

Hartmann von Aue, *Iwein*, Manuscript A: Universitätsbibliothek Heidelberg, *Codex Palatinus Germanicus 397*: Introduction to the manuscript edition

The manuscript of Hartmann von Aue's *Iwein* classified with the sigla A is owned by the Ruprecht-Karls-Universität Heidelberg University Library and bears the shelfmark *Codex Palatinus Germanicus 397*. The classification with the sigla A goes back to Karl Lachmann, who assumed it to be not only the the oldest, but also the most reliable manuscript of this Arthurian romance, deserving the sigla A for its superior textual transmission (see Cramer 160). There is no doubt, that this manuscript is of special interest for the textual criticism and the textual history of Hartmann's *Iwein*. Digital images of the manuscript are published online in Roy Bogg's »Hartmann von Aue Portal« at <http://www.fgcu.edu/rbogg/hartmann/Iwein/IwMain/IwHome.htm> and also at the Heidelberg University Library website at <http://digi.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/cpg397>.

1. The Manuscript

The manuscript is written on parchment in a single book hand and contains 90 folios. There are 12 gatherings in this manuscript: the first contains fol. 1–7b, the second fol. 8–15, the third fol. 16–23, the fourth fol. 24–31, the fifth fol. 32–39, the sixth fol. 40–47, the seventh fol. 48–55, the eighth fol. 56–62, the ninth fol. 63–70, the tenth fol. 71–78, the eleventh fol. 79–86, and the twelfth fol. 87–88. There is evidence on the outside pages of these gatherings that this manuscript remained unbound for quite some time, as the outside pages are very worn, with faded or washed out ink, making much of these pages unreadable. This is specifically the case for folios 1^r, 23^v, 31^v, 32^r, 39^v, 40^r, 55^v, 56^r, 86^v, 87^r 87^v, and 88^r. The text of folio 1^r is entirely lost, except for a few letters in the lower left corner. Bogg did not include this page in the Hartmann von Aue Portal, the Universitätsbibliothek Heidelberg did.¹ While this first folio was already in a damaged state in 1886, as Karl Bartsch noted, his application of ammonium hydrosulfide to this page to temporarily bring out the ink and thus the writing on this folio, further and permanently damaged the page. Bartsch published his reading of fol. 1^r in *Germania* 31 (1886): 122–3, but he, too, could not recover the entire text of this initial page.

However, the individual gatherings were not sequenced correctly, when the manuscript was finally bound, which was noted by someone probably in the nineteenth century, who glued a handwritten note into the inside cover of the binding. S/he comments on the manuscript's incorrect numbering and incorrect sequencing of some of its gatherings. The note reads:

No. Die handschrift hat nicht 88 sondern 90 blätter; denn 7 u. 61 kommt zweymal vor. Es fehlt kein blatt; aber die blätter sind verbunden, u. müssen in folgender Ordnung gelesen werden: 1 bis 23, dann 40 bis 70, dann 24 bis 31, dann 71 bis 86, dann 32 bis 39 und endlich 87 bis 88.

Der Grund ist das falsche Zusammenbinden der Einheiten.

¹ To see fol. 1^r, go to <http://digi.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/cpg397/0009>

[Note: The manuscript does not have 88 sheets, but 90; for 7 and 61 appear twice. No sheet is missing; but the sheets are bound together incorrectly and have to be read in the following order: 1 to 23; then 40 to 70, then 24 to 31, then 71–86, then 32–39, and finally 87–88.

The reason is the incorrect binding of the units.]²

Except for the above mentioned problems on the outside pages of gatherings and some smudges and holes here and there, the manuscript is preserved reasonably well. Overall, the parchment is light to dark brown in color, the folios are lined and show pricking marks on the outside margins. The page is 198 x 122 mm in size. The margins are approximately 15 mm at the top, 20 mm at the outside margin and 30 mm at the bottom; there is little or no inside margin in the center where the folios are stitched together, resulting in a writing space the size of 150–165 x 85–100 mm. The text is written as one column averaging 25 to 27 lines per page; verses are not written as separate individual lines, as is the case e. g. in *Iwein* B (Hs. Nr. 97 Universitätsbibliothek Gießen). In *Iwein* A, the text is written continuously to the end of each line; verses are, however, separated by a *Reimpunkt* [rhyme dot]. The ink used throughout this manuscript is brown. Likewise, red initials are used throughout the text ranging from one-line initials slightly larger in size than regular letter to two-line large initials clearly set off from the text. Occasionally, a large initial was written outside of the writing space into the margin when the usual two-line indentation within the writing space was not provided for. The red initials were most likely filled in at a later point in time than the main body of text, as the respective initials were usually noted in brown ink in the margin.

