



# New Research: Yearbook for the Society of Medieval Germanic Studies

---

Volume 1

Issue 1 *New Research in Medieval Germanic Studies: The Yearbook of the Society for Medieval Germanic Studies*

Article 4

---

5-2009

## The Critics Remain Silent at the Banquet of Words: Marchand on the Names in Wolfram Von Eschenbach's Parzival

Stephen Mark Carey  
*University of Minnesota, Morris*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/smgs>

---

### Recommended Citation

Carey, Stephen Mark (2009) "The Critics Remain Silent at the Banquet of Words: Marchand on the Names in Wolfram Von Eschenbach's Parzival," *New Research: Yearbook for the Society of Medieval Germanic Studies*: Vol. 1: Iss. 1, Article 4.

Available at: <https://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/smgs/vol1/iss1/4>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Journals at University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well. It has been accepted for inclusion in *New Research: Yearbook for the Society of Medieval Germanic Studies* by an authorized editor of University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well. For more information, please contact [skulann@morris.umn.edu](mailto:skulann@morris.umn.edu).

THE CRITICS REMAIN SILENT AT THE BANQUET OF WORDS:  
MARCHAND ON THE NAMES IN  
WOLFRAM VON ESCHENBACH'S PARZIVAL

Stephen Mark Carey  
Georgia State University

Even Lachmann knew it. Serious researchers did not have time for Wolfram's "alberne Wortspiele" and that, at least in regards to anything that might be perceived as off color, critics "*sullen niht vil gevraegen*" (Parz. 171, 17).<sup>1</sup> Like Parzival, who says nothing when presented with the wonders of the banquet at the Grail Castle, critics have too often remained silent with regards to the smorgasbord of double entendre that Wolfram offers. Wordplay on *vilan* (peasant) und *vil an* (much on) (Parz. 257, 23 - 24) roused Lachmann's ire. Wolfram tells the audience that it would be improper to refer to Jeschute as *vil an/ vilan* because she is an aristocratic lady and because, at that point in the text, she hardly has any clothes on. Even today, in an era supposedly much more open to sexuality, scholars of German Medieval Literature still cringe at the abundant wordplays and onomastic jokes in Wolfram's *Parzival* and accusations of over-interpretation abound. Even though critical recognition of similar poetic projects in both medieval French and Spanish texts have been standard since the last millennium, scholars of German are still reticent to let those "founders of German literature," - fashioned in the minds of nineteenth century bible researchers to be our poetic medieval German moral paragons - talk dirty.<sup>2</sup> But the danger of engaging in obvious prudery, without being guilty of it, lies in championing a so-called textual exactness, that more often than not, involves not only wholesale leveling of the truth but also an exclusion of the pleasure of the text. Now and again, it would be productive to err on the side of playfulness.

When talking about sexuality, the limit is zero plus infinity. It is this limitlessness that disconcerts, not unjustifiably, scholars of not only medieval German literature. One still observes, in many fields, that the attraction of demonstrating academic rigor by suppressing it, is more often than not, far too tempting to resist. The accusation that one might be "looking for sex everywhere" functions, for the most part, much like the oft-attributed Freudian admonition, "Sometimes a cigar is just a cigar."<sup>3</sup>

In other words, a cigar is always a phallic symbol, but the powers that be will decide when and how one can and cannot talk about it as such. In this essay, I would like to introduce some of James W. Marchand's ideas on Wolfram's wordplays and to demonstrate, with some examples of my own, how the recognition of the multivalence generated by grammatical and phonetic ambiguity enriches and often clarifies context.

There have been more than a few scholars who have breached the subject of sexual and allegedly obscene wordplays in Wolfram's *Parzival* but not many who have made it a primary focus. A brief look at three studies treating the subject will help demonstrate three points that need to be considered when engaging this material. First, the recognition of an alternative, possibly obscene, meaning does not cancel out a traditional reading. As Wolfram promises in the prologue, the double meanings co-exist like the black and white plumage of the magpie. (*Parz.* 1, 1-14)

Secondly, Wolfram revels in suggestion and uncertainty and guards the ambiguity of the text. In the prologue, he promises a poem with words that bounce around like rabbits on the run and narrative mirages that mimic the appearance of what is not there (*Parz.* 1, 15 - 25). Wolfram equates those who would base an interpretation of the tale on the surface meaning with children who would seek to pull hairs from the palm of his hand. Even though Wolfram intentionally leads the audience astray, he criticizes those who look for meaning where there is none. They are like fools who would look for fire in a spring or dew in the sun (*Parz.* 1, 26 - 2, 4). In short, *Parzival* is a text that fully and intentionally generates conflicting meanings. On one level, it is one of the most successful literary pranks of all time.

Finally, the medieval text is an aural composition. No work of vernacular literature in the high Middle Ages was conceived as something that would be experienced in silence. Even if read alone, it was conceived as work to be read aloud.<sup>4</sup> As such, poetic meter matters and can certainly change the meaning of a spoken phrase entirely. Moreover, the lack of punctuation allows for various interpretations of any given scene. Furthermore, the lack of a standard grammar makes putting all too fine a point on it anachronistic. In short, interpretation must take the aural, performative, orthographical / grammatical parameters of the medieval text into consideration.

In his 1991 article entitled "Gahmuret's Erection," Blake Lee Spahr irreconcilably refutes the consensus on Parzival's father, Gahmuret.

“Gahmuret is a cad, a vain show off, and a profligate spendthrift. He is a womanizer, a liar, and a deceiver. His only real virtue is his enormous talent for fighting.”<sup>5</sup> Spahr's iconoclastic reading of Gahmuret continues into his exposition of lines 64, 4-12. In the action preceding this scene, Gahmuret has just abandoned his first wife, Belakâne, who is pregnant with their first child, Feirefiz. Gahmuret secretly leaves in the night and sets out for a tournament to take place at Kanvoleis. He pompously parades into the city where he will encounter the queen, his second wife and Parzival's mother, Herzeloide. The ever-vain Gahmuret sports loose attire and is riding side-saddle in order to display his manly thighs to ladies as he passes by. Herzeloide is on hand to behold his grand entrance. Gahmuret catches sight of her and her shining beauty stirs his passions.

*von dem liechten schîne,  
der von der künegîn erschein,  
derzucht im neben sich sîn bein:  
ûf rihte sich der degen wert,  
als ein vederspîl, daz gert.  
diu herberge dûht in guot.  
alsô stuont des heldes muot:  
si dolt ouch wol, diu wirtin,  
von Wâleis diu künegîn. (Parz., 64, 4-12)*

[because of the glaring radiance / that was shining out from the queen / something jumped up beside his leg / the worthy knight stiffened up / like a falcon with a lust for the hunt / the lodgings seemed quite attractive to him / thus his manly courage stood up / the hostess tolerated this with good-cheer / the Queen of Wales. (*translation mine*)]

This reading of Gahmuret and the above lines should not be taken as a correction of the conventional understanding, but rather as an explication of the richness of the poem. Two possible understandings of the figure of Gahmuret and of this passage co-exist and the burden of generating meaning is placed upon the recipient of the tale.

