companies¹⁶. The current reality of religiously motivated violence may also be a factor in these revivals. They may well illustrate the need to see the Münsterites as “progenitors of the political and religious violence that have become so much a part of our world today.”¹⁷

Meyerbeer's opera is the first dramatic attempt to devote the entire plot and setting to the horrific events in Münster. Meyerbeer, like Dürrenmatt, focuses on the hypocrisy of the religious zealots who led off this peculiar Anabaptist revolt. The opera's ringleader, Jean of Leyden, calls himself a prophet and predicts that the armies of the Bishop will never subdue the people of God. When it becomes apparent

that he is losing the battle, Jean prepares a banquet in the town hall for the citizens of the city. He opens all the wine casks and a bacchanal scene ensues. In the midst of the festivities, Jean gives the order to ignite the gunpowder that is stored in the basement of the city hall. The final scene of the opera is the massive explosion that follows as the tyrant of Münster commits suicide and kills his own followers. This final twist, while not rooted in history, gives the opera a dramatic and haunting ending. Meyerbeer appears to have developed this ending for dramatic purposes, but also to have the opera provide a warning to all who might be intrigued by religious zealots who come with the promise of a Kingdom of God on earth.

This “Kingdom of God” interpretation also has roots in the historical events – events that Dürrenmatt overlooks. In the closing months of the rebellion, the rebels’ only hope lay in a faith based on an apocalyptic vision of swift divine intervention. In an attempt to hasten this possibility, the radical reformers renamed the city the New Jerusalem, minted new currency and remade the calendar with 1534 as year One! The leader who emerged as a dominant figure was Jan Bockelson from Leyden in the Netherlands. He rewarded his faithful with food, wood for winter heating and new marriage laws. He rewarded himself by claiming to be the new Solomon, King of Israel. And in order to emulate his biblical namesake, he instituted the practice of polygamy and the community of goods. Later, when the population faced starvation, the few remaining horses were the only source of food. Eventually, with the arrival of reinforcements around the city and the weakening of the population, the Münsterites and their vile leaders were defeated, tortured and killed.

Frequently, those who condemn the Münsterites are slow to acknowledge that those who attacked them were also lacking a modern sense of integrity and justice. The efforts to condemn the rebellion¹⁸ have frequently been dominated by melodramatic claims that these radicals were a threat to the established church and the empire. The revolt in Münster symbolized the undermining of the very foundation of empire and religion. While many scholars seem to sympathize with the predicament of the religious and political authorities, they fail to note that the tactics of those in power provided the soil where the seeds of radicalism sprouted.

Dürrenmatt’s dramaturgy assumes that both of these arguments contained a large measure of truth. He portrays Münster as a cultural symbol of savagery while refusing to taint the entire radical reformation with this accusation. In fact, he avoids mention of the scattered Anabaptist movement. His emphasis lies elsewhere and a brief comparison between his initial play and the revised text illustrates this developing dramatic agenda.

The initial draft of the play *Es steht geschrieben*¹⁹ explored the religious causes of violence in history and implied that only religious belief would turn humanity against a repetition of these acts of violence. The play lacked dramatic tension, since the plot sought to explicate transcendent explanations for human suffering. The 1967 rewrite separated the theological argument from the dramatic plot and focused instead on the necessity for a human struggle for justice. The initial play was, according to Margareta Deschner,²⁰ an account of God's inhumane world; the later play portrays "man's inhumanity to man." This shift was also important for the audience because the first approach defines the blame on human injustice as a theological problem, while the later approach challenges humans to seek justice as an existential reality. This shift can be illustrated by one significant change from the first to the second script. Initially, Dürrenmatt followed the historical conclusion where Bockelson was tortured and killed with an emphasis on divine justice for his multiple offenses. In the second script, he is freed and rewarded for the audacious role he played in history. The human political and religious institutions are no longer handmaidens to divine justice; instead they participate in the inhumane acts by admiring and rewarding them. With this device Dürrenmatt challenges the audience to seek the courage to act against such tyrants.

So Dürrenmatt provides an indictment against the violent tactics of the Anabaptists while at the same time exposing the duplicity of the princes and bishops who organize the campaign to condemn and crush the revolt. As we have noted, historians are in agreement that the fanatics were engaged in vile acts that violated religious sensibility and moral codes of established religion. Dürrenmatt portrays those who organized the campaign against Münster as an odd assortment of personalities who were petty, corrupt, capricious and equally prone to tyrannical acts. Dramatically, both sides in the plot vie for the same moral high ground with the princes and the bishops holding a strategic advantage because they are entrenched in power and hold larger purses; but they fail to impress the viewer with a higher moral claim.

As stated earlier, the historical Bockelson was tortured and torn to pieces but in the play he does not die. Dürrenmatt tantalizes his audiences with the prospect that history's great villains are seldom brought to justice and that their horrendous misdeeds frequently go unpunished. The character Bockelson is allowed to live because of the audacious role he enacted on the stage of history. This shift is significant because by symbolic implication Bockelson is free to roam and reappear within history and on German soil as the greatest despot of all time. Dürrenmatt accepts the interpretation that Münster is symbolic of a great demonic power and that four centuries after those

cataclysmic events that same demon captured a nation and re-enacted that story on the world scene. Germany has become what it vilified: the tyranny of Münster, which was condemned for centuries as an abhorrent expression of religious fanaticism, became the legacy of the twentieth century. What Germany sought to avoid, a city's nihilistic rebellion led by a crazed prophet, eventually became an international cataclysm led by a demented secular tyrant.

