Press, 2003); Felice Lifshitz, "Difference, (Dis)appearances and the Disruption of the Straight Telos: Medievalology ('Mediävistik') as a History of Gender," *Mediävistik im 21. Jahrhundert*, ed. Hans-Werner Goetz and Jörg Jarnut (Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 2003), 295–312; Nancy F. Partner, ed. *Studying Medieval Women* (Cambridge, MA: Medieval Academy of America, 1993); Joan Wallach Scott, "Gender: A Useful Category of Analysis," *American Historical Review* 91 (1986): 1053–75.

Hiram Kümper

German Studies

A. Definition

While German scholars dominated the field in the 19th century and continued well into the 20th – even after World War II –, scholars from other nations were also busy building on the ground-breaking efforts of their German colleagues and, beyond that, establishing their own identities and approaches which came into full fruition, in the United States, especially, in the last quarter of the 20th century and the first years of the 21st. This essay will concentrate on the development of the field in Germany and, to a lesser extent in the United States, Great Britain and France.

The number of significant scholars in the field – on both sides of the Atlantic and past and present – is immense. If an attempt were to be made to include the names of even just "a lot" of the individuals, this essay would degenerate into a mere list. In the 19th century in Germany and Austria alone, for example, such a list would comprise at least one hundred names from Johann Christoph Adelung to Ignaz Vinzenz Zingerle. Thus more attention will be directed toward the establishment of the discipline, the schools of thought, controversies, indeed disputes, and will demonstrate the slow, but inexorable development from a narrow philological viewpoint of a text to the exciting, multifaceted literary approaches continuing to unfold in the present. Only those individuals will be singled out by name whose work truly played a significant role in the development of the field. The scholars of the 20th century, who will be singled out, will be considerably fewer in number, not because this essay is epigonic in nature, far from it – for are we not all like dwarves on the shoulders of giants? Nonetheless, rather than citing the names of individual scholars, especially of more recent times, for the important scholarly contributions that they have made and, in some in-

stances, continue to make, this essay will concentrate on the research impulses that inform their work, but which, again, would not have been possible without the pioneering work of their 19th- and 20th-century forebears.

B. The Corpus

The periodization of medieval German literature (ca. 750 – ca. 1400) is as follows: The Old High German Period (ca. 750 – ca. 1050) is not only a stage in the development of the German language, but also in the process that ultimately culminates in a distinctively German literature. The beginnings are, however, mainly a continuation of the impulses of late antiquity and early Christianity. The extant literature can be seen as a voice trying to define itself primarily within the Christian missionizing context, seeking to mediate between the new and foreign on the one hand and the traditional and familiar on the other. With one significant exception, vernacular writings from this period are primarily religious in nature. Most, if not all, had surely enjoyed a pre-literary existence. Aside from many glosses and simple prayers the literature of this period offers fragments of Biblical epics and a heroic song (*Hildebrandslied*, ca. 800) in alliterative verse, as well as a complete Life of Christ (*Heliand*, ca. 830), in Old Saxon, also in alliterative verse, and, most importantly, Otfried's *Evangelienbuch* (ca. 870).

Middle High German literature (ca. 1060 – ca. 1400) can be subdivided into three not completely discrete eras: a) Early Middle High German (ca. 1060 – ca. 1160) comprising over ninety works primarily of a religious content; b) The Classical Period (ca. 1160 – ca. 1250) comprising the great romances of Wolfram von Eschenbach, Gottfried von Straßburg, and Hartmann von Aue, the heroic epic, the *Nibelungenlied*, and the first flourishing of German courtly love lyric, (*Minnesang*), including Neidhart (von Reuental) who made this very subtle genre even more so by appearing to coarsen it; and c) Late Middle High German (ca. 1250 – ca. 1400) comprising the sometimes very lengthy, often extremely tedious didactic works as well as shorter didactic and poetic pieces of great originality, e. g., *Helmbrecht* (ca. 1280), masterpieces of German mysticism, and one of the most original poets of the Middle or any other age, Oswald von Wolkenstein. Of course there are many more works, authors and genres. But before a broader public could become acquainted with any of them, editions had to be produced.