In this light, the narrative program behind Wolfram's so-called “*krumme Sprache*,” that is, his garbled grammar and syntax, becomes clear.

Wolfram's language maintains ambiguity and generates a multiplicity of co-existing meanings. These multiple possible meanings do not have to be reconciled with one another. The multiple interpretations of Wolfram's crooked style produce the heteroglossia and dialogic discourse that Mikhail Bakhtin has identified as germane to the novel. Bakhtin christened Wolfram's *Parzival* as "the first German novel to be profoundly and fundamentally double-voiced, capable of coordinating the unconditional quality of its intentions with a subtle and considered observing of distances vis à vis language, all of which takes into account language that has been somewhat reified and relativized, removes [this language] ever so slightly from the author's lips by means of a [taunting] smile."<sup>6</sup> Thus, the narrative program of Wolfram's tale lives up to the promise of the prologue, it presents a narrative and characters that are, by virtue of the multiple voices in his text, "parriert" -- intertwined with the black and the white, with the good and the bad: Gahmuret, the proud hero, who straightens up at the sight of the queen is presented simultaneously with Gahmuret, the lascivious rouge, who gets an erection at the sight of her.

Focusing on the doubled-voiced nature of Wolfram's tale, alternative readings of several passages of the poem begin to emerge. The presentation of "Gahmuret's Erection," is not a simply a joke intended to break up the tedium of the poem but rather an integral part of coherent reading of an alternate level of the poem. A negative reading of Gahmuret sets the stage for a negative reading of all of the tropes and characters conventional to the Arthurian genre and courtly literature in general. Wolfram revels in intrusion. He employs language and scenarios that violate conventions and beg the audience to question the ideals of that particular convention. The multiplicity of meanings inherent in passages like the one described above are the vehicle Wolfram's uses to deliver his scathing critique of the spiritual shortcomings of courtly love as presented in the works of his contemporaries. Furthermore, the incessant ambiguity supports Wolfram's insistence that his text is not a book (*Parz.*, 115, 25 - 116, 4), if we understand a book as a text that communicates an explicit message. Wolfram presents the audience with an experience. The audiences makes the interpretive choices to either ignore or enact the critique the text conveys.

A decade or so before Spahr introduced us to the other side of Gahmuret, James W. Marchand had already catalogued a number of the more naughty jokes with his essay, "Wolfram's Bawdy."<sup>7</sup> *Parzival* encounters figures,

who like him and like the intended audience, are imperfect human beings developing within salvation history. The resulting series of competing perspectives draws the audience into the protagonist's developmental process. Wolfram provides the woman in the tent with a name, Jeschute, and refers to her as *diu süeze kiusche* (Parz. 131, 3). However, her name, circumstances, and the "alberne Wortspiele" surrounding her indicate that she too is less than perfect. Marchand explains that her name is derived from the French *gisoit* (*gesir*), "lay"; taken from the description of Chrétien's anonymous maiden: *el lit toute seule gisoit une pucelete endormie* (Perc., 671 - 672).<sup>8</sup> This explains why she would be the ideal paramour for a knight: *gerndes ritters herzen not* (Parz. 130, 7). As James Marchand has demonstrated, Wolfram tantalizes the audience. He conjures up erotic images that are subsequently suppressed and then reactivated. The audience must negotiate between Parzival's perspective and their own perception of the events.

[. . .] *diu frouwe slief,  
der munt ir von einander lief:  
der truoc der minne hitze fiur.  
sus lac des wunsches âventiur.  
von snêwîzem beine  
nâhe bi ein ander kleine,  
sus stuonden ir die liechten zene.* (Parz. 130, 7 - 13)

[[. . .] the lady slept / her lips had come apart / her mouth carried the raging fire of love / thus desire's (perfection's) adventure's did lay / of snow white leg (bone), close to each other delicate / so stood her bright (white) teeth. (translation mine)]

We encounter the snow white *beine* (bone/leg) of Jeschute, only to discover that what Parzival presumably sees are her teeth and not her legs. However, Wolfram then goes on to tell us that because of the heat, Jeschute had her blanket folded back up to her waist, justifying the initial perception of those less modest in the audience (Parz. 130, 17 -25). Parzival springs upon her and we are informed that *ir scham begunde switzen* (Parz. 132, 8). This could either mean that she was sweating from shame or that her genitals became wet.<sup>9</sup> The audience must determine the meaning. However, for those who

catch the sexual innuendo, the “bawdy” in this passage still participates in the communication of values. Although *scham* can mean both “shame” and “pudendum” as in modern German, *switzen* still means “to sweat.” Thus, Wolfram infuses the erotic with the fear of rape and demands a critical audience reaction. Wolfram employs this sexual “humor” to portray both the good and evil inherent in Parzival’s ignorance. Parzival lacks an awareness of the gravity of the situation which the audience possesses. Later, the audience learns that the episode unfolded in accordance with his *tumpheit* and had Parzival learned the “courtly” ways of his father, he would have raped this woman (*Parz.* 139, 15- 22). His ignorance, or *tumpheit*, proves to be a virtue in this instance. Wolfram provokes the audience to view the erotic in light of the existential rights and needs of the object of desire.

The episode questions the ideals of courtly love while simultaneously emphasizing the innocence of the youth. For our purposes, it also demonstrates that, as Walter Haug has noted, in several different essays, Wolfram requires that the reader/listener actively experience the text. In Haug’s words,

Da das, was sein Werk bietet, nicht ein Glaubensrezept, nicht eine Lehre ist [. . .] sondern auf die nur in der Aktualität zu vermittelnde religiöse Erfahrung zielt, so ist das adäquate Verhalten gegenüber seinem Werk gleichbedeutend mit dem Weg zum Heil.”<sup>10</sup>

[Since what this work provides is not a prescription of faith or a lesson [. . .] but rather focuses on religious experience that can only be communicated in actuality; the proper attitude vis á vis his work is identical to the path of salvation. (*translation mine*)]

The mindset and sophistication of the audience will determine the weight and meaning of the message and Wolfram will not, as he promises in his prologue, refrain from leading some astray. In other words, if one tries to pull hairs from his palm, he will say “ouch!” D. H. Green also points to this phenomenon in *Parzival*.

“[in *Parzival*,] we have a threefold pattern: a first stage in which the listeners know for certain as little as Parzival; a second stage in which they realize

more than he does; and a third stage in which the hero once more draws level with them. The result of this shifting pattern is that the listeners, sharing ignorance with Parzival, are invited to make his experience their own, but are also given the superior knowledge with which to ascertain his ignorance."<sup>11</sup>

Obscenities that are lost on Parzival are held tantalizingly before the audience, so that throughout the text the innocence of Parzival clashes with the possible lasciviousness of the audience.