Will Dürrenmatt's mockery force modern tyrants to take notice and transform? As stated earlier, that question, along with the plea at the end of the play, remains unanswered. After the audience has witnessed an endless series of destructive acts, the victor, Bishop Waldeck, rises from his wheelchair for the first time and poses his question: "The world must become more humane, but how, but how?" Instead of answering this haunting query, Dürrenmatt transfers to the audience the obligation to answer the Bishop. In a manner typical of Brecht, the Bishop is asking the audience to construct an ethical response to corruption and violence in the play.

A number of scholars have suggested that the play and its ending are absurd,²¹ or at least inconclusive in its meaning.²² This essay has explored an alternative possibility: Dürrenmatt is clear in his opposition to violence when the justification for it is 1) ideological rebellion or 2) the suppression of ideological rebellion. This double condemnation of war (of both the insurgent and the suppressor) serves as the foundation for the grotesque nature of the play and its characters. With the grotesque ending of the play, where the main rebel, Bockleson, is celebrated by the victors for his audacity, Dürrenmatt scoffs at the prospect of a just revolution and a just war that quells the revolution. As Edward Diller has noted, "The monster paradox of our time can only be expressed by the grotesque."²³ The character that embodies the disparity between an articulated ideal and the reality of human actions illustrates the historical and dramatic problem of the twentieth century.

Pessimistically, he finds very little hope in these events, but appears to find a glimmer of optimism in the prospect that the play will motivate the audience to act.²⁴ The text poses questions and demands of the audience a response that is rooted in action – the task of making a more humane world. Dürrenmatt's portrayal of Münster is not just another condemnation of a horrific episode in history; instead, he uses it as a call for justice. Dürrenmatt has shifted the historical events of Münster to all of Germany and to the century of the Great World Wars. He has shifted the audience's awareness of Münster as a European pariah to a larger perspective where chaos and religiously inspired violence reign over a continent. According to this scenario, the dreaded Münsterites have been marching again through the halls of power in the twentieth

century. Religion, in the West and in the Middle East, is again the framework for political and religious instability. Dürrenmatt's epic play explores the grotesque possibility that violent fanaticism, cloaked in religious fervor, which at one time was considered a singular act of German religious and political ignominy, has become a dominant icon for the modern age.

Notes

- ¹ *Die Wiedertäufer* (Zurich: Diogenes Verlag, 1967). There are no published English translations of this play. My English translation is in manuscript format.
- ² The original cages hung on the spire until the Second World War. After the war, new ones replaced the originals and they can be seen there today.
- ³ Peter Brock, *Pacifism in Europe* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1972), 89.
- ⁴ Dürrenmatt is the last in a long list of playwrights who have addressed the revolt at Münster. Hugo Hermsen, *Die Wiedertäufer zu Münster in der deutschen Dichtung* (Stuttgart, 1913). Hermsen lists 21 novels and dramas from 1777 to 1904.
- ⁵ *Es steht geschrieben* (Zurich: Diogenes Verlag, 1947).
- ⁶ Arrigo Subiotto, "The Swiss Contribution," in *The German Theatre*, edited by R. Hayman (New York: Barnes and Noble, 1975) 182.
- ⁷ Wolfgang Böthe, *Vom religiösen Drama zur politischen Komödie* (Bern: Peter Lang, 1979). Böthe provides a detailed analysis of the progression of this script from first play to final draft.
- ⁸ Martin Esslin in Volkmar Sander, ed., *Friedrich Dürrenmatt: Plays and Essays* (New York: Continuum, 1982) xx.
- ⁸ Mennonite historians, as spiritual descendents of the Anabaptists, have argued with some persuasiveness that the Münsterites were an aberration and that the remainder of the radical reformation, whether in France, Switzerland, South Germany or the Netherlands, practiced a strict form of nonviolence (*Gewaltlosigkeit*).
- ⁹ Anthony Arthur, *The Tailor-King* (New York: St. Martin's Griffin, 1999) and Sigrun Haude, *In the Shadow of "Savage Wolves"* (Boston: Humanities Press, 2000).
- ¹⁰ George H. Williams, *The Radical Reformation* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1964) 124.
- ¹¹ Haude, *In the Shadow*, 153.
- ¹² Arthur, *The Tailor-King*, 201.
- ¹³ Peter Brock, *Pacifism in Europe* (Princeton University Press, 1972), 89.
- ¹⁴ Friedrich Dürrenmatt, *Plays and Essays*, trans. G. Neuhaus (New York: Continuum, 1982) 260.
- ¹⁵ Ben Jonson, *Five Plays* (New York: Oxford Press, 1981), 403ff.
- ¹⁶ In the 1990s this opera was revived in Hamburg, London, Kiel, Essen, Stockholm and Beyreuth, Milan, Prague, Dallas and New York.
- ¹⁷ Arthur, *The Tailor-King* (New York: St. Martin's, 1999), 201.
- ¹⁸ Arthur, *The Tailor-King*. Even though Arthur acknowledges that the Bishop was not ordained and was not a moral citizen, he avoids considering the modern sensibility that questions whether a Bishop possesses the authority to organize an army.
- ¹⁹ For a good comparison of the initial and the latter script, see Timo Tiusanen, *Dürrenmatt* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1977).
- ²⁰ Margareta Deschnere, "Dürrenmatt's *Die Wiedertäufer*" *German Quarterly*, 1971; 44:234.
- ²¹ Kenneth S. Whitton, *The Theatre of Friedrich Dürrenmatt* (New Jersey: Humanities Press, 1980), 185.

²² Tiisanen, Dürrenmatt, 319.

²³ Edward Diller, "Aesthetics and the Grotesque: Friedrich Dürrenmatt," *Wisconsin Studies in Contemporary Literature*, 1966; 7:333.

²⁴ Martin Esslin in Volkmar Sander, ed., *Friedrich Dürrenmatt: Plays and Essays* (New York, Continuum, 1982), 20.