

Jennifer Gerber

About Form and Function of German Vernacular Commentaries

I) Introduction

Only canonical texts written by authorities have normally been subject to commentary, as the articles attempting to define commentary by Jan Assmann, Burkhard Gladigow, and Glenn W. Most have shown. Changes to these texts are precluded by their authority and foundational status, and so modifications, modernizations, and reinterpretations can only be added through commentary.¹ While canonical and legal texts in the vernacular do possess this authority, the case appears quite different for non-canonical texts like romances. According to Joachim Bumke and Franz Josef Worstbrock, premodern text production is based on retelling and re-textualization.² That premodern text production tends to revise their template already shows that such texts do not create the necessary authority.³ Following Assmann, Gladigow, and Most, it could be concluded at first that a retold or re-textualized text should not be suitable for commenting. However, if we consider the previous research on premodern vernacular romances, it identifies such factors as narrators, figures, illustrations, actions of individual characters or the genesis of the narration which do have a commentarial dimension.

Overall, vernacular commentaries are based on the Latin school commentaries and represent early forms of commentaries on and in literature.⁴ While ver-

1 Jan Assmann, »Text und Kommentar. Einführung«, in: id. and Burkhard Gladigow (eds.), *Text und Kommentar. Archäologie einer literarischen Kommunikation*, München 1995, pp. 9-35, here p. 13; Glenn W. Most, »Preface«, in: id. (ed.), *Commentaries – Kommentare*, Göttingen 1999, pp. V-XV, here p. VIII.

2 Joachim Bumke, »Retextualisierungen in der mittelalterlichen Literatur, besonders in der höfischen Epik«, in: id. and Ursula Peters (eds.), *Retextualisierungen in der mittelalterlichen Literatur*, Berlin 2005, pp. 6-46; Franz Josef Worstbrock, »Wiedererzählen und Übersetzen«, in: id. (ed.), *Mittelalter und frühe Neuzeit. Übergänge, Umbrüche, Neuansätze*, Tübingen 1999, pp. 128-142.

3 Cf. Joachim Bumke, »Autor und Werk. Beobachtungen und Überlegungen zur höfischen Epik (ausgehend von der Donaueschinger Parzivalhandschrift G^d)«, in: *Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie* 116 (1997) Sonderheft, pp. 87-114, here p. 103.

4 Christoph Huber, »Formen des poetischen Kommentars in der mittelalterlichen Literatur«, in: Most (ed.), (as note 1), pp. 323-352, here p. 327.

vernacular glosses, especially Old High German glosses and the ›Buch'sche Glosse‹ to the *Sachsenspiegel* are well investigated⁵, fewer academic contributions deal with commentaries on or in poetical texts. Included in this assessment are the volumes edited by Assmann and Gladigow, *Text und Kommentar. Archäologie einer literarischen Kommunikation*⁶, published in 1995, and Glenn W. Most, *Commentaries – Kommentar*⁷, published in 1999. Both publications contain only two contributions on Middle High German commentaries and their practices in total. While the contribution of Walter Haug⁸ that deals with exegetical interpretations of clerical or mystical texts fits into the broad field of vernacular gloss-research, only Christoph Huber deals with so called ›poetical commentaries‹.⁹

Even if there are only a few contributions, they consider various concepts that count as commenting, and I will present a critical overview of approaches with respect to these concepts. For this purpose, exemplary contributions which are dedicated to the narrator's commentary (Huber, Nellmann, Linden, Völkel)¹⁰, commenting as a concept of retelling (Zumthor, Huber, Hausmann, Baisch)¹¹ and illustrations as commentary (Baisch and Manuwald)¹² will be examined.

5 See the foundational work by Rolf Bergmann and Stefanie Stricker, *Die althochdeutsche und altsächsische Glossographie. Ein Handbuch*, Berlin 2009; Bernd Kannowski, *Die Umgestaltung des Sachsenspiegelrechts durch die Buch'sche Glosse*, Hannover 2007.

6 Jan Assmann and Burkhard Gladigow, *Text und Kommentar. Archäologie einer literarischen Kommunikation*, München 1995.

7 Most (ed.), (as note 1).

8 Walter Haug, »Der Kommentar und sein Subjekt. Grundpositionen der exegetischen Kommentierung in Spätantike und Mittelalter: Tertullian, Hohelied-Mystik und Meister Eckhart«, in: Assmann and Gladigow (as note 6), pp. 333-354.

9 Huber (as note 4), pp. 323-352.

10 Ibid.; Eberhard Nellmann, *Wolframs Erzähltechnik. Untersuchungen zur Funktion des Erzählers*, Wiesbaden 1973; Sandra Linden, *Exkurse im höfischen Roman*, Wiesbaden 2017; Carola Völkel, *Der Erzähler im spätmittelalterlichen Roman*, Frankfurt a. M. 1978.

11 Paul Zumthor, »La glose créatrice«, in: Gisèle Mathieu-Castellani and Michel Plaisance (eds.), *Les commentaires et la naissance de la critique littéraire*, Paris 1990, pp. 11-18; Huber (as note 4); Albrecht Hausmann, »Stil als Kommentar. Zur inhaltlichen Funktion des sprachlichen Klangs in Gottfrieds von Straßburg *Tristan*«, in: Elisabeth Andersen, Ricarda Bauschke-Hartung et al. (eds.), *Literarischer Stil. Mittelalterliche Dichtung zwischen Konvention und Innovation*, Berlin, Boston 2015, pp. 205-226; Martin Baisch, *Textkritik als Problem der Kulturwissenschaft. Tristan-Lektüren*, Berlin, New York 2006.

12 Ibid.; Henrike Manuwald: *Medialer Dialog. Die ›Große Bilderhandschrift‹ des ›Willehalm‹ Wolframs von Eschenbach und ihre Kontexte*, Tübingen 2008; Id., »Der Autor als Erzähler? Das Bild der Ich-Figur in der ›Großen Bilderhandschrift‹ des *Willehalm* Wolframs von Eschenbach«, in: Gerald Kampffammer, Wolf-Dietrich Löhr, and Barbara Nitsche (eds.), *Autorbilder. Zur Medialität literarischer Kommunikation in Mittelalter und Früher Neuzeit*, Münster 2007, pp. 63-92.