C. The Beginnings

Long before the establishment of systematic editorial procedures in the 19th century, portions of the Old High and Middle High German corpus were published. The earliest complete text is an edition of Williram's (d. 1085)

paraphrase (ca. 1060) of the *Song of Songs* (Paullus Merula, *Willirami Abbatis in Canticum Canticorum Paraphrasis genuina, prior Rhythmis Latinis. Altera veteri lingua Francica; addita explicatio lingua Belgica et notae quibus veterum vocum Francicarum ratio redditur*, 1598). With respect to this Leiden *Williram*, it should be noted that the text is based on a lost Old High German original and is the result of an unknown scribe's attempt to render the East Franconian of the original in his local Old Dutch dialect. And while it is true that the previous year, 1597, also witnessed the publication of a fragmentary section (lines 19–78) of the ca. 1080 *Annolied* (Bonaventura Vulcanius, *De literis et lingua Getarum sive Gothorum*, 1597), Vulcanius's work is of prime importance not for the appearance of several lines from an Early Middle High German work, but rather that he was the first to make available the translation of the Gospels in Gothic, as well as the first who connected this version with the name of Ulfilas. It is to Martin Opitz (1597–1639) that we owe the only complete copy (878 lines in 49 strophes of unequal length) of the *Annolied* (*Incerti poetae teutonici: Rhythmus de Sancto Annone colon: Archiepiscopo*, 1639). Interestingly both appear to be based on different redactions of the same manuscript which is, unfortunately, lost.

Other works like the *Nibelungenlied* and the *Klage* saw several editions, either complete or fragmentary, by such individuals as Johann Jakob Bodmer (1757 – fragmentary using ms. C), Christoph Heinrich Myller (1782 – using mss. A and C), Friedrich Heinrich von der Hagen (1807 – mainly mss. A and C, with some consideration of mss. B and D; and again, somewhat more scientifically, but still inadequate, in 1816 and 1820 according to ms. B), August Zeune (1815 – using mss. A and C, with occasional consideration of ms. B.). No doubt reflecting the nationalistic attraction of the *Nibelungenlied*, Zeune published a "Zelt- und Feldausgabe" (edition for use in the tent or field) in a smaller format which the soldiers could carry with them into the war against Napoleon. Other works which were edited (after a fashion) prior to Karl Lachmann were *Minnesang* (Johann Jacob Bodmer and Johann Jacob Breitinger, 1759), Hartmann von Aue's *Arme Heinrich* (Christoph Heinrich Myller, *Samlung deutscher Gedichte aus dem XII., XIII. und XIV. Jahrhundert*, vol. 1, 1784, 197–208) and Hartmann's *Iwein* (Christoph Heinrich Myller, *Samlung deutscher Gedichte aus dem XII., XIII. und XIV. Jahrhundert*, vol. 2, 1784/1785).

All of these editions were for their time important and the Opitz edition is still being used today, to be sure in place of the lost manuscript. Nonetheless the range of quality among the various early editions even among those by one editor, e. g. von der Hagen, was quite large and did not begin to approach that of the editions which would soon follow. The response of the

readers to these editions was varied from Goethe's early disinterest in the *Nibelungenlied* to his enthusiasm for it in later life to the outright rejection of the great epic by no less a personage than Frederick the Great, whose reaction to MYLLER's edition is well known: "In my opinion, such 'poems' are not worth a rap and do not deserve to be lifted from the dust of obscurity. In my library at any rate, I would not tolerate such miserable stuff but would toss it out!"

D. The New Discipline

As crisp, clear, and unambiguous as the above declaration of Frederick the Great might be and as appropriate as the sentiment expressed in it might have been for MYLLER's edition, the time of the emergence of German Philology as an independent discipline was at hand and the value of medieval German literature would soon be recognized on the basis of reliable and scientifically edited texts.

The area of Medieval German Studies is, however, quite complex and cannot be understood properly without at least a glance at the discipline of which it is an offspring, Classical Philology. With the publication of Richard BENTLEY's (1662–1742) *Epistola ad Millium*, appended to the 1691 edition (*editio princeps*) of the Oxford *Malalas*, a new era of critical, philological methodology began. This slender tract (fewer than one hundred pages) is a masterpiece of brilliant emendations and corrections and displays the author's complete familiarity with ancient grammarians, drawing on their works to bolster his readings. He was in close contact with the great German Classical scholar, Johann Georg GRAEVIUS (1632–1703), who was a professor in Utrecht and for whom he collected all the fragments of Callimachus, half of which were unknown at that time – even to GRAEVIUS – and contributed them to the latter, making GRAEVIUS's *Callimachus* a model edition. In the Netherlands, in general, BENTLEY was held in great esteem, but in Germany it was primarily Friedrich August WOLF (1759–1820) who hailed him and, according to WILAMOWITZ-MOELLENDORFF, viewed himself as a sort of BENTLEY *teutonicus*, a conceit that was carried on by Karl LACHMANN and others of his students.

