Martin Baisch

Reproductive Authorship in the Courtly Novel

Abstract

Around 1200 the genre of courtly romance gained profound cultural significance and importance. This chapter discusses aspects and conditions in a wide range which facilitate the aesthetical and poetical complexity of this genre. Courtly Novels show different forms of collaborative and multiple authorship.

"In the written narratives of the Middle Ages, the birth of the author occurs: as a metaphor."[1] This surprising punchline concludes an essay by Hartmut Bleumer, who in the 1990s masterfully summarizes the lively discussion about authorship and its conceptualization in the literature of the medieval period, and who also attempts to decipher the renewed interest in the author. Bleumer thus examines authorship, which he connects in the Middle Ages to the criteria of the attribution of meaning and writing, on the one hand, as a narrative within literary studies and, on the other hand, as a paradoxical staging in Wolfram's von Eschenbach *Parzival*, which famously differentiates the construction of the author and the role of the narrator to the highest degree and which, among other things, inexorably contrasts them with regard to the treatment of traditional clerical knowledge.[2]

With regard to the authorial self-design of the *tîhter* in the courtly novels around 1200, scholarship has to take note of rich material that chronicles the status and legitimacy, the assertion and withdrawal, of authorship and authority. Indeed, it can be observed in these representations, unfurled in prologues, epilogues, and metapoetic

---

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

1 Bleumer 2015, p. 35. See also Nichols 2006; Helle 2019.
2 See here also the account by Kragl 2019.

excurses, how forms of reflexive knowledge about the genesis of a work and the profile of an author emerge through reference to others and to oneself. Undoubtedly, these testimonies of novelists in the High and Late Middle Ages are of particular interest if one wishes to get to the root of the 'figures of aesthetic reflection' of this period.[3]

If, however, the analysis of these self-descriptions is delimited to the immanent properties of the text, scholarship forfeits the possibility of taking into account contextual conditions – however hazy – in the textual production of courtly novels.[4] The discussion of authors in medieval German studies at the end of the last millennium was also only peripherally concerned with this contextual knowledge, with the material conditions of textual production; it is instead more closely linked to the social-historical approaches of the 1970s and 1980s, such as Joachim Bumke's investigations into the patrons and benefactors of a literature that exists as commissioned art, and which is subject to heteronomous interests.[5] Recently, however, the commendable volume of research on patronage edited by Bernd Bastert, Andreas Bihrer, and Timo Reuvekamp-Felber had to state that the widely held assumptions of Old German studies in the last decades about the courtly literary scene are in need of revision in urgent and critical exchange with historical scholarship.[6]

This revision has led to the hypothesis in recent research that the concrete practice of literary productivity in the Middle Ages is less attributable to an individual ruler as patron but was rather accomplished by other members of the court who had access to education.[7] Certain personal constellations and habitual attitudes that could be formed in the noble courts of the 12th and 13th centuries appear to have shaped courtly literature, and must be taken seriously and reflected upon as dimensions of social practice – however difficult they may be to reconstruct historically.[8] And it is precisely this aspect that is made invisible in a research survey by Ursula Peters when she represents scholarship that proceeds on the basis of immanent textual properties and that questions assertions of legitimacy and threats to validity in courtly literature – decontextualizing the names of authors and patrons, and treating them as ciphers of a textuality defined

---

3   On the terminology, see the programmatic essays by Braun/Gerok-Reiter 2019 and Gerok-Reiter/Robert 2022, pp. 29–31 (English translation: Gerok-Reiter/Robert 2025).

4   See, for example, Felber 2001. As is well known, sources for the material conditions of the medieval literary world are mostly sparse and often suffice for rather speculative reconstructions only, such as those of the patronage relationships of authors or the dating of works.

5   See Bumke 1979; Bumke 1986; subsequently Heinzle 1993; for a critical response, Müller 1993.

6   Bastert/Bihrer/Reuvekamp-Felber 2017.

7   See, for example, Bezner 2019; Benz 2021.

8   The extent to which these groups of people can be understood as 'networks' requires, on the one hand, a precise historical appraisal of the individual case, and, on the other, a terminological review of the applicable theoretical approaches with regard to the concept of 'network.'

by alterity[9] – as a necessary methodological reaction to the social-historical and literary-sociological orientation of Medieval German studies in the 1970s:

> The extent to which their readjustment against the background of cultural studies can set foot on new methodological shores and locate our understanding of courtly poetry on a fundamentally altered basis can be seen, for example, in medievalist scholarship on patrons, a branch of the historical-societal project, systematically pursued by Joachim Bumke in the 1970s and 1980s, of analyzing the overall panorama of (Western European) courtly culture in the 12th and 13th centuries and the literary production associated with it.[10]

It seems to me, however, that one does not have to abandon one approach in order to pursue the other. Literary productivity in the Middle Ages – and this does not come into view in the studies of author-patron relationships that can be sociohistorically reconstructed, nor in the literary-sociological reflections on the institutionality of court literature – is also bound to demands that commit it to specific figures of justification. The often-observed dependence on tradition, which does not exclude renewal and transformation, should be mentioned, as well as the concept of *translatio studii*.[11] It has also been observed that the Latin literature of the Middle Ages developed conceptualizations of authoriality which evidence the advanced nature of this writing culture beyond question. The medieval theoretical strand regarding origination and authorship is not based on the notion of a creator *ex nihilo*; rather, the author "participates in a discourse that began long before him and merely places his own accents by adding more or less of his 'own' material."[12] In an analysis of Bonaventure's preface to the commentary *In primum librum Sententiarum*, Alastair J. Minnis has compiled those terms that are used to describe degrees of participation in original creation:

> The literary role of the *auctor*, considered in its widest sense, was distinguished from the respective roles of the scribe (*scriptor*), compiler (*compilator*) and commentator (*commentator*). [...] The *auctor* contributes most, the *scriptor* contributes nothing, of his own. The scribe is subject to materials composed by other men which he should copy as carefully as possible, *nihil mutando*. The *compilator* adds together or arranges the statements of other men, adding no opinion of his own (*addendo, sed non de suo*). The *commentator* strives to explain the views of others, adding something of his own by way of explanation. Finally and most importantly, the *auctor* writes *de suo* but draws on the statements of other men to support his own views.[13]

---

9   See Kellner / Strohschneider / Wenzel 2005; Strohschneider 2014.
10 Peters 2018, p. 49. See also Peters 2009.
11 See Friede / Schwarze 2015.
12 Müller 1995, p. 25.
13 Minnis 1984, pp. 94 f.; see also Bumke 1997, p. 102: "The medieval theory of authorship that emerged from the tradition of late antique commentary is based on the close relationship of the terms *auctor* and *auctoritas*. The *auctores*, according to the medieval understanding, were those

Here, concrete concepts (or terms!) of work in dealing with the text transmitted are adduced for a more accurate definition of 'authorship.' The definitional differentiation in the distinction between scribe, compiler, commentator, and author has also been applied to vernacular literature. Thus, the term *compilatio* has been used to describe the literary work of courtly epicists in the 12th and 13th centuries.[14] Bent Gebert has recently used the term fruitfully in a methodologically advanced study with regard to Konrad von Würzburg and his monumental Trojan novel:

> Konrad's accumulation of sources can hence be regarded as a difficult, extreme case of 'multiple authorship' [...] between material heterogeneity and compositional homogenization, the product of which I would like to examine as 'compilatory narration' beyond poetological self-assertion.[15]

Authorship, vested with attested authority to varying degrees of intensity, can also be signified in medieval manuscript culture by its 'complicity,' as Beatrice Trînca puts it:

> Under the specifically medieval conditions of multiple authorship, the 'author' forms a cipher for a collective contribution that emerges from diverse constructive and destructive intentions and coincidences, as well as from a text's own intratextual dynamics. All persons who, over time, shape and reshape the text in all its versions can be included in the authorial collective: authors of the narration (whose name may be mentioned in the text), writers, redactors, readers (who leave behind traces of their reading). The emergence of scholarly editions represents an (artificial) line of demarcation in this process. In transmission, the boundaries between scribe and scriptorium on the one hand and author or redactor on the other become more and more indistinct. Part of the aforementioned collective – although they do not impinge directly on the narrative fabric, but contextualize it – are also illuminators, rubricators, bookbinders, and the authors of other texts contained in the respective manuscripts.[16]

This description of medieval multiple authorship can serve as an exemplary notion of which entities or actors may be involved, in a co-ordinated way, in a socially and aes-

---

authors to whom *auctoritas* was due; apart from the authors of the Holy Scriptures, these were the poets and philosophers of Roman antiquity and of Christian late antiquity, whose works formed the foundation for and the subject of education in schools." See also Kelly 1999.

14   See Bumke 1997, p. 110.

15   Gebert 2021, p. 319.

16   Trînca 2019, pp. 24f. The availability of the author's name bears witness to a new significance for vernacular authorship, which is evidently connected to the reorientation of literature in the 13th century. The reorientation back to the renowned poets of the period around 1200 bestowed on them an authority that vernacular poetry had never possessed before, and which is encountered again in German literature only in the veneration of Opitz in the 17th century. People composed songs in the names of Reinmar and Neidhart, signed didactic works with the names of Stricker or Tannhäuser, and wrote epics under the name of Wolfram. Thus, a new canon emerged that influenced literary consciousness until the 15th century. See Bumke 1997, p. 97.

thetically determined setup – bound to the materiality of the exclusive object of the manuscript – in order to produce a written and pictorial work of courtly culture.[17]

Further assumptions, ideas, and attributions may be addressed here concerning conditions of origin and conceptualizations of the geneses of works, as well as the social functions that the aristocratic culture of the High and Late Middle Ages developed in its interest in the new vernacular literature. I have already touched on the moment of representation of aristocratic norms and values – however difficult the source situation is for the reconstruction of this social practice.