The focus will be on the formal determination and the advantages of a formal definition of commentary as well as the possible interplay of form and function.¹³

II) Poetical Commentary

Most's anthology *Commentaries – Kommentar* includes a contribution by Christoph Huber on the *poetical* commentary of vernacular texts of the Middle Ages. Huber defines commentary itself as a translation or transcoding which generates meaning by the commentator and understanding by the listener.¹⁴ Under the concept of ›poetical commentary‹, Huber assembles commentaries that are part of literary texts and have an explanatory influence on them. A more precise definition helps us to understand at least two out of the three aspects on which Huber focuses. First, those commentaries should use the same poetical-literal technique as the primary texts. That means, poetical commentaries use the same meters and rhymes as their reference texts.¹⁵ The second aspect is that the poetical commentary often refers to another earlier literary text¹⁶ and because of their textual interweaving, these commentaries cannot be removed from the text.

In his analysis, Huber presents various forms of poetical commentary in various genres. One of Huber's examples which I will examine is Otfrid von Weißenburg's *Evangelienbuch*. Otfrid is the first Old High German poet of the 9th century known by name.¹⁷ The text is part of the so-called ›Bibelepén‹, which deal with biblical content in the vernacular. These ›Bibelepén‹ are not to be confused with Bible translations, but are rather narrative adaptations of biblical scenes.¹⁸ When Huber writes about Otfrid's *Evangelienbuch*, he describes three levels of commenting the biblical text.¹⁹ For Huber, the first level is the structure of the text.

13 Unfortunately, due to the abundance of papers to be covered here and the limited scope of this paper this will not be the place for a detailed analysis of the various research opinions that deal with the examples of the primary texts as well. I will therefore refer primarily to the authors mentioned. For more detailed discussions I would like to refer to the contributions I have discussed as examples.

14 Huber (as note 4), p. 324.

15 Ibid., p. 326 f.: »[...] die poetisch-literarischen Verfahren, die sonst für die Dichtung der Primärtexte zur Verfügung stehen.«

16 Ibid., p. 327.

17 Cf. Werner Schröder, »Art. Otfrid von Weißenburg«, in: *Verfasserlexikon. Die deutsche Literatur des Mittelalters* 7, ed. by Kurth Ruh, Gundolf Keil, Werner Schröder, Burghart Wachinger, Franz Joseph Worstbrock, Berlin, New York 2010², col. 173.

18 Cf. Dieter Kartschorke, »Art. Bibelepik«, in: *Reallexikon der deutschen Literaturwissenschaft*. Neubearbeitung des Reallexikons der deutschen Literaturgeschichte, ed. by Klaus Weimar, Berlin, New York 2007, col. 218–221.

19 Huber (as note 4), p. 329.

Across five books, Otfrid presents a selection of biblical scenes to the recipient. The five books are divided into various chapters, marked with Latin headings. The second level relates to exegetical chapters, with which Otfrid enriches and interprets his own text. These chapters, although being mainly explicative, also meet the requirements Huber indicates in his aspects and definition of poetical commentary: They have the same metric shape as the narrative chapters and, of course, they refer to earlier texts. In the case of the exegetical chapters of the *Evangelienbuch* they refer to Alcuin, among other authors.²⁰ The third level, Otfrid's literary self-reflection, relates to Huber's defining aspects, and like the exegeses, is divided into separate chapters. The content of those chapters, for example, the four dedications in Latin and German, also fit with the aesthetic of the narrative chapters.²¹ While levels two and three fit very well into Huber's above-named two aspects of the poetical commentary, the first level is a bit more difficult. The structure of the text selection into five chapters, which are always introduced by Latin headings, represent interventions in the text, which speak to a sense-order desired by the writer and probably contribute to the better understanding of the recipient or even simplify the development of the text. In this sense, according to Huber's definition of commentary, the organization into a single chapter would be a commentary. Paul Zumthor in particular also argues that the process of retelling and dealing with the template in various ways includes the commenting of a text. Furthermore, he assumes that writing, in the sense of re-textualization and intertextual connections, arises from the will to comment.²² According to Zumthor, self-referential commentaries are always part of the text.²³ All in all, it seems questionable whether the structure or headlines of a text form a commentary or rather ought to belong to the pragmatics of the text. Although, as Gérard Genette notes, there may be an overlap between paratext and metatext, through which the paratext approaches the metatext and thus takes on a commenting function²⁴, this overlapping, in my opinion, should not be accepted in principle: Each paratext should first be checked for its function as metatext and commentary.

Overall Otfrid's *Evangelienbuch* presents itself as a very good example of poetical commentary, as the exegetical chapters always refer to the narrative chapters in an autoreferential manner, and explicitly identify themselves as exegetical methods.

²⁰ Ibid.

²¹ Ibid., p. 330.

²² Zumthor (as note 11), p. 14.

²³ Ibid., p. 16.

²⁴ Gérard Genette, *Palimpseste. Literatur auf zweiter Stufe*, trs. by Wolfram Bayer and Dieter Hornig, Frankfurt a. M. 2015, p. 18.

In his analysis, Huber also turns to the courtly romance, at which I would also like to take a closer look. Commentaries provided by a narrator, which Huber examines, are different from the commentaries in Otfrid's *Evangelienbuch*, because they are not obviously marked by explicitly named exegetical chapters or anything similar.

Overall, Huber understands the narrator as a commentator and a mediator: When he departs from the story, as for instance to comment on the plot, he interrupts the coherent structure of the narrative.²⁵ The narrator of the Arthurian romance *Iwein* by Hartmann von Aue provides a good example. Here, the narrator describes a fight between two knights, yet interrupts the description as he says:

ich machte des strîtes harte vil,
mit worten, wan daz ichn wil,
als ich iu bescheide.
sî wâren dâ beide,
unde ouch nieman mê
der mir der rede gestê.
Spræche ich, sît ez nieman sach,
wie dirre sluoc, wie jener stach?²⁶

By changing the past tense into the present tense, he breaks the coherent structure of the plot, while reflecting on his narrative template.

Again, following Zumthor, Huber includes the retelling of a template text as part of the main process of commenting. Viewing retelling as simultaneously commenting reveals occasionally open and concealed commentaries that refer to the template.²⁷ His example of Heinrich von Veldeke's *Eneasroman* shows both forms. Here, the narrator often directly refers to his template text of Vergil, when he says:

Virgiliûs der mâre,
der saget uns, daz her wære
von der gote geslehte
geboren mit rehte [...] ²⁸

²⁵ Huber (as note 4), p. 343.

²⁶ Hartmann von Aue, *Iwein*, ed. and trs. by Volker Mertens, Frankfurt a. M. 2008, vv. 1029-1036. – »I could describe the fight with many words, but I will not as I tell you: There were only the two and no one else who could tell me about the fight. How should I tell how one hit and the other stabbed?«

²⁷ Huber (as note 4), p. 342.