If, as is claimed, in the beginning was the word, i. e. the text, then immediately thereafter came Karl LACHMANN (1793–1851), who, although a Classical philologist by training, together with Jacob GRIMM (1785–1863) fashioned and defined the area of German philology (the only "German Studies" at the time). Without his (LACHMANN's) editorial work the evolution of the discipline to its present form would be quite unthinkable. As the initiator of textual criticism in German philology as well as being one of the

greatest textual critics in the history of Classical philology, LACHMANN's approach utilized the "genealogical" or "stemmatic" method which compared all textual witnesses of a work and drew up a "family tree," so to speak, mainly by comparing variants, i. e. errors and omissions. After discarding all repetitions, the text is reconstructed (with emendations) from the remaining agreements among the witnesses. This text would then represent the "archetype," i. e., the lost copy from which all the witnesses descend. During the time he was a student in Göttingen, LACHMANN attended lectures on older German literature delivered by Georg Friedrich BENECKE (1762–1844), professor of English and older German. This experience left a lasting mark on him – as well as leading to a later collaboration with the great scholar –, and he spent the rest of his life dedicated both to Classical and German philology. In addition to his pioneering work in the new discipline, he also continued to be active in the area of Classical philology, among other things editing the works of Propertius and Lucretius. Although LACHMANN was involved with several editorial undertakings in Classical Latin, the Bible, and Middle High German, the discipline of German Philology can really be said to begin with his treatise *Über die ursprüngliche Gestalt des Gedichts von der Nibelungen Noth* (1816). In this work, LACHMANN applied Friedrich August WOLF's theory, set forth in his well-known *Prolegomena ad Homerum* (1795) on the origin of the Homeric epics, to the *Nibelungenlied* (*Liedertheorie*). WOLF postulated that the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* were not the work of one poet, but rather of a series of poets or singers who composed short pieces which were then later ordered, edited, and combined into the epics known by subsequent ages as being composed by Homer. In his consideration of the *Nibelungenlied*, LACHMANN had two major concerns: the identification of the primary manuscript, which, in his opinion, would be the least complete – something that would speak for its greater age; and determining the structure of the epic. With regard to the first concern, he determined that there were three genealogical groups, aligned according to the three main manuscripts, *A*, *B*, and *C*, for all textual witnesses known at that time. Because of its lack of polish and apparent *lacunae*, he considered manuscript *A* to be the earliest and, therefore, primary manuscript (an assumption that would later be refuted as would the concept of three genealogical groups; today they are viewed as representing two redactions: the – *nôt* group and the – *liet* group, so named after the last lines of the epic: "daz ist der Nibelunge liet" [*C*], or "daz ist der Nibelunge nôt" [*AB*]). By 1836 in his *Anmerkungen zu den Nibelungen und zur Klage*, LACHMANN had refined his *Liedertheorie* to the extent that he determined there were twenty individual "Lieder" or rhapsodies that made up the structure of manuscript *A*.

From the beginning, LACHMANN's views were questioned, most notably by Friedrich Heinrich VON DER HAGEN (1780–1856), the first academic to hold the professorship for German Language and Literature in Berlin. As noted above, VON DER HAGEN, himself, had published editions of the *Nibelungenlied* in 1807, 1816, and 1820. Unfortunately the editions, but especially the earliest, were not characterized by scholarly or any other kind of rigor. The 1807 edition received little positive notice from the scholarly community, and in 1809 Wilhelm GRIMM wrote about it: "It [the edition] is a modernization, which is worse than the original, and yet not at all modern." As a result, VON DER HAGEN's protests failed to gain any significant support.

A brief glance at the events which took place after LACHMANN's death with regard to the *Nibelungenlied* will provide a fascinating glimpse into the development of German philology in general in the 19th and early 20th centuries. For after his death, a scholarly struggle over his theories – concerning both the primary manuscript and the genesis of the epic – ensued, characterized by unusual vituperativeness and *ad hominem* attacks, the so-called *Nibelungenstreit*. The dispute centered around those followers of LACHMANN like Karl MÜLLENHOFF (1818–1884) who not only advocated the primacy of manuscript *A*, but also applied LACHMANN's *Liedertheorie* to the epic *Gudrun*, and "dissidents," like the Heidelberg professor Adolf HOLTZMANN (1810–1870) and Friedrich ZARNCKE (1825–1891), professor at Leipzig who claimed primacy for manuscript *C*. HOLTZMANN's *Untersuchungen über das Nibelungenlied* (1854) not only advocated manuscript *C*, but rejected the *Liedertheorie* to boot! He was joined later in the same year by ZARNCKE, who modified his support somewhat when Karl BARTSCH (1832–1888) was the first to champion manuscript *B* (1865) as the primary manuscript. We owe to BARTSCH the most widely-used critical edition of the epic to the present day. Supporting BARTSCH's conjecture as to the primacy of *B* was Wilhelm BRAUNE's (1850–1926) study, *Die Handschriftenverhältnisse des Nibelungenliedes* (1900). He posited the stemma in which, as mentioned above, the three main manuscripts form two branches **AB* and **C* and all derive from one original **x*. In 1963, in his *Beiträge zur Handschriftenkritik des Nibelungenliedes*, Helmut BRACKERT subjected BRAUNE's theory to a rigorous examination. BRACKERT concluded that the presupposition upon which BRAUNE constructed his stemma, namely that there was an original (**x*), was simply not verifiable. BRACKERT's equally controversial position theorizes that there never was one single work that could be considered the original *Nibelungenlied*. The common text appearing to lie behind the transmitted texts is, in actuality, just one of several versions. As might be expected, BRACKERT's