Before turning our attention to some excerpts from Marchand's guide to Wolfram's speaking names, one final and more recent contribution to obscenity in Wolfram's *Parzival* should be considered. James Schultz begins his volume *Courtly Love, the Love of Courtliness, and the History of Sexuality* with a chapter on Parzival's penis, which offers a chance to make one final point when considering sex, the body, and sound in Wolfram's work.<sup>12</sup> Schultz cites the direct reference, inference or lack thereof, to the heroes' penis or to those of his relatives in *Parizval*, *Der Jüngere Titurel*, and the *Rappoltsteiner Parzifal*. Schultz aims to raise questions about authorial intention with regards to the mention of certainly body parts and to caution against anachronistic readings. Schultz begins by discussing the scene of Parzival's birth (*Parz.* 112, 6 – 112, 30). The new born is being bathed by women, who all begin to look between the hero's legs at his *visellin* (little penis) (*Parz.* 112, 25) and the women feel compelled to caress him because of his *manlichiu lit* (*Parz.* 112, 27). Schultz makes the point that although reference to *manlichiu lit*, the boy's "manly limbs," is grammatically plural, both Helen Mustard and James W. Marchand translate it in the singular as "had the organ of a man" and "manly member" respectively.<sup>13</sup> As Schultz notes, "This is crucial, since these words provide the only explanation for the women's caresses. Translating them as 'manly member' indicates that the women are responding to the penis, when in fact, they are reacting to the size of the newborn and the promise of adult heroism."<sup>14</sup> Pertinent to the point that Schultz makes here, not all references to the penis or limbs are necessarily erotic. However, precisely the inappropriate nature of such an inference makes the scene ripe for the kind of pranks Wolfram likes to play. The issue in question is whether or not the passage was intentionally constructed to produce a double meaning. To that answer that question, there are a few other aspects to consider.

First, *lit* is actually identical in the plural and the singular, so although it is clearly plural here because of the plural adjective ending, it could easily be misheard. Wolfram uses *lit* (limb / limbs) five times in *Parzival*, four times in the plural (Parz. 35, 24; 112, 27; 742, 1; 570 13) and all as rhyming words. He uses it once in the singular (Parz. 693, 2), where it does not form the rhyme. The plural form *lide* (limbs), on the other hand, appears sixteen times.<sup>15</sup>

Secondly, *lit* is modified here by *manlīchiu*, which constitutes a further distinction. The modern English translation, “manly limbs” is actually entirely different than the modern German “männliche Glieder,” which would be translated as “penises” not “manly limbs.” To rectify this, modern German translations do not translate the *manlīchiu* and simply render it “Glieder” (limbs).<sup>16</sup> However, the *manlīchiu* is far too significant just to leave out when it becomes inconvenient. A search of the 258 complete texts of the *Middle High German Conceptual Database*, which includes all of the major Middle High German epics and lyrical collections, yields only two results for any combination of *manlīch* and *lit* or *lide*. Both citations are from Wolfram’s *Parzival* and both provocative. They are, the line in question (Parz. 112, 27), of course, and the scene at Plimizoel when Cundrie ridicules Parzival (Parz. 315, 21).<sup>17</sup> First, however, a brief look at a questionable use of *lit* not modified by *manlīch* will enhance an understanding of those two unique instances.

The first of the five uses of the term *lit* in *Parzival* is also a plural. The scene is in Belakâne’s castle. Gahmuret has just met her and he is plagued with desire after she puts him to bed alone.

[. . .] sô lanc was diu naht.  
 in brâhte dicke in unmaht  
 diu swarze Moerinne,  
 des landes küneginne.  
 er want sich dicke alsam ein wit,  
 daz im krachten diu lit.  
 strit und minne was sîn ger:  
 nu wünschet daz mans in gewer. (Parz. 35, 19 -26)

[[. . .] the night was so long. / in great distress brought him / the black Moor-woman / the queen of the country. He turned and turned like a stick, so that his limbs cracked. Combat and love were what he desired: now wish that one grants it to him. (*translation mine* )]

Here we have the obvious singular *diu lit* (*Parz.* 35, 24) meaning “the bed” but, in light of the reading above, combined with the fact that the verb *krachten* is plural, we have a clear plural: *diu lit*, meaning “the limbs”. This reading coincides with Schultz’s reading of *manlichiu lit* (*Parz.* 112, 27). Yet here we also have a scene ripe for a wordplay. The implausible nature of the event and the unconventional nature of the communication invite the audience to look for other interpretations. A man in his prime usually does not have creaky joints and this is not the kind of information one usually finds in romances. Considering the context, an alternative understanding presents itself. That Gahmuret is tossing and turning so much that he nearly cracks the bed in half could provide a humor scene in its own right. Gahmuret pines away alone in bed. He longs for the queen with whom he has fallen in love. In his restless passion, he continuously turns over. Of course, his passions may be having other effects on him as well. The context certainly allows for the lines to be understood as “He turned around violently like [one on] a spit, so that he cracked his genitals / bent his erect penis.” One can hardly imagine that a hearing of these lines in this context would not invite this humorous mishearing – even if a modern reading does not. Gahmuret sprains his penis after rolling over on his own erection. This interpretation can only displease those who assume that a humorless audience attentively followed an expressionless reader with copies in hand to check and double check what they may or may not have heard. It is far more probable that this joke was intentional. If the context allows for a joke and the language does as well, it is probably safe to assume that a joke has happened.

In this case, the initial passage cited by Schultz that started this discussion, *manlichiu lit*, was read as “manly limbs” because it is indeed plural and not something that obviously lends itself to eroticism as in the above example. The only other use of *manlich* and *lit* together occurs when Cundrie castigates Parzival, cursing his beauty and his manly limbs for not asking the redeeming question: *gunêrt sî iwer liechter schîn / und iwer manlichen lide* (*Parz.* 315, 20-21). The reference here may be fleeting but the mentioning

of Parzival's manly limbs at that point in the text certainly recalls Anfortas' injury, keeping in mind also that the Latin word *genitalia* is plural as well. Another provocative use of *lit/lide* is found in the reference to the genitalia as the "sinful limbs" (*diu süenebaeren lide* (*Parz.* 193, 12)) during the first sexless wedding night of Parzival and Condwiramurs.