²⁸ Heinrich von Veldeke, *Eneasroman*, ed. and trs. by Dieter Kartschoke, Stuttgart 1997, vv. 18, 11-14. – »Vergil told us that he was born from the gods.«

In addition to these open and obvious commentaries that refer to the template, Huber argues, with regard to indirect quotations in Heinrich's text of the Vergil-Commentary by Servius, that Heinrich *qua* narrator understands himself as a critical poet, who tries to substantiate the historical claim of his text.²⁹ Here, the concealed poetical commentary is given by Eneas himself: When he reports to Dido's court about the Greek found on the beach by the people of Troy who calls himself Sinûn, Eneas comments on his own report by telling Dido that Sinûn's real name was Ulixes (vv. 45, 36 f.).³⁰ In contrast to the open commentary, this style of commenting is not obviously demarcated linguistically, but rather by the break with the coherent structure of the plot; Eneas introduces knowledge that was not yet available at this point of his story, but is indeed only retrospectively available. However, it is, in my opinion, problematic that Huber treats the narrator's commentaries and commentaries given by figures of the narration in the same way: That Eneas cannot explicitly give a commentary on Servius, who comments on Eneas' history, among others, is evident. Rather, I believe Huber is dealing here with two different forms of commenting. Especially against the background of the historical claim of the text, which Huber sees in Heinrich's commentaries, narrator's and figure's commentaries have to be analyzed separately: What is part of the history of Troy material for the narrator, is for Eneas, as a figure, empirical knowledge.

In Arthurian romance, Huber detects a new quality of the poetical commentary.³¹ The commentary refers to its material, but it also relates to the narrative itself. For example, Chrétien's *Érec*, the protagonist of *Érec et Énide*, the first old French Arthurian romance, is compared to Absalom, Salomon, a lion and Alexander to illustrate his beauty, wisdom, bravery and generosity:

Or fu Érec de tel renon
 Qu' an ne parloit se de lui non;
 Nus hom n'avoit se boene grace
 Qu'il sanbloit Ausalon de face
 Et de la lengue Salemon,
 Et de fierté sanbla lyon,
 et de doner et de despandre
 refu il parauz Alixandre.³²

²⁹ Huber (as note 4), p. 343.

³⁰ Ibid., p. 342.

³¹ Ibid., p. 343.

³² Chrétien de Troyes, *Érec et Énide*, trs. and ed. by Albert Glier, Stuttgart 1987, vv. 2207-2214 – »Érec had so high reputations, everyone was only talking about him; no one had such excellent qualities as he. He seemed as beautiful as Absalom and eloquent as Salomon, brave as a lion and resembled Alexander in donating and giving.«

Here, Huber detects a commentary in the form of a literary quotation, which is intended to embed the figure into ancient contexts.³³ While function of a possible commentary is present, the coherent structure of the plot is not broken because the recipient is only told what the other figures can see in Érec. In contrast to the above-mentioned examples of the *Eneasroman* there does not appear to be any formal indication to understand this passage as a commentary. Also, Huber's definition of literary quotations is not explicit. Here I see an intertextual link rather than a quotation. Furthermore, it seems questionable to me to open the commentary to such an extent that even physical and psychological comparisons between characters may be understood as commentary. They do not so much explain and interpret as they paint a picture of the figure. I would like to illustrate this problem briefly with the self-chosen example of Hartmann von Aue's *Der arme Heinrich*.³⁴ *Der arme Heinrich* is a courtly novella with legendary elements. In a few introductory lines, it tells about the virtuous and brilliant life of the knight Heinrich. At the peak of his life, Heinrich falls ill from leprosy and is excluded from society. During the story, a young girl establishes herself as Heinrich's rescuer. Her blood can cure him of his suffering. A short time before the girl would have died for him, Heinrich sees her flawless naked body and realizes that if God wants him to suffer and die, he should not try to change his fate. With this realization, Heinrich is cured by a miracle not further explained in the text and is integrated back into society. In the description of Heinrich, the narrator tells us that Heinrich is like Absalom. Just like Absalom's secular crown fell to his feet, so did Heinrich's:

An im wart erzeiget,
als ouch an Absalône,
daz diu üppige krône
werltlicher süeze
vellet under vüeze
ab ir besten werdekeit,
als uns diu schrift hât geseit.³⁵

A few verses after that comparison, Heinrich is compared to Job:

Als ouch Jôbe geschach,
dem edeln und dem rîchen,

³³ Huber (as note 4), p. 344.

³⁴ Hartmann von Aue, *Der arme Heinrich*, ed. by Nathanael Busch, Stuttgart 2015.

³⁵ Ibid., vv. 84-90 – »By him was shown, as well as by Absalom, that the luxurious crown of worldly sweetness falls down to the feet while it's at its highest dignity, as the story told us.«

der ouch vil jæmerlîchen
 dem miste wart ze teile
 mitten in sînem heile.³⁶

In the first line, we can understand these literary quotations, like Huber does for Chrétien's *Érec*, as an attempt to embed the character into a biblical context. But if these two comparisons to Heinrich are interpreted in this way, as commentaries on his life and his suffering, there would be two opposing reading directions: The Job parable would suggest suffering as a test for Heinrich's secular life, while the Absalom parable would suggest a punishment. Instead of an explicit interpretation, a poetical commentary thus leads to confusion about the stance of the text in this crucial matter. Even if some commentaries intend to puzzle the reader, two such contradictory interpretations seem questionable to me, especially if we want to consider the text as fulfilling a didactic function.

The examples of *Érec et Énide* and *Der Arme Heinrich* show two methodological problems. Both supposed commentaries on *Érec* and Heinrich are not marked explicitly by any gesture that calls attention to an explanation or something similar. Furthermore, the Heinrich example shows that the intertextual links to Job and Absalom would not have precisely the same function as a commentary. In my opinion, only an explicit marker on a formal level would give reason to think of these passages as commentaries. While Huber's concept of poetical commentaries including their own possible aesthetic is very interesting, his definitions are, all things considered, problematic on a formal and methodological level.

III) Narrator's Commentary and Digression

Besides commentaries, narrators of courtly romances can also embark on digressions which present to the audience some general knowledge, as an author named Der Pleier did in his late Arthurian romance *Meleranz*. He describes some gemstones that are shaped like Venus and Cupid. His short digression to the attributes of Venus and Cupid starts for example with [...] *da by bekannt / was [...]* (vv. 664 f.).³⁷ However, the research of Carola Völkel, among others, shows how thin the line between narrator commentary and digression really is. In her description of the narrators in various courtly romances, Völkel uses the term digression as seemingly synonymous with commentary. Although during

³⁶ Ibid., vv. 128-132 – »It was the same with the noble and rich Hiob. As Hiob, the noble and rich, who fell from his fortune into the filth as well.«

³⁷ Meleranz von Frankreich, *Der Meleranz des Pleier*, nach der Karlsruher Handschrift, Edition – Untersuchung Stellenkommentar, ed. by Markus Steffen, Berlin 2011 – »as was known.«

the course of her work she tends to separate the two terms, she does not go into detail about the differences.³⁸ It turns out that even the supposedly clear demarcation of a narrator's commentary through a specific narrative attitude, such as referring to his own narration (cf. the above mentioned example of Hartmann's *Iwein*), the use of apostrophe, or by breaking with the coherent structure of the text by changing the tense, continues to cause difficulties.

