



Syddansk Universitet

**The Medieval German Lohengrin
Narrative Poetics in the Story of the Swan Knight**

Matthews, Alastair

Publication date:
2016

Document version
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Document license
CC BY-NC-ND

Citation for published version (APA):
Matthews, A. (2016). The Medieval German Lohengrin: Narrative Poetics in the Story of the Swan Knight. Rochester, NY: Camden House. Studies in German Literature Linguistics and Culture

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal ?

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Alastair Matthews, ‘Wolfram and Chronicles: *Lohengrin* and the *Sächsische Weltchronik*’

chapter 2 of *The Medieval German Lohengrin: Narrative Poetics in the Story of the Swan Knight*, by Alastair Matthews (Rochester, NY: Camden House, 2016). All rights reserved. For more information and to order, see

<https://boydellandbrewer.com/the-medieval-german-i-lohengrin-i-hb.html>.



This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License. To view a copy of this licence, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>.

2: Wolfram and Chronicles: *Lohengrin* and the *Sächsische Weltchronik*

Introduction: Text and Narrator at the End of *Lohengrin*

IF THE *WARTBURGKRIEG* is the primary point of intertextual reference for understanding the beginning of *Lohengrin*, the *Sächsische Weltchronik* (Saxon World Chronicle) takes on a comparable significance at its end. The *Weltchronik*, which is believed to have originated in the Magdeburg area in the early 1230s,¹ is drawn on throughout the text—for instance, in the battles on the Unstrut and Garigliano during the reign of Henry I. Its sustained appropriation, however, is most apparent between Lohengrin’s departure for the Grail and the epilogue—in a survey of the Ottonian rulers from the demise of Henry I to Henry II (strophes 731–62).² The status of this earlier text is different from that of the *Wartburgkrieg* insofar as it provides material for the content of the story, rather than presenting the situation of its telling;³ but the connection with Wolfram’s role as narrator remains. He appears to be relating, albeit at an accelerated pace, developments following the departure of the hero and the death of the emperor for whom he had fought: “Daz ich iu sage daz ist wâr: / der keiser des rîches pflac ahtzen iâr” (What I’m telling you is true: the emperor [Henry I] reigned for eighteen years; 731.7301–2).⁴ The irony, from a modern perspective, is that Wolfram the narrator does this with the help of a text (i.e., the *Weltchronik*) that was probably written *after* the lifetime of Wolfram the author,⁵ whom the *Lohengrin* poet presents as a model in the epilogue that follows the Ottonian strophes:

ez ist sô meisterlîch erhaben
sîn getiht, swer eben stempft in daz ergraben,
daz ich den prüev, er hab kunst under brüste.⁶ (764.7638–40)

[His [Wolfram’s] poem is so masterfully undertaken that anyone who similarly carves out what he engraved bears, I can tell, art in his heart.]

The end of *Lohengrin* could, therefore, be seen as doubly derivative. The identity of the Wolfram-narrator is determined by the earlier author's reputation, his words by the content of an antecedent text—and if this gives rise to an impression of hybridity, that impression might well be strengthened by the stylistic contrast between the largely straightforward, matter-of-fact diction in the Ottonian strophes and the language of the epilogue as exemplified in the quotation above. This chapter aims to show why such an impression is misleading with regard both to the use of the *Sächsische Weltchronik* and to the status of Wolfram as narrator. It reassesses the way in which the *Sächsische Weltchronik* is worked into the Ottonian strophes, and what other sources might have been used, turning with the help of previously unpublished manuscript material to the form of the narrative, rather than just the content on which earlier studies have concentrated. It then, building on the presence of the narrator that becomes apparent in the process, reconsiders the relationship between the Ottonian strophes and the epilogue, showing how the treatment of the speaking voice in the text provides a counterweight to the apparent disjunctiveness in the material from which it is derived.

The chapter thus combines and extends existing perspectives on the interplay between the presentation of the Wolfram-narrator and the appropriation of source material in *Lohengrin*. Critics have long been aware that the sources used and influences at play are not confined to works by or attributed to Wolfram von Eschenbach,⁷ but the implications of this for the presentation of the narrator have still not been fully appreciated. An important step in this direction was taken in Annette Volting's recent study of the extent to which "Texte, die mit einem Wolfram-Erzähler operieren, auch den literarischen Stil des 'historischen Wolfram' nachahmen wollen" (texts that operate with a Wolfram-narrator seek also to imitate the literary style of the "historical Wolfram").⁸ The formulation of the question is crucial because it makes clear that the adaptation of sources and models in *Lohengrin* is to be seen not only in terms of the act of composition by the author who used them but also in terms of how they relate to the narratorial voice in the resultant text. At the same time, Volting focuses on sources associated with Wolfram, arguing

dass der *Lohengrin* nur wenige Gemeinsamkeiten mit anderen Werken Wolframs aufweist. Zumindest teilweise resultiert das aus stilistischen Überlagerungen zweier anderer wichtiger Prätexte, nämlich dem *Wartburgkrieg* und dem *JT*.⁹

[That *Lohengrin* displays no more than a few similarities with other [*sic*] works by Wolfram. This is at least in part due to the fact that it is overlaid stylistically with two other important pre-texts, namely, the *Wartburgkrieg* and the *Jüngerer Titurel*.]

The Wolfram of *Lohengrin* is thus approached in terms of his authorial counterpart, either real (whose influence is relativized) or imagined (as in the *Jüngerer Titurel*, of which he was believed to be the author in the Middle Ages, and the *Wartburgkrieg*, in which he appears as a participant).¹⁰ What is not accounted for here is a third cluster of pre-texts that have been identified or mooted as sources for *Lohengrin*, first and foremost the *Sächsische Weltchronik*. Crucially, they extend the range of material at stake beyond the more overtly “literary” output of Wolfram von Eschenbach and his successors to include a new, historiographical form of writing: the chronicle.

Chronicles: From Sources of Content to Forms of Style

The first question that presents itself with regard to the adaptation of historiographical material in *Lohengrin* is a fundamental one: of what, precisely, did that material consist? Answering it is beset with difficulties posed by the textual history of the material and its representation in modern editions. The *Sächsische Weltchronik* was identified as a source for *Lohengrin* as early as the mid-nineteenth century;¹¹ but the exact form in which it was known to the author of *Lohengrin* has still not been ascertained, and the possibility that he drew on other chronicles alongside it has been raised but not conclusively verified. There are clear patterns in the use of the *Weltchronik* in *Lohengrin* (such as the omission of material that concerns internal disputes, so as to glorify the empire).¹² On the other hand, there is also historical information in *Lohengrin* (such as the pope’s invitation of Henry II to Rome in strophes 757–58) that cannot have been derived from the *Weltchronik*—at least not from any of the versions in which it has been preserved.¹³ The possibility that the *Weltchronik* was nonetheless the source in such cases, albeit in a recension that has since been lost, was discounted by Cramer on the basis that one would have expected traces of such a recension to be apparent in the surviving manuscripts (more than fifty are currently known) if it had existed.¹⁴ Conversely, though, this *ex-negativo* argumentation raises

the question of which of the three *Weltchronik* recensions (A, B, or C) *was* actually used in *Lohengrin*—and that is also uncertain.¹⁵ The best appraisal of the evidence to date has been provided by Jürgen Wolf:

Die von T. Cramer in seiner Ausgabe zusammengestellten (S. 130f.) und ausgewerteten (S. 132–154) SW-Passagen enthalten ausschließlich Textpassagen, die gemeinsam in allen Rezensionen vorkommen. Allerdings finden sich weder die norddeutschen Zusätze von BC, noch die für C so typischen “Kaiserchronik”-Interpolationen. Deziidiert für A spricht zudem die Übernahme des nur in den A-Hss. 1–3, 6, 11 und 12 sowie den nd. B-Hss. 15–17 vorkommenden Namens “Hunnen” für die Ungarn (SW 162,18^e).¹⁶

[The *Weltchronik* passages assembled (pp. 130–31) and assessed (pp. 132–54) by Cramer in his edition [of *Lohengrin*] are composed entirely of passages that appear in all recensions. What we do not find are the north German additions of BC or the *Kaiserchronik*-interpolations that are so typical of C. The use of A is further supported by the fact that the name “Hunnen” is adopted for the Hungarians; it occurs only in the A-manuscripts 1–3, 6, 11, and 12 and in the Low German B-manuscripts 15–17 (*Weltchronik*, 162.18^e).]