With the issue of the women caressing Parzival's manly limbs upon birth, the impetus for the translations of *manlīchiu lit* as "male member" can be found in the next stanza. The lines which begin the next stanza immediately after Schultz's citation ends forcefully thrust the previous passage into a different light:

*die künigîn des geluste  
daz sin vil dicke kuste.  
si sprach hinz im in allen flîz  
'bon fîz, scher fîz, bêâ fîz.'  
Diu künigîn nam dô sunder twâl  
diu rôten vâhvelohten mâl:  
ich meine ir tüttels grânsel: (*Parz.* 113, 1-7)*

[the queen took great pleasure / in kissing him over and over again / she said to him with great passion, / 'good boy (face, penis) good (face, penis) / boy, (face, penis)' / The queen took without delay / those reddish pale bumps / I mean her little nipples: (*translation mine*)]

Now, this still takes nothing away from Schultz's point that the nursemaids are not particularly interested in Parzival's penis as an object of desire but it adds to the notion that the audience is being goaded into thinking that they are. The queen passionately kisses him and refers to him as *fîz* three times, recalling the three possible meanings of *fîz*: boy (*filz*); face or countenance (*vis/visage*) and penis (*vis*) as in the above mentioned *visellin*. Thus, the line could be translated using any one of the three terms. (Keep in mind this is always on some level a text being performed live and not in its entirety in one sitting. A gag like this would work perfectly in that context.) Wolfram then employs a technique that he uses throughout the poem when he wants to call the audience's attention to a deeper meaning. Max Wehrli has demonstrated this technique with regards to the Falcon-Episode in his essay "Wolframs Humor."<sup>18</sup> Wolfram overstates that which

a traditional reading would hold to be obvious in order to call attention to an alternate reading. Wolfram's qualification, "I mean her little nipples," begs the audience to conceive of what else could possibly have meant in order to justify the qualification. If one thought that they heard Herzeloide spouting off honorifics for the penis, then it would not be surprising if the little bumps that she reached for next were testicles. This comedy here is physical and sexual but not erotic.

Similar wordplays are found again and again in the poem and certainly could generate pages of discussion both in the context of Schultz's work and the work of others. For the purposes of this short essay, the point is simply that these types of wordplays do exist. Although some of the double meanings reveal aspects of the poem which contribute to alternate interpretations, others seem to be jokes that function primarily as a part of the performance of the poem now largely lost on modern readers. Many of the wordplays, as in the case of Gahmuret's tossing and turning, depend on audiences picking up on cues for a mishearing. Sometimes it depends on choosing from a number of possible meanings as in the case with *fi*z, and sometimes Wolfram will interrupt his flow and invite the audience to think twice.

Some of these aspects of Wolfram's wordplays were developed through discussions with James W. Marchand, largely at the place in cyberspace where I met him, the list serve MEDTEXTL. On Sunday, April 14<sup>th</sup> 2002, Jim posted the following.

[. . .] talking about names in Parzival. That Wolfram sure was a wild and crazy guy, and you can expect most anything. He gives us the etymology of Parzival himself. Parzival pierced his mother's heart through when he left her (*perce aval*). Wolfram knew quite a bit about French and does not hesitate to use the various dialects, whence *-ar-* for *-er-*, *-h-* for *-s-* post vocalic.  
 [. . .] He likes to make characteristics into names, as in the case of the proud Orgeluse, or her male counter-part, Orilus. Or even connecting Jeschûte with Old French *gisoit*, since it is in a reclining position that Parzival encounters her. Speaking of knowledge of languages, Wolfram is always in name-need, so he will take a French name beginning with *n* + vowel and change it to the vowel, thus having two names, e. g. *Averre* and *Navers*, *Normandi* and *Oriman*, though he uses only *Nouriente*.<sup>19</sup>

The oldest focused study of Names in Wolfram's *Parzival*, Karl Bartsch's "Die Eigennamen in Wolframs *Parzival* und *Titurel*," demonstrates much of what Marchand mentions, including the notion that Wolfram was familiar with French dialects although Bartsch does not cover the same variations that Marchand does.<sup>20</sup> Wolfram's knowledge of French cannot be exaggerated. Wolfram invented many of the most important names in *Parzival*, including the names of Parzival's father, mother, cousin, aunt, maternal uncles, stepbrother and the stepbrother's mother, to name just a few. He also modified several names already found in Chrétien de Troyes' *Li Contes del Graal*, most obviously, the name of Parzival himself. No other German poet of the period uses as many French words.<sup>21</sup> Certainly, Wolfram deliberately manipulates the French language in his texts. As seen most readily in the names, Repanse de Schoye, (Vision of Pleasure/ Joy), Schiönatulander (*li joenet de [la] lande*, the youth from the country or *li joenet ù l'alant*, the youth with the dog) and of course, Parzival, - *der nam ist rehte enmitt en durch*, "the name means straight through the middle" (*Parz.* 140, 17).<sup>22</sup> Many of the deviations either serve his narrative program or provide an opportunity for wordplay.

Of course, Wolfram did make some mistakes with French. Jean Fourquet's influential study of Wolfram's relationship to his source identifies several passages of Chrétien de Troyes' *Perceval* (*Li Contes del Graal*) that are misconstrued in *Parzival*. (Chrétien was without doubt one of Wolfram's sources and most probably the only source.)<sup>23</sup> Many of the misconstrued words would have been uncommon or ambiguous for native French speakers as well. The words *graal* (*Perc.* 3220) and *taillëor* (*Perc.* 3231) provide the most famous examples. The exact meaning of the word *graal* is still disputed. Consequently, Wolfram does not even try to translate it. He hedges with the famous equivocation, *daz was ein dinc, daz hiez der grâl*, "there was a thing called the grail" (*Parz.* 235, 23). Wolfram handles the word *taillëor* (plate) with equal finesse. There is no documented use of word *taillëor* before Chrétien's *Perceval*.<sup>24</sup> Wolfram knew French well enough to invent a plausible etymology. He derives *taillëor* from *taillier* (to cut) and translates it as "knives." These knives play a significant role in Wolfram's continuation of the story (*Parz.* 490, 21). Eberhard Nellmann's concept of "productive misunderstanding" reconciles the apparent conflict between error and intention. Nellmann explains that Wolfram did misread some

of the more ambiguous passages in Chrétien but was able to incorporate these “misunderstandings” into his narrative. Certain translation difficulties led to some of Wolfram's most significant innovations. In the latter half of the nineteenth century, Karl Bartsch already expressed the suspicion that Wolfram could read Old Provençal.