Sandra Linden has recently addressed the question of digressions in courtly romance. In this context, she sees commentaries as germ-cells of digressions. Commentary and digression are accordingly so closely interwoven that Linden derives the function of the digression from the function of the commentary. The functions are correspondingly closely related: The digression sets its own literary impulses and drives the action forward, while the commentary only explains.³⁹ But the question of how commentaries can be distinguished from digressions in courtly romance while their function is so similar remains open. Furthermore, Linden emphasizes that digression and commentary are themselves not clearly distinguishable from self-reflexive passages and can digress as well.⁴⁰ It also remains an open question at what point commentary and digression are considered as digressive and thus open to more general reflections. Because of this uncertainty, the line between the narrator's commentary and digression seems to me hard to draw. Distinguishing between the two would have great relevance for the courtly romance, however, because in contrast to digressions, the very presence of commentaries may mark passages of the narration itself as important or critical. By commenting passages, the narrator could guide the attention and change the perspective of how the audience will understand those passages and perhaps even the whole text. Those changed perspectives could be very important for Medieval German Studies because they clearly impact the reading of the texts. While Linden's categories give, with a view to digressions, a more explicit idea of a formal definition than Huber's, they show that only a functional definition of commentary (and digression) is possible. However, an explicitly formulated formal definition would be needed as well.

Narrators in courtly romance in general, and therefore also the commentarial dimension of their interventions, are insufficiently researched despite their regular occurrence. Only a few works on the narrator in the courtly novel discuss commentary as part of the narrator's many expressions.⁴¹ Moreover, it is noticeable

³⁸ Völkel (as note 10), pp. 68 ff.

³⁹ Linden (as note 10), p. 28.

⁴⁰ Ibid., p. 27.

⁴¹ Uwe Pörksen, *Der Erzähler im mittelhochdeutschen Epos. Formen seines Hervortretens bei Lamprecht, Konrad, Hartmann, in Wolframs »Willehalm« und in den »Spielmannsepen«*, Berlin 1971; Ursula Kuttner, *Das Erzählen des Erzählten. Eine Studie zum Stil in Hartmanns »Iwein« und*

that the form and function of the narrator's commentary is often only questioned very superficially. Even if the narrator's commentary is often part of literary elaborations, scholarly literature, except for that of Huber and Linden, rarely deals with theory or even the practices of commentary with regard to courtly novels.

Eberhard Nellmann's book on the function of the narrator in Wolfram von Eschenbach's *Parzival* is one of the few early works which included an analysis of narratorial commentary and outlined what kinds of special meanings Wolfram's form of narratorial commentary has for the whole text. Nellmann rightly reflects that the definition of commentary could be ambiguous and could be related to almost all interventions of the narrator in the text.⁴² However, he uses a narrower definition of commentary. For his analysis, he only uses commentaries that interpret or teach. Nellmann does not elaborate on a formal definition of the commentaries, insofar as he only includes commentaries by the narrator and not those by characters. Thus, in contrast to Huber, he separates the level of narration from the level of the narrator and commentaries.⁴³ Nellmann divides the narrator's commentaries into various functions: The factual explanation, defense, and criticism of action and figures, and guesses.⁴⁴ Additionally, he works out a kind of ›special form‹ of Wolfram's commentaries: The defense and criticism of the action and of the protagonist are very often inserted either in parallel or in contrast to the environment of the narrator himself or the present time of his audience. In the case of parallels, Wolfram uses comparison, such as equating characters with historical figures or even with the narrator himself.⁴⁵ At the same time, however, commentaries can also express increased or decreased value of the diegetic vis-a-vis the real world.⁴⁶ Thus, narratorial commentaries may cast the present time of the audience or the environment of the narrator either as inferior to the diegetic world or vice versa, depending on the context.⁴⁷ In my view, Nellmann not only describes commentary and its function in general, but also, and more specifically, Wolfram's commentarial practice. Both the parallelization and the contrast of the diegetic world and the audience's ›reality‹ have an impact on the illusion of reality in the narrative. By making this ›reality‹ a self-evident object of comparison, it seems that both worlds would actually be

›Iwein‹, Bonn 1978; Johannes Frey, *Spielräume des Erzählens. Zur Rolle der Figuren in den Erzählkonzeptionen von ›Yvain‹, ›Iwein‹, ›Ywain‹, und ›Ivens saga‹*, Stuttgart 2008; Markus Greulich, *Stimme und Ort. Narratologische Studien zu Heinrich von Veldeke, Hartmann von Aue und Wolfram von Eschenbach*, Berlin 2018.

42 Nellmann (as note 10), p. 129.

43 Cf. Huber (as note 4), pp. 342 ff.; see also above, p. 144.

44 Nellmann (as note 10), pp. 130–140.

45 Ibid., p. 136.

46 Huber (as note 4), p. 137.

47 Ibid.

comparable to each other. The line between the narration and reality becomes more and more obscure, and the fiction more and more credible.⁴⁸ Nellmann argues here at least as much about the *discourse* level as about the *histoire* level. In other words, he sees the function of the commentary both on the level of its content and on its form. So, it seems to me, not only does the content of the commentary have a function on the text, but also on the form and practice of commenting.

Nellmann interprets references to the narrator in *Parzival* as happening in service of the amusement of the audience. According to Nellmann, as the narrator repeatedly presents himself as mediocre and average, and compares himself to the ideal world of the romance, a tension arises for the depicted world, which creates a comic effect.⁴⁹ At the same time, the narrator directs the attention of the audience onto his own preferred tracks and can thus distract from other passages. Beyond inserting humorous elements, the narrator here manages once again to move more explicitly into the foreground of the narrative.⁵⁰ If in *Parzival* he already tends to stage himself as the ›ruler‹ over the narrative, this kind of comparison offers another possibility for self-expression. In my opinion, through this self-expression, the narrator gains more and more personality and acquires the contours of an anthropomorphic but also a literary figure, who seems to stand almost on the border between the hetero- and the homodiegetic.⁵¹ Furthermore, such findings would be an explicit benefit to subsequent academic explorations of the narrator in pre-modern texts. Nellmann's examples show various functions (general reflections, explanations, defense, critique of characters and their actions and evaluation) of the narrator's commentaries. In particular, the impact of commentarial practices on the text opens up the question of what other possibilities of commenting pre-modern texts might be able to employ and which functions they, in turn, assume for the content of the commentary and the narrative.