Wolf’s thesis is thus that the *Lohengrin* poet will most likely have had access to a form of recension A, but he remains aware that tying *Lohengrin* to a particular recension in this manner is marked by “einer gewissen Unsicherheit” (a certain amount of uncertainty).¹⁷ Attempts to resolve the matter are not helped by the fact that the text of the *Weltchronik* edited by Ludwig Weiland in the nineteenth century is still the standard critical edition. It is based on a manuscript of recension C, and, although it does contain indications of the differences between the recensions, its selection of variant readings is subjective and incomplete.¹⁸

There are two further historiographical sources whose use, according to Cramer, would explain the presence of some of the details in *Lohengrin* that are not found in the *Sächsische Weltchronik*.¹⁹ The first is the *Prosakaiserchronik* (Prose Chronicle of the Emperors), which appears to have originated around Augsburg in the later thirteenth century as a historical introduction to the legal code in the *Schwabenspiegel* (Mirror of the Swabians), a work that is likewise used in *Lohengrin*.²⁰ The second is the twelfth-century *Kaiserchronik* (Chronicle of the Emperors), whose verse history of rulers from Julius Caesar to Conrad III was the primary source for the *Prosakaiserchronik*. Their most persuasive similarity with

Lohengrin is the fact that they, too, report, contrary to historical fact and unlike the *Weltchronik*, that Henry I became emperor in Rome. The case made by Cramer for direct knowledge of the *Kaiserchronik*, however, rests on a verbal similarity during the coronation of Henry I in *Lohengrin* that is not entirely convincing (the wording in the *Prosakaiserchronik* would appear to be closer).²¹ On the other hand, further evidence for knowledge of the *Prosakaiserchronik* can be found, according to Cramer, (i) during the coronation of Henry I more generally and in the account of the seven prince-electors in *Lohengrin*, which exhibit familiarity with details from the presentation of Charlemagne in the *Prosakaiserchronik*,²² and (ii) in the fact that the vagueness of the *Prosakaiserchronik* could have given rise to the historically erroneous belief that Ulrich of Augsburg took part in the Battle of Lechfeld under Otto I, as stated in *Lohengrin* (735.7341–42).

By introducing the *Prosakaiserchronik* and *Kaiserchronik* into the discussion, Cramer showed that deviations from the *Weltchronik* in *Lohengrin* do not necessarily have to be attributed to oral tradition or first-hand authorial experience, as was often the case in Friedrich Panzer's earlier study.²³ At the same time, the status of the *Prosakaiserchronik* and, to a greater degree, the *Kaiserchronik* remains to be clarified, particularly where the Ottonian strophes are concerned. The only possible case of knowledge of the *Kaiserchronik* (the coronation of Henry I) is dubious and occurs prior to them, and the only example of possible use of the *Prosakaiserchronik* in them (Ulrich on the Lechfeld) is inconclusive. Conventional analyses of content, it would seem, have reached an impasse given the current state of knowledge; the rest of this chapter turns, instead, to narrative form as an alternative perspective from which to describe the relationship between *Lohengrin* and the historiographical texts.

That this has not been done before is surprising insofar as the stylistic affinity between chronicles and the Ottonian strophes has been noted on numerous occasions. They have, for instance, been described as presenting a “chronikartigen Abriß der deutschen Kaisergeschichte von Heinrich I. bis zu Heinrich II.” (a chronicle-like outline of German imperial history from Henry I to Henry II);²⁴ yet there does not appear to be a clear understanding among critics of what “chronicle-like” actually means as a characterization of textual construction when applied to *Lohengrin*. To come to terms with this, two particular parameters of narrative form are singled out below. They are grounded in the prototypical concept of the chronicle as a historiographical genre that—unlike annals, for instance—

not only employs a timeline but also has a narratorial voice that creates an organized narrative.²⁵ These two parameters—the structure of the narrative and the presentation of the voice that tells it—will make it possible to describe the new fabric of narrative form with which Wolfram becomes associated in the Ottonian strophes, as well as to reassess the roles played by the *Prosakaiserchronik*, the *Kaiserchronik*, and the *Sächsische Weltchronik*. The manuscript form of the latter will, in the process, be brought more clearly into play than has previously been the case. Relevant variant readings given by Weiland are listed in the endnotes; more importantly, quotations are provided both as they appear in Weiland's critical text and as they are transmitted in a selected early manuscript from recension A (Herzog August Bibliothek Wolfenbüttel, Cod. Guelf. 23.8 Aug. 4°; = ms. 1). Its association with the Bavarian dialect area and its dating to the first quarter of the fourteenth century mean that it provides a more contemporary point of reference for readings of *Lohengrin*.²⁶ The aim is not to suggest that the *Lohengrin* poet knew the *Weltchronik* in exactly this form;²⁷ instead, it is to provide a textual starting point for pursuing further Wolf's hypothesis and to steer the critical discussion toward a perspective that is no longer defined solely by the lens of the problematic editorial practice that has underpinned the two major attempts, by Cramer and Kerdelhué, to date to deal with the relationship between the two works.²⁸

Narrative Form in the Ottonian Strophes

Structure

The fundamental macrostructural organizing principle in both the *Sächsische Weltchronik* and the Ottonian strophes at the end of *Lohengrin* lies in the reigns of the kings and emperors who are described in sequence. The delineation into narrative units on this basis in the *Weltchronik* is expressed most obviously by formulaic introductions at the beginning of each section. Otto III is a representative example:

In deme 984. jare van der bort
 unses herren Otto, des roden
 keiser Otten sone, gewan dat rike,
 de 83. van Augusto, unde was
 daran 18 jar. (ed. Weiland,
 165.35–36)

IN dem tusentigsten vnd zwein-
 tzigsten iar von gots geburte
 Otte, dez roten keiser Otten sun,
 gewan daz rike, der drie vnd
 ahtzigst von augusto. der waz dar
 an ahtzehen iar. (ms. 1, fol. 60v)

[In the 984th [1020th; ms. 1] year after the birth of our Lord, Otto, the son of Emperor Otto the Red, took control of the empire, the 83rd since Augustus. He reigned for 18 years.]

The opening formula typified here imparts a range of basic facts about the ruler, from the year in which he took office to the length of his reign, his place in the sequence of rulers since Augustus, and his genealogical descent.²⁹ If beginnings are thus marked by statements of knowledge relating to the temporal dimension, endings are associated with spatial information, specifically about where a ruler was buried or died.³⁰ This manifests itself as follows in the case of Otto III:

Do ward de keiser Otto begraven
to Aken mit groten eren. Dit is
de keiser Otto, de let upgraven
den koning Karle. (ed. Weiland,
167.3–4)

Do wart der keiser Otte begraben
zv ache mit grozen eren. ditz ist
der cheiser Otte, der vz graben
liez den kunich karle. (ms. 1, fol.
61v–62r)

[Then Emperor Otto was buried in Aachen with great honor. This is the Emperor Otto who had King Charlemagne exhumed.]

The statement of this information does not, however, serve to delineate the narrative in the same way as its counterpart at the beginning of each reign: further details that can (but do not have to) be linked to the ruler can be appended before moving on to his successor (in this case, we find digressions about Charlemagne's exhumation, the beginning of which is included in the above quotation, and the visions of a hermit).³¹ There is thus a tension between two points of reference for narrative structure that are not necessarily congruent with each other in the sequence of elements in the text. On the one hand, there is the biographical unit of a ruler's life (whose end is marked by the place of death/burial but which can begin before the introductory formula, as in the introduction of Otto I and Otto II as successors during their fathers' reigns).³² On the other hand, there is the chronological unit of the ruler's reign (the beginning of which is marked by the introductory formula but events in which can be described after the ruler's demise, as illustrated above with reference to Otto III).

The Ottonian strophes of *Lohengrin* are structured in an essentially similar fashion. The beginning of the section on each ruler is clearly marked, above all by references to the descent of the new emperor, and further details can follow the death of the emperor and his place of burial at the end of the section. In the case of Otto III, for instance, the frame is opened with "nâch im sîn sun wart künic in kurzer wîle. /

Nâch sînem vater Ott er hiez” (After him his [Otto II’s] son [Otto III] soon became king; he was called Otto after his father; 742.7420–743.7421) and closed as follows:

Dâ ze Achē er sich bestaten hiez,
 des die vürsten und sîn rât dô niht enliez,
 sie braehten daz gebeine dar nâch êren,
 Dâ ez noch hiut begraben lît.
 ahtzeihen iâr was bî dem rîch sîns lebens zît
 ê in der tôt mit gifte kunde versêren.
 Keinen erben hinder im er lie als im vor sagete
 künic Karl, dô er im erschein. (752.7511–18)

[He wanted to be laid to rest in Aachen, enjoined the princes and his council to bring his bones honorably there, where he still lies buried today. Eighteen years of his life were spent ruling the empire before the sting of death struck him. He left no heir behind him, as King Charlemagne predicted when he appeared to him.]

There are, however, also differences in *Lohengrin’s* organization of the chronicle strophes. As Otto III illustrates, the narrative is structured more strongly around the lives of the emperors: where there is intervening material between the death of an emperor and his successor, it is always bound to the figure of the former—the reference to Charlemagne’s rein-terment above is followed immediately in the text by the next ruler, not by more wide-ranging occurrences as in the *Weltchronik*. The overlaps between father-and-son pairs remain but are configured differently (in one case they are stronger, in another weaker).³³

Otto III also exemplifies two further patterns in the delineation of narrative units that are particularly important in comparison to the *Weltchronik*. The first concerns the location of information about the rulers. At the beginning of the section on Otto III, only one piece of characteristic information in the *Weltchronik* (the genealogical link) is retained. Two further pieces (the date and position after Augustus) are omitted entirely, and the fourth (the length of reign) has been moved to the end of the section. Although not universal, there is a clear tendency in *Lohengrin* to reposition the length of the emperor’s reign in this way. Specifically, this detail appears once at the beginning as in the *Weltchronik* (Otto II), once at both the beginning and the end (Otto I), and three times at the end (Henry I, Otto III, Henry II).³⁴ This is not necessarily a coincidence, for it may be based on knowledge of at least one other chronicle: with the exception of Henry II, the stories of the individual

emperors in the *Prosakaiserchronik* (and its own source, the *Kaiserchronik*) are also concluded with the length of the emperor's reign. In the case of Otto III, for instance, the *Prosakaiserchronik* reads: "da ward er siech vnd starb. er was an dem rich achzehen iar vnd vier monat mer. die herren begrüben in in das münster sant marien etc" (There [Aachen] he fell ill and died. He ruled the empire for eighteen years and four months. They buried him in the cathedral of Saint Mary, etc.; 340).³⁵