theories were also quite controversial. Although most scholars agreed that Brackert had successfully dismantled Braune's stemma, his conclusion that there can thus be no 'original' provoked much discussion. While agreeing with Brackert about the inadequacy of Braune's stemma, Joachim Heinzle's observations are typical of some of the scholarly reservations: "We can infer an original in the sense that the *Nibelungenlied* tradition goes back to an original or basic text, in whose author we may see the poet of the *Nibelungenlied*. **AB* and **C* are revisions of this basic text, which is fairly well preserved in **AB* whereas **C* represents a systematic reworking, which in turn, however, influenced the total **AB* tradition secondarily. In general, one has to take into consideration also the repeated impact of oral epic tradition on the written, but it is not the rule as Brackert thought. We have to see the written tradition as essentially closed. In spite of these facts, it is just as impossible to reconstruct the basic text, which probably originated in Passau around 1200, as it is to reconstruct the **AB*-version" (*The Nibelungen Tradition: An Encyclopedia*, 2002, 210).

The other Lachmann hypothesis, the *Liedertheorie*, was also disposed of in the new century. In his classic work *Lied und Epos in germanischer Sagendichtung* (1905), Andreas Heusler (1865–1940) convincingly demonstrated the untenableness of Lachmann's theory. Heusler differentiated between "lay" and "epic" as follows: "A lay does not relate [just] an episode, but rather a cohesive narrative. The epic narrative and the lay content are the same," or put more concretely: "According to [Lachmann's] theory, the epic stands in the same relationship to a lay as a group of trees to an individual tree [...]. In reality, however, the epic stands in relationship to a lay as a grown person to an embryo." Heusler's refutation of the *Liedertheorie*, while viewed by some scholars as too rigid, was nonetheless the final nail in the Lachmannian Nibelungen coffin. We will return to the *Nibelungenlied* when discussing the turn from philological to literary studies.

However completely Lachmann's Nibelungen hypotheses were disproved, his other critical and methodological achievements have stood the test of time. Not only did he provide an exemplary edition of the works of Wolfram von Eschenbach (1833), but also, together with Georg Friedrich Benecke, Hartmann von Aue's *Iwein* (1827) which forms the basis for all subsequent editions to the present. In this connection mention must be made of Benecke's dictionary to *Iwein* (*Wörterbuch zu Hartmanns 'Iwein'*, 1833). Indeed there is scarcely a major work from the Classical Middle High German period with which Lachmann did not occupy himself – with the notable exception of Gottfried von Straßburg's *Tristan*. He also began work on an edition of *Minnesang* which was, however, completed by his longtime

associate and admirer Moriz HAUPT (1808–1874), who, too, must be recognized as playing a most important role, possibly as important as LACHMANN's, in the establishment of German philology. Like LACHMANN, he was a follower of the theory of the Classical philologist, Gottfried HERMANN (1772–1848), who maintained that the accurate knowledge of the respective language(s) – in his case Latin and Greek – was the only path to an understanding of the ancient world (language as the only correct way to knowledge). (In other words such "tangential" subjects as archeology, history and the like play no significant role in Classical philology. This is in opposition to August BÖCKH [1785–1867] whose expansive view of Classical philology can be summed up as "language as one way among others." The "BÖCKH-HERMANN dispute" – much like the *Nibelungenstreit* in German philology – dominated the discussion in Classical studies in the 19th century.) Thus it is no surprise that he (HAUPT) defended LACHMANN's text-critical methods, especially with regard to the *Nibelungenlied* (third and fourth editions of LACHMANN's text, 1852, and 1867). As mentioned above, HAUPT published the edition of *Minnesangs Frühling* (1857) which LACHMANN had started. In addition, he edited and published the following: Hartmann von Aue's *Erec* (1839) and his *Lieder*, *Klage*, and the *Arme Heinrich* (1842); Rudolf von Ems's *Guten Gerhard* (1840); Konrad von Würzburg's *Engelhard* (1844); the *Winsbeke* (1845); Gottfried von Neifen's *Lieder* (1851); the poetry of Walther von der Vogelweide (1853, and 1864); Neidhardt von Reuental's *Lieder* (1858; modern scholarship no longer refers to this poet as 'von Reuental', which is only his *nom de plume*); and *Moriz von Craon* (1871). To be sure, most of these editions had to be completely reedited in the 20th century – and *Minnesangs Frühling* – already in the early 1900s. In the newest edition (Hugo MOSER and Helmut TERVOOREN, *Des Minnesangs Frühling*, 1977) the entire editorial procedure was changed from the basic principle of emendation, conjecture, and reconstruction of the "archetype" to that of the "Leithandschrift," a principle that Werner SCHRÖDER also employed with his monumental edition of Wolfram's *Willehalm* (1978). These editions, plus several others, as well as important studies, e. g. BRACKERT's observations about the *Nibelungenlied* manuscripts, demonstrate the gradual loosening of the philological bonds imposed upon the discipline by LACHMANN and his followers. (We will have occasion to mention these later when discussing "New Philology" in the medieval German context.) Nonetheless, it must be pointed out, and forcibly so, that the more recent developments would have been unthinkable, without the pioneering accomplishments of LACHMANN and others!