48 Nellmann (as note 10), p. 137.

49 Ibid., p. 138.

50 Ibid.

51 Cf. Andreas Kablitz, »Literatur, Fiktion und Erzählung – nebst einem Nachruf auf den Erzähler«, in: Irina O. Rajewsky and Ulrike Schneider (eds.), *Im Zeichen der Fiktion. Aspekte fiktionaler Rede aus historischer und systematischer Sicht. Festschrift für Klaus W. Hempfer zum 65. Geburtstag*, Stuttgart 2008, pp. 32–34. – Kablitz assumes that authors and narrators are generally equated. Accordingly, the narrator should not be understood as an anthropomorphic figure. Based on the result described above, however, this assumption does not seem to reach far enough for premodern texts. – Regarding the differences between narrator and author cf. Monika Unzeitig, *Autornamen und Autorschaft. Bezeichnung und Konstruktion in der deutschen und französischen Erzählliteratur des 12. und 13. Jahrhunderts*, Berlin, New York 2010; Timo Reuvekamp-Felber, »Autorschaft und Textfunktion. Zur Interdependenz von Erzählerstilisierung, Stoff und Gattung in der Epik des 12. und 13. Jahrhunderts«, in: *Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie* 120 (2001), pp. 1–23; Bumke (as note 3).

What Nellmann calls a ›special form‹ of commentary⁵² in Wolfram's *Parzival* can also be found in Wirnt von Grafenberg's *Wigalois*.⁵³ Even though Elisabeth Lienert describes the narrator of *Wigalois* as forming fewer personal contours than the narrator of *Parzival*,⁵⁴ Wirnt's commentaries and commentarial practices are comparable to Wolfram's on the textual as well as on the formal level. The commentaries of Wirnt's narrator go even one step beyond Wolfram's. After Wigalois killed the pagan Roaz and freed the land Korntin, Roaz' wife Japhite dies from a broken heart. The entourage of Roaz and Japhite falls into deep grief. The narrator reports that there were 40 women in deep mourning and woe (vv. 8058-8060). With this, the report of the narrator ends, and he begins, so he claims, with a true story. This passage is a short report about the funeral of the prince of Meranien, at which the narrator was present. On this occasion, women also displayed deep sadness. The narrator ends with an intercession on behalf of the mourners to relieve their pain and to take care of them (vv. 8091-8093). The report of the true story is translated back into the action by the narrator explicitly picking up the storyline again: *nu wil ich an die rede mîn / wider grîfen dâ ich si lie*.⁵⁵ The coherence of the text is broken on a formal and textual level. The narrator's report about the mourning women in the story world of *Wigalois* is told in the past tense, just as the rest of the narrated action. The step into the reality of the narrator, however, is introduced by the present tense (even if the event is told in past tense). The same applies to the transition back to the plot. The narrator says that he intends to speak about an event at which he was present. The formal level of the change of tense corresponds here with the content: While the fictitious world is described in the past tense, the change to the present tense marks the change to the narrator's presence. In his report, the narrator formulates a direct comparison with the unspecified historical event of the burial of the Prince of Meranien and his environment, for he was part of the event:

ich wil gelichen dirre nôt
eines vil edeln vürsten tot
von Merân, dâ ich jâmer sach.⁵⁶

52 Nellmann (as note 10), p. 136.

53 Wirnt von Grafenberg, *Wigalois*, ed. and trs. by Sabine Seelbach and Ulrich Seelbach, Berlin, Boston 2014.

54 Elisabeth Lienert, »Zur Pragmatik höfischen Erzählens. Erzähler und Erzählerkommentar in Wirnts von Grafenberg *Wigalois*«, in: *Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen und Literaturen* 234 (1997), pp. 263-275, here p. 265.

55 Wirnt von Grafenberg (as note 53) vv. 8094 f. – »Now I want to pick up my story where I left it.«

56 Ibid., vv. 8062-8064 – »I want to compare their distress with the death of the prince of Meranien, where I saw grief.«

As in the *Parzival*, the comparison requires putting fiction and history on the same level. The lines between the fictional and the real world are thus not only blurred but almost eliminated on the content level. The result is the illusion of reality described by Nellmann. This is explicitly demonstrated by the fact that the narrator speaks for the characters of the romance. Although narrators often show empathy for their characters⁵⁷, here, they are so closely linked with the reality of the narrator that the impression arises that the intercession, recited in the narrator's presence, can actually help the mourning women. Thus, the narrator also undermines the line between homo- and heterodiegetic narration, which he had established previously. Through this, the position of the narrator in the narration as an anthropomorphic and/or literary figure is also affected. Based on these results, Lienert's thesis that commentaries are not referring to the narrative, but only addressed to the audience⁵⁸, cannot be confirmed or must at least be qualified.

The examples from Wolfram's *Parzival* and Wirnt's *Wigalois* show that besides the question of the function of the commentary content, questions should also be asked about its formal appearance and its function for the content and the reference texts. Only through the combination of a specific commentarial practice and the content of the commentary can the commentarial dimension of a narrator's intervention be discerned, and its special significance be seen. The formal aspect of a narrator's commentaries is thus a non-negligible factor and must always be the subject of reflection. However, this requires a much narrower definition of the commentary concept, which also takes into account the formal aspects.

4) Allusion and Abridged Version as Commentary in the *Tristanroman*

The work of Albrecht Hausmann can be considered as another example of a very broad commentary concept. At the same time, Hausmann's concept illustrates how important a narrower formal definition would be.

In his discussion of Gottfried von Straßburg's *Tristanroman*⁵⁹, Hausmann identifies the linguistic style and the sound of the spoken text as commentary,

57 Cf. Lena Zudrell, »Was fühlen Erzähler?«, in: Cora Dietl, Christoph Schanze, Friedrich Wolfzettel, and Lena Zudrell (eds.), *Emotion und Handlung im Artusroman*, Berlin 2017, pp. 47-62.