If reign lengths thus tend to be moved to the end of narrative units, a new motif appears at their beginning. This second trend in *Lohengrin* is exemplified by the introduction of Otto III with an act of naming using the verb "hie�": "Ott er hiez" (he was called Otto; 743.7421). The same verb, transitively, is used to introduce Otto II: "Otten hiez / man sînn sun" (they called his [Otto I's] son Otto; 741.7401). Otto I is likewise explicitly "genennet" (named; 733.7327) at the start of his section, and only for Henry II is there no "naming" of this kind. The *Sächsische Weltchronik* does not offer a precedent for this.³⁶ The *Prosakaiserchronik*, on the other hand, introduces all of the rulers included in *Lohengrin*, with the significant exception of Henry II, using "hieẗ"—for example, "Otto hieẗ sin sun. der was nû zwôlff iar alt. das was der trit ott" (His [Otto II's] son was called Otto [Otto III]. He was then twelve years old. This was the third Otto; 340). The *Kaiserchronik* is less uniform and employs this device only for Otto I and II.³⁷ *Lohengrin* thus appears to have adopted the motif, if not the consistency in wording, of explicit naming found in the *Prosakaiserchronik* as a means of marking the beginning of the section on each ruler, just as it turned to the device of stating the lengths of their reigns to mark the end of their stories.

There is, therefore, a clear awareness of the macrostructural possibilities of chronicle narration in the Ottonian strophes of *Lohengrin*, for which the *Prosakaiserchronik* may well have provided a model. A convincing reason to assume knowledge of the *Kaiserchronik* has not, however, presented itself. We shall now see how the similarities to and differences from the historiographical narratives are configured differently again where the direct involvement of the narrator in the telling of the story is concerned.

The Narrator

The foregrounding of the narrator is apparent from the very beginning of the Ottonian strophes, as can be seen from the demise of Henry I immediately after *Lohengrin*'s departure. First, the length of

his reign is stated as follows: “Daz ich iu sage daz ist wâr: / der keiser des rîches pflac ahtzehen iâr” (What I’m about to tell you is true: the emperor ruled the empire for eighteen years; 731.7301–2). Second, his burial is described thus:

. . . . er wart begraben schône
ze Quittelburc, dâ er noch lît,
des er stifter was bî sînes lebens zît,
dar umb im dort got gibt die êwic krône. (732.7317–20)

[He was buried splendidly in Quedlinburg, where he still lies in the place he founded when he was alive. Because of this, God grants him the eternal crown on the other side.]

With the first-person assurance of veracity and present-tense comments in these quotations, the voice of the narrator manifests itself in a way that it does not in the equivalent passages of the *Sächsische Weltchronik*. According to the latter, Henry “quam an dat rike . . . unde was daran 18 jar”/“kom an daz rîche . . . vnd waz dar an ahtzehen iar” (took over the empire . . . and ruled it for 18 years; ed. Weiland, 158.18–19/ms. 1, fol. 55v) and “ward begraven to Quedlingeborch mit groten eren”/“wart begraben zv quindenlingburch mit grozen eren” (was buried in Quedlinburg with great honor; ed. Weiland, 160.31/ms. 1, fol. 57v).

These changes are examples of what can be described, respectively, as the testimonial and commentative functions of the narrator,³⁸ the introduction of which is characteristic of the Ottonian strophes in *Lohengrin*. Thus, Otto I’s actions are said to provide a precedent “des hiut kein künic noch keiser sich verzîhet” (which no king or emperor today neglects to follow; 731.7310), and his victory on the Lechfeld is accompanied by an address underlining the authenticity of what is reported: “als uns diu wârheit seit” (as the truth tells us; 734.7335). A similar address accompanies conflict with the Saracens in the reign of Otto II: “Nû ist iu vor wol kunt getân, / daz erbeschefte iâhen die von Affricân / ûf roemisch rîch” (You’ve been told previously that the Africans claimed inheritance of the Roman Empire; 741.7404–6). The appeal of Gregory V to Otto III for help is reported “als uns diu korônîc tuot mit schrift bekant” (as the chronicle tells us in writing; 747.7469); and of Charlemagne, whom Otto III had exhumed, it is stated: “nû ligt er in eins schoenen grabes särke” (He now lies entombed in a fine grave; 748.7476). Henry II’s sister, finally, was called Gisela, “als hiut geschriben stêt” (as it is written today; 755.7542); and of him

and his wife it is said: “noch krôn sie tragent in dem êwigen thrône” (They still bear their crowns on the eternal throne; 759.7586). In each of these cases—and in this respect they are representative—the narrator’s presence is foregrounded in *Lohengrin* where it is absent from the *Weltchronik*.

The appearance of the testimonial function is particularly striking because it is not evidenced at all in the Ottonian sections of the *Weltchronik* (apart, according to Weiland, from a single instance in some manuscripts of recension C) or the *ProsaKaiserchronik*, even though they are both based on antecedent material that could have been highlighted.³⁹ The *Kaiserchronik*, on the other hand, is characteristically replete with such assurances.⁴⁰ None is a direct precursor to those in *Lohengrin*, although they are phrased in terms of the same points of conceptual reference (written material, truth, verbal utterance).⁴¹ Their presence in *Lohengrin* will in part be due to the fact that such assurances are part of a conventional topos of asserting truthfulness and veracity in historiographical narrative. *Lohengrin* is, after all, based on a source or sources in at least most cases where the testimonial function appears.⁴² It is generally added straightforwardly to passages drawn directly from the *Weltchronik*, as in this example concerning the battle with the Saracens under Otto II:⁴³

Lohengrin

Ir wurden alsô vil erslagen,
als uns diu korônîc kan mit wârheit sagen,
daz sich daz mer muost nâch dem bluot verben.

(742.7411–13)

[So many of them were slain, as the chronicle tells us in truth, that the sea was stained with their blood.]

Sächsische Weltchronik

Der heidenen ward also vile geslagen, dat sic dat mere van der heidenen blûde varwede. (ed. Weiland, 165.19–20)	der heiden wart also vil geslagen, daz sich daz mer mit blut verwete. (ms. 1, fol. 60v)
--	---

[So many heathens were slain that the sea was stained with the blood
[of the heathens; ed. Weiland].]

The testimonial function can, however, also highlight the status and position of the narrator while fulfilling this otherwise conventional purpose. The assurances of veracity, for example, do not only refer directly

to the content of the source for a particular passage: they also can express an awareness of the textual sequence of the *Weltchronik* and the order in which it was reworked. Thus, of Otto I we read that

. . . sîn sun Willehalme was ze Mênze bischof worden,
 sô tuot diu sag iu vor bekant,
 daz sîn bruoder Heinrîch in der Beier lant
 daz herzogetuom mit der kûr im kund horden.

(737.7367–70)

[His son William had become bishop of Mainz; as the story has previously made known to you, his brother Henry held for him the Duchy of Bavaria with its electoral dignity.]

The foundation for the beginning of this passage in the *Weltchronik* is “Disse koning Otten sone Willehelm ward bischof to Megenze”/“Des kunich otten sùn wilhem wart bischof zv megentze” ([This; ed. Weiland] King Otto’s son, William, became bishop of Mainz; ed. Weiland, 162.28/ms. 1, fol. 59r). The description of Henry into which it leads in *Lohengrin* is drawn from an earlier passage in the *Weltchronik*: “sîn broder Heinric, de ward sider hertoge to Beieren”/“sîn brüder heinrich. der wart sider hertzog zv beiern” (his brother Henry, who later became Duke of Bavaria; ed. Weiland, 162.3/ms. 1, fol. 58v).⁴⁴ It is, therefore, possible that the adverb “vor” (previously) in *Lohengrin* is not just a generic reference to a source from the past but refers also to the specific order in which the material is presented in that source.⁴⁵ Similar reflection on the act of adaptation can be found in two other cases. After the first reference to Otto I, on his succession to the throne (*Lohengrin*, 731.7307–9 = *Weltchronik*, 161.1–3), the *Lohengrin* narrator moves back in historical time and textual sequence to describe Otto’s designation as heir, his brothers, and the death of Henry I (= *Weltchronik*, 160.26–31), introducing the switch with the phrase “Nû habt ir wol vernumen daz . . .” (You’ve certainly heard . . . ; 732.7311). Similarly, the conflict with the Saracens under Otto II is introduced with “Nû ist iu vor wol kunt getân, / daz erbeschefte iâhen die von Affricân / ûf roemisch rîch” (You’ve been told previously that the Africans claimed inheritance of the Roman Empire; 741.7404–6), referring back to the earlier encounter with the Saracens under Henry I (= *Weltchronik*, 159.11–15).⁴⁶

The image that takes shape here is that of a narrator figure who depicts himself using the *Weltchronik* and manipulating the sequence in which events are described in it, drawing addressees into that process by

presupposing knowledge of the source on their part. The presentation of the narrator in this way is complemented by two cases where the assurances of veracity might, depending on how their ambiguity is resolved, lead beyond the content—and the form—of the familiar cluster of textual sources centered on the *Weltchronik*. The comment “dâ vint man ez noch hiut geschriben inne” (there it is still found written today; 733.7326), referring to the foundations of Henry I’s wife, Matilda, in Nordhausen and Pöhlde, could be an oblique reference to the *Weltchronik*, which mentions them in 159.1–2;⁴⁷ but it can also be read as referring to the presence of a textual object in them.⁴⁸ Similarly, the remark “als sîn diu wârheit noch bekennet” (as the truth still witnesses; 761.7607) that accompanies the burial of Henry II in Bamberg could refer to the *Weltchronik* (168.15–16); but it could also be a reference to visual evidence that can still be seen or otherwise experienced at first hand in the cathedral there. Read in this way, these manifestations of the testimonial function underline the presence of the narrator as a mediator between evidence and narrative, thus making the references to the former more than a mere mechanical *topos* devoid of semantic content. With the importance they attach to a state of affairs in the present, they also represent a bridge to the commentative function of the narrator.