The scribe wrote in a careful book hand, which shows a strong tendency towards the developing gothic script. Karin Schneider notes that the scribe uses »den schon im ersten Jahrhundertviertel stark gotisierten kantigen westdeutschen Schrifttyp mit regelmäßiger, oft doppelter Brechung der Schäfte und Bögen« [the strongly gothicized, angular West German script, which already was used in the first quarter of this century (i. e. 13th), and which regularly uses double breakings in shafts and bows] (157). Both Schneider and Bernhard Bischoff note forked ascenders as a feature of transitional gothic script, as well as the mixture of round or bent shafts alongside vertical shafts for such letters as *d* and *k*. Biting seems to be primarily absent in *Iwein* A, which is a key feature of full gothic script. The use of hairlines to connect parts of letter forms and letters themselves to form words, likewise, is an indicator for transitional gothic script, which in full gothic script are replaced more and more by broken shafts that give the letter forms the angular and distinctive look of the Gothic textura (see Schneider, 120, 155–8; Bischoff 128–30). Peter Jörg Becker similarly identifies the script as a transitional one between the rounded minuscule and the broken gothic script and notes like Schneider, that this transition is first noticeable in Western Germany, presumably from French influence (55).

While it is impossible to date the manuscript precisely, most scholars seem to agree that it was written approximately between 1225 and 1260. Thomas Cramer dates the manuscript as from the 1st half of the thirteenth century (160 and note 26; also Bumke 33). Ludwig Wolff, in the 7th edition of Hartmann's *Iwein*, dates it from the middle of the

2 To see the note, go to <http://digi.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/cpg397/0002>; all translations are my own.

thirteenth century (2:1). Karin Zimmermann, upon whose description the dating of the Heidelberg University Library's website of CPG 397 is based, and Becker date the manuscript as having been written in the second third of the thirteenth century (n.pag. on website, Becker, 54), and similarly Schneider, who dates it slightly earlier as closer to the beginning of the second quarter of the thirteenth century (158).

There is disagreement among scholars regarding the dialect or language the manuscript is written in. Thomas Klein assumes that the dialect is Middle German-Low German (*mitteldeutsch-niederdeutsch*) and disputes as faulty Wolff's identification of Riparian (*ripuarisch*) (2:2), as well as Becker's of Rhenish Franconian (*rheinfränkisch*) (54) (see Klein 148). According to Karin Zimmermann the Heidelberg University Library's website simply names »Mittelrhein« [Middle Rhine] as the region of origin and West Middle German (*westmitteldeutsch*) as the linguistic classification. Schneider assumes that the *Schreibsprache* [writing language] of *Iwein* A is Middle-Franconian (*mittelrheinisch*) based on such features as unshifted *p*, but only rarely unshifted *t* which appears in its shifted form *z*, or the use of the Middle German form *her* for *er*, etc. (see Schneider 158). Thus she »adjusts« Klein's Middle German-Low German and Becker's Rhenish Franconian placements for a slightly more Southern one.

2. About the Edition

I used the manuscript itself for a preliminary transcription of the manuscript as part of my dissertation research during a 2001 summer research trip to the Handschriftenabteilung of the Universitätsbibliothek Heidelberg, as well as the digital images published in the Hartmann von Aue Portal for my revisions of this transcription and coding in TUSTEP (= Tübinger System von Textverarbeitungs-Programmen) during 2006. While editions of medieval texts use modern print convention layouts for publications adjusting the text on the page to follow the rhymed verses, I decided to follow the manuscript layout by rendering text per line as it is found on the manuscript page. While this breaks with convention of what we are used to from editions and some transcriptions of medieval manuscript text, it will make it easier to find and compare text from this edition of the manuscript to the digital images of the manuscript itself. However, to allow users of the Lachmann print-culture edition of Hartmann's *Iwein* who wish to consult the textual evidence in the manuscript itself to find the corresponding text, I have referenced the line numbers of the Lachmann edition as they correspond to the manuscript text on each folio page. In the references, I not only note the corresponding line numbers, but also additional or nonexistent verses when compared to the Lachmann edition, as well as the occasional reversed sequence of verses. For example, the reference 84^v 6922–7120 (+6925:1) means that the manuscript contains one additional line after line 6925 when compared with the Lachmann print edition. The reference 1^v 41–78 (– 69–70) means that by comparison to the Lachmann edition folio 1^v contains lines 41–78 but not lines 69–70. The reference 2^r 78–115 (L95/96 = 96/95) means that lines 95 and 96 are sequenced in reverse order in the manuscript than in the print edition.

I follow the manuscript text as closely as possible, marking superscript letters as such, as well as ligatures (the scribe primarily only used the long $f+t^3$ and the $o+2$ ligatures) and abbreviations without expanding them. The abbreviation ' is used in the manuscript and in this edition which represents *-er*; likewise, the abbreviation of a superscript ⁹ is used in the manuscript and this edition which represents the Latin *-us*-ending, which in this manuscript primarily is attached to the name *art*⁹ for *Artus*. For capital *M* the uncial letterform is used in the manuscript which I have rendered as a capital *M*. While the scribe usually marked *i* with an accent to differentiate them from other letters formed by minims, I have not carried this into this edition, as modern print clearly differentiates between *i*, *u*, *n* and *m*. The scribe frequently marked word separation across text lines by placing a hyphen into the margin, which I did include in the edition.