In *Willehalm*, the use of the loan word *loschieren* provides Wolfram with an opportunity to comment on his French and his German.<sup>25</sup>

*Herbergen ist loschiern genant.  
 sô vil hân ich der sprâche erkant.  
 ein ungefüeger Tschampâneys  
 kunde vil baz franzeys  
 dann ich, swiech franzoys spreche.  
 seht waz ich an den reche,  
 den ich diz maere diuten sol:  
 den zaeme ein tiutschiu sprâche wol:  
 mîn tiutsch ist etswâ doch sô krump,  
 er mac mir lihte sîn ze tump,  
 den ichs niht gâhs bescheide:  
 dâ sûme wir uns beide. (Willehalm 237, 3-14)*

[To set up camp is also called lodging / so much I can recognize from the language. / A boorish native of the Champagne region / could speak much better French / than I, the way I speak French. / Look at what I inflict upon those / for whom I am supposed to interpret this tale: / a German translation would suit them well / but my German is so crooked / he will soon become too dumb for me / the one to whom I do not tell it quickly: / then we would both get hung up. (translation mine)]

This statement is obviously intended to be humorous. Wolfram would have hardly needed to translate the word *loschieren* for his audience. He uses the word two times in *Parzival* (681,15; 753,4) and also twice in *Willehalm* before these lines (97,23; 234,1). At the very least, he did not need to translate it with another word of French origin, as he could have used the German word *lêgen*. Wolfram already comments directly about translating French in *Parzival*: *swaz er en franzoys dâ von gesprach, bin ich niht der witze laz, daz sage ich tiuschen fürbaz*, “whatever he said in French / if I am not

slow-witted, I will say to you in German" (*Parz.* 416,28-30).

Critics have pointed out the wordplay surrounding Wolfram's other self-deprecating comments, which were initially read within the framework of the humility topos alone. Hans Eggers' reading of *ine kan deheinen buochstap* (*Parz.* 115, 27) and Friedrich Ohly's reading of *Willehalm* 2,19-20 (*swas an den buochen stêt geschriben bin ich künstelôs beliben*) contend that Wolfram directly translates or paraphrases *Psalms* 70:15, *non cognovi litteraturam* with these lines and is not really admitting that he is illiterate.<sup>26</sup> Ohly and Eggers base a good portion of their arguments on Bernard de Clairvaux's use of *non cognovi litteraturam* in his twenty-sixth sermon on the *Song of Songs*.<sup>27</sup> Their thesis was soon questioned by the historian Herbert Grundmann in his article "Dichtete Wolfram von Eschenbach am Schreibtisch."<sup>28</sup> Grundmann demonstrates quite convincingly that Bernard's use of the phrase to describe his beloved brother Girard is meant literally.<sup>29</sup> Despite Herbert Grundmann's objection, the theses of Eggers and Ohly are now widely accepted.

Herbert Kolb added yet another element to this debate with his article on a clause in the Benedictine Rule for novices who could not read: *non scire litteras*.<sup>30</sup> The clause is translated in a twelfth century Württemberg Middle High German version of the rule as *ib nit er kan di buochstabin*. This, of course, closely resembles Wolfram's statement as well as the Middle High German translations of *Psalms* 70:15. Kolb points out that *ine kan* is closer to *non scio* than it is to *non cognovi* and that *buochstap* is closer to *littera* than to *litteraturam*. Both the allusion to the Psalm as well as that to the Benedictine Rule may have been intended to communicate a gesture that further distances Wolfram from the "bookish" "clerical" *litterati*. It certainly would be typical of Wolfram to compact two separate textual allusions into one verse. Two centuries before *Parzival*, in his Old High German gloss of the *Psalms*, Notker Labeo employs language similar to both Wolfram's and the Benedictine rule to translate Psalm seventy, verse fifteen: *ih nebechnâta dia buôchscrift*.<sup>31</sup> Notker's verb choice blurs the distinction that Kolb makes between *non scio* and *non cognovi*, providing justification for reading the allusion in *Parz.* 115, 27. Finally, recent criticism has produced an inadvertent answer to Grundmann's sarcastic question. Burghart Wachinger's essay, "Wolfram von Eschenbach am Schreibpult," identifies a miniature from the "Willehalm Trilogy" manuscript depicting Wolfram writing at a rostrum.<sup>32</sup> Of course, the above arguments become

superfluous if one accepts, as many critics now do, the notion that Wolfram created a fictional narrator to tell his tale.<sup>33</sup>

Similarly, early scholarship understood the above mentioned lines from *Willehalm* as an admission of an inadequate knowledge of French.<sup>34</sup> However, here as well, humility does not seem to be the motivation for Wolfram's statements. Wolfram only indicates here that he cannot speak French as well as a native speaker.<sup>35</sup> He claims that an uncouth *Champenois* could speak French much better than he can. Wolfram may also be indicating that he speaks Provençal and not the French of the Champagne region. Typical of Wolfram, the statement *ungefüeger Tschampâneys* has a double meaning. If we trace *Tschampâneys* to the root *campagne*, and understand *Tschampâneys* as *champagnard* then the phrase translates as "a crude rustic man." The phrase also obviously translates as, "a crude Champenois."<sup>36</sup> The word *ungefüeger* functions as an adjectival substantive for "peasant." Dieter Kartschocke translates the phrase with a feel for these meanings as, "ein Bauer aus der Champagne."<sup>37</sup> Understood as such, the statement is almost certainly directed at Chrétien de Troyes.

From 878 until the French Revolution in 1789, the capital of the Champagne Region was none other than Troyes. The city of Troyes was the center of the Champagne court in the twelfth century and Chrétien's language is flavored with the dialect of that region.<sup>38</sup> Chrétien's *Erec et Enide* and *Perceval*, two works that Wolfram was certainly familiar with, are introduced with rustic images and metaphors. In *Li Contes del Graal*, Chrétien parallels his role as an author with that of the field hand sowing seeds: *Crestiens semme et fait semence d'un romans qui li encomence* (*Perc.*, 6-7) also, the very first verse of *Erec et Enide* introduces the sayings of peasants, *Li vilans dit an son respit* (*EeE.*, 1). Lines like these provide the impetus for Wolfram's jibe. If we accept the author of these texts, as the "peasant from the Champagne," then Wolfram is simply saying that Chrétien's French is better than his own.<sup>39</sup> Of course, Wolfram dismisses Chrétien de Troyes as the source for a good portion of the *Parzival*, but obviously, Wolfram's audience was familiar with Chrétien and probably familiar with that poet's stylization of himself as a "sower of seeds," which would have justified Wolfram's characterization of him as a peasant from the Champagne. Again, by claiming that anyone who slows down to try to understand him will be dumbfounded, Wolfram is inviting the audience to do precisely that. Given this information, it is not surprising that, as Marchand asserts, Wolfram

knew French well and that many of the names that he invented are based on that language. Considering that the majority of Landgrave Hermann I of Thuringia's court, including the Landgrave himself, would have probably understood spoken French, since they studied in Paris, it is to be expected that the court in Eisenach would have understood wordplays based on the French language.<sup>40</sup>

Of course, not all of the names are wordplays on French. Wolfram uses Latin and German as well. Marchand touched on many of the possible meanings of the names in *Parzival*, not all of them can be treated in this short essay but a few of the most useful wordplays should be mentioned here.