Linking events to the present, either in the form of generalizations or references to the traces they have left behind them, is characteristic of the narrator in the Ottonian strophes of *Lohengrin* but relatively rare in recension A, at least, of the *Weltchronik*. Of those cases where it does take place in the latter, only one is reproduced in *Lohengrin*, with reference to the battle on the Lechfeld under Otto I: “Daz was ein der höhste strît, der ie ze diutschen landen / geschehen was vor oder nâch” (This was one of the largest battles ever seen in the German lands before or since; *Lohengrin*, 734.7337–38), equivalent to “Dit was der grotesten segenunft en, de ie to Dudischeme lande gescha”/“ditz was der grōsten signuft ein, die iê in dutschen landen geschach” (This was one of the greatest victories ever seen in the German land [lands; ms. 1]; ed. Weiland, 162.20–21/ms. 1, fol. 59r).⁴⁹ On one occasion, the commentative function is clearly omitted from *Lohengrin* where it occurs in the *Weltchronik*—in the following aside about King Stephen of Hungary: “Dit is de heilege koning Stephan, to des grave god vile tekene dod”/“Ditz ist der helige kunich stephan, zv des grave got vil zeichen tēt” (This is the blessed King Stephen at whose grave God gives many signs; ed. Weiland, 167.28–29/ms. 1, fol. 62v).⁵⁰ In a number of instances, on the other hand, *Lohengrin* introduces the com-

mentative function without a parallel in the *Weltchronik*, as with Henry I's actions shortly before his death: "er tet als die wîsen liute noch gerne tuont / und besant die vürsten gar an allen sîten" (He did as wise people still do today and sent for his lords everywhere; 731.7305–6), derived from "He sande na den herren unde besched sinen sone Otton to deme rike"/"er sant nach den herren vnd beschiet sinen sun zv̄ dem rîche" (He sent for his lords and designated his son [Otto; ed. Weiland] as heir to the empire; ed. Weiland, 160.29–30/ms. 1, fol. 57v).⁵¹

Extrapolating from these observations is not easy, given the uncertainty about the exact form in which the *Weltchronik* was used. The examples above are straightforward, but the status of other "omissions" and "additions" is more problematic because they occur in the context of wider passages that are, respectively, not included in *Lohengrin* or not present in the *Weltchronik* as it is known.⁵² What does seem to be the case, though, is that the *Weltchronik* provides a precedent for the two expressions of the commentative function that are developed most extensively in *Lohengrin*: generalizations about events and behavior, and statements about places of burial. At the same time, the development of the narratorial presence by these means becomes most pronounced precisely where *Lohengrin* departs at greatest length from the *Weltchronik*: in the section on Henry II. It contains a number of elements that cannot be put down to supplementary knowledge of "facts" provided by the *Prosakaiserchronik* or the *Kaiserchronik*: the elaborate account of Pope Benedict VIII's invitation of Henry II to Rome in strophes 757–58, the crowning of Kunigunde with Henry in Rome, and the supposed burial of Benedict in the Bamberg cathedral.⁵³

This (apparent) divergence from (known) sources goes hand in hand with the foregrounding of the narrator in (i) the statement that the royal couple "noch krôn . . . tragent in dem êwigen thrône" (still bear crowns on the eternal throne; 759.7586), (ii) the generalization about Henry's just rule that "gewalt hât niht gunst, hât got mit in niht pflîhte" (force has no favor if God is not with them; 759.7590), (iii) the linking of the papal grave to the here and now with "Sîn grap noch hiut dâ vunden wirt, / in dem hindern kôr, dâ man des niht verbirt / man pflec sîn schône und halt ez reiniclîche" (His [Benedict VIII's in *Lohengrin*; in reality Clement II's] grave is still to be found there today in the choir at the back, where no effort is spared in looking after it well and keeping it pure; 761.7601–3), (iv) the remark that Henry was buried in Bamberg "als sîn diu wârheit noch bekennet. / sus lît er dâ in sîner stift" (as the

truth still witnesses; so he lies there in the cathedral he founded; 761.7607–8), and finally (*v*) the praise of the royal couple in the transition to the epilogue in strophe 762, according to which Henry deserves

Daz man in billîch êren sol.
 er und sand Kunigunt mugent gehelfen wol,
 daz diu sêl werde gefloriert und geperlte
 Mit der himelischen zier dort vor des gots gerihte.
(762.7614–17)

[To be honored as is fitting. He and Saint Kunigunde can help the soul to be covered in blossom and pearls in heavenly splendor there, before the judgment of God.]

The distinctive features of the commentative function of the narrator in *Lohengrin* thus converge in the account of Henry II at the end of the Ottonian strophes. The comment about God's sanctioning of power, for instance, belongs to the same tendency to generalize that occurs not only in relation to the Lechfeld battle, but also (see n. 51) with reference to the marriage of the future Otto II and in the proverbial commentary on the punishment of John XVI. Similarly, the remarks about the papal grave in Bamberg fit in with the tendency to link places of burial to the present that appears in relation to Henry I, the reinterment of Charlemagne, and Henry II. These patterns in the deployment of the commentative function thus provide the Ottonian strophes with a cohesion that stands at odds with the disjunctive impression that arises if attention is focused on the problems of where the content originated.⁵⁴

The case of Henry II also points to a further aspect of the relationship between *Lohengrin* and the historiographical texts. For the most part, as with the testimonial function, the characteristic use of the commentative function in *Lohengrin* cannot be explained by assuming the use of the *Prosakaiserchronik* or the *Kaiserchronik*: the *Kaiserchronik* contains only a single reference to a place of burial in the present,⁵⁵ and although both *Prosakaiserchronik* and *Kaiserchronik* contain generalizations about the present, they are confined to specific facts in relation to the bishoprics of Bamberg and Würzburg, in contrast to the more wide-ranging scope of those in *Lohengrin*.⁵⁶ There is, however, an exception to this where the saintly deceased are concerned. The *Kaiserchronik* narrator includes an aside about the martyred Albert of Prague in heaven that—although the incident itself is not related in *Lohengrin*—certainly mirrors the latter's comments on Henry I, Henry II, and Kunigunde.⁵⁷

Furthermore, and more importantly, both the *Kaiserchronik* and the *Prosakaiserchronik* digress to include praise of the saintly Henry II after his death, just as *Lohengrin* does and the *Sächsische Weltchronik* does not:

Prosakaiserchronik

er tet grosù zaichen. die blinden
machtet er gesehent die krummen
gerecht. er ward begraben in sin
münster das er frummt. er ward
sider erhaben vnd ward
geheiliget. sant hainrich kumme
vns ze hilff an lib vnd an sel an er
und an gût. (342)

[He gives great signs. He gives sight to the blind and restores life to the crippled. He was buried in the cathedral. May Saint Henry come to the aid of our bodies, souls, honor, and goodness.]

Kaiserchronik

In sante Pêters munster wart er
begraben.
wir megen iu wol wærlîchen sagen:
die blinden werdent dâ gesehende,
den sundigen ist er wegende,
halze unde crumbe
die werdent dâ gesunde.
daz tuot got durch sîn êre.
sante Hainrîch wege uns an dem
lîbe unt an der sêle! (16246–53)

[He is buried in Saint Peter's Cathedral. We can assure you: the blind regain their sight there, he stands by sinners, the lame and crippled become healthy there. God does this because of his honor. May Saint Henry stand by our bodies and souls!]

Neither passage is a direct antecedent for *Lohengrin*, not least because of the inclusion of Kunigunde in the latter. These passages do, however, show that *Lohengrin's* development of the techniques grounded in the *Sächsische Weltchronik* cannot be understood solely against the background of that text but must also be seen in the context of wider conventions and practices in historiographical narrative—in this case, the narrator's digression to include a collective praise of saints and a call for help from them.

The relationship between *Lohengrin* and the historiographical texts considered above is also conditioned by pragmatic factors, for the strophic form of *Lohengrin* brings with it constraints of structure and rhyme scheme that are not present in a prose text such as the *Sächsische Weltchronik* or the *Prosakaiserchronik*. The need to meet these constraints may well have been at play in at least some of the passages in *Lohengrin* that have been discussed in this chapter—consider, for instance, the remark “sô tuot diu sag iu vor bekant” (as the story has previously made known to you; 737.7368, discussed on p. 51 above), where the narratorial remark supplies a full line without which the strophe would be incom-

plete. Nonetheless, the patterns and tendencies that have taken shape in the examples considered here show that the *Lohengrin* author was not merely resorting to arbitrary “fillers” or “padding” with which to maintain structural integrity, just as he did not merely lift content mechanically from earlier texts and associate it with Wolfram as a stereotyped figure of authority. Instead, he also engaged with their narrative form in shaping the presence of Wolfram as a narrator of history.