E. Noteworthy Editions of Smaller Works (including Old High German) in the 19th Century

Of course editing activity was not limited to the well-known epic and lyric works of the Middle Ages. Many text editions were made which offered, in addition to excerpts from larger works, complete texts of smaller works, especially those from the Early Middle High German period as well as the few monuments in Old High German and Old Saxon, and collections of courtly love lyric. Some of the more noteworthy collections are: Karl Bartsch, *Deutsche Liederdichter des zwölften bis vierzehnten Jahrhunderts* (2nd ed. 1878, rpt. 1966); Karl Bartsch, *Die Schweizer Minnesänger* (1886, rpt. 1964); Eberhard Gottlieb Graff, *Diutiska: Denkmäler deutscher Sprache und Litteratur aus alten Handschriften*, vol. 1 (1826), vol. 2 (1827), vol. 3 (1829); Heinrich Hoffmann (von Fallersleben), *Fundgruben für Geschichte deutscher Sprache und Litteratur*, vol. 1 (1830), vol. 2 (1837); Hans Ferdinand Massmann, *Deutsche Gedichte des zwölften Jahrhunderts und der nächstverwandten Zeit*, part 1: *Die Straßburg-Molsheimische Handschrift*, and part 2: *Aus Wiener Handschriften* (1837); Theodor G. von Karajan, *Deutsche Sprach-Denkmale des zwölften Jahrhunderts* (1846); Joseph Diemer, *Deutsche Gedichte des XI. und XII. Jahrhunderts* (1840, rpt. 1968); Karl Goedeke, *Deutsche Dichtung im Mittelalter* (1854); Oskar Schade, *Geistliche Gedichte des XIV. und XV. Jahrhunderts vom Niederrhein* (1854); Oskar Schade, *Veterum Monumentorum Theotiscorum Decas*, Diss. Halle/Saale (1860); Oskar Schade, *Altdeutsches Lesebuch* (1862); Karl Müllenhoff and Wilhelm Scherer, *Denkmäler deutscher Poesie und Prosa aus dem VIII.-XII. Jahrhundert*, vol. 1 (1864, 2nd ed. 1873, 3rd ed. 1892 by Elias Steinmeyer, rpt. 1964); Wilhelm Braune, *Althochdeutsches Lesebuch* (1875, 17th ed. 1994); Wilhelm Braune, *Althochdeutsche Grammatik* (1886, 14th ed. 1987); Paul Piper, *Lesebuch des Althochdeutschen und Altsächsischen* (*Die Sprache und Litteratur Deutschlands bis zum zwölften Jahrhundert*, 2. Theil) (1880); Paul Piper, *Die geistliche Dichtung des Mittelalters*, 1: *Die biblischen und die Mariendichtungen* (1888, rpt. 1986); Albert Waag, *Kleinere deutsche Gedichte des XI. und XII. Jahrhunderts*, (1890, 2nd ed. 1916). Waag's edition has been reedited twice: an East German edition by Hans Joachim Gernentz, *Kleinere deutsche Gedichte des 11. und 12. Jahrhunderts: Nach der Ausgabe von Albert Waag* (1970, 3rd ed. 1977); and a West German one by Werner Schröder, *Kleinere deutsche Gedichte des 11. und 12. Jahrhunderts: Nach der Ausgabe von Albert Waag*, 2 vols. (1972). The latter two editions, especially Schröder's, were made as a "protest" against the magisterial accomplishment of Friedrich Maurer, *Die religiösen Dichtungen des 11. und 12. Jahrhunderts: Nach ihren Formen besprochen und herausgegeben*, 3 vols. (1964, 1965, 1970). This became a fairly contentious issue among some scholars at the time in that Maurer maintained that the strophic form