It is good to know that his aunt is named Repanse de Schoye 'spreader of joy', since his mother is named Herzeloyde 'heart sorrow', married to Mr. Speedy, Gahmuret (Wolfram changes Old French Gomoret to Gahmuret 'quick to love', and his uncle is kind of weak or sick (maybe even infirm): Anfortas. Parzival's folks come from a country which is good to look upon: Anschouwe (Anjou).<sup>41</sup>

One of Marchand's most fruitful etymologies has been the recognition of the name Gahmuret as an elision of the Middle High German for "fast" (*gah*) and the Latin "he might love" (*amaret*) to function as a homophon to the extant French name Gomoret. In the passage immediately preceding the hero's possible penis sprain in Queen Belakâne's castle, Wolfram reminds us again that he is *der helt von Anschouwe* (*Parz.* 41,17) which makes "Gahmuret von Anschouwe" the one who is "quick to love at first sight." Belakâne's name might mean beautiful cheeks (Old Provençal, *belle quenne / cane*)<sup>42</sup>, but the name most certainly also refers to an aesthetic estimation of her genitals, her *belle con*<sup>43</sup>.

Belekâne's son with Gahmuret, Feirefiz has a name that compliments his mother's. For those listeners who pricked up their ears, as it were, when Herzeloyde chanted 'bon fiz, scher fiz, bêâ fiz,' the possible interpretations of the name Feirefiz will come as no surprise. The name might be understood as *vair fiz (fils)*<sup>44</sup> (fair youth), *vair vis* (fair face) or *vair viz* (pretty penis)<sup>45</sup>, the latter being most probably a trait inherited from his mother, *belle con*. As one might expect, the courtship of Gahmuret and Belakâne unfolds in

the middle of the first *Minnekrieg* of the text and inaugurates the theme of love and combat that characterizes the Gahmuret adventure and lineage. It also sets the stage for several wordplays. This conflict develops, as do all of the *Minnekriege* in *Parzival*, as a result of a disgruntled warrior who attacks his lady's kingdom because she refused him the erotic favors that he expected in return for bullying the other knights on her behalf. This war differs slightly. Belakâne's knight, who given her name, is quite appropriately Isenhart (iron hard), dies in her service and his kin attack her out of revenge. Although Belakâne attributes the problem to her prudish femininity, *schandiu wîpheit* (*Parz.* 27,9), one might infer that Isenhart's sexual reluctance was the cause. After all, he was even more chaste than a woman, *noch kiuscher denne ein wîp* (*Parz.*, 26,15). (This statement could also be understood ironically.<sup>46</sup>)

Marchand also points to the fact that "Condwiramurs 'she who conducts love' (*condiur amor*) has come in for some bad etymologizing."<sup>47</sup> Certainly the many attempts at the name were not entirely unsolicited by Wolfram. He puts a very strange spin on this name to call attention to its various possible meanings. Wolfram translates the following for his audience:

*Condwîr âmûrs:*  
*diu truoc den rehten bêâ curs.*  
*Der name ist tiuschen schoener lîp.* (*Parz.* 187, 21-23)

[*Condwîrâmûrs* / she had a real *bêâ curs* / the name means beautiful body in German. (*translation mine*)]

Wolfram translates *bêâ curs*, two words that would have been clear to anyone remotely familiar with popular Latin, to say nothing of French. Wolfram tempts the audience to doubt the narrator's knowledge of French and Latin. He intentionally confronts the audience with the statement, "the name means beautiful body in German." Of course, the German *schoener lîp* is a translation of *bêâ curs* but confusion arises when trying to make sense of the assertion that the speaking name *Condwîr âmûrs* connotes a beautiful body. However, if we follow the rhythm of the poem, here the name gets four beats and would be read: *con faire amour*. Considering the names of Belakâne and Feirefiz, this is not an outlandish assertion at all

and certainly would connote a beautiful body.

There are always going to be skeptics and these not unwarranted. Nonetheless, the usefulness of many of these bawdy readings deserves greater attention. They explain almost every enigma of the text, not in the least the program put forth in the prologue. The purpose of this essay was to recall James W. Marchand's role in pioneering this area of Wolfram research and to argue for a greater playfulness and attention to sound when approaching Wolfram's work. As Marchand himself noted, "This has scarcely touched the subject, but you can see that there's lots there." And let this be an invitation to discover it. Certainly, Wolfram's alleged source, "Kyot la schantiure," (*Parz.* 416, 21) *Qui joue le chanteur*, enjoyed playing around with singer he heard.<sup>48</sup>

1. Wolfram von Eschenbach, *Parzival: Studienausgabe. Mittelhochdeutscher Text nach der sechsten Ausgabe von Karl Lachmann*. Peter Knecht Trans., Bernd Schirok Fwd. (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1998): xii. In his preface to the first addition Lachmann refers to Wolfram predilection for rude word plays, particularly in passages treating Jeschute.
2. For examples, particularly in Old French see Laura Kendrick, *The Game of Love: Troubadour Wordplay*. (University of California Press: Berkeley, 1988) and Catherine Brown, *Contrary Things: Exegesis, Dialectic, and the Poetics of Didacticism*. (Stanford University Press: Stanford California, 1998)
3. This is attributed with no evidence that Freud actually said it. See Ralph Keyes, *Nice Guys Finish Seventh False Phrases, Spurious Sayings, and Familiar Misquotations*. (New York: Harpercollins, 1993)
4. For a definitive discussion of this, see D. H. Green, "Terminologische Überlegungen zum Hören und Lesen im Mittelalter" *Eine Epoche im Umbruch: Volkssprachliche Literalität 1200 – 1300*. Christa Bertelsmeier Kierst and Christopher Young, eds. (Max Niemeyer Verlag, Tübingen, 2003): 1-22.
5. Blake Lee Spahr, "Gahmuret's Erection: Rising to Adventure," *Monatshefte* 83 (1991 Winter): 403.
6. Mikhail Mikhailovich Bakhtin, "Discourse in the Novel," *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays* by M.M. Bakhtin, Michael Holquist and Caryl Emerson Eds. (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1981): 377. Also cited in German since the translations differ in nuance. See Mikhail M. Bakhtin, "Das Wort im Roman" *Untersuchungen zur Poetik und Theorie des Romans*. Edward Kowalski and Michael Wegner eds. (Berlin: Aufbau Verlag, 1986): 210. "Parzival ist der erste wirklich zweistimmige deutsche Roman: In

ihm ist die Unbedingtheit der eigenen Intentionen in gelungener Weise mit einer feinsinnigen und sorgsam variierten Distanzhaltung gegenüber der Sprache, mit einer leichten Objektivität und Relativität dieser Sprache verknüpft, einer Sprache, die durch ein leichtes spöttisches Lächeln ein wenig von den Lippen des Autors weggerückt ist.”