The Transition to the Epilogue

The foregrounding of the narrator described above is not only characteristic of the relationship between the Ottonian strophes in *Lohengrin* and their source material. It also draws attention to the question of *who* is speaking in them and how this affects their structural position at the end of *Lohengrin* more generally. The story of the Swan Knight, which ends with “dâ mit von dan sie riten unde vluzzen” (With that, they rode and sailed away; 730.7300), is clearly spoken by the Wolfram-narrator, and the epilogue is, as we saw at the beginning of the chapter, to be attributed to the authorial voice of “Nouhuwius.”⁵⁸ The precise point at which this switch in speaker occurs, however, is not clear: is the speaking presence so strongly expressed in the Ottonian strophes still that of Wolfram, or already that of the authorial voice? The first lines of the Ottonian strophes, quoted at the very beginning of this chapter as representing the voice of Wolfram, are already potentially ambiguous in their use of the “ich” pronoun in this respect—“Daz ich iu sage daz ist wâr” (What I’m telling you is true; 731.7301–2)—and this problem appears again at the end of this section, on the boundary between the Ottonian strophes and the epilogue.⁵⁹

The epilogue strophes are certainly set apart from what comes before them in terms of content, which turns from the Ottonian rulers to an expression of artistic self-image (strophes 763–65) and a prayer to Mary (strophes 766–67). This difference in content does not, however, necessarily map directly onto a change in speaker. The bridging strophe 762, which departs from the *Weltchronik* to praise the saintly Henry II, is crucial here. It begins with an ambiguous pronoun in the lines “Dise âventiure der Antschouvîn / hebent ist, sô lâz wirz an dem Beier sîn” (This tale had its origin in the man from Anjou [a reference to Lohengrin via his paternal lineage]; we will end it with the Bavarian man; 762.7611–12). “Wir”

could refer already to the collective of authorial voice and recipients—or still to the embedded performance situation of Wolfram and his audience at the court of Landgrave Hermann, who earlier implored him: “diser âventiure begin ze ende uns sprich” (Tell us to the end the tale that’s begun; 107.1069). Only from subsequent textual signals does it become clear that the speaker has changed: at the end of the strophe, the authorial voice would seem to be behind the comment that Bavaria “billîch hât pflîht an dem getihte” (partakes as is fitting in the poem; 762.7620), and the switch appears to be confirmed by the opening of the epilogue proper: “Nû ist der âventiure grunt, / swer daz buoch ist lesent, schôn gemachet kunt” (The depths of the tale—whoever is reading the book—have now been made known in style; 763.7621–22).⁶⁰ A later reference to Wolfram in the third person (“der von Eschenbach”; 764.7635) reinforces the switch linguistically. Precisely when it took place, however, remains uncertain, and this uncertainty is reinforced by the handling of syntax and imagery.

On the one hand, the impression of a clear break and associated change in speaker would seem to be favored by the fact that the epilogue evokes associations not with the relatively straightforward diction of chronicles such as the *Sächsische Weltchronik* but with very different forms of writing.⁶¹ Thus, the closing prayer is tied to the tradition of Mariological texts—the description of Mary as “Dû süeze zuckers trâmes wirz” (you sweet liquor of the maple tree; 766.7654), for instance, recalls Konrad von Würzburg’s *Goldene Schmiede* (Golden Smithy), where she is “du zuckerstude” (you sugarcane; 864). The association of poetic production with the acts of the craftsman in “des getihtes zimmer, / ob daz nâch winkelmezze sî / niht geschicket . . .” (Even if the chamber of the poem has not been measured out with a protractor . . .; 765.7647–49), meanwhile, recalls presentations of artistry in *Sangspruchdichtung*, such as Frauenlob’s “Ja tun ich als ein werzman, der sin winkelmaz / ane unterlaz / zu sinen werken richtet, / . . . also ist ez geschichtet” (I act like a craftsman who applies his protractor constantly to his work, . . . thus is it divided up; V.13.1–5).⁶²

On the other hand, similar diction and fields of language use are already increasingly apparent before the epilogue, near the end of the Ottonian strophes, as in the way that the pope’s invitation of Henry II to Rome is characterized and reported:

Sîn botschaft stuont, der wûrze saf
 wûrd von im erviuh, als nâch des winters schraf
 des meien kunft mit touwe sie kan vrûhten
 Und alliu krêatiur erhûgt

wirt von im gein vreuden, alsô het ervlügt
 er manic sêl ze den werden genühten.
 Die brief mit grammaticâ het meisters kunst geblüemet.
(758.7571–77)

[His message was that the sap of the root was quickened by him just as, after winter's chill, the coming of May makes it fertile with dew, and that all creatures were made happy by him on the way to joy, thus had he given many a soul wings to fly to precious fulfillment. The art of a master had made the letter flowery with grammar.]

The praise of the saintly Henry and his wife is similar:

er und sand Kunigunt mugent gehelfen wol,
 daz diu sêl werde gefloriert und geperlte
 Mit der himelischen zier dort vor des gots gerihte.
(762.7615–17)

[He and Saint Kunigunde can help the soul to be covered in blossom and pearls in heavenly splendor there, before the judgment of God.]

These passages anticipate the hope of the authorial voice in the epilogue that an audience of “reine vrouwen” (pure ladies) will wish, “Ob in daz tihte wol behag, / daz in saelde zuo des himels thrône trag” (if they are pleased by the poem, that blessedness take him to the throne of heaven; 763.7623–25), and his prayer to Mary in her “reinen magettuomes garten birtz / daz uns dort scheid von êwic vluoche wernde” (the resplendence of the garden of her pure virginity that separates us from damnation everlasting; 766.7655–56).⁶³

If such features associate the narrator at the end of the historical account with the authorial voice and his epilogue, another set of parallels points in the other direction, recalling the language of Wolfram in the opening strophes from the *Wartburgkrieg*. Henry II is praised in the pope's letter at the end, for instance, “sint in het gesuocht sun und des mânen trift / mit kraft der stern und lûn an allê ir orten” (since the sun and the path of the moon had sought him out with the force of the stars and the changing moon in all their reaches; 757.7569–70).⁶⁴ This brings to mind the astronomical knowledge that Wolfram was forced to defend against Nazarus (see pp. 27–28 above). Speaking of “Plânêten kraft, der sterne louf, des firmamentum klingen” (the force of planets, the course of the stars, the resonance of the heavens; 16.157), he declared: “ich weiz, der alle dinc vermac, / der hât gezirkelt beidiu naht und ouch den tac” (I know that he who can do all things has measured

out both night and day; 16.158–59). The imagery used to characterize the descent of Henry II with reference to Otto III has a similar effect:

des selben sun und er gelîchiu ruoder

Dâ zugen an der sippe teil,
 der tô⁶⁵ keiser und dem daz rîche wart ze teil
 herzog Heinrich, ze Beierlant gebürtet. (753.7530–754.7533)

[The latter's son and he pulled the same oars in partaking of the lineage—the dead emperor and he who gained the empire: Duke Henry, Bavarian by birth.]

This harks back to the metaphors of travel on or through water found in the opening strophes (see pp. 36–37 above), such as Wolfram's "sus kan ich vürte in Rîne vinden" (This is how I find fords across the Rhine; 7.70) and "sus swebt ûf dîner künste sê mîn arke" (With that, my ark rules the sea of your artistry; 5.50). The effect of these commonalities is to undermine the notion of a clear shift between Wolfram and the authorial voice at the end of *Lohengrin*: the transition between the Ottonian strophes and the epilogue is, on the basis of the textual evidence, designed to evoke associations with both entities as speakers.

Alongside this gradual transition from Wolfram to the authorial voice as speaker at the end of *Lohengrin*, there is also a tendency for the two to merge in a more fundamental way. This applies (*i*) to the very words that were quoted above as marking the start of the epilogue and clarifying the status of the authorial voice as speaker: "Nû ist der âventiure grunt, / swer daz buoch ist lesent, schön gemachet kunt" (The depths of the tale—whoever is reading the book—have now been made known in style; 763.7621–22). The statement echoes—indeed, has the status of a response to—Clinschor's early exhortation to Wolfram: "Wirt mir der âventiure grunt / von dir mit gesange durnehticlichen kunt . . ." (If the depths of the tale are made fully known to me by you in song . . .; 108.1074–75). Likewise (*ii*), the imagery ("arke," "künste sê") of aquatic confrontation with which Wolfram addresses Clinschor in the opening dispute reappears when the authorial voice in the epilogue compares himself to his model: "Ist ein tragemunt bî sîner arc / daz getiht ûf künste sê . . ." (If my poem is a dromon next to his [i.e., Wolfram's] ark on the sea of artistry . . .; 765.7641–42). Finally (*iii*), the prayer of the authorial voice to Mary in the epilogue—

. . . der dich, vrou, geschuof swie dû in doch gebaere,
 daz er uns scheidet von helle hir,
 von ir sûren tampfes smackes bradems gir.
 des bit dîn kint, daz der throen was wurkaere. (766.7657–60)

[. . . [him] who created you, lady, even though you bore him—implore your child who built the thrones, to part us from the vehemence of hell, from the clutches of its painful smoke, its stench, its steam.]