of Early Middle High German religious literature (ca. 1060 – ca.1160) was composed of strophes of unequal length employing essentially the Otfridian long line (ca. 870) with internal rhyme, as opposed to short line rhyming couplets, the "new" form of Middle High German poetry. In volume three MAURER presents those works which no longer offer evidence of the long-line structure. The foreword to the third volume, in which MAURER discusses the criticism the first two volumes encountered, primarily from Werner SCHRÖDER, reflects that the "battle" was still going on. Although, ironically enough, MAURER, in his refutation of SCHRÖDER, makes his claim even more compelling.

F. Other Disciplinary Developments in the 19th Century

In addition to textual criticism and the establishment of a more or less reliable scholarly corpus, three outstanding journals were founded: *Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum* (1841) by Moriz HAUPT; *Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie* (1868) by Julius ZACHER; and the *Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur* (1873) by Hermann PAUL and Wilhelm BRAUNE. All three journals are still thriving today. And, of course, they have been joined by many more in all parts of the world.

Large-scale dictionaries of Middle High German were also produced: Georg Friedrich BENECKE, Wilhelm MÜLLER, and Friedrich ZARNCKE, *Mittelhochdeutsches Wörterbuch*, 4 vols. (1854–1866; = *BMZ*); and Matthias LEXER, *Mittelhochdeutsches Handwörterbuch*, 3 vols. (1872–1878). The *BMZ* is truly a colossal achievement. While it has an abundance of contextual examples taken from 250 sources, it can be difficult to work with due to its arrangement according to word stem rather than the alphabet arrangement. And what started out to be an alphabetical index to the *BMZ* became the massive three-volume *Lexer* that not only collates its alphabetical entries with the word stem ones in the *BMZ*, but also has included many more sources (720) and a substantial supplement section – in the modern print version over 400 pages. Excerpted from the *Handwörterbuch* – mainly for the convenience of students – was the venerable *Taschenwörterbuch*, the so-called '*kleine Lexer*' (1882) which went through numerous reprintings and revisions well into the 1990s. It has now been thoroughly revised by Beate HENNIG (*Kleines mittelhochdeutsches Wörterbuch*, 1993, 5th ed. 2007). The two dictionaries together with supplementary materials linked to the original sources mentioned in the dictionaries are available as a CD-Rom (*Mittelhochdeutsche Wörterbücher im Verbund*, 2002). It is produced by a team of scholars led by Professor Kurt GÄRTNER of the University of Trier. The ultimate goal of the project, which is also being carried out in part at the University of Virginia, is to produce an-

other printed dictionary – to be completed by 2025. More information about the project can be found at: http://www.mwb.uni-trier.de/index.php?id=6907.

G. University Professorships in the 19th Century

The discipline slowly established itself at German universities. The number of Chairs dedicated to German philology before the full effect of LACHMANN was felt was small. Some of the more important of the early Chairs and their holders were: BENECKE, Professor of English and "Old German" in Göttingen (1805); Jacob GRIMM, Professor in Göttingen (1830) and in Berlin (1841); Wilhelm GRIMM, Extraordinary Professor (1831) then Ordinary Professor in Göttingen (1835), and in Berlin (1841); VON DER HAGEN moved from Berlin as an Extraordinary Professor (1810) to Breslau and back to Berlin as an Ordinary Professor (1824); HAUPT, Ordinary Professor in Leipzig (1843) and Berlin (1853); KARAJAN, Ordinary Professor in Vienna (1850); LACHMANN, Extraordinary Professor of Classical and German philology in Berlin (1825) and Ordinary Professor (1827). The first "Deutsch-Philologische Seminar" (=department or institute) dedicated to German Studies was instituted in 1858 at the University of Rostock. By the end of the century, however, Chairs and Seminars were to be found at all universities in Germany and Austria.

A major reason for the acceptance of *Altgermanistik*, aside from the scientific editorial procedures which were set in place or the enthusiasm which the leading professors instilled in their students, was that the German Middle Ages and its literature, particularly the *Nibelungenlied* (as indicated above) filled a patriotic need of the Germans who until 1871 were united in language only. From the wars of liberation in the 19th century to the periods of the First World War, the Weimar Republic, and World War II in the twentieth, the *Nibelungenlied* was viewed more as a nationalistic artifact than as a work of genius in its own right, which hindered any serious literary analysis of it until well after World War II. Essentially, medieval German literature was viewed not so much as literature, but rather either as a philological or nationalistic laboratory exhibit.