7. James W Marchand, “Wolfram’s Bawdy,” *Monatshefte* 69 (1977): 131 -149
8. Félix Lecoy, Ed., *Les Romans de Chrétien de Troyes, V: Li Contes del Graal*. (Paris: Champion, 1972)
9. Marchand, “Wolfram’s Bawdy,” 131.
10. Walter Haug, “Die Symbolstruktur des höfischen Romans und ihre Auflösung bei Wolfram von Eschenbach,” *Strukturen als Schlüssel zur Welt. Kleine Schriften zur Erzählliteratur des Mittelalters* (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1989): 512.
11. D. H. Green, *Art of Recognition*, 14.
12. James A. Schultz, *Courtly Love, the Love of Courtliness, and the History of Sexuality* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2006):3-15.
13. Schultz, *Courtly Love*, 4-5. Schultz refers to Helen Mustard and Charles E. Passage, trans. *Parzival A Romance of the Middle Ages*. New York: Vintage, 1961):112, and to Marchand’s translation in “Wolfram’s Bawdy,” 139.
14. Schultz, *Courtly Love*, 5.
15. Appearance of *lide*: *Parz.*, 112, 7; 193, 12; 212, 3; 215, 27 ;273, 18 ;298, 18 ;315, 21; 341, 27; 357, 10; 366,21; 411,1; 459, 12; 515,4; 537,28; 691,28; 745, 8) . It forms the rhyme nine times.
16. See, for example, Wolfram von Eschenbach, *Parzival*. Wolfgang Spiewok, trans. 2 vols. (Stuttgart: Reclam 1986)
17. “Mittelhochdeutsche Begriffsdatenbank” Nikolaus Morocutti , Ed.(last updated July 10, 2007). Universität Salzburg. April 1, 2009. <http://mhdadb.sbg.ac.at>.
18. Max Wehrli, “Wolframs Humor,” *Überlieferung und Gestaltung, Festgabe für Theophil Spoerri*. Zürich: Speer-Verlag, (1950):9-30.
19. “The Medtextl Database” Bill Schipper, Ed.(last updated November 15, 2004). Queen Elizabeth II Library at Memorial University, St John’s, Newfoundland, CA. April 14, 2002. <<http://www.mun.ca/mst/medtext/>>
20. Karl Karl Bartsch, “Die Eigennamen in Wolframs *Parzival* und *Titurel*,” *Karl Bartsch, Germanistische Studien* Vol. 2 (Wien: Verlag von Carl Gerold’s Sohn, 1875): 114-158.
21. Bumke, *Wolfram von Eschenbach* (Stuttgart: Verlag J. B. Metzler, 1997):19. See also Ludiwg Wolf, “Vom persönlichen Stil Wolframs in seiner dichterischen Bedeutung,” *Kleinere Schriften* ed. Werner Schröder (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1967): 284. “[Die]

Einschaltung französischer Worte ebenso wie die Aufnahme aus dem Französischen stammender Fremdworte beruht auch nicht auf einer Abhängigkeit von der Quelle (die für die Sigunendichtung ja gar nicht vorlag), das zeigt der Vergleich [mit der jeweiligen Quelle], sondern entspringt nur der Lust am Fremdartigen."

22. See Bartsch, "Die Eigennamen in Wolframs *Parzival* und *Titurel*," 142-143.

23. Jean Fourquet, *Wolfram d'Eschenbach et le Conte del Graal, Les divergences de la tradition du Conte del Graal de Chrétien de Troyes et leur importance pour explication du Parzival* (Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1966): 51. Fourquet argues, for example, that in *Parz.* 286,25, Wolfram misunderstood *Perc.* 4219, ". . . devant le pavillon le roi/ Sagremor, qui par son desroi/ estoit Desreez apelez." and thought that Segremor was a king.

24. Eberhard Nellmann, "Produktive Mißverständnisse: Wolfram als Übersetzer Chrétiens," *Wolfram Studien* 14. ed. Joachim Heinze (Berlin: Erich Schmidt Verlag, 1996):141. "Und erwünschte Klärung bringt in dieser Frage das Altfranzösische Wörterbuch von Tobler/Lommatzsch. Danach ist auch *taillëor* im 12. Jahrhundert nur äußerst selten belegt: vor dem Percevalroman überhaupt nicht!" Nellemann cites Erhard Lommatzsch and Hans Helmut Christmann, eds., *Altfranzösisches Wörterbuch: Adolf Toblers nachgelassene Materialien* Vol. 10 (Berlin: Weidmann, 1976)

25. Wolfram von Eschenbach, *Willehalm: Mittelhochdeutscher Text und Übersetzung*. Ed. Werner Schröder and Trans. Dieter Kartschoke. (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter & Co, 1989)

26. Hans Eggers, "Non Cognovi Litteraturam, zu *Parzival* 115,27," *Festgabe für Ulrich Pretzel dargebracht von Freunden und Schülern* eds. Werner Simon, Wolfgang Bachofer, and Wolfgang Dittmann Berlin: Erich Schmidt Verlag, (1963):162-172. also in *Wolfram von Eschenbach, : Wege der Forschung* 57 ed. H. Rupp (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1966) :533- 548. and Friederich Ohly, "Wolframs Gebet and den heiligen Geist im Eingang des *Willehalm*," *Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum und deutsche Literatur* 91. (1961/2):1-37 also in *Wolfram von Eschebach, : Wege der Forschung* 57. H. Rupp, ed. (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1966) :455- 518.

27. Ohly, "Gebet," 467-468. Eggers, "non cognovi litteraturam," 333-335. Bernard de Clairvaux, *Sermones super Cantica Cantecorum* eds. Jean Leclercq, Charles Hugh Talbot, and Henri M. Rochais (Rome: Editiones Cistercienses, 1957): 169 - 181.

28. In his diatribe against Eggers and Ohly's arguments for Wolfram's literacy, Herbert Grundmann outlines the the most significant developments in the history of the Wolfram literacy debate up to 1967. Hertbert Grundmann, "Dichtete Wolfram von Eschenbach am Schreibtisch?" *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte* 49.3 (1967): 391-405.