58 Lienert (as note 54), p. 274.

59 Gottfried's *Tristan* tells the well-known story of Tristan and Isolde. Isolde is supposed to marry Tristan's uncle Marke. On the crossing from Ireland to Cornwall, Isolde's servant inadvertently gives her and Tristan a love potion that Isolde's mother cooked for Isolde and Marke. This is the beginning of the forbidden and secret love between the two.

which in part intends to relate the aesthetics and content of the narrative to the unity between Tristan and Isolde.⁶⁰ In his article, Hausmann assumes that the content of the text deliberately confuses the recipient in order to portray later events, such as the servant accidentally giving the love potion to Tristan and Isolde, as coincidental.⁶¹ However, through his suggestive narrative, Gottfried's narrator very early on proposes ways of evaluating the plot, so that the randomness later displayed in the narrative can be deemed necessary by the recipient.⁶² In addition, the linguistic style, together with the sound of the read or recited text, implicitly creates a unification between Tristan and Isolde, in that the style provides a surplus of meaning to the event.⁶³ Hausmann gives the following example:

ein senedære unde ein senedærîn,
 ein man ein wîp, ein wîp ein man,
 Tristan Îsolt, Îsolt Tristan.⁶⁴

Hausmann posits that the doubling of the oppositional pairs like male and female lover, man and woman and Tristan and Isolde cancels the opposition between Tristan and Isolde. He further argues that the chiasmus in the last two verses increases the reading speed and finds its end in Tristan and Isolde's unity as the solution.⁶⁵ Hausmann interprets this surplus of meaning as a suggestive commentary.

At first, it is questionable whether allusion and commentary go well together because contrary to commentary, suggestion does not want to be consciously perceived at all. After all, according to Michel Foucault, it is the task of the commentary, »de dire *enfin* ce qui était articulé silencieusement *là-bas*«. ⁶⁶ Since the commentary here should not be perceived as such, it also cannot be found. Thus, there is no explicit distinction here between aesthetic play and commentary. The problem of demarcating the commentary, as well as its attributability, arises again, because the unity between Tristan and Isolde results in an overall interpretation of the text, whereby it is not sufficiently explicit why only certain passages in the text form this surplus of meaning.

60 Hausmann (as note 11), p. 208.

61 Ibid., p. 209.

62 Ibid., pp. 214 f.

63 Ibid., p. 216.

64 Gottfried von Straßburg, *Tristan*, ed. and trs. by Rüdiger Krohn, Stuttgart 1986, vv. 128-130.
 – »A (male) lover and a (female) lover, a man and a woman, Tristan Isolde, Isolde Tristan.«

65 Hausmann (as note 11), p. 217.

66 Michel Foucault, *L'ordre du discours*, Paris 1971, p. 27 – »to *finally* say what was already secretly articulated *there*.« – Emphasis in original.

Another example where the problem of demarcating and assigning alleged commentaries becomes even more explicit can be found in the monograph *Textkritik als Problem der Kulturwissenschaft* by Martin Baisch.⁶⁷ The Munich *Tristan* manuscript Cgm 51 – the subject of Baisch's analysis – gained some prominence in earlier medievalist research, because of its elisions in comparison to the text of Gottfried von Straßburg and the continuation of Ulrich von Türlenheim. The focus of Baisch's investigation lies precisely in these abridged passages, for which he points out that both Gottfried's method of composing meaning and the suspension of this textual level in the tradition can be considered as evidence of a practice of commenting.⁶⁸ Comparable to Otfrid's *Evangelienbuch*, the telling and restructuring or rather reducing of a traditional text is a form of retelling. Baisch thus follows the concept of commentary, described above, favoured by Zumthor and Huber, who already understand the process of retelling as commenting. That means that the reduced passages and especially the absence of the text would be the commentary here.

The illustrations of the manuscript are also considered under the premise that the text's cuts and deletions pursue the goal of harmonizing Gottfried's *Tristan*, in which the conflict between love and society is dissolved.⁶⁹ Baisch for example concludes from the illustrations of the ›Minnegrotte‹ that the illustrations, like the cuts in the text, reduce the tensions between love and society.⁷⁰ At the same time the relation of text and illustration gives no space for an allegorical exaggeration of the love between Tristan and Isolde⁷¹, which leads to the above mentioned harmonization of the abridged version.

Commentary in the way Baisch describes it would only be recognizable if one knows the elided passages and lines and recognizes their meaning for the text. Similar to Hausmann, the question arises whether a commentary can be a commentary if it runs the risk of not being recognized as such. Of course, the cuts will have made sense for the editor, the only question is whether this can also be recognized and understood by the recipient. Thus widely-used commentaries that are not demarcated and are sometimes very inaccurate in their assignment to the reference point open up a huge field of commentary attributions. Building off Baisch and Huber, it would be possible to interpret every paratext, poetic

67 Baisch (as note 11).

68 Ibid., p. 93. – »[...] sowohl Gottfrieds Verfahren der Sinnmodellierung wie auch die Suspension dieser Textebene [können, note JG] in der Überlieferung als Belege einer Praxis der Kommentierung gelten.«

69 Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 146–306.

70 Ibid., p. 244.

71 Ibid., p. 247.

concept, bible parable, and even the co-transmissions⁷² of a certain text in medieval manuscripts as commentary.

5) Illustrations as Commentary in Eike von Repgow's *Sachsenspiegel* and Wolfram von Eschenbach's *Willehalm*

This section examines how the marking and attributability of illustrations as commentaries can be seen in the examples of the *Sachsenspiegel* and the illuminated manuscript of the *Willehalm* also by Wolfram von Eschenbach.

The *Sachsenspiegel* by Eike von Repgow is the most important German juridical text of the Middle Ages. It is handed down in various manuscripts, which partly include glosses. The glossing of the *Sachsenspiegel* was necessary because it was common law, which was initially distributed only orally and later was translated from Latin into the vernacular.⁷³ To avoid ambiguity, Eike von Repgow adds examples or illustrations that clarify the oral tradition.⁷⁴

Four manuscripts include such illustrations instead of glosses. The Dresden (D), Heidelberg (H), Oldenburg (O) and Wolfenbüttel (W) manuscripts⁷⁵ were written in the 14th century and probably go back to a common manuscript X, which most likely originated in the 13th century.⁷⁶ The Dresden manuscript is the one with the most illustrations; 924 illustrations accompany the text on 92 pages. Its gold decoration also makes the codex the most artistically valuable manuscript of the *Sachsenspiegel*. Of course, it is possible that these manuscripts were only composed for their exhibition value. The golden decoration of the Dresden manuscript in particular suggests this may be the case, but strong signs of use can be found in the manuscript, just like in the others.⁷⁷ At first, illustrations as a whole were understood as help for illiterate people. However, this thesis was rejected, because the illustrations are hardly interpretable without the text. They

72 Co-transmission means, in this context, texts which are repeatedly handed down together in manuscripts.

73 Cf. Heiner Lück, *Über den Sachsenspiegel. Entstehung, Inhalt und Wirkung des Rechtsbuches*, Döbel 2013, p. 19.

74 Ruth Schmidt-Wiegand, »Die Bilderhandschriften des Sachsenspiegels und ihre praktische Bedeutung«, in: Dieter Pötschke (ed.), *Rolande, Kaiser und Recht. Zur Rechtsgeschichte des Harzraums und seiner Umgebung*, Berlin 1999, pp. 198–210, here p. 207.