H. The 20th Century (and Beyond)

If one can characterize the 19th century as the era of a new beginning, the 20th is somewhat more elusive regarding convenient, all-encompassing designations. In addition to the obvious, the two World Wars greatly hindered the productive analysis and study of medieval German literature. If nothing else, at least two generations of young scholars either had their studies severely interrupted or they were killed. Philological inquiry together with

source studies still held the dominant hand through World War II. However, whether that was because the subject matter was "objective" and, thus, non-political, i. e., controversial or whether it was because philological investigations had not run their course is difficult to say. I suspect it was a combination of both. One important contribution to the discipline was made in the area of word-field investigations by Jost Trier (*Der deutsche Wortschatz im Sinnbezirk des Verstandes: Die Geschichte eines sprachlichen Feldes*, 1931). His work remained influential well into the latter part of the century. However, some important literary and cultural analyses were also undertaken. Hans Naumann (1886–1951) is an interesting, if unfortunate case in point. He produced major studies on Germanic history and culture, medieval culture, and folklore. *Höfische Kultur* (1929) and *Der staufische Ritter* (1936) are two noteworthy contributions. He was, however, an adherent of National Socialism and was unable to separate his later writings, especially, from his ideology. But perhaps one of the most important contributions and a topic which Naumann might have taken up with more resolve had the political situation been different was written before World War I "Ministerialität und Ritterdichtung" (*Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum* 52 [1910]: 135–68) by Paul Kluckhohn. Kluckhohn's short but seminal work opened up an area of research that introduced social factors for consideration, namely the role that the ministerials played in the creation of chivalric literature that received its greatest attention only well after the end of the World War II, first in Romance Studies with Erich Köhler (*Ideal und Wirklichkeit in der höfischen Epik*, 1956; 2nd ed. 1970) followed in German Studies by Joachim Bumke (*Ministerialität und Ritterdichtung*, 1976; and *Studien zum Ritterbegriff im 12. und 13. Jahrhundert*, 1964, 2nd ed. 1976). The thesis was applied to the Arthurian romances of Hartmann von Aue by Gert Kaiser (*Textauslegung und gesellschaftliche Selbstdeutung*, 1973, 2nd ed. 1978). Influential for Bumke and Kaiser were the many writings on the ministerials and medieval German society of the eminent historian Karl Bosl.

Developments after World War II gradually shifted away from an almost exclusive concentration on medieval works as philological artifacts to consideration of them as literary ones. The late 1940s and the 1950s witnessed the reemergence of *Altgermanistik* as discipline worthy of international respect, and the 1960s and 1970s were the "golden age" of medieval German research. From Hugo Kuhn and his pioneering essay on the formal structure of Hartmann's *Erec* (1948) to Gert Kaiser's abovementioned socio-historical study on Hartmann's Arthurian romances, new critical vistas were being opened and the emphasis had shifted irrevocably from exclusive concern with textual criticism. Perhaps the one work which, in my opinion at any rate, was

decisive in the struggle to view medieval literature as literature was by Friedrich MAURER (*Leid: Studien zur Bedeutungs-und Problemgeschichte, besonders in den großen Epen der staufischen Zeit*, 1951, 3rd ed. 1964). MAURER's study came as a breath of fresh air in the area of Medieval German Studies, especially in *Nibelungenlied* research, and while MAURER was a philologist of the first order, he thought it possible to grasp authorial intention in a medieval literary work and arrive at a consistent interpretation by utilizing the basic philological tool of the word study. And as such, his examination represents a decisive break with the thrust of medieval German research in Germany up to that time. Well into the 1980s the major impulses in research methodologies came from Germany, perhaps most conspicuously: Reception studies. The name most closely linked with reception in Medieval German Studies is Ulrich MÜLLER, who in the late 1970s and 1980s held a series of conferences in Salzburg which served to define the methodology – understood in English more as "medievalism" than the theoretical proposals of Hans-Robert JAUSS and Wolfgang ISER. The fruitful interface of the latter's ideas with concerns in German studies occurred during the "orality-literacy" debate, about which more below. Other areas which had their start in Germany would include Gender and Cultural studies which were more or less conceived as part of the already-existing socio-cultural approach. Last but certainly not least is the *Institut für Realienkunde des Mittelalters und der frühen Neuzeit* of the Austrian Academy of Sciences in Krems (http://www.imareal.oeaw.ac.at/) whose research focus is Material Culture and daily life in the Middle Ages.