—returns to the words of Wolfram at the beginning of *Lohengrin*:

diu den gebar, der sie beschuof
 und uns erlôste von der helle mit sînem ruof,
 Mariâ, maget, ruoch uns von sünden kêren. (15.148–50)

[She who bore the one that made her and redeemed us from hell with his command—Mary, virgin, deign to turn us from our sins.]

These parallels generate an ambivalent relationship of similarity and difference between Wolfram and the authorial voice in which the latter imitates the former by adopting his diction. Examples (i) and (ii), at least, include explicit signals of distance between the two in the form of elements tied to the authorial voice as speaker (when he addresses the reader of the book and refers to his model with a third-person “er”). Example (iii), however, does not. Lacking an explicit marker of difference from Wolfram, this passage near the end of the epilogue mirrors on a linguistic level the ambiguity about the identity of the speaker that can be observed on a sequential level at its beginning.⁶⁶

All that remains is to point out that the reception and perception of the text as documented by its manuscript presentation is similarly ambivalent. The acrostic that encodes the name “Nouhuwius” spans strophes 763 to 765. It is, on the one hand, a clear formal indication that the epilogue is to be set apart from Wolfram and what comes before and attributed instead to the authorial voice. On the other hand, the acrostic is not highlighted as such in any of the manuscripts: large initials and rubrication are all used in A, B, and M to mark the same elements of strophic form as they do in the rest of *Lohengrin*, and no indication is given that the relevant letters have an additional status as part of an acrostic in these strophes.⁶⁷ The acrostic thus builds a reference to the author into the form of the text, but this is neither foregrounded visually in the surviving manuscripts nor coincides unambiguously with a switch between Wolfram and the authorial voice in the content of the text. Just

as the alternation between speakers is not marked graphically in the opening strophes (see p. 33 above), so, too, the manuscripts do not provide explicit orientation in this respect where the closing strophes are concerned. Only manuscript B comes close to doing so. In it, the story of Lohengrin and the Ottonian strophes are both accompanied by illustrations—the first showing Elsam at the beginning her quest for a champion (fol. 8r) and the last showing Otto III observing the blinding of a pope (fol. 178r).⁶⁸ The opening strophes with Wolfram and Clinschor and the closing epilogue strophes, on the other hand, are not provided with illustrations. This does reflect an awareness of a macrostructural difference between the embedded narrative and the surrounding material, but it still fails to represent transitions on a microstructural level—the actual “end” of the chronicle strophes, for example, is not marked at all. This manuscript evidence is not, of course, necessarily representative of the original *Lohengrin* text or the intentions of its author. It is very possible, given the misunderstandings that are apparent elsewhere in their renditions of the text, that the copyists, rather than deliberately downplaying the prominence of the acrostic, did not recognize it as such in the first place.⁶⁹ That, however, would, in turn, underline just how effective the drawing together of Wolfram and the authorial voice as speakers could be in practice.

Conclusion

This chapter has questioned the impressions of difference—between story and epilogue, narrator and author, model and imitator—that might otherwise seem to be emblematic of the end of *Lohengrin*. First, the way in which the work is positioned in relation to Wolfram von Eschenbach’s literary legacy is more complex than has previously been appreciated. In particular, the seemingly straightforward distinction between the Wolfram-narrator in the text and the historical authorial Wolfram has become increasingly problematic. It remains a helpful analytical construct from a modern perspective—the historical Wolfram did not, to state the obvious, tell the story of the Swan Knight to Landgrave Hermann and his retinue. Yet this is not necessarily how the logic of the text operates—the effectiveness of deploying Wolfram as the narrator figure depends on his sharing the identity of the authorial Wolfram whose prestige and mastery are praised in the epilogue. The invocation

of Wolfram in this manner, furthermore, is more than just a topos of establishing legitimacy by associating the text with an archetypal exponent of poetic mastery from the past. The authorial voice not only compares himself with Wolfram in the epilogue as a model whose abilities he is hard put to match—he also, as we have seen, blurs the boundary between himself and Wolfram in the textual present.

Second, this convergence of identities is expressed in the relationship of the epilogue not only to the much earlier *Wartburgkrieg* strophes but also to the strophes about the Ottonian rulers that immediately precede it. The appraisal of their narrative form has, in the first instance, provided new evidence with which to refine existing theories about their historiographical context. The suggestion that recension A of the *Sächsische Weltchronik* was adapted is reinforced from this perspective, and the case for knowledge of the *Prosa-Kaiserchronik* is strengthened considerably; familiarity with the *Kaiserchronik* as a separate text, on the other hand, now seems unlikely. Further research would be needed to cover other aspects of narrative technique and the refashioning of the chronicle(s) elsewhere in *Lohengrin*. At the same time, however, examining the construction of the narrative has made it possible to negotiate from a new angle the difficulties associated with reconstructing such dependencies: it has become clear that, for all the derivative aspects of the Ottonian strophes and for all the discontinuities in our knowledge of their sources, they are held together by the distinctive way in which they configure the possibilities of chronicle narration. Most of all, the foregrounded speaking voice of the narrator underlines the link between these strophes and that same figure of Wolfram whose presence, from the *Wartburgkrieg* opening, to the *Lohengrin* story, to the epilogue, defines the text of which they are a part.

material to come—but this is precisely one of the strophes that is *not* present in any of the “other” *Wartburgkrieg* manuscripts and therefore, on the face of it, supports readings that emphasize the disjunction between the *Wartburgkrieg* and *Lohengrin*. The significance of the examples given here lies in the fact that they create the opposite impression.

⁷² Hallmann, *Studien*, 275, 277–78, identifies two further such correspondences—between the setting of the *Fürstenlob* and the judicial combat between Lohengrin and Telramunt, and between Lucifer and the *superbia* of Telramunt.

⁷³ In particular, it would now be possible to describe more precisely the role of polemic in the antagonistic structures that were identified by Kellner and Strohschneider, who hint at its relevance in a footnote but do not explore it in more detail (“Poetik des Krieges,” 340 n. 16).

⁷⁴ Unger, *Wolfram-Rezeption*, 9.

⁷⁵ Meyer, “Intertextuality in the Later Thirteenth Century,” 104.

⁷⁶ Hallmann, *Studien*, 270.

Chapter 2

¹ See J. Wolf, *Sächsische Weltchronik*, 1–17, 121–66, for an introduction to the *Sächsische Weltchronik*, the dating and localization of its various versions, and the misleading focus on “Saxony” in its modern title. See further von Olberg-Haverkate, *Zeitbilder—Weltbilder*; von Olberg, “Makrostrukturen.” On the debate about the origins of the *Weltchronik*, see p. 153 in appendix 2.

² The essential foundation for interpreting the adaptation of the *Weltchronik* was laid by Cramer in *Lohengrin*, 130–56; the tabular overview at the beginning of his account, though, should be used with caution.

³ The fact that the historical overview at the end encompasses the Ottonian rulers complements the thematic concern with genealogy in the story of the Swan Knight; *Lohengrin* thus presents a different perspective on the relationship between genealogy, history, and the hero from that in other versions of the material, in which the Swan Knight is drawn into a historical lineage (see Kellner, “Schwanenkinder,” 131–33).

⁴ See, however, p. 56 on the ambiguity here.

⁵ On the dates of Wolfram’s literary activity, see Bumke, *Wolfram*, 19–21.

⁶ On this passage and its translation, see Hübner, *Loiblumen*, 78–79.

⁷ Traunwieser, *Lohengrin*; Hur, “Darstellung der großen Schlacht”; *Lohengrin*, ed. Cramer, 130–80; Kerdelhué, *Lohengrin*, 88–264; Kerdelhué, “*brevitas et prolixitas*”; Kerdelhué, “*Lohengrin et la Sächsische Weltchronik*.”

⁸ Volffing, “Wolfram als stilistisches Vorbild,” 323.

⁹ *Ibid.*, 330.

¹⁰ Compare here the metaphor of a “mosaic” in the early description of *Lohengrin* as a “Mosaik aus Wolframischen Reminiscenzen [*sic*]” (mosaic of Wolframian reminiscences; *Lohengrin*, ed. Rückert, 228) and—motivated by it—the title of

Traunwieser's *Die mittelhochdeutsche Dichtung Lohengrin: "Eine Mosaik aus Wolfram Eschenbach."*

¹¹ See Introduction, n. 19.

¹² *Lohengrin*, ed. Cramer, 149. It should, however, be noted that there is at least one manuscript of the *Weltchronik* that shows a tendency to truncate: manuscript 9 in recension A (Strasbourg, Bibliothèque Nationale et Universitaire, Ms. 2119) omits (from 161.19 to 162.5) the greater part of a lengthy section on internal disputes under Otto I that is not present in *Lohengrin* (on which see *Lohengrin*, ed. Cramer, 141).

¹³ On the transmission of the chronicle, see the manuscripts listed on <http://www.handschriftencensus.de/werke/327> (accessed 24 February 2016); J. Wolf, *Sächsische Weltchronik*; Menzel, *Sächsische Weltchronik*; Herkommer, *Überlieferungsgeschichte*.

¹⁴ *Lohengrin*, ed. Cramer, 150.

¹⁵ Cramer did not consider this question at all. Kerdelhué's comparative studies of *Lohengrin* and the *Sächsische Weltchronik* did not resolve it, either ("brevitas et prolixitas"; "*Lohengrin* et la *Sächsische Weltchronik*").