75 Library call numbers: D = Dresden, Landesbibl., Mscr. Dresd. M. 32; H = Heidelberg, Universitätsbibl., Cod. Pal. germ. 164; W = Wolfenbüttel, HAB, Cod. Guelf. 3.1 Aug. fol.; O = Oldenburg, Landesbibl., CIM I 410.

76 Schmidt-Wiegand (as note 74), p. 199.

77 Lück (as note 73), p. 37.

rather complement, expand, and clarify it.⁷⁸ In several ways they seem to work like visual commentaries. The images form a special relation to the text: The columns with illustration are always placed on the left side of the page. The basic structure of the illustrated columns can be divided into two categories: The first category shows one action or a whole process in a single illustration line. The second category shows a whole process in a whole column by stringing single illustration lines together.⁷⁹ According to Henrike Manuwald, both categories of illustrations can develop the narrativity of the text.⁸⁰ By reading the *Sachsenspiegel* we would start on the left side with the pictures. Because text and illustrations cannot always be at the same height in the layout, every illustration is related to the corresponding text passage with the initial of the beginning of the passage, which is drawn in the illustrated scene. The marking of the illustrations shows that they are more than ornaments. The structure of these references may be conceived as a kind of precursor of our modern footnote apparatus. So, the form of this reference system may remind us of commentaries. But the presentation of the various figures in the illustrations provides additional information about their use: Clothes, headwear, objects and even the gestures of the illustrated figures are only hard to understand without the text. Even if one knows the text, one also must know the social stereotypes and legal gestures which the figures present.

Some illustrations show special figures which reinforce the argument that they may expand the meaning of the text. Some depictions of the law text include figures with more than two arms and hands. These characters can denote more than one action. Two illustrations of the Wolfenbüttel manuscript will clarify the difference between the few illustrations that only present a fact, and those that complement and expand it and so may also become narrative themselves: The passage about hunting rights starts with an explanation of how hunters have to behave in the game preserve.⁸¹ It is said that the hunting dogs must be leashed while the hunter's bow and his crossbow have to be unstretched. This is the same as the illustration shows us. But the text goes on. Also, his quiver has to be covered which is something we cannot see in the illustration. However, the text goes even further. It also tells what is allowed and forbidden outside the

78 A clarification would be, for example, gestures, which clarify the jurisdiction. The illustrations show also by the colour of their cloth which type of judge is needed etc. – Cf. Manuwald, *Medialer Dialog* (as note 12), p. 447 and Schmidt-Wiegand (as note 74), p. 204.

79 Cf. Manuwald, *Medialer Dialog* (as note 12), p. 443.

80 Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 441–446.

81 Wolfenbütteler-Manuscript (as note 75), fol. 40r: <http://diglib.hab.de/mss/3-1-aug-2f/start.htm?image=00109> [last accessed 19 September 2019].

preserve. But this is not part of the illustration.⁸² I think it is only an ornament to the text. However, in the case of feudal law, for example, it seems less important to present a picture artfully than it is to make a concrete statement. A look at folio 71r should serve as an example (Fig. 1).⁸³ First of all, it is noticeable that the text passage and the image are also connected by repeating the initial ›s‹. Since three consecutive passages begin with ›s‹, they were written in yellow (or more precisely gold), green, and red to allow for the explicit assignment of the illustration to the text. The illustration with the golden ›s‹, to which I refer, shows three figures. One figure is standing on the left edge of the picture and is provided with a bevor, a helmet, and a sword. He holds wheat stalks in his hands. The figure in the middle wears blue cloth and has four hands, while the figure on the right wears green cloth, a ›Schapel‹⁸⁴, has three hands, and is sitting. The faces of the middle and right figures are facing each other. The corresponding text passage describes a part of the feudal law. The following facts and procedures are described: If a lord voluntarily grants his land to a man and he is deprived of his goods, then the lord must provide for the replacement of the goods as long as the man complains about the loss within a specified period. Overall, it is very noticeable that the hands of the acting figures are displayed as quite large and out of proportion. Indeed, the focus here is on the gestures that put the action in the foreground.⁸⁵ In the illustration, the feudal lord is presented through the sitting figure on the right side. The figure in the middle is his vassal. That the fiefdom was given voluntarily is clarified by the commendation gesture. For this purpose, the vassal places his folded hands in the hands of the feudal lord. His other arm points to the man on his right side. With this gesture, he first complains about the robbery. As a symbol for the robbery, the left standing figure holds the stalks in his hands. That the vassal has turned his face away from the robber indicates that the offense is in the past. By pulling the cloak of his feudal lord, the vassal urges his lord to refund his fiefdom. In the illustration, the lord responds to the law and replaces the lost fiefdom by pointing to the stalks behind him. The se-

82 The Oldenburger illustration shows instead of the crossbow a falcon on the hunter's arm: (as note 75), fol. 60r: urn:nbn:de:gbv:45:1-3571 [last accessed 19 September 2019], cf. as well: Eike von Repgow, *Sachsenspiegel. Die Wolfenbütteler Bilderhandschrift, Faksimile, Text und Kommentarband*, ed. by Ruth Schmidt-Wiegand, Berlin 1993, fol. 40r, p. 215.

83 Wolfenbütteler Manuscript (as note 75), fol. 71r: <http://diglib.hab.de/mss/3-1-aug-2f/start.htm?image=00171> [last accessed 19 September 2019].