Perhaps a brief mention about the phenomenon known as "New Philology" would be in order at this point. As has been pointed out in other essays in this volume, volume 65/1 (1990) of *Speculum* was devoted to the "New Philology" and was hailed as the cornerstone of a new way of looking at medieval literature without being encumbered by the various modes of thought of traditional philology. Manuscript texts are perceived to have an "openness," a unique variability (or *mouvance*). Of course, the "New Philology" could have implications for Medieval German Studies, which relies on texts, many of which were produced using the methods of LACHMANN or his followers, i. e. reproducing the stemma or archetype. To determine how or if "New Philology" affected Medieval German Studies, Horst WENZEL and Helmut TERVOOREN edited a Special Volume of the *Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie* (116 [1997]), "Philologie als Textwissenschaft: Alte und neue Horizonte." A nuanced discussion of the volume and of the "importance," if any, for Germanists is provided by D. H. GREEN in *The Modern Language Review* (94.4 [1999]: 1145–47). In addition to demonstrating clearly that the "newness" of the "New Philology" is, in most cases in German studies, at any rate, not all

that terribly new, Green also raises the issue of the apparent absolute concentration on the "manuscript" and the ignoring of other methods of transmission or reception, namely oral. The question or "Orality" and "Literacy" will be discussed below. To the other examples he cites indicating the anticipation of "New Philology" in Medieval German Studies, e. g., the research areas of reception studies and analysis of the roles of patrons (Joachim Bumke, *Mäzene im Mittelalter: Die Gönner und Auftraggeber der höfischen Literatur in Deutschland 1150–1300*, 1979), one could also add the results of Helmut Brackert's above-mentioned research on the manuscripts of the *Nibelungenlied* as anticipating the manuscript uniqueness aspect of "New Philology."

I. Medieval German Studies in the Diaspora

Until relatively recently, Medieval German Studies in non-German speaking countries tended to be quite conservative in their methodologies, mirroring the time-honored text-critical approach. Of course, there were some brilliant scholars outside of Germany who contributed philological and literary studies of high quality, but who were not pioneering in their methodologies and, thus, did not influence the discipline as a whole. One who might have been able to make a difference was the French scholar, Ernest Tonnelat (*La chanson des Nibelungen*, 1926), who provided a new close reading of the *Nibelungenlied*, focusing on the style and character descriptions. Unfortunately, Tonnelat's theories could not overcome the dominance of Heuslerian thought. Among Dutch scholars who have also made noteworthy, if not suitably acknowledged, contributions to the field is Hendricus Sparnaay. His *Hartmann von Aue: Studien zu einer Biographie* (2 vols., 1933, 1938), while now somewhat out of date, still has much to offer in terms of the biographical material collected in the volumes. In addition to much work on Hartmann von Aue, Sparnaay wrote the unique monograph (*Karl Lachmann als Germanist*, 1948) which offers a remarkable depiction of Lachmann and convincingly demonstrates that he truly deserves to be viewed as a giant of the discipline.

One important branch of research that began with the seminal essay of the German historian Herbert Grundmann ("Litteratus-illitteratus. Der Wandel einer Bildungsnorm vom Altertum zum Mittelalter," *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte* 40 [1958]: 1–65) concerned the notion of literacy and the modes of reception of literature in the Middle Ages. The attraction of this avenue of inquiry (but not "medievalism" as advocated by Müller) resonated especially with scholars in the United States and Great Britain. The American scholar Franz Bäuml was a pioneer in this endeavor and was the first to apply the theories of Jauss and Iser to his work in "oral-formulaic theory" (for an excellent appreciation of Bäuml's achievement as well as a compre-

hensive overview of pertinent research on the topic see: Ursuala SCHAEFER, "Alterities: On Methodology in Medieval Literary Studies," *Oral Tradition* 8.1 [1993]: 187–214). And although British researchers have been more philologically and text-critically oriented, within the group of the many productive scholars one, especially, stands out, Dennis H. GREEN. His *The Carolingian Lord: Semantic Studies on Four Old High German Words. Balder, Fro, Truhtin, Herro* (1965) was to Medieval German Studies in English what MAURER's *Leid* was in German. Along with like-minded scholars in Germany (Alois WOLF) and the United States (Michael CURSCHMANN), GREEN took up the topic of "orality" and "literacy." GREEN provides insight into his thinking in his 1989 plenary lecture to the Medieval Academy of America ("Orality and Reading: The State of Research in Medieval Studies," *Speculum* 65 [1990]: 267–80). In this lecture he, too, acknowledges the debt owed to Franz BÄUML. He writes: "Franz H. BÄUML, to whom we owe the first applications of the PARRY-LORD theory to medieval German, now stresses more the need for research into the interrelationship between literacy and orality, while Michael CURSCHMANN, whose work on the theory was always critical of it, now writes on the different dimensions of hearing, reading, and seeing" (269). The culmination of his research can be seen in *Medieval Listening