¹⁶ J. Wolf, *Sächsische Weltchronik*, 207 n. 43. The B-manuscripts mentioned presumably fall out of consideration owing to their northern provenance (see Wolf, 149). Wolf's reference to the naming of the Hungarians is based specifically on *Weltchronik*, 162.18 (= *Lohengrin*, 735.7350), where the manuscripts to which he refers have "Hunen" (matching "Hiunn"; *Lohengrin*, 725.7350) rather than "Ungere." It should, however, be noted that *Lohengrin* appears to alternate freely between both terms in passages that are not drawn from the *Weltchronik*; for example, "Hiunen" (272.2712) and "Unger" (274.2731). On the terminology, see Schotte, *Heidendarstellung*, 176 n. 3; Wisniewski, "Ungarneinfälle," 356–57.

¹⁷ J. Wolf, *Sächsische Weltchronik*, 207 n. 43.

¹⁸ On the shortcomings of Weiland's edition, see Herkommer, *Überlieferungsgeschichte*, 18–23.

¹⁹ *Lohengrin*, ed. Cramer, 150–52.

²⁰ See S. Müller, "'Schwabenspiegel' und 'Prosakaiserchronik,'" 233–35, 249–52; Herkommer, "'Das Buch der Könige alter ê und niuwer ê"; Bertelsmeier-Kierst, *Kommunikation und Herrschaft*, 169–72; *Lohengrin*, ed. Cramer, 152–53. Note that the *Prosakaiserchronik* was in the past known as the *Buch der Könige (niuwer ê)* (Book of Kings (of the New Testament)).

²¹ Henry I is crowned emperor in Rome with the injunction "witeben und weisen solt er sîn gereht" (he should be just to widows and orphans; *Lohengrin*, 656.6559)—but this resembles more the *Prosakaiserchronik*, "er richt nach der pfat witwen vnd waisen" (He brought justice to widows and orphans in line with the law; 336), than the *Kaiserchronik*, "der bâbes wihet in dô ze chaiser / ze tröste witwen unt waisen" (The pope consecrated him as emperor for the good of widows and orphans; 15832–33, quoted here and subsequently from Schröder's edition).

²² Note, however, the evidence from manuscript transmission that shows that this section could be detached from the rest of the *Prosakaiserchronik*; see Müller, "'Schwabenspiegel' und 'Prosakaiserchronik.'"

²³ Panzer, *Lohengrinstudien*, 22–31, 45–51.

²⁴ Cramer, “Lohengrin,” 901. Similarly Unger, *Wolfram-Rezeption*, 305; Schotte, *Heidendarstellung*, 205–6; Kerdelhué, *Lohengrin*, 247–64 (who realized that the *Lohengrin* poet may have modified the style of his source, but does not in practice advance far beyond the observation that material was added, removed, and rearranged).

²⁵ See Dumville, “What Is a Chronicle?”; Poole, *Chronicles and Annals*.

²⁶ On the dating and provenance, see J. Wolf, *Sächsische Weltchronik*, 207; K. Schneider, *Gotische Schriften*, 2:Textband, 48–49. The manuscript is discussed in more detail, alongside its account of the Ottonians, in appendix 2.

²⁷ According to *Lohengrin* (731.7309), for example, Otto I reigned not for thirty-one (ms. 1, fol. 57v) but for thirty-eight years.

²⁸ *Lohengrin*, ed. Cramer, 130–56; Kerdelhué, *Lohengrin*, 247–60.

²⁹ According to Weiland, the genealogical information for Otto I and Henry II is absent from manuscripts 18 and 19 of recension C (161 note c, 167 note k), and the year of Otto I’s succession is absent from manuscripts 6 and 7 of recension A (161 note a).

³⁰ Otto I is an exception in manuscript 1 and, according to Weiland, in manuscripts 2–6, 9, and 10 of recension A, where his burial in Magdeburg is not mentioned (164 note u).

³¹ The extent of such reports varies by recension and manuscript; according to Weiland, for instance, the conversion of the Wends is also described after Otto III’s death in recension C (167.7–9), whereas the place of Otto I’s burial is named at the very end of the section about him in manuscripts 18 and 19 of recension C (165.1–2).

³² The overlap between Henry I and Otto I is weaker in the case of manuscript 1, where Otto is not identified by name as successor: “er sant nach den herren vnd beschiet sinen sun z̄ dem rîche” (He [Henry] sent for the lords and assigned his son to the empire; fol. 57v).

³³ *Lohengrin* weakens the overlap on a textual level in the case of Otto II, who is referred to obliquely—“sinen sun” (his son; 739.7382), similarly 739.7386—rather than by name during the reign of Otto I. In the case of Henry I and Otto I, on the other hand, the overlap is more pronounced in *Lohengrin* owing to the fact that Otto is introduced between the statement of how long Henry reigned and the statement of where he died (the two characteristic markers of the end of a ruler’s reign in *Lohengrin*, as will be shown).

³⁴ Henry I is admittedly a special case insofar as the beginning of his story is not present in the Ottonian strophes.

³⁵ The corresponding passage in the *Kaiserchronik* reads: “Daz rîche hêt er vur wâr / rehte ahtzehen jâr / unt vier mânode mêre. / da ze Âche begruoben si den hêrren” (He controlled the empire for—this is the precise truth—eighteen years and four months. They buried him in Aachen; 16138–41).

³⁶ According to Weiland, there is only one comparable example in the *Weltchronik*: manuscripts 18 and 19 of recension C introduce Otto II with the words “Dessen Otten nante man den roten Otten . . .” (His son they named Otto the Red . . .; 165 n. †).

³⁷ The passages from the *Kaiserchronik* for Otto I and II, respectively: “Also der kaiser Hainrich versciet, / ainen sūn er verliez, / gehaizen was er Ottô” (Thus Emperor Henry passed away. He left a son behind him, Otto he was called; 15850–52) and “Alsô der kunich Ottô versciet, / ainen tiurlichen sun er liez, / gehaizen was er Ottô. daz rîche besaz er dô” (Thus King Otto passed away. He left a splendid son behind him, Otto he was called. He then took control of the empire; 15974–77).

³⁸ The terminology builds on the framework for describing the narrator’s presence in a text described by Ryan, “Narratorial Functions.” Its application to vernacular historiographical narrative in the form of the *Kaiserchronik* is explored in Matthews, “Erzähler im Text.” The testimonial function involves “presenting the story as true of its reference world” (Ryan, 147). I introduce the term *commentative function* here for referring to generalizations and comments that link events in the narrative of the past to the world of the present.

³⁹ The variant passage in the *Weltchronik* is “Swe so de orloge vorbat horen wille, de lese Cronica Wilhelmi van deme lande over Elve” (Anyone who wishes to hear more about this campaign should read William’s chronicle about the lands beyond the Elbe; ed. Weiland, 163.26–27).

⁴⁰ “daz saget daz buoch vur wâr” (that’s what the book says in truth; 15846, similarly 16029, 16120, 16242), “ich sage iu âne zwîvel” (I’m telling you without any doubt; 15894), “Ist ez als wirz vernomen hân” (If what we’ve heard is so; 16168).

⁴¹ On these strategies of asserting veracity, see, for example, Schmitt, *Glaubwürdigkeit*; Grubmüller, “Wahrheit.”

⁴² There are two unambiguous cases in which the testimonial function is not underpinned by a known passage in the *Weltchronik*: *Lohengrin*, 735.7342, referring to the claim that Ulrich took part in the Lechfeld battle, and 747.7469, referring to Gregory V’s request for help; both involve reference to a “korônîc” (chronicle). Two further cases, which use the term “wârheit” (truth), involve extrapolation from the *Weltchronik*: *Lohengrin*, 734.7335, which accompanies details on Otto I’s involvement in the Lechfeld battle, and 761.7607, on the burial of Henry II in Bamberg, which is not explicitly mentioned in the *Weltchronik* (see ed. Weiland, 168 n. 5); the latter can also be read as referring to other forms of evidence (see p. 52 above).

⁴³ Likewise bound to the *Weltchronik*: “Daz ich iu sage daz ist wâr” (What I’m telling you is true; 731.7301), “man sagt” (It is said; 737.7365), “als hiut geschriben stêt” (as it stands written today; 755.7542).

⁴⁴ On the addition of Bavaria’s electoral role, see *Lohengrin*, ed. Cramer, 152–53, 158–59.

⁴⁵ This was first noted by Panzer, *Lohengrinstudien*, 47; he did not, however, recognize the pattern of which it is a part.

⁴⁶ In these cases, the testimonial function thus merges with what could, to borrow and reinterpret another of Ryan’s terms, be called the “transmissive function” (in the sense of reflection on/thematization of the act of telling). The final example is admittedly ambiguous insofar as the “vor” (previously) could also refer to the conflict with the Saracens under Henry I as narrated earlier in *Lohengrin* rather than to the *Weltchronik*.

⁴⁷ Compare “als hiut geschriben stêt” (as it stands written today; 755.7542, referring to *Weltchronik*, 167.25).

⁴⁸ Whether the existence of the object is authentic or imagined is of secondary importance in the context of assertions of authenticity as an aspect of narratorial self-presentation; compare Panzer, *Lohengrinstudien*, 45.

⁴⁹ Prior to the Ottonian strophes, a comment about the Holy Lance in the *Weltchronik* is also matched by a similar remark in *Lohengrin*: “Dit is dat sper, darvan geheret is Romisch rike mit deme kruce unde mit der cronen”/“ditz ist daz sper, da von gehohet ist romische riche mit dem crutze vnd mit der chronen” (This is the Lance with which the Roman Empire is graced alongside the cross and the crown; ed. Weiland, 158.31–2/ms. 1, fol. 55v) = “Daz sper ist noch dem rîche mit” (The Lance is still in the hands of the empire; *Lohengrin*, 389.3884, which adds a reminder about Christ’s role as the savior of humanity).