84 A wreath of metal or flowers worn in the 12th century as headgear.

85 Manuwald, *Medialer Dialog* (as note 12), pp. 430-433; Schmidt-Wiegand (as note 74) presents a catalog with five categories which describe the function of the various illustrations, pp. 208-211.

veral hands of the two main characters denote the entire process the text passage describes. The gestures refer to the main components of the text. In addition, the illustration expands the text. While the text only talks about the theft of the fiefdom, the illustration shows an armed figure holding the sword upright. This implies that the fief is forcibly taken, something the text does not say. In total, the reference system that connects text and illustration to its content suggests that some illustrations are commentaries. Also, the transmission of the *Sachsenspiegel* gives further reason to understand the illustrations as commentaries: In printed editions of the 16th century, these kinds of illustrations disappear and are once again replaced with a gloss; these editions only include small wood engravings to introduce the chapters.⁸⁶

If one looks at the illustrations of the so-called ›Große Bilderhandschrift‹⁸⁷ of the *Willehalm* of Wolfram von Eschenbach, one will see several similarities in the type of presentation, which suggest a connection to the *Sachsenspiegel*. The GB was conceived around 1270/75 in Quedlinburg/ Halberstadt.⁸⁸ As in the *Sachsenspiegel*, the pages are evenly divided between text and illustration. The illustrations are always placed on the left side of the page and are connected to the text passages by the repetition of the initial in the illustration like in the *Sachsenspiegel*. A relationship of influence or dependency between the illustrated *Sachsenspiegel* manuscripts or a possible template X and the GB can indeed be presumed, but not proven, since only the Oldenburg manuscript is located and dated.⁸⁹ However, it is clear that all these manuscripts are similar in the function of their illustrations and, as stated above, are identical in their formal text-illustration relation. While the *Sachsenspiegel* illustrations often attempt to depict as much action as possible in one line of the illustration, the GB images follow more of the second category and attempt to translate the text word by word into illustrations. Manuwald shows this for Gyburg's speech on religion. The metaphor *ich diene im vn(t) d(er) hohesten hant*⁹⁰ is translated into the picture and concretized at the same time: We can see the head of Christ, which is placed at the top of the picture.⁹¹ Gyburg's position as a baptized ›pagan‹, on the other hand, is further consolidated in the illustrations by being placed higher

86 Cf. Gabriele von Olberg-Haverkate, *Die Textsorte Rechtsbücher. Die Entwicklung der Handschriften und Drucke des Sachsenspiegels und weiterer ausgewählter Rechtsbücherhandschriften vom 13. – 16. Jahrhundert*, Frankfurt a. M. 2017, pp. 102 ff.

87 Abbreviated as GB, library signatur: München, BSB, cgm 193/III.

88 Manuwald, *Medialer Dialog* (as note 12), p. 3.

89 About a possible relation between the *Sachsenspiegel* and the GB cf. *ibid.* pp. 412–466.

90 Wolfram von Eschenbach, *Willehalm*, ed. and trs. by Dieter Kartschoke, Berlin, New York 2003, v. 220, 30. – »I serve him and the highest hand.«

91 Manuwald, *Medialer Dialog* (as note 12), p. 282.

in the picture composition than her ›pagan‹ father Terramer.⁹² Additionally, the pictures gain some autonomy over the text and offer more information than the text does. Elsewhere, the illustrations forego the literal translation and devalue the differentiated depiction of Muslims in Wolfram's text. This happens, similarly to the *Sachsenspiegel*, through the attributes of the figures, etc. While the text gives information about the clothing of the figures only in some places, the images enrich the text with more information about their appearance.⁹³ Particularly intriguing in this context is the narrator figure⁹⁴, who is here transformed into the illustration of a courtly epic for the first time and offers an interesting form of commentary⁹⁵: In the text passages where the narrator comes to the foreground through a longer narratorial commentary and explicitly takes on the characteristics of a character, he is also partially embedded in four illustrations. Especially striking is the appearance of the narrator in the illustrations during the time he speaks directly to his audience. Therefore, he is not only ›audible‹, but can also be seen.⁹⁶ Michael Curschmann, however, sees here the failed attempt to develop a kind of vernacular iconography, which attempts to make the picture readable and, accordingly, also depicts the narrator. However, according to Curschmann, this leads to confusion rather than to conveying the text, because in the illustration the narrator is only one figure among many.⁹⁷ But every time he appears in an image, the narrator stands between two parties and identifies himself as a mediator by his gestures. Likewise, his blue clothes make him recognizable again and again as a recurring figure. Since not every insertion of the narrator is illustrated, the illustrated narrator-figure can be understood as a certain emphasis of the illustrations and thus possibly direct the reception of the text.⁹⁸ In addition, Kathryn Starkey notes that the illustrations, through

92 Ibid., p. 284.

93 Ibid., p. 297.

94 About the narrator in Wolfram's *Willehalm* cf. Pörksen (as note 41) and Nellmann (as note 10).

95 Norbert H. Ott, »Texte und Bilder. Beziehungen zwischen den Medien Kunst und Literatur in Mittelalter und Früher Neuzeit«, in: Horst Wenzel, Wilfried Seipel, and Gotthart Wunberg (eds.), *Die Verschriftlichung der Welt. Bild, Text und Zahl in der Kultur des Mittelalters und der Frühen Neuzeit*, Wien 2000, pp. 105-145, here p. 110.

96 Cf. Horst Wenzel, »Autorenbilder. Zur Ausdifferenzierung von Autorenfunktionen in mittelalterlichen Miniaturen«, in: Elizabeth Andersen, Jens Haustein, Anne Simon, and Peter Strohschneider (eds.), *Autor und Autorschaft im Mittelalter, Kolloquium Meissen 1995*, Tübingen 1998, pp. 1-28, here p. 10. – Wenzel speaks in this context of ›vor Augen stellen‹.

97 Michael Curschmann, »Pictura laicorum litteraturae. Überlegungen zum Verhältnis von Bild und volkssprachlicher Schriftlichkeit im Hoch- und Spätmittelalter bis zum Codex Manesse«, in: Hagen Keller, Klaus Grubmüller, and Nikolaus Staubach (eds.), *Pragmatische Schriftlichkeit im Mittelalter. Erscheinungsformen und Entwicklungsstufen*, München 1992, pp. 211-229, here p. 220.

98 Cf. Manuwald, »Der Autor als Erzähler?« (as note 12), pp. 76-79.

the narrator's portrayal, place great value on the various narrative attitudes. This would not only address the external mediation situation (that is the mediation of the text to the recipient), but also the inner mediation situation, in other words the narrative structure.⁹⁹ As the illustrations reflect the narrator's commentary as a text-organizing element through the visualized narrator's commentary, its significance for the narration is further emphasized.



Fig. 1: Eike von Repgow, *Sachsenspiegel*, Herzog August Bibliothek: Cod. Guelf. 3.1 Aug. fol., fol. 71r

⁹⁹ Kathryn Starkey, »Bilder erzählen – Die Visualisierung von Erzählstimme und Perspektive in den Illustrationen eines *Willehalm*-Fragments«, in: Jutta Eming, Annette Jael Lehmann, and Irmgard Maassen (eds.), *Mediale Performanzen. Historische Konzepte und Perspektiven*, Freiburg i. Br. 2002, pp. 21-48, here pp. 31 f.