I have already mentioned the problems on the outside pages of gathering. I have used a 0 for each letter, which can no longer be made out and/or identified. Unfortunately, sometimes it is impossible to determine exactly, how many letters were written in the illegible areas on the manuscript. Furthermore, I comment on difficulties or legibility issues of the manuscripts in footnotes throughout the edition, as well as on scribal corrections and other unique features of this particular scribe and manuscript. I have chosen to include more paleographically unique features of the manuscript in this edition than is done normally, but I consider such evidence important, as it provides useful information about time, place, dialect, grammar and scribal practices of this manuscript, all of which was ignored and edited out in the commonly used print-culture editions of medieval texts. As our discipline, our methods and assessment of medieval scripta and text are changing, this, too, needs to be reflected in the editions of manuscript versions of literary texts. I hope this edition of *Iwein A* contributes to our field in such a way. According to Joachim Bumke (33) *Iwein A* transmits a version (*Fassung*) of its own which has never been systematically compared with *Iwein B*, the other of the two main manuscripts of Hartmann's *Iwein* and also representing a version of its own. Bumke's comparison (33–42) for the first time points out the differences and convincingly substantiates his assumption of two different versions. This is one more reason for a close study of the manuscript itself and for facilitating this study by the edition of *Iwein A*.

I would like to thank Herrn Stanske for giving me access to CPG 397 during my 2001 summer research trip to the Handschriftenabteilung of the Universitätsbibliothek Heidelberg and for making my research stay an enjoyable and fruitful endeavor. Furthermore, I would like to thank Professors Kurt Gärtner and Roy Boggs for their assistance with TUSTEP, their many useful suggestions for further readings and especially to Kurt Gärtner for converting the file and dealing with the technical challenges when codes would not convert the way they were supposed to and to Roy Boggs for his work done on the website and including this edition in the Hartmann von Aue Portal.

EVELYN MEYER
SAINT LOUIS UNIVERSITY

³ The $f+t$ ligature cannot be rendered in ligature in the this version of the edition. The scribe, however, always used it in the $f+t$ combination.

Bibliography

- Bartsch, Karl. "Die erste Seite der Iweinhandschrift." *Germania* 31 (1886): 122–3.
- Becker, Peter Jörg. *Handschriften und Frühdrucke mittelhochdeutscher Epen*. Wiesbaden, 1977.
- Bischoff, Bernhard. *Latin Paleography. Antiquity & the Middle Ages*. Transl. Dáibhí Ó Cróinín and David Ganz. Cambridge, 1990.
- Bumke, Joachim: *Die vier Fassungen der ›Nibelungenklage‹. Untersuchungen zur Überlieferung und Textkritik der höfischen Epik im 13. Jahrhundert*. Berlin/New York, 1996.
- Hartmann von Aue. *Iwein*. CPG 397. <http://digi.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/cpg397> & <http://www.fgcu.edu/rboggs/hartmann/Iwein/IwMain/IwHome.htm>
- . *Iwein*. Text of the 7th ed. of G. F. Benecke, K. Lachmann and L. Wolff. Trans. and Comments by Thomas Cramer. 4th revised edition. Berlin, 2001.
- Klein, Thomas. "Ermittlung, Darstellung und Deutung von Verbreitungstypen in der Handschriftenüberlieferung mittelhochdeutscher Epik." *Deutsche Handschriften 1100–1400. Oxforder Kolloquium 1985*. Eds. Volker Honemann & Nigel F. Palmer. Tübingen, 1988. 110–167.
- Marburger Repertorium. Deutschsprachige Handschriften des 13. und 14. Jahrhunderts*. <http://cgi-host.uni-marburg.de/~mrep/beschreibung.php?id=243>
- Meyer, Evelyn: "Disputed Gender Categories in the Yvain Stories: Manuscripts, Authors, and Editors." Diss. U of Minnesota, 2003.
- Schneider, Karin. *Gotische Schriften in deutscher Sprache, I. Vom späten 12. Jahrhundert bis um 1300, Text- und Tafelband*. Wiesbaden, 1987.
- Wolff, Ludwig. *Vol 2: Handschriftenübersicht. Anmerkungen und Lesarten*. Accompanying *Vol 1: Iwein. Eine Erzählung von Hartmann von Aue*. Eds. G. F. Benecke, K. Lachmann and newly edited by L. Wolff. 7th ed. Berlin, 1968. 2:1–12.
- Zimmermann, Karin: Description of CPG 397. <http://digi.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/sammlung2/werk/pdf/cpg397.pdf>