⁵⁰ This is omitted from the account of the conversion of Poland and Hungary during the reign of Henry I in strophes 755–56 of *Lohengrin*.

⁵¹ Likewise: “er wart begraben schône / ze Quittelburc, dâ er noch lît, / des er stifter was bî sînes lebens zît, / dar umb im dort got gîbt die êwic krône” (He was buried splendidly in Quedlinburg, where he still lies in the place he founded when he was alive. Because of this, God grants him the eternal crown on the other side; 732.7317–20, on Henry I, added to his death in *Weltchronik*, 160.30–31; but compare 158.32–33), “sô was ez doch wol der schoensten hôhzît eine, / diu ie mit lob in sange wart bedoenet” (it was still one of the finest marriages ever to be celebrated with praise in song; 739.7389–90, on the marriage of the future Otto II to Theophanu, added to *Weltchronik*, 164.28–30), “ez iehent diu kint: ‘selb taet dûz, selb dirz hab.’ / sus unreht hôchvart kund sich selb ie schenden” (As children say, “as you do, so you will receive.” That’s how misguided pride has always come back to bite; 750.7499–500, added to the punishment of Pope John XVI by Otto III in *Weltchronik*, 166.25–26).

⁵² “Additions” (the cluster that occurs in relation to Henry II is discussed separately later): “des hiut kein künic noch keiser sich verzîhet” (which no king or emperor today neglects to follow; *Lohengrin*, 731.7310, on Otto I), “nû ligt er in eins schoenen grabes sarke” (Now he lies in the sarcophagus of a fine grave; 748.7476, on Charlemagne reinterred by Otto III).—“Omissions”: “Dit is de paves, van dem dumme lude wanet, dat sin grab swete”/“ditz ist der babste, von dem tumme lute wenen, daz sin grab switze” (This is the pope whose grave silly people think grows moist; *Weltchronik*, ed. Weiland, 166.33–34/ms. 1 fol. 61v, on Pope Sylvester II during the reign of Otto III; many manuscripts, including manuscript 1, extend this with a further explanation about moist stones), “Do starf oc de gûde sente Hemmerad, de dar is begraven”/“do starp auch der gut sant emerat, der da ist begraven” (Then the good Saint Heimerad, who is buried there [Hasungen], died; ed. Weiland, 168.29–30, according to whom the passage is missing from manuscript 19 of recension C/ ms. 1, fol. 63r, from events after Henry II’s death), “De keiser Otto vor wider an Dudisch lant unde hadde enen hof to Colne; dat was der grotesten hove en, de ie to Dudische lande wart”/“Der keiser Otte vur wider in dutschiv lant vnd hette einen hof zv chôlne. daz waz der grozten hôf einer, der iê zv tuschem lande wart” (Emperor

Otto returned to the German lands and held court in Cologne. That was one of the biggest courts ever held in the German lands; ed. Weiland, 164.26–27/ms. 1, fol. 60r, after Otto I's conquest of Calabria and Apulia). Further instances outside of recension A can be found in 163.28–29, 165.1, 169.32–33. The following remark, and its context, prior to the section of the *Weltchronik* used in the Ottonian strophes are missing from *Lohengrin*: “darvan hevet de hertoge van Beieren sinen hof . . .”/“da uon hat der hertzog von beiern sinen hof . . .” (that's why the Duke of Bavaria has his court . . .; ed. Weiland, 158.26–27/ms. 1, fol. 55v, on the settling of Henry I's dispute with Arnulf of Bavaria).

⁵³ See *Lohengrin*, ed. Cramer, 148–49, 157; Panzer, *Lohengrinstudien*, 50–51, 58; Meier, “Schlussabschnitt,” 404–5.

⁵⁴ The motif of heavenly crowning also contributes to this effect, linking as it does the deceased Henry I at the beginning of the Ottonian strophes (732.7320) with Henry II and his wife at their end.

⁵⁵ “Mägedeburch haizet diu stat / dâ er sît begraben wart” (Magdeburg is the name of the city where he [Otto I] was later buried; *Kaiserchronik*, 15968–69).

⁵⁶ “von diu ist Bâbenberc / ain bistuom wol lobelîche, / so iz wol gezimet dem rîche” (That's why Bamberg is such a praiseworthy bishopric, as is well befitting to the empire; *Kaiserchronik*, 16201–3, similarly 16222–24), “dû stat rotenburg ist dû hoptstat des herczogentûms ze franken. wer dem bystumm die er nimmet der berobet sant kylian” (The city of Rothenburg is the capital of the Duchy of Franconia. He who deprives the bishopric [of Würzburg] of its honor is stealing from Saint Killian; *Prosakaiserchronik*, 341–42).

⁵⁷ “in der mærtêrære kôre / hât er daz himelrîche besezen. / dâ nesol er unser niht vergezzen” (He has won the kingdom of heaven in the choir of martyrs. May he not forget us there; 16131–33).

⁵⁸ The phrase *authorial voice* is intended to reflect the fact that the authorial presence evoked is an act of self-presentation that may be at one remove from the actual author. See Introduction, n. 26, on the spelling of the name.

⁵⁹ The appearance of Wolfram as the narrator of a chronicle in the Ottonian strophes has a certain elegance from a literary-historical perspective, for Wolfram von Eschenbach displayed knowledge of the *Kaiserchronik* in *Willehalm* and, perhaps, *Parzival* (see Singer, *Willehalm*, 43–45; Johnson, “Silvester und Anfortas”).

⁶⁰ Even these passages have a degree of ambiguity regarding the speaker who is to be assumed: *geiht(e)* can mean “artistic creation,” as well as a written text or “poem” (see Lexer, *Handwörterbuch*, 1:944; Gärtner, Grubmüller, and Stackmann, *Wörterbuch*, vol. 2, pt. 1, cols. 631–32), and the aside “swer das buoch ist lesent” could be seen as an extension of the references to source material in the Ottonian strophes rather than as a reference to the book of *Lohengrin* as textual object.

⁶¹ The question of whether the passages discussed in what follows exemplify the *geblümt(e) Stil* is of secondary importance here. See Unger, *Wolfram-Rezeption*, 36–52; Hübner, *Lobblumen*, 78–81; Volting, “Wolfram als stilistisches Vorbild,” 333–34.

⁶² See Hübner, *Lobblumen*, 81 n. 137.

⁶³ This wish for salvation also provides the epilogue with an internal unity by linking the reflection on artistry to the prayer to Mary.

⁶⁴ According to Hübner, *Lobblumen*, 80, this is an echo of the idea that Henry II had been cosmologically designated as emperor.

⁶⁵ Cramer's text adopts the reading "rôt" (red—as in manuscripts A and B, i.e., referring to Otto II "the Red"), but Panzer, *Lohengrinstudien*, 49, must be right in preferring "tôt" (dead—following manuscript M, i.e., referring to Otto III, Henry II's deceased predecessor): the thought is that Henry II's status as a great-grandson of Henry I paralleled that of Otto III.

⁶⁶ This merging of identities can be linked to the argument put forward by Kablitz, "Nachruf auf den Erzähler," 28–38, 41–42, against separating author and narrator as a matter of theoretical principle. The "staging" of a narrator figure (Wolfram) that Kablitz suggests be used as a criterion for deploying the concept of the narrator as a distinct entity from the author is clearly present at the beginning of *Lohengrin*. Such staging, however, has vanished from these closing strophes, which instead foreground the narrating agent by means of pronouns alone; Kablitz argues that this is not sufficient to justify separating a narrator from the author.

⁶⁷ For an example of how an acrostic could be highlighted in manuscript form in the later Middle Ages, see the beginning of *Willehalm von Orlens* (William of Orleans) by Rudolf von Ems in Universitätsbibliothek Heidelberg, Cpg 323, fol. 3r (ca.1420). The manuscript is online at <http://digi.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/diglit/cpg323> (accessed 25 February 2016); see Coxon, *Authorship*, 58–62; Miller and Zimmermann, *Cod. Pal. germ. 304–495*, 82–83.

⁶⁸ The rubric for the illustration identifies the pope (actually John XVI) as Crescentius, perhaps prompted by the appearance of "Crescencius"/"Crescencium" as name twice (749.7488, 750.7494) in the adjacent text; the misidentification of Crescentius as a pope is also apparent, albeit in a different context, in a misreading in the manuscripts (see the note on 746.7460 in *Lohengrin*, ed. Cramer, 582).

⁶⁹ Poetologically significant acrostics were, indeed, not always preserved or graphically marked in the transmission of medieval texts; Gottfried von Straßburg's *Tristan* and the *Ackermann* are two good examples of this, both of which, like *Lohengrin*, involve references to the author. See, for example, Schiroke, "Akrosticha"; Kiening's commentary, in Johannes von Tepl, *Ackermann*, 142.

Chapter 3

¹ Meyer, "Intertextuality in the Later Thirteenth Century," 104–5.

² *Lohengrin*, ed. Cramer, 182.

³ *Ibid.*, 183.

⁴ Unger, *Wolfram-Rezeption*, 134–69, 170–73 (quotations: 134, 170).

⁵ *Lohengrin*, ed. Cramer, 183.

⁶ Jannidis, *Figur und Person*, 172.