In his sociohistorically oriented sketches of French culture in the 12th century, the Romance philologian Erich Köhler paints a picture of the emergence of a new social force that was becoming self-aware – that of the now also legally recognized class of chivalry, which attempted "to legitimate itself as the bearer of a superior culture,"[18] and therefore associated itself with the clerics at the courts: "*Chevalerie et clergie*, chivalry and education, reads the slogan that [...] is already inscribed in the cradle of the novel."[19] In his reflections on the genre of the novel in relation to its historical function, Köhler links the idea of *translatio studii* to the "translation of chivalry," and thus situates it in courtly-chivalric discourse.[20] As a medium for the self-legitimation of a new social elite, the genre of the novel obtains the valorization that it is supposed to effect.[21] It is perhaps unsurprising that the courtly novel has also been connected to other significant concepts of aristocratic culture. Using the *Erec* novels as an example, Karlheinz Stierle examines, with a clearly perceptible emphasis, the semantics and functionalization of *cortoise* in medieval culture, which he characterizes as "a boon of comity that, as the essence of the courtly, permeated all class and linguistic boundaries."[22] According to Stierle, it is the courtly novel especially that contributed to the dissemination of this new social norm and elevated it to an ideal. This was possible, Stierle continues, because the newly emerging literature at the courts did not yet recognize the modern distinction or categorical separation between poetry and reality:

> To a special degree, *cortoisie* is a transitional category between imaginary and social reality. Through *cortoisie*, as it were, an ideal of heightened life is brought from fiction into reality. *Cortoisie* is novelistic in life; it strives, as it were, over and above the real.[23]

---

17 See here also the well-known works of the Romanist Stephen G. Nichols under the heading of material philology; I will refer simply to Nichols 2016.

18 Köhler 1981, p. 243.

19 Köhler 1981, p. 243.

20 Köhler 1981, p. 251.

21 Köhler's 1981 essay does not provide a further definition of the term 'education.' In later research, the term seems to have been replaced by the concept of 'knowledge.'

22 Stierle 1994, p. 256.

23 Stierle 1994, p. 258.

Ultimately, the establishment of *cortoisie*, or comity, aims at forms of reciprocal communication that imprint themselves on the form of the novel.

*

To account for the conditions, possibilities, and functions of the genre of the courtly novel in the High and Late Middle Ages, and in order to adequately describe such figures of aesthetic reflection for this type of text as well as to elaborate concepts of (multiple) authorship, different methodological approaches must be chosen and different thematic perspectives adopted – and that is the purpose of this chapter. The following reflections focus on those methodological dimensions and thematic emphases that take an aesthetic-praxeological perspective on the textual material and that factor in the autological and heterological dimensions of courtly epic poetry, in order to invoke the terminology of the Collaborative Research Center (CRC) 1391 *Different Aesthetics*. Multiple or collaborative authorship always appertains to the criterion of reproducibility. The category of 'reproductivity' stands in contrast to the terminology of the 'autological' versus the 'heterological dimension'; it has a share in both areas of the model proposed by the CRC.[24] On the one hand, it refers to the cultural knowledge of a written tradition based in rhetoric, as well as to the generic requirements and specifications of the courtly novel. On the other hand, it incorporates the interests of historically concrete contexts and the effects of social practices, which can only be deduced through precise analyses and interpretations of the material evidence. From my perspective, the courtly novel can be adequately understood in its historicity – and also in its aesthetics – through this category, as hopefully has already become clear in my line of argument thus far. I accordingly attempt to trace the conditions (of expression) and possibilities of medieval authorship in the courtly novel in terms of the aesthetics of production and reception. The reconstruction of the text-critical debate over the courtly novel forms the first important field of investigation. It shows how influential the conceptions of the content and form of authorship established here have been, even beyond the narrow context of the discussion of textual criticism. This is followed by reflections on the courtly novel's autological dimension and the constraints of its genre: the rhetorical-historical approach allows to make plausible conceptions of multiple authorship. As I will argue, abridgements, as a distinct form of representation for courtly epic, are a result of reproductive contact with the previous text. Using examples from the work of Wolfram von Eschenbach, I consolidate my thoughts by considering aspects of reception, variance, and mediality.

24   See the contributions on the research programme: Gerok-Reiter / Robert 2022, pp. 26–29; Gerok-Reiter / Robert 2025.

1. Authorship in the Courtly Novel: the Text-critical Dimension

> What is to be done need not be described at length. The rescued and recaptured monuments are kept in careful preservation everywhere; it is of no benefit to us to put them into print hastily so that their content may be opened to mere curiosity, but rather we should make an effort toward the production and protection of their original form. What the past has brought forth must not be at the arbitrary service of the needs or opinion of our present age; instead, the latter must do its utmost that it may pass faithfully through its hands and pass down untampered to the most recent posterity.[25]

Starting from Joachim Bumke's thesis "that the concept of authorship in the Middle Ages was most closely linked to the transmission of texts,"[26] it is also necessary to consider how the discipline of German studies has dealt with this transmission methodologically. The courtly novels of the period around 1200 represented the classical field of application for classical textual criticism in medieval German studies, in the sense of Lachmann's method, for a long time.[27] In this regard, it was surely decisive that, since its beginnings, the discipline has operated with emphatic concepts of 'author' and 'text' or 'work' in relation to this genre. Concepts of authorship based on the aesthetics of the genius marked the assumptions and presuppositions of editing, as well as of interpretation. Yet it was not only the transfer of emphatically conceived models of authorship to the genre of the courtly novel that predestined these texts to become objects of Lachmann's classical method; this genre additionally represents a type of text that is literarized to a greater degree than other high medieval genres of text, and which is not based in orality. That the textual form of the courtly verse novels in the extant witnesses to transmission evidences the 'inconstancy' or 'openness' of these texts was brought to the attention of the discipline in the 1990s by Joachim Bumke's text-critical studies on the courtly novels. In particular, Bumke's monograph on the *Nibelungenklage* and his edition of this text are to thank for the fact that the textual history and criticism of the courtly novels have received new impetus. This is an advanced attempt to process the transmission of a courtly narrative with all the means of traditional textual criticism and, at the same time, to outline a theoretical model of medieval textuality on the basis of the analyzed material. Bumke's study, based on the results of his empirical and philological work with texts transmitted by manuscript, seems to depart from a production-related concept of the author – in the sense of a cohering figure centring and organizing the textual material. The model of description and analysis of the 'equivalent parallel versions,' which lays claim to its legitimacy in the corpus of courtly epic poetry, rests on the insight that, in the field of this textual genre, one can assume multiple early, i.e.

---

25   Grimm 1966, p. 31.
26   Bumke 1997, p. 87.
27   See Müller 1999.

'author-proximate,' versions of the texts, which are characterized by a high degree of variability.

While Bumke's model of 'equivalent parallel versions' has been discussed with much approval in the field, objections have also been raised that should be pursued further. Albrecht Hausmann, for instance, defended the text-critical method but pointed out its methodological limitations:

> Behind the parallel versions, there may very well stand in principle an archetype and also an authorial text, only this cannot be reconstructed – in any case, not with the means of text-critical comparison. It is not the historical absence of 'originals' or 'archetypes,' and thus a peculiarity of medieval culture, but rather the impossibility of reconstructing them with one's own methodological means that was and is the problem of a textual criticism that is directed, by means of the process of collation, at the 'original' text. The phenomenon of 'parallel versions' is thus the result of a process of collation that assigns a privileged status to primary filiations compared to later stages of transmission; these parallel versions are not 'equivalent' in a historical sense but at best in a methodological one, specifically because of their equal position in the stemma.[28]

In addition, Bumke's concept of 'versions' also shows theoretical implications that model the textuality of courtly novels in a specific way. A philology that postulates the existence of multiple versions of the texts transmitted does not simply state an objective textual finding in the history of transmission, but rather constructs a model of transmission that in turn conceptualizes the scholarly approach by means of editorial and interpretative presuppositions.[29] This observation is directed at the fact that Bumke's investigations into the history of transmission and textual criticism relocate the object of scholarly insight from the text of an author to the versions of a text:

> In this way, the concept of the work shifts from the original to the versions. If the epic work is accessible only in different versions, the versions represent the work itself because it is not possible to form an idea of the work independently of the versions.[30]

Because Bumke insists here on the criterion of 'creative drive' or 'originality'[31] for the categorical definition of the concept of version, it is not only the boundaries between

---

28 Hausmann 2001, p. 82.
29 Peter Strohschneider 2001, p. 29, characterizes Bumke's new conception of the history of the courtly epic's transmission as the "reconstructive result of a complex multiplicity of hermeneutic operations."
30 Bumke 1996, pp. 48 f.
31 See also Henkel 2001, p. 138: "The introduction of the concept 'originality' into the definition seems problematic to me because the recognizably motivated and individually shaped access to a previous state of the text can also be recognized in 'adaptation.'"

the 'version' of a text and the 'adaptation' of the same that remain fluid.[32] The concepts of 'version' and 'adaptation' remain bound to the category of the intentionality of the respective creators of the texts – in the case of versions, to that of the (or an) 'author.' It remains unclear how the model of 'equivalent parallel versions' relates to the category of authorial intention:

> This means, however, that the historically specific confusion of the genesis and legitimacy of a text, passed down in the classicist concept of 'originality,' is not disrupted by the concept of 'versions.' Accordingly, the moment of authorization of the text by its creator, i.e. authorship, is also claimed for 'versions,' at least implicitly, and specifically when 'versions' are distinguished from 'adaptations' as 'primary' and 'secondary' versions of texts [...] and when the criterion of their 'originality' encompasses 'a different drive in formulation and design.'[33]

Yet the textuality of medieval culture is also tied to the function of the author in the thoughts of Johannes Janota, who, among other things, has produced authoritative editions in the genre context of the highly variable liturgical dramas:

> On the contrary, it is precisely the text-altering authorization of a work – through all its distortions of transmission, up to misunderstandings and objective errors – that confirms the authority of the author (even if he remains anonymous) in the updated adaptation. It is thus not only medieval attestations of authors or the collections of declared authors that demand we also retain the concept of the author for the Middle Ages.[34]

By contrast, one can argue along with the Anglicist Hans Walter Gabler that, in medieval textual production, the entity of the author is less decisive than the act of writing itself, which instead aims at adaptation. The fact of the materiality of a text's genesis is therefore not to be underestimated:

> The fact that medieval scribes and *scriptoria* [...] lived happily with the variance in the texts of works, and even participated in their enrichment, in all their efforts to hand down 'good' texts also indisputably suits the assumption that, for medieval poets and their listeners and readers, the names of authors and the faithful reproduction of the thoughts and ideas of transmitted works sufficed as an appeal to 'authorities.' It could be claimed that this was a period for the dissociation of authors and texts. The author-authority stood for the thoughts and meaning of the transmitted works. The texts in which they were transmitted were at the same time both variable and able to

---

32   See also the criticism of Strohschneider 2001, p. 115: "First of all, the expression 'creative drive' ties the genesis and identity of a version to the position of a subject, which it furnishes with the criterion of intentionality; in this respect, 'versions' and 'adaptations' do not differ from one another. Yet the actuality or non-actuality of a creative drive on the part of a text's originator is not a fact that can be proven by textual analysis."

33   Strohschneider 2001, p. 115.

34   Janota 1998, p. 79.

be critically corrected when being copied, for if scribes did not promote the corruption of the text through their copying errors, they were certainly critical proofreaders and understood themselves as such. In this, there is revealed an immediate attentiveness regarding the materiality of the texts. The text passed down in writing should be, and remain, comprehensible. By contrast, the author, or even the author's intent, remained alien to the copyist who made the transmission of the text possible.[35]

Within medieval German studies, it seems striking to me that, in discussions about the author and his functions in medieval culture, these are connected with ethical and normative positions, and less with the principle of securing intelligibility:

> The figure of the author constitutes itself in the concern over the correct text: in the fulfilment of the rules of art, and in the especially dogmatic correctness of the content. This concern can lead to the liberalization of the text, but also to the assumption of responsibility for the text and therefore to the demand for its conservation. In this sense (not in a genius-aesthetic sense), 'emphatic authorship' also existed in the Middle Ages.[36]

The debate over the model of 'versions' in the courtly novel reveals that the genre of the courtly novel is closely linked to notions of a creative subject, whose conception of the work should also be tangible in the transmitted versions. Forms of multiple authorship are not taken into account in this summary of the discussion, even though editors are aware of the work processes out of which these texts emerge.

2. Reproductive and Interpretive: Retelling in the Courtly Novel

> Han ich nu kunst, div zeige sich!
> durch reine hertze, den wise ich
> dises bůches rehtez angenge,
> des materie vns vil enge
> her Wolfram hat betůtet:
> div iv wirt baz belůtet.[37]

> Do I own the art, then I show it!
> Those who own a pure heart, to them will I reveal
> the real opening of the book
> whose matter Sir Wolfram von Eschenbach has only
> interpreted in a delimited manner:
> This I will illuminate for you.

---

35 Gabler 2012, pp. 320 f.
36 Grubmüller 2000, pp. 32 f.
37 Ulrich von dem Türlin: Arabel, R. 4,1.

Ulrich von dem Türlin takes a surprisingly critical stance on his famous predecessor's narrative practice, which Ulrich wishes to surpass both quantitatively and qualitatively in his attempt to depict the prehistory of those events that Wolfram von Eschenbach treated in his crusade novel. Moreover, in the concept of *materie*, the passage names a central aspect of the conditions of production in the realm of the courtly epic and describes the activity of the *tihter* as reproductive and interpretive.

The finding that the adaptation of the mostly French or Latin originals occurred by means of the expansion or abridgement of the text is of central significance in the description of models of authorship in the courtly novel. The responsibility for such treatment of text was assigned – at least in the essays by Franz-Josef Worstbrock,[38] which decisively influenced German studies – to medieval poetic treatises, such as those by Matthew of Vendôme and Geoffrey of Vinsauf, who, taking up classical concepts and postulates, each transformed and codified them for their own contexts, "which is already a practiced and recognized standard of literary practice and linguistic and formal design in the literature of their time."[39] If vernacular authors around 1200 are characterized as 'retellers' – a conceptualization has been astoundingly successful – there is some proximity to the concept of the compiler, who, as already explained, shapes anew that which he encounters.[40]

Worstbrock also recognizes significant analogies between the work of the courtly narrators around 1200 and the poetic treatises of medieval Latin.[41] He regards what theoretical discourse and 'practical' narrative work share as common perspectives – the *materia* handed down and the *artificium* constitute the text of the reteller – as the "universals of the epoch."[42] Yet he also does not ignore the problem that the "concept of *materia* [lacks] a firm contour."[43]

Marie-Sophie Masse and Stephanie Seidl describe how to imagine this practice in the context of studies on German-language novels of antiquity, which the two philologists refer to as 'third-level texts':

---

38 Worstbrock 1985; Worstbrock 1999.

39 Henkel 2017, p. 28.

40 See Worstbrock 1999, p. 139: "According to all this, the reteller is not an author in the medieval understanding, but the artifex. Similarly, the Middle High German word '*tihtære*,' as far as I am able to track its occurrence in the realm of epic poetry, does not signify the author, but rather the one who gives it artful form, starting with the rhymes."

41 Worstbrock 1999, p. 137.

42 See Worstbrock 1999, p. 138: "It [that universal of the epoch, M.B.] is developed in poetics into a rhetorically instrumented operational system in relation to the field of *artificium* that represents procedural possibilities of disposition, expansion and abridgement, and formulation."

43 Worstbrock 1999, p. 138.

> With the *materia*, the *latinitas* also provides instruction for the *tractatio materiae*. The vernacular authors, who very probably received a clerical education, were familiar with Latin theories of poetry, which were taught in schools and codified in the *artes poeticae* from the second half of the 12th century. In this respect, it seems legitimate to use the theory of poetry originally targeted at Latin stylistics for the study of vernacular literature.[44]

In her highly relevant professorial dissertation, Silvia Schmitz refers to the knowledge codified in the medieval *artes poeticae* as 'rules of adaptation.'[45] She primarily consults the *Ars versificatoria* of Matthew of Vendôme, the *Poetria nova* of Geoffrey of Vinsauf, and his abridged version of the *Documentum de modo et arte dictandi et versificandi.* The focus of her investigations is on *inventio* and its associated procedures of *abbreviatio* and *dilatatio*.[46] In the *artes poeticae*, the purpose of topical *inventio* to guarantee the principal diversity of arguments is limited (by systematization, the doctrine of *proprietates*, and the *officia* of the *genus demonstrativum*), as Schmitz shows in relation to Matthew. By means of a subtle comparison between Johannes de Garlandia, who appended a separate chapter for *inventio* to his *Parusiana Poetria*, and Matthew, *inventio* is described as a hermeneutic act – as a method of interpreting and shaping *materia* – with the author taking into account the adapting of rhetorical practice to the needs of textual interpretation. Finally, Schmitz points out that the term and the concept of *inventio* can also be targeted at the intellectual penetration of the work.

The medieval conceptualization of *abbreviato* and *dilatatio* is first set apart from the *minutio* and *amplificatio* of classical rhetoric. Where the conceptual enhancement of the expression and the dilation and the lessening (or concentration) of the expression and the abridgement are combined in classical rhetoric, the qualitative dimension recedes in medieval techniques of textual adaptation:

> In contrast to classical techniques, the qualitative dimension recedes in *dilatatio* and *abbreviatio* as encountered in the *artes poeticae*. They are predominantly directed at the expansion or contraction of a given subject. Nonetheless, it must be noted, especially for *amplificatio* and *dilatatio*, that an overly sharp distinction of the two methods does not do justice to either classical or medieval teachings.[47]

44　Masse / Seidl 2016, p. 12.

45　Schmitz 2007. See also Schmitz 2016.

46　Linden 2017, p. 6: "In *amplificatio*, i. e. artful expansion, a poet who works with pre-existing material can demonstrate his own skill. Accordingly, this field receives a great deal of attention in medieval poetic treatises, which adapt their instructions to the contemporary literary situation. In addition, *abbreviatio* and *dilatatio* are two sides of the same coin, specifically two opposite movements in engagement with a basic text, which can also be understood through the image of folding in and folding out."

47　Schmitz 2007, p. 263.

Abbreviatio and *dilatatio* owe their revaluation in the medieval tradition to the progymnasmata – "for in the rhetorical exercises for paraphrasing and embellishing a subject, considerable significance is attributed to abbreviation and expansion"[48] – and to the commentary tradition of late antiquity (such as the commentaries of Servius). Through the authority of Virgil, the methods of abridgement and expansion, practiced in school lessons, gain substantial importance as the procedural steps of adaptation. Yet the picture remains complex, conditioned by the hardly uniform terminology and the categorical indeterminacy of these terms in the poetic treatises.

For methods of expansion, Geoffrey names "eight techniques by means of which a *materia* can be expanded: the 'accumulation of synonymous statements,' paraphrase (*circuitio*), comparison (*collatio*), address (*apostropha*), personification of the speaker (*prosopopoeia*), excursus (*digressio*), description (*descriptio*), and 'antithetical means of expression.'"[49]

For techniques of abridgement, Geoffrey correspondingly describes seven methods of textual adaptation, to which belong, for instance, the reduction of expression to the essential (*emphasis*) and the avoidance of repetition.[50] As Schmitz concludes, Geoffrey treats the techniques of *abbreviatio* only briefly in the *Poetria nova*; however, this undoubtedly has dispositional functions in the order and weighting of the material.

In an important contribution, Ludger Lieb criticized the distinction between *materia* and *artificium* that Wortsbrock, in particular, strongly argued for in the debate, and questioned whether "an applicability of the rhetorical model of Latin poetic treatises to major forms of vernacular narrative is reasonable."[51] The rhetorical-poetic terms "hardly [lead] to clean enough differentiations."[52] Lieb comes to the thought-provoking conclusion

> that the application of the rhetorical-poetic concept to courtly novels tends to reduce complexity. It obscures the complex situation of the problem, especially in suggesting that the *artificium* can be separated from the *materia* in epics and novels as it can in fables. Instead of busying oneself historically with *dilatio* and *abbreviatio* and quickly bumping up against the model's analytical limitations precisely because of its attractive dichotomy, one could rather emphasize the reciprocal conditionality of *materia* and *artificium* [...].[53]

---

48   Schmitz 2007, p. 265.
49   Schmitz 2007, p. 269.
50   Schmitz 2007, p. 269: "For *abbreviatio*, he names seven methods: the reduction of the expression to the essential (*emphasis*), the use of (short) clauses (*articulus*), the ablative absolute (*ablativus*), the avoidance of repetition, the mere allusion to a broad subject, the unconnected order of individual words and groupings of words, and the fusion of several statements into one."
51   Lieb 2005, p. 357. See also Hasebrink 2009; Gollwitzer-Oh 2012; Köbele 2017.
52   Lieb 2005, p. 359.
53   Lieb 2005, p. 362.

On the one hand, Lieb insists on taking the paradoxes of the semantics of *materia* more seriously than rhetorical approaches do. He states that no interpretation – at least, no methodologically transparent one – can be gained from collections of dilations and abbreviations alone. The question of the relationship between (classical and medieval) 'theory' and practice and the practices of writing (and copying) by medieval scribes and redactors should also receive more attention. Of course, the fact that theory and practice also each have a different significance and scope in regard to medieval textual production remains important.[54] Finally, as Susanne Köbele notes, it must also be considered that, in the context of the practice of courtly narration, it cannot be assumed that one may apply the "strict alternative of stable *materia* on the one hand and variable *artificium* on the other."[55]

3. The Practice and Poetics of Abridged Courtly Novels

In the course of the debate initiated by Joachim Bumke on the genesis and legitimacy of parallel versions in the context of courtly epic poetry, those versions of texts that have had the term 'abridgement' assigned to them, and which have mostly been attributed to the entity of a redactor, have also received new attention in scholarship. Here, for instance, the *J version of *Die Klage* and the *M version of Gottfried's von Straßburg *Tristan* can be cited, to name just two well-known representatives.[56] In addition, Joachim Bumke, Nikolaus Henkel, and recently Julia Frick have constructed models for describing the techniques and practices of abridgement, which have emerged from intensive engagement with the stock of transmitted texts.[57] As this discussion has made clear, abridgements are to be understood as the "form of representation of a distinct type of narration" that enriches the image of a courtly literary scene characterized

---

54 See Knapp 2014, p. 231: "The *artes poeticae* and other high medieval poetological works and passages are importance indices of this 'literary infrastructure,' but [...] by no means constitute it alone. Every medieval storyteller who had attended a better school for a longer period of time or who had had professional contact with an advanced student knew e.g. that a narrative 'should be short, clear, and verisimilar' (Rhetorica ad Herennium I,9,14: *ut brevis, ut dilucida, ut veri similis sit*). Storytellers who grossly violate this therefore often attempt to defend themselves seriously or ironically, at least nominally, against reproaches of this kind; thus, for instance, they promise to skip over something out of a need for brevity – in most cases, before they in fact portray it."

55 Köbele 2017, pp. 167 f.

56 The *J version of the *Klage* represents the manuscript I/J Berlin SBB SPK mgf 474 (Nibelungenlied, Klage, Winsbecke and Winsbeckin); Frick 2018 gives a more recent overview of this version of the text. The *M version of *Tristan* represents an illuminated manuscript from Munich, the famous Cgm 51 (Gottfried von Straßburg: Tristan, Ulrich von Türheim: Fortsetzung); see Baisch 2006.

57 See Bumke 1996; summaries in Henkel 1992; Henkel 1993. Frick 2018 distinguishes three types of abbreviation by redactors.

by its collectivity.[58] Because narrative emerges in the courtly epic not infrequently as description (in the context of *descriptiones*, for example), the impression of a paucity of information and redundancy arises in reception with regard to the level of plot. By concentrating on the narrative's progression and reducing descriptive elements, such as *ornatus*, a narrative is implemented in which the benefit of conciseness and the avoidance of redundancy come into their own as poles of the effects that can be produced by abridgement.[59]

Abridgements of courtly epic can aim at conventionality; however, this effect is hardly to be understood as a reduction of meaning, but rather as a relocation of meaning. Abridgements always affect the temporal order of the narrative and that which is narrated, such as when adaptation induces an increase in the narrative tempo. Semantic reaccentuations – for example, in regard to conceptions of character – can be observed and given plausibility through a hermeneutics of comparison, which can also assess the validity of interpretations for the non-abridged versions. It may then be possible to discern the formation of a profile that can be understood as an interest in the reception of reproductive or multiple authorship. The text-critical findings for the abridged versions must be carefully kept in view in order to be able to assess the scope of the thesis' formation regarding the drive toward *brevitas*. Contingency and errors in transmission also characterize these processes of textual adaptation and transmission. These are what they are, and they are to be highlighted as such.

4. Multiple Authorship and Forms of Aesthetic Experience

> Smaragde wâren die buochstabe, mit rubînen verbundet.
> adamante, krisolîte, grânât dâ stuonden. Nie seil baz gehundet
> wart, ouch was der hunt vil wol geseilet.
> ir muget wol errâten, welhez ih dâ næme, op wære der hunt dergegene geteilet.

> The letters were of emerald, mingled with rubies. There were diamonds, chrysolites, and garnets. Never was a leash better hounded, and indeed the hound was very well leashed. You may well guess which I would choose, if the hound were the alternative choice![60]

---

58   Frick 2021, p. 13. See also Frick 2018, p. 25: "In this view, early long versions and abridgements of courtly epics, as different manifestations of medieval retelling within a spectrum with fluid boundaries, represent two narrative modes belonging to the genuine possibilities of the genre, in which the *materia* is in each case retextualized by means of the poetic *artificium* in different ways, i.e. it is always interpreted anew in each case."
59   See Frick 2021, p. 25; see also Frick 2020.
60   Wolfram: Titurel, v. 147,1–4 (Wolfram: Parcival and Titurel, trans. Edwards 2006, p. 364, v. 142).

The young, educated noblewoman Sigune gets into a strange situation in a forest clearing where she had wanted to meet her lover, which induces her to undergo a complex aesthetic experience; by means of some writing on a truly luxurious dog leash – the letters of which are formed of gemstones, fastened with gold nails to a cord of precious silk – the young woman receives the story of an unhappy love, namely that of the young Queen Clauditte and the Duke Ehkunaht. Sigune's appreciation of this love story, divested from the courtly context and its public forms of literary reception, has been characterized as a solitary and isolated reading. It has even been interpreted as an expression of "a radical autonomization of literature,"[61] as if Werther, in one of his letters to Wilhelm, were here reporting on his reading of Homer in nature. What exactly the heroine reads, however, requires an interpretation of Wolfram's fragment, the aesthetic strategy of which seems to leave precisely this aspect in the dark. Sigune strives to discern the consciously employed textual strategy of fragmentariness[62] and to resolve this in a secure understanding of the writing on the dog leash. Yet the hunting dog then escapes her along with the wonderful leash that bears the gemstone script. She can perceive it only for a moment – Sigune's experience is that of the ephemerality of the textual. Stability and duration, properties of the text that later book culture came to appreciate, do not characterize the duchess' act of reading. Whether Sigune perceives the gemstone script on the leash as a form of "blocked textuality,"[63] thus aiming at eventfulness, or as a norm-mediating practical text meant to guide the action is difficult to determine. In the case of this written artwork, the aesthetic is to be understood only as a potentiality, specifically "in the sense that even if this possibility is not taken up, the linguistic artwork in question is not yet nihilated in its status as an object of perception."[64] Perhaps it is the case, however, that Sigune reads the gemstone text in distanced reflexivity as an aesthetic artwork with chiastic word order, neologisms, ambitious metaphors, and polysemous narrative commentary – role distance seems to be a condition of more complex forms of aesthetic experience. Still, quite a few scholarly positions purport that Sigune's mode of reception proceeds in an identificatory manner.

In Albrecht's von Scharfenberg transformation of Wolfram's stanzas – *Der jüngere Titurel* – it is recounted how Sigune's solitary reading in the forest becomes a courtly public performance in which the text of the dog's leash is anchored "institutionally in Arthur's court."[65] Where Sigune had previously read the gemstone script on the hunting dog's leash alone and without social oversight or hermeneutic support in Wolfram's narrative – with the result that she 'coveted' the reading of the text, how the text could

61 Brackert 1996, p. 173.
62 See Köbele / Kiening 1998.
63 Strohschneider 2006.
64 Küpper 2001, p. 219.
65 Neukirchen 2006, p. 205.

gain control over her[66] – the text of the dog leash is made accessible here by a clerically educated intermediary after Tschionatulander and other courtiers wonder about the strange object and its writing. Distressingly, it is ensured that all those present keep quiet under threat of sanctions and that all also hear the instructive message. What is offered on the leash is no *aventiure*, but rather courtly doctrine: the text of the inscription[67] begins as a letter from Clauditte to Ekunat, in which she praises her partner and explains her choice, but then deploys didactic, authoritative speech over a variety of stanzas, which scholarship divides into a doctrine of duties, a doctrine of morals, a doctrine of love, and a doctrine of virtue.[68] For the narrator, however, the 44 stanzas are, in their entirety, a doctrine of virtue.[69] Those expecting or hoping for some other knowledge of Wolfram's fragment, such as a narrative of the *aventiure* about Clauditte and Ekunat, will be disappointed.

This view of an (admittedly unusual) situation for the reception of courtly literature yields interesting aspects in regard to the issue of the historical configurations of multiple authorship. *Titurel* imagines the result of reproductive or multiple authorship in the context of a primarily courtly and exorbitant display of splendour, which emphasizes the materiality and mediality of writing and text. Its reception – first through Signune's solitary and free interpretation and then, in Albrecht's retelling, in the collective and directed performance of teaching – corresponds on the side of production to the scalable participation in authorship.

5. Dialogue of the Variants: *krâm* or *chranz* – *minne* or *helfe*. To What Has the Duchess Orgeluse Committed Herself?

At the end of Wolfram's von Eschenbach grail novel *Parzival*, King Gramoflanz and the Arthurian knight Gawain are to meet in a chivalric duel in the field near Jôflanze. After Gawain's return to his beloved, she, the Duchess Orgeluse, kneels before Gawain (like Laudine before Yvain in Hartmann's second Arthurian novel) and asks to be excused for the things she had demanded of him. The knight – who up to that point had to endure nothing but mockery and insults from the duchess, yet who was able to demonstrate his great capacity for suffering and willingness to love as a result – retorts that her mockery is also inappropriate because it has damaged the institution of knighthood. He then hands over the garland stolen from Gramoflanz, thereby eliciting a strong emotional reaction in the duchess. In tears, and with great rhetorical gesticulation, she tells the

---

66   Wenzel 1997, p. 270.
67   Albrecht: Jüngerer Titurel 1, v. 1874–1927.
68   Haug 1992, esp. pp. 368–370; see also Baisch et al. 2010.
69   Albrecht: Jüngerer Titurel 1, v. 1508.

Arthurian knight of her lover and husband Cidegast – *der triuwe ein monîzirus* (of fidelity a unicorn)[70] – and of his death, for which King Gramoflanz is responsible. Gawain tells her about his impending duel with the latter, forgives her everything, and asks for the immediate granting of her favour: after all, no one else is there.[71] The duchess sharply reproaches him and begins crying again.[72] The tears get through to the hero: *unz er mit ir klagete* (so long he lamented with her).[73] In response, Orgeluse tells Gawain of the pact she made with the magician Clinschor.[74] In order to take revenge on Gramoflanz, the duchess sought the help and the service of knights whom she sent into battle against Gramoflanz. Among them was King Amfortas, with whom she entered into a love affair. She received from him valuable goods from Thabronit as a gift; he received in her service the wound that forms a narrative centre in Wolfram's narrative cosmos. The duchess uses that gift from Amfortas, who could no longer tend to the protection of Orgeluse following his wounding, to steady her friendship with the dangerous magician Clinschor.

The D and G manuscripts of *Parzival*, central to Lachmann's edition, transmit notable presumptive variants in this part of the text:

D, L:	G:
durch vride ich Clinschore dar	Dur fride ich chlinshor.
gap mînen *krâm* nâch rîcheite var:	Dar gap minem *chranz*.
swenne diu âventiur wurde er*liten*,	Nach richeit wurde ganz.
swer den prîs het erstriten,	swenne diu aventiur wurde er*biten*.
an den solt ich *minne* suochen:	swer den pris het erstriten.
	an den solt ich *helfe* suochen.
wolt er min [nur g: minne] niht geruochen,	wolt er min niht geruochen.
der *krâm* wær anderstunde mîn	der *chranz* waer anderstunde min.
(italics: M. B.)	(italics: M. B.)
In order to have peace with Clinschor,	To have peace with Clinschor,
I gave him my wonderful things.	I gave him my wonderful wreath.
If ever one should pass the adventure	If ever one should have solicited the adventure
obtain victory,	and could and could obtain victory,
I should seek my love with him.	I should look for help with him.
If he, however, would not want me (my love),	If he, however, would not want (to support) me,
then the things should fall back to me.	then the wreath should fall back to me.

---

70   Wolfram: Parzival, v. 613,22.
71   Wolfram: Parzival, v. 615,1.
72   Wolfram: Parzival, v. 615,22.
73   Wolfram: Parzival, v. 615,23.
74   Wolfram: Parzival, v. 617,17–23.

It is perhaps less conspicuous that manuscript G replaces *krâm* (things) with *chranz* (wreath); like D, it elsewhere transmits *krâm*.[75] Rather, it is worth considering how the manuscripts differ in their report of what the duchess pledged to the one who knew how to survive the adventure over the dangerous ford.

> One must [...] ask oneself whether Orgeluse has forgotten that she made a contractual pledge to Clinschor to compete for the love of the one who survives the adventure of *Schastel marveile* (617,19 ff.). When she meets Gawain again after his victory on *Lit marveile*, she treats him just as contemptuously as before (598,16 ff.). Gisela Zimmermann has pointed out that Orgeluse has committed herself to *minne* (617,21) towards the victor of *Schastel marveile* only in the manuscripts of the *D class; in most manuscripts of the *G class, *helfe* [help] stands in place of *minne* [love].[76]

Yet not only this – Gisela Zimmermann has also tried to vindicate the text transmitted in manuscript G with arguments that are worth taking into account:

> Orgeluse could ask for *helfe* [help] from the conqueror of the hall's magic even if she had previously given her love to another. At first, she is also interested in *helfe* when she meets Gawain again. In addition, the version of manuscript G now allows us to attribute some influence on Orgeluse's behaviour after Gawain's first success on *Schastel marveile* to the arrangement between Orgeluse and Clinschor. This arrangement – but not the version in manuscript D – can also be squared with the fact that Orgeluse makes any reward for Gawain dependent on the outcome of the adventure at the ford. A caveat of this kind would hardly be comprehensible if she were obliged to win his love.[77]

Previous editions of the text follow Lachmann's editorial decision and adopt the text of D. Future interpretations of Wolfram's von Eschenbach *Parzival* should not only carefully appreciate the results of text-critical research, as the work of the Bern *Parzival* project impressively attests, but also implement them appropriately in their analyses.

6. Mediality

> Any archetype exists primarily as an intellectualized standard for evaluating the variations worked out in the individual texts. These manuscript texts, in themselves and in their mutability, are the proper subject of critical analysis. Since they represent a collaborative re-creation involving authors, performers, revisers, and scribes, the work is completely detached from its originator, who at any event had thoroughly subverted his individuality in the production of literary compositions.[78]

---

75   Wolfram: Parzival, v. 617,6.

76   Bumke 1994, p. 110.

77   Zimmermann 1972, p. 146. See also Zimmermann 1974.

78   Speer 1980, p. 318.

The great interest in the figure of Cundrîe revealed by the cycle of pictures in the famous Cgm 19 – which probably came into being in the second third of the 13th century and which transmits Wolfram's von Eschenbach *Parzival*, both fragments of *Titurel*, and two of Wolfram's *Tagelieder* – corresponds to the lack of interest in a figure who even so occupies a prominent position in Wolfram's Arthurian grail novel.[79] The Duchess Orgeluse, as well as Arnîve, Sangîve, and Itonjê (i. e. King Arthur's female relatives), who all play an important role in the peace negotiations in Book XIV of the novel, are almost disregarded in the pictorial presentation. That book narrates how the battle between King Gramoflanz and Gawain is able to be settled peacefully thanks to King Arthur's skill in negotiation; however, Arthur only develops the initiative to do so when he is urged on by his female relatives. In the end, not only are ritual kisses of reconciliation exchanged between the hostile parties, but Arthur also brings about a sequence of political marriages: *Artus was der frouwen milte*.[80] The first illustrated page transmitted in Cgm 19 (Fig. 1)

> tells the story of the amicable settlement of the conflict by Arthur in a scenic sequence. Three bands are arranged from top to bottom, depicting the consultation with the messengers and preliminary conversations in the tent, the meeting of the convoys, and the reconciliation of the parties in the conflict. In all three bands of the image, the area of confidentiality is delimited by the tents standing on the left and right. The preparatory discussions take place in them. The space in between is in natural surroundings and freely visible, and is thus the space for the production of the public sphere.[81]

Among the illustrated manuscripts of *Parzival*, it is only manuscript G of Wolfram that selects the conflict resolution scene described here as a pictorial motif. Monika Unzeitig-Herzog sees this as evidence of how decidedly current the political theme of reconciliation, also represented in Wolfram's text, was for the early 13th century.[82]

The upper register on fol. 49r depicts Gramoflanz in the tent on the right taking counsel, probably with his uncle Brandelidelin. The messengers, signified by the saddled horses, are to inform Arthur that Gramoflanz wishes to fight Gawain and no one else. In the tent on the left, King Arthur – who, like Gramoflanz, is labelled with a scroll – confers with his female relatives. Sangîve, Arthur's sister; Arnîve, his mother; and Itonjê, his granddaughter, call on the king to tell him of the (long-distance) love between Gramoflanz and Itonjê. Does the blank scroll refer to Gramoflanz' love letter to Itonjê?

The middle register of this page illustrates Arthur and Gramoflanz meeting each other with their followers on the plain of Jôflanze. Both are wearing silver crowns, are

79   Cf. to this cycle of images most recently Fahr-Rühland 2021; see also Saurma-Jeltsch 1992 and Ott 1993.
80   Wolfram: Parzival, v. 730,11.
81   Unzeitig-Herzog 1998, pp. 215f.
82   Unzeitig-Herzog 1998, pp. 215f.

Fig. 1. Wolfram von Eschenbach: Parzival – Titurel – Tagelied.
Bayerische Staatsbibliothek Munich, Cgm 19, fol. 49ʳ.

unarmed, and are again labelled with a scroll. The throng of knights accompanying King Gramoflanz is explicitly mentioned in Wolfram's novel; however, as portrayed by Wolfram, it is not Arthur but Gawain's brother Beacurs who rides out to Gramoflanz on Arthur's behalf. On the left-hand side of the image is probably Queen Guinevere in the tent at the back.

The lower register depicts two scenes that are consecutive in the novel: the reconciliation of the parties and the deeds of the *frouwen milte* Arthur respectively. The two episodes are contrasted with each other through different ratios. While the text elucidates the sizeable contribution that the female figures make toward preventing the battle between Gramoflanz and Gawain, not a single female figure on this side of the picture has been furnished with a scroll. The greeting kiss and the embrace between Gramoflanz and Itonjê are depicted in the centre of the picture; the actual reconciliation between the parties in the conflict is signified by a handshake between Gawain and Gramoflanz. The greeting and reconciliation scenes are thus consolidated into a single image. By contrast, there is no portrayal of the reconciliation between Orgeluse and Gramoflanz in the pictorial scheme. On the right-hand edge of the picture, Arthur arranges the marriage between Gramoflanz and Itonjê. The lower register of the image is therefore less concerned with the pictorial realization of the complex relationships that the peace settlement between the parties must observe; instead, it illustrates the love story between Gramoflanz and Itonjê, which ends happily.

> The sequence of images in the Munich *Tristan* Cgm 51 and the *Parzival* Cgm 19 creates a 'new story' that presupposes the text but that – by force of the immanent horizon of meaning of the iconographic formulae developed in Christian art – reinterprets it and narrates it independently.[83]

In Norbert Ott's view of the illustrations of courtly literature, the image thus, on the one hand, asserts an autonomous position but, on the other hand, is connected back to the interests of courtly society and culture (to a greater degree than the verse novels themselves). The picture cycles are understood as witnesses to the texts' reception and are related to a use-context that seems to govern their pictorial schemes directly and guides their design in a deproblematizing and legitimizing manner. Ott's methodological approach is based on the concept of an expanded concept of literature

> that asks less about the autonomy of the individual literary texts and more about its 'situation' in literary and social life; about the function of literature, its use by groups of patrons and classes of users; about the reception, and thus the related transformation, of the textual situation.[84]

---

83   Ott 1993, p. 63.
84   Ott 1984, pp. 356f.

Ott also fruitfully applies this approach concerning the history of transmission to the study of manuscript illustrations.

> In addition to the representative idea of the *aventiure* of battle and *minne* as exemplary ideologisms – or [...] as the displacement of this society's contradictions – there also seems to be, in the use-context of the pictorial witnesses, an appeal to the balancing of violence, to the pacification of feudal anarchy, to the securing of territorial sovereignty as signalled by *minne* and marriages resulting from *minne*. The central use-proposition of medieval pictorial witnesses, according to reproaches of the courtly novel, is the self-identification, the representative idealization of one's own societal norms, often by means of the model of ideal *minne*, in which feudal marriage and personal romantic relationships are brought together.[85]

The historically specific variance of the macro-narratives that dominate in a culture materializes in the difference not only between the versions of a text but also in the different affordances of meaning that a text and the pictorial cycle associated with it each update. This can be observed in how text and image develop a divergent way of dealing with the systems of norms and meaning that determine them. Text and image become the media of such means of access and the respective 'commentary' on the other form of expression.[86]

In the reconciliation scene, in which ritual kisses are exchanged between the participants, the manuscript transmission evidences the seismic nature of the event. When Gramoflanz asks the duchess for *suone* (atonement) and kisses her, manuscript D reads: *dar umbe si weinens luste* (therefore she liked to weep).[87] The verse in Cgm 19, by contrast, reads: *Des si doh wenc lûste* (At this she was little delighted). In manuscript G, Orgeluse does not weep; she merely endures the reconciliation with reluctance.

<div align="center">*</div>

This chapter takes up questions about the concepts and functions of medieval authorship, as these are also (and especially) amplified in the parallel versions of courtly epic poetry in the 12th and 13th centuries. These forms of authorship can be characterized, as argued, as multiple as well as collaborative, insofar as different entities are involved in the manufacture of these works. The focus of these considerations was on the (propositional) conditions and possibilities of medieval authorship, using the example of the textual genre of the courtly novel. According to my argument, these can be comprehensively described using the concept of 'reproductivity.'

---

85 Ott 1982/1983, p. 20. The concept of 'use-function,' which is important to Ott's approach, is found in Kuhn 1936.

86 See Nichols 1989.

87 Wolfram: Parzival, v. 729,20.

Bibliography

Primary Literature

Albrecht: Jüngerer Titurel 1 = Albrechts von Scharfenberg Jüngerer Titurel, vol. 1 with stanzas 1–1957, nach den ältesten und besten Handschriften, ed. by Werner Wolf, Berlin 1955 (Deutsche Texte des Mittelalters 45).

Albrecht: Jüngerer Titurel 2 = Albrechts von Scharfenberg Jüngerer Titurel, vol. 2 with stanzas 1958–4394, nach den ältesten und besten Handschriften, ed. by Werner Wolf, Berlin 1964–1968 (Deutsche Texte des Mittelalters 55/61).

Albrecht: Jüngerer Titurel 3 = Albrechts von Scharfenberg Jüngerer Titurel, vol. 3 with stanzas 4395–6237, nach den Grundsätzen von Werner Wolf, ed. by Kurt Nyholm, Berlin 1985–1992 (Deutsche Texte des Mittelalters 73/77).

Albrecht: Jüngerer Titurel 4 = Albrechts von Scharfenberg Jüngerer Titurel. vol. 4: Textfassungen von Handschriften nach den Mittelgruppen, ed. by Kurt Nyholm, Berlin 1995 (Deutsche Texte des Mittelalters 79).

Ulrich von dem Türlin: Arabel = Ulrich von dem Türlin: Arabel. Die ursprüngliche Fassung und ihre Bearbeitung, ed. by Werner Schröder, Stuttgart/Leipzig 1999.

Wolfram: Parzival = Wolfram von Eschenbach: Parzival. Study edition, Middle High German text based on the 6th ed. by Karl Lachmann, trans. by Peter Knecht, introd. by Bernd Schirok, Berlin/New York 1998.

Wolfram: Titurel = Wolfram von Eschenbach: Titurel, ed., trans. and provided with a commentary and materials by Helmut Brackert and Stephan Fuchs-Jolie, Berlin 2002.

Wolfram von Eschenbach: Parzival. Auf der Grundlage der Handschrift D, ed. by Joachim Bumke, Tübingen 2008 (Altdeutsche Textbibliothek 119).

Wolfram: Parzival and Titurel = Wolfram von Eschenbach: Parzival and Titurel, trans. by Clive Edwards, London 2006.

Secondary Literature

Baisch 2006 = Baisch, Martin: Textkritik als Herausforderung der Kulturwissenschaft. *Tristan*-Lektüren, Berlin/New York 2006 (Trends in Medieval Philology 9).

Baisch et al. 2010 = Baisch, Martin/Meyer, Matthias/Keller, Johannes/Kragl, Florian (eds.): Der *Jüngere Titurel* zwischen Didaxe und Verwilderung. Neue Beiträge zu einem schwierigen Werk, Göttingen 2010 (Aventiuren 6).

Bastert/Bihrer/Reuvekamp-Felber 2017 = Bastert, Bernd/Bihrer, Andreas/Reuvekamp-Felber, Timo (eds.): Mäzenaten im Mittelalter aus europäischer Perspektive. Von historischen Akteuren zu literarischen Textkonzepten, Göttingen 2017 (Encomia Deutsch 4).

Benz 2021 = Benz, Maximilian: Volkssprachige Literatur und höfische Kultur um 1200. Pasticcio über eine hofklerikale Perspektive, in: Deutsche Vierteljahrsschrift für Literaturwissenschaft und Geistesgeschichte 95.1 (2021), pp. 1–21.

Bezner 2019 = Bezner, Frank: Literaturbetrieb – Mittelalter, in: Eva von Contzen/Stefan Tilg (eds.): Handbuch Historische Narratologie, Berlin 2019, pp. 44–57.

Bleumer 2015 = Bleumer, Hartmut: Autor und Metapher. Zum Begriffsproblem in der germanistischen Mediävistik – am Beispiel von Wolframs *Parzival*, in: Susanne Friede/Michael Schwarze (eds.): Autorschaft und Autorität in den romanischen Literaturen des Mittelalters, Berlin/Boston 2015 (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie 390), pp. 13–40.

Brackert 1996 = Brackert, Helmut: Sinnspuren. Die Brackenseilinschrift in Wolframs von Eschenbach Titurel, in: Harald Haferland / Michael Mecklenburg (eds.): Erzählungen in Erzählungen. Phänomene der Narration in Mittelalter und Früher Neuzeit, Munich 1996 (Forschungen zur Geschichte der Älteren Deutschen Literatur 19), pp. 155–175.

Braun / Gerok-Reiter 2019 = Braun, Manuel / Gerok-Reiter, Annette: Selbstbezüglichkeit und ästhetische Reflexionsfigur als Bausteine einer historischen Literarästhetik. Einige grundsätzliche Überlegungen aus Sicht der germanistischen Mediävistik, in: Annette Gerok-Reiter / Stefanie Gropper / Jörg Robert / Anja Wolkenhauer (eds.): Ästhetische Reflexionsfiguren in der Vormoderne, Heidelberg 2019 (Germanisch-romanische Monatsschrift 88), pp. 35–66.

Bumke 1979 = Bumke, Joachim: Mäzene im Mittelalter. Die Gönner und Auftraggeber der höfischen Literatur in Deutschland 1150–1300, Munich 1979.

Bumke 1986 = Bumke, Joachim: Höfische Kultur. Literatur und Gesellschaft im hohen Mittelalter, 2 vols., Munich 1986 (dtv 4442).

Bumke 1994 = Bumke, Joachim: Geschlechterbeziehungen in den Gawan-Büchern von Wolframs Parzival, in: Amsterdamer Beiträge zur Älteren Germanistik 38/39 (1994), pp. 105–121.

Bumke 1996 = Bumke, Joachim: Die vier Fassungen der *Nibelungenklage*. Untersuchungen zur Überlieferungsgeschichte und Textkritik der höfischen Epik im 13. Jahrhundert, Berlin 1996 (Quellen und Forschungen zur Literatur- und Kulturgeschichte 8 [242]).

Bumke 1997 = Bumke, Joachim: Autor und Werk. Beobachtungen und Überlegungen zur höfischen Epik (ausgehend von der Donaueschinger Parzivalhandschrift Gᵹ), in: Helmut Tervooren / Horst Wenzel (eds.): Philologie als Textwissenschaft. Alte und neue Horizonte. Sonderheft der Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie 116 (1997), pp. 87–114.

Fahr-Rühland 2021 = Fahr-Rühland, Nina: Symmetrie und Symbolik. Bildliches Erzählen in den *Parzival*-Illustrationen des CGM 19, in: Volker Leppin (ed.): Schaffen und Nachahmen. Kreative Prozesse im Mittelalter, Berlin / Boston 2021 (Das Mittelalter, Perspektiven mediävistischer Forschung, Beihefte 16), pp. 171–190.

Felber 2001 = Felber, Timo: Autorschaft als Textfunktion. Zur Interdependenz von Erzählerstilisierung, Stoff und Gattung in der Epik des 12. und 13. Jahrhunderts, in: Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie 120.1 (2001), pp. 1–23.

Frick 2018 = Frick, Julia: *abbreviatio*. Zur historischen Signifikanz von Kürzungsfunktionen in der mittelhochdeutschen höfischen Epik des 13. Jahrhunderts. Eine Projektskizze, in: Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur 140.1 (2018), pp. 23–50.

Frick 2020 = Frick, Julia: Zwischen Sinnreduktion und Prägnanz. Kürzung als Instrument der Sinnbildung in historischer Poetik und literarischer Reflexion, in: Birgit Zacke / Peter Glasner / Susanne Flecken-Büttner / Satu Heiland (eds.): Beiträge zur mediävistischen Erzählforschung 2020. Themenheft 5: Text und Textur. WeiterDichten und AndersErzählen im Mittelalter, Oldenburg 2020, pp. 219–244.

Frick 2021 = Frick, Julia: Literarische Kürzung. Konzepte der *abbreviatio* in historischer Perspektive, in: Julia Frick / Oliver Grütter (eds.): abbreviatio. Historische Perspektiven auf ein rhetorisch-poetisches Prinzip, Basel 2021, pp. 9–41.

Friede / Schwarze 2015 = Friede, Susanne / Schwarze, Michael: Einleitung, in: Susanne Friede / Michael Schwarze (eds.): Autorschaft und Autorität in den romanischen Literaturen des Mittelalters, Berlin / Boston 2015 (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie 390), pp. 1–12.

Gabler 2012 = Gabler, Hans Walter: Wider die Autorzentriertheit in der Edition, in: Jahrbuch des freien deutschen Hochstifts 2012, pp. 316–348.

Gebert 2021 = Gebert, Bent: Heterogene Autorschaft und digitale Textanalyse. Ein Experiment zum kompilatorischen Erzählstil Konrads von Würzburg, in: Norbert Kössinger / Astrid Lembke (eds.):

Beiträge zur mediävistischen Erzählforschung 2021. Themenheft 10: Konrad von Würzburg als Erzähler, Oldenburg 2021, pp. 309–344.

Gerok-Reiter/Robert 2022 = Gerok-Reiter, Annette/Robert, Jörg: Andere Ästhetik – Akte und Artefakte in der Vormoderne. Zum Forschungsprogramm des SFB 1391, in: Annette Gerok-Reiter/Jörg Robert/Matthias Bauer/Anna Pawlak (eds.): Andere Ästhetik. Grundlagen – Fragen – Perspektiven, Berlin/Boston 2022 (Andere Ästhetik – Koordinaten 1), pp. 3–51.

Gerok-Reiter/Robert 2025 = Gerok-Reiter, Annette/Robert, Jörg: Different Aesthetics – Premodern Acts and Artifacts. The Program of the Tübingen Collaborative Research Center 1391, in: Annette Gerok-Reiter/Jörg Robert/Matthias Bauer/Anna Pawlak (eds.): Different Aesthetics. Principles – Questions – Perspectives, Berlin/Boston 2025 (Andere Ästhetik – Koordinaten 1E), pp. 3–48.

Gollwitzer-Oh 2012 = Gollwitzer-Oh, Kathrin: *materia* und *artificium.* Tradition und poetischer Möglichkeitssinn im *Eneasroman* Heinrichs von Veldeke, in: Hartwin Brandt/Benjamin Pohl/W. Maurice Sprague/Lina K. Hörl (eds.): Erfahren, Erzählen, Erinnern. Narrative Konstruktionen von Gedächtnis und Generation in Antike und Mittelalter, Bamberg 2012 (Bamberger Historische Studien 9), pp. 169–194.

Grimm 1966 = Grimm, Jacob: An Professor von Savigny, in: Reden und Aufsätze. Eine Auswahl, ed. by Wilhelm Schoof, Munich 1966, pp. 28–34.

Grubmüller 2000 = Grubmüller, Klaus: Verändern und Bewahren. Bewusstsein vom Text im deutschen Mittelalter, in: Ursula Peters (ed.): Text und Kultur. Mittelalterliche Literatur 1150–1450, Stuttgart/Weimar 2000 (Germanistische Symposien-Berichtsbände 23), pp. 8–33.

Hasebrink 2009 = Hasebrink, Burkhard: Die Ambivalenz des Erneuerns. Zur Aktualisierung des Tradierten im mittelalterlichen Erzählen, in: Ursula Peters/Rainer Warning (eds.): Fiktion und Fiktionalität in den Literaturen des Mittelalters. Jan-Dirk Müller zum 65. Geburtstag, Munich/Paderborn 2009, pp. 205–217.

Haug 1992 = Haug, Walter: Albrechts *Jüngerer Titurel.* Ethos und Magie der Brackenseilinschrift, in: Walter Haug (ed.): Literaturtheorie im deutschen Mittelalter. Von den Anfängen bis zum Ende des 13. Jahrhunderts, 2nd, rev. and exp. ed., Darmstadt 1992, pp. 364–375.

Hausmann 2001 = Hausmann, Albrecht: Mittelalterliche Überlieferung als Interpretationsaufgabe. 'Laudines Kniefall' und das Problem des 'ganzen Textes,' in: Ursula Peters (ed.): Text und Kultur. Mittelalterliche Literatur 1150–1450, Stuttgart/Weimar 2000 (Germanistische Symposien-Berichtsbände 23), pp. 72–95.

Heinzle 1993 = Heinzle, Joachim (ed.): Literarische Interessenbildung im Mittelalter. DFG-Symposion 1991, Stuttgart 1993 (Germanistische Symposien-Berichtsbände 14).

Helle 2019 = Helle, Sophus: What Is An Author? Old Answers to a New Question, in: Modern Language Quarterly 80.2 (2019), pp. 113–139.

Henkel 1992 = Henkel, Nikolaus: Kurzfassungen höfischer Erzähltexte als editorische Herausforderung, in: Editio 6 (1992), pp. 1–11.

Henkel 1993 = Henkel, Nikolaus: Kurzfassungen höfischer Erzähldichtung im 13./14. Jahrhundert. Überlegungen zum Verhältnis von Textgeschichte und literarischer Interessenbildung, in: Joachim Heinzle (ed.): Literarische Interessenbildung im Mittelalter. DFG-Symposion 1991, Stuttgart/Weimar 1993 (Germanistische Symposien-Berichtsbände 14), pp. 39–59.

Henkel 2001 = Henkel, Nikolaus: Rezension zu Joachim Bumke: Die vier Fassungen der *Nibelungenklage* und Joachim Bumke (ed.): Die *Nibelungenklage*, in: Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur 123 (2001), pp. 137–144.

Henkel 2017 = Henkel, Nikolaus: Reduktion als poetologisches Prinzip. Verdichtung von Erzählungen im lateinischen und deutschen Hochmittelalter, in: Franz-Josef Holznagel/Jan Cölln (eds.) (in Verbindung mit Ricarda Bauschke-Hartung und Susanne Köbele): Die Kunst der *brevitas.* Kleine

literarische Formen des deutschsprachigen Mittelalters. Rostocker Kolloquium 2014, Berlin 2017 (Wolfram-Studien 24), pp. 27–55.

Janota 1998 = Janota, Johannes: Mittelalterliche Texte als Entstehungsvarianten, in: Andrea Bartl / Jürgen Eder / Harry Fröhlich / Klaus Dieter Post / Ursula Regener (eds.): "In Spuren gehen ..." Festschrift für Helmut Koopmann, Tübingen 1998, pp. 65–80.

Kellner / Strohschneider / Wenzel 2005 = Kellner, Beate / Strohschneider, Peter / Wenzel, Franziska (eds.): Geltung der Kunst. Formen ihrer Autorisierung und Legitimierung im Mittelalter, Berlin 2005 (Philologische Studien und Quellen 190).

Kelly 1999 = Kelly, Douglas: The Conspiracy of Allusion. Description, Rewriting, and Authorship from Macrobius to Medieval Romance, Leiden 1999 (Studies in the History of Christian Thought 97).

Knapp 2014 = Knapp, Fritz Peter: Poetik, in: Fritz Peter Knapp (ed.): Die Rezeption lateinischer Wissenschaft, Spiritualität, Bildung und Dichtung aus Frankreich, Berlin / Boston 2014 (Germania Litteraria Mediaevalis Francigena 1), pp. 217–242.

Köbele 2017 = Köbele, Susanne: Registerwechsel. Wiedererzählen, bibelepisch (*Der Saelden Hort*, *Die Erlösung*, Lutwins *Adam und Eva*), in: Bruno Quast / Susanne Spreckelmeier (Hgg): Inkulturation. Strategien bibelepischen Schreibens in Mittelalter und Früher Neuzeit, Berlin / Boston 2017 (Literatur. Theorie. Geschichte 12), pp. 167–202.

Köbele / Kiening 1998 = Köbele, Susanne / Kiening, Christian: Wilde Minne. Metapher und Erzählwelt in Wolframs *Titurel*, in: Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur 120 (1998), pp. 234–265.

Köhler 1981 = Köhler, Erich: Der Roman in der Romania, in: Henning Krauß (ed.): Neues Handbuch der Literaturwissenschaft, vol. 7: Europäisches Hochmittelalter, Wiesbaden 1981, pp. 243–282.

Kragl 2019 = Kragl, Florian: Autor und Erzähler – Mittelalter, in: Eva von Contzen / Stefan Tilg (eds.): Handbuch Historische Narratologie, Berlin 2019, pp. 82–93.

Kuhn 1936 = Kuhn, Hugo: Mittelalterliche Kunst und ihre 'Gegebenheit.' Kritisches zum geisteswissenschaftlichen Frage-Ansatz, in: Deutsche Vierteljahrsschrift für Literaturwissenschaft und Geistesgeschichte 14 (1936), pp. 223–245.

Küpper 2001 = Küpper, Joachim: Einige Überlegungen zur Ästhetik des Wortkunstwerks, in: Zeitschrift für Ästhetik und Allgemeine Kunstwissenschaft 46.2 (2001), pp. 209–226.

Lieb 2005 = Lieb, Ludger: Die Potenz des Stoffes. Eine kleine Metaphysik des 'Wiedererzählens,' in: Joachim Bumke / Ursula Peters (eds.): Retextualisierung in der mittelalterlichen Literatur. Sonderheft der Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie 124 (2005), pp. 356–379.

Linden 2017 = Linden, Sandra: Exkurse im höfischen Roman, Wiesbaden 2017 (Münchener Texte und Untersuchungen zur deutschen Literatur des Mittelalters 147).

Masse / Seidl 2016 = Masse, Marie Sophie / Seidl, Stephanie: 'Texte dritter Stufe.' Eine Einleitung, in: Marie Sophie Masse / Stephanie Seidl (eds.): 'Texte dritter Stufe.' Deutschsprachige Antikenromane in ihrem lateinisch-romanischen Kontext, Berlin / Münster 2016 (Kultur und Technik 31), pp. 9–19.

Minnis 1984 = Minnis, Alastair J.: Medieval Theory of Authorship. Scholastic Literary Attitudes in the Later Middle Ages, London 1984.

Müller 1993 = Müller, Jan-Dirk: Zu einigen Problemen des Konzepts 'Literarische Interessenbildung,' in: Joachim Heinzle (ed.): Literarische Interessenbildung im Mittelalter. DFG-Symposion 1991, Stuttgart 1993 (Germanistische Symposien-Berichtsbände 14), pp. 365–384.

Müller 1995 = Müller, Jan-Dirk: Auctor – Actor – Author. Einige Anmerkungen zum Verständnis vom Autor in lateinischen Schriften des frühen und hohen Mittelalters, in: Felix P. Ingold / Werner Wunderlich (eds.): Der Autor im Dialog. Beiträge zu Autorität und Autorschaft, St. Gallen 1995, pp. 17–31.

Müller 1999 = Müller, Jan-Dirk: Aufführung – Autor – Werk. Zu einigen blinden Stellen gegenwärtiger Diskussion, in: Nigel F. Palmer / Hans-Jochen Schiewer (eds.): Mittelalterliche Literatur und Kunst

im Spannungsfeld von Hof und Kloster. Ergebnisse der Berliner Tagung 9.–11. Oktober 1997, Tübingen 1999, pp. 149–165.

Neukirchen 2006 = Neukirchen, Thomas: Die ganze *aventiure* und ihre *lere*. Der *Jüngere Titurel* Albrechts als Kritik und Vervollkommnung des *Parzival* Wolframs von Eschenbach, Heidelberg 2006 (Beihefte zum Euphorion 52).

Nichols 1989 = Nichols, Stephen G.: The Image as Textual Unconscious: Medieval Manuscripts, in: L'Esprit Créateur 29.1 (1989), pp. 7–23.

Nichols 2006 = Nichols, Stephen G.: The Medieval 'Author.' An Idea Whose Time Hadn't Come?, in: Virginie Green (ed.): The Medieval Author in Medieval French Literature, New York 2006, pp. 77–101.

Nichols 2016 = Nichols, Stephen G.: From Parchment to Cyberspace. Medieval Literature in the Digital Age, New York et al. 2016 (Medieval Interventions. New Light on Traditional Thinking 2).

Ott 1982/1983 = Ott, Norbert H.: Geglückte Minne-Aventiure. Zur Szenenauswahl literarischer Bildzeugnisse im Mittelalter. Die Beispiele des Rodenecker *Iwein*, des Runkelsteiner *Tristan*, des Braunschweiger *Gawan*- und des Frankfurter *Wilhelm-von-Orlens*-Teppichs, in: Jahrbuch der Oswald von Wolkenstein-Gesellschaft 2 (1982/1983), pp. 1–32.

Ott 1984 = Ott, Norbert H.: Überlieferung, Ikonographie – Anspruchsniveau, Gebrauchssituation. Methodisches zum Problem der Beziehungen zwischen Stoffen, Texten und Illustrationen in Handschriften des Spätmittelalters, in: Ludger Grenzmann/Karl Stackmann (eds.): Literatur und Laienbildung im Spätmittelalter und in der Reformationszeit, Stuttgart 1984 (Germanistische Symposien-Berichtsbände 5), pp. 356–386.

Ott 1993 = Ott, Norbert H.: Bildstruktur statt Textstruktur. Zur visuellen Organisation mittelalterlicher narrativer Bildzyklen. Die Beispiele des Wienhausener Tristanteppichs I, des Münchner *Parzifal* Cgm 19 und des Münchner *Tristan* Cgm 51, in: Klaus Dirscherl (ed.): Bild und Text im Dialog, Passau 1993 (Passauer Interdisziplinäre Kolloquien 3), pp. 53–70.

Peters 2009 = Peters, Ursula: Die 'Gesellschaft' der höfischen Dichtung im Spiegel der Forschungsgeschichte, in: Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie 128.1 (2009), pp. 3–28.

Peters 2018 = Peters, Ursula: Die Rückkehr der 'Gesellschaft' in die Kulturwissenschaft. Zur gesellschaftsgeschichtlichen Neuorientierung der Mittelalterphilologie, in: Scientia Poetica. Jahrbuch für Geschichte der Literatur und der Wissenschaften 22.1 (2018), pp. 1–52.

Saurma-Jeltsch 1992 = Saurma-Jeltsch, Lieselotte E.: Zum Wandel der Erzählweise am Beispiel der illustrierten deutschen *Parzival*-Handschriften, in: Wolfram-Studien 12 (1992), pp. 124–152.

Schmitz 2007 = Schmitz, Silvia: Die Poetik der Adaptation. Literarische *inventio* im *Eneas* Heinrichs von Veldeke, Tübingen 2007 (Hermaea 113).

Schmitz 2016 = Schmitz, Silvia: Wenn eine Hindin nicht mehr 'modern' ist. Heinrichs von Veldeke *Eneas* und der Verlust poetischer Komplexität 'auf dritter Stufe,' in: Marie Sophie Masse/Stephanie Seidl (eds.): 'Texte dritter Stufe.' Deutschsprachige Antikenromane in ihrem lateinisch-romanischen Kontext, Berlin 2016 (Kultur und Technik 31), pp. 21–37.

Speer 1980 = Speer, Mary B.: Wrestling with Change: Old French Textual Criticism and *Mouvance*, in: Olifant 7.4 (1980), pp. 311–326.

Stierle 1994 = Stierle, Karlheinz: Cortoisie. Die literarische Erfindung eines höfischen Ideals, in: Poetica 26 (1994), pp. 256–283.

Strohschneider 2001 = Strohschneider, Peter: Rezension zu Joachim Bumke (ed.): Die *Nibelungenklage*. Synoptische Ausgabe aller vier Fassungen, Berlin/New York 1999, in: Arbitrium 1 (2001), pp. 26–32.

Strohschneider 2006 = Strohschneider, Peter: Sternenschrift. Textmodelle höfischen Erzählens, in: Eckart Conrad Lutz (ed.): Text und Text in lateinischer und volkssprachiger Überlieferung des Mittelalters. Freiburger Kolloquium 2004, Berlin 2006 (Wolfram-Studien 19), pp. 33–58.

Strohschneider 2014 = Strohschneider, Peter: Höfische Textgeschichten. Über Selbstentwürfe vormoderner Literatur, Heidelberg 2014 (Germanisch-romanische Monatsschrift, Beiheft 55).

Trînca 2019 = Trînca, Beatrice: Amor conspirator. Zur Ästhetik des Verborgenen in der höfischen Literatur, Göttingen 2019 (Aventiuren 10).

Unzeitig-Herzog 1998 = Unzeitig-Herzog, Monika: *Artus mediator*. Zur Konfliktlösung in Wolframs *Parzival* Buch XIV, in: Frühmittelalterliche Studien 32 (1998), pp. 196–217.

Wenzel 1997 = Wenzel, Horst: *Wilde Blicke*. Zur unhöfischen Wahrnehmung von Körpern und Schriften, in: L'Homme. Zeitschrift für feministische Geschichtswissenschaft 8.2 (1997), pp. 257–271.

Worstbrock 1985 = Worstbrock, Franz-Josef: *Dilatatio materiae*. Zur Poetik des *Erec* Hartmanns von Aue, in: Frühmittelalterliche Studien 19 (1985), pp. 1–30.

Worstbrock 1999 = Worstbrock, Franz-Josef: Wiedererzählen und Übersetzen, in: Walter Haug (ed.): Mittelalter und Frühe Neuzeit. Übergänge, Umbrüche und Neuansätze, Tübingen 1999 (Fortuna vitrea 16), pp. 128–142.

Zimmermann 1972 = Zimmermann, Gisela: Untersuchungen zur Orgeluseepisode in Wolframs von Eschenbach *Parzival*, in: Euphorion 66.2 (1972), pp. 128–150.

Zimmermann 1974 = Zimmermann, Gisela: Kommentar zum VII. Buch von Wolframs von Eschenbach *Parzival*, Göppingen 1974 (Göppinger Arbeiten zur Germanistik 133).