29. Grundmann, "Dichtete Wolfram von Eschbach am Schreibtisch," 396 - 401.

30. Herbert Kolb, "Die Wiedergabe von *non scire litteras* (RB 58,20) im Mittelhochdeutschen," *Archiv für das Studium der neuern Sprachen und Literaturen* 224 (1987):95-97.
31. Paul Piper, ed., *Die Schriften Notkers und seiner Schule II: Psalmen und Katechetische Denkmäler nach der St. Galler Handschriftengruppe*. (Akademische Verlagsbuchhandlung: Freiburg I. B. und Tübingen, 1883): 279.
32. Burghart Wachtinger, "Wolfram von Eschenbach am Schreibpult," *Wolfram Studien XII: Probleme der Parzival Philologie, Marburger Kolloquium 1990*. Joachim Heinze, L. Peter Johnson, and Gisela Vollmann-Profe Eds. (Berlin: Erich Schmidt Verlag, 1992): 9-14. The manuscript in question is the Vienna Austrian National Library cod. Ser. n. 2643, (leaf 313r): "O kunstericher wolfram/ Das nich den suzen got gezam/ do du nicht enger soldest leben/ das mir doch wer dein kunst gegeben." In an investigation of the miniatures of the King Wenzel IV manuscripts of the "Willehalm-Trilogie" produced in 1387. Wachinger calls attention to the figure nestled in the "O" of Ulrich von Türheim's words of praise for Wolfram von Eschenbach. In the manuscript, the artist consistently depicts Ulrich as young beardless man. Wachinger, therefore, argues that the figure of the bearded old man nestled in the "O" must be Wolfram himself. "Wolfram," dressed in non-descript garb, sits writing at his "desk"!
33. Franz H. Bäuml, "Varieties and Consequences of Medieval Literacy and Illiteracy," *Speculum* 55 (1980):252. "[Wolfram] . . . endowed a fictional "I" called Wolfram von Eschenbach with the inability to read and write, or with an ignorance of learned literature, depending -- in the absence of a sufficiently limiting redundancy -- on the reader's interpretation of 'buochstap.'"
34. See for example, Samuel Singer, *Wolframs Willehalm* (Bern: A. Francke, 1918) or Gottfried Weber, *Wolfram von Eschenbach, seine dichterische und geistliche Bedeutung: Teil I, Stoff und Form*. (Frankfurt am Main: M. Diesterweg, 1928):18.
35. Joachim Bumke, *Wolframs Willehalm. Studien zur Epenstruktur und zum Heiligkeitsbegriff der ausgehenden Blütezeit* (Heidelberg: C. Winter, 1959): 202.
36. Jean-Baptiste de La Curne, *Dictionnaire historique de l'ancien langage françois, ou Glossaire de la langue françoise depuis son origine jusqu'au siècle de Louis XIV* (Niort: L. Favre, 1875-82)
37. Wolfram von Eschenbach, *Willehalm: Text Ausgabe von Werner Schröder*. Trans. Dieter Kartschocke (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1989)
38. Jean Frappier, *Chrétien de Troyes: L'homme et l'œuvre*(Paris: Hatier-Boivin, 1957):8-9. "Il n'est pas exclu que la mention de Troyes indique seulement la ville où il a résidé un temps, mais on peut guère douter qu'il soit né en Champagne: sa langue, bien que très proche du francien, garde quelques traces du dialecte champenois." Chrétien identifies

himself as “Crestiens de Troies” (*Erec et Enide*, 9 and Wolfram identifies him as “von Troys meister Cristjân” (*Parz.*, 827,1).

39. Alexandre Micha, Ed., *Les Romans de Chretien de Troyes, Vol. II: Cliges* (Champion, Paris, 1957).

40. Christian Haeutle, “Landgraf Hermann von Thüringen und seine Familie,” *Zeitschrift des Vereins für thüringische Geschichte und Alterthumskunde* 5 (1863): 76.

“Landgraf Ludwigs II. älteste Söhne, Landgraf Ludwig III. und unser Hermann [befanden] sich 1161 zum Behufe ihrer wissenschaftlichen Heranbildung bereits in Paris.” There is also a letter believed to be from Ludwig II (Hermann’s father) to King Louis VII of France asking for protection and support of his two sons while they are studying in Paris. “Filius enim meos omnes littera discere proposui, ut qui majoris ingenii necnon majoris inter eos notaretur discretionis, in studio perseveraret . [ . . ] Ex his vero duos ad presen nobilitati vestre mittere proposui, ut vestro juvamine necnon vestra defensione Parisius stabilius possent locari.” H. Denifle and E. Chatelain, Eds. *Chartularium universitatis Parisiensis*. Vol 1, 1999. quoted in Joachim Bumke, *Höfische Kultur: Literatur und Gesellschaft in Mittelalter*. Vol. 1 (München: Deutsche Taschenbuchverlag, 1986.): 106. See also Vol. 2, 610. “Die französischen Texte, die an den deutschen Höfen rezipiert wurden, waren zwar in der Regel auch schriftlich abgefaßte Texte, nicht anders als die lateinischen, mit denen nur der literarisch Gebildete umgehen konnte. Aber man brauchte nicht lesen und schreiben zu können, um Französisch zu verstehen. Die Sprachkenntnisse wurden mündlich vermittelt, und auch ein Analphabet konnte an der französischen Literatur teilhaben, indem er sie sich volesen ließ.” See also, Michael Curschmann, “The French, the Audience, and the Narrator in Wolfram’s *Willehalm*,” *Neophilologus* 59 (1975):548-562 and Oswald Holder-Egger, ed. “Cronica Reinhardsbrunnensis,” *Monumenta Germanae Historia* SS 30.1 (Hannover: Hahn 1896): 490-658. Manfred Lemmer, *Der Dürnge bluome schinet dur den snē: Thüringen und die deutsche Literatur des hohen Mittelalters*. (Eisenach: Wartburg Stiftung, 1981):19.

41. “The Medtextl Database” April 14, 2002. <<http://www.mun.ca/mst/medtext/>>

42. Erhard Lommatzsch and Adolf Tobler, eds., *Altfranzösisches Wörterbuch*. vol 8. (Wiesbaden: Steiner, 1924-2008)

43. Erhard Lommatzsch and Adolf Tobler, eds., *Altfranzösisches Wörterbuch*. vol 2. (Wiesbaden: Steiner, 1924-2008)

44. Louis W. Sonté, William Rothwell, and T. B. W. Reid, *Anglo-Norman Dictionary* (London: Modern Humanities Research Association, 1983)

45. Frédéric Mistral, *Lou Tresor dóu Felibrige ou Dictionnaire Provençal-Français*. vol 2. (Paris: Librairie Delagrave, 1890)

46. Early thirteenth century scientific texts are already proposing the reality of female lasciviousness based on humoral theories. Certainly such ideas would have already been current while Wolfram was writing. See Dyan Elliott, *Fallen Bodies Pollution, Sexuality, and Demonology in the Middle Ages* (New York: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1998):45-46
47. "The Medtextl Database" April 14, 2002. <<http://www.mun.ca/mst/medtext/>>
48. James F. Poag first suggested the *Qui joet* solution to the Kyôt question. See James F. Poag, "Wolfram von Eschenbach: Lapsi't Exillis," *Monatshefte*, 60.3 (1968): 243 - 244. Poag reads *laschantiure* as either *lasche chanteor* (poor or weak singer) or as *lasche ch(e) anceor* (undisciplined dicer). He reads Kyôt as *Ky yot* or *Qui joet* (He who plays at dice or as a minstrel.) Poag sees the possibility of the poem supporting all of these meanings simultaneously. Certainly, support for the Kyôt etymology can be found in the fact that a similar etymology works for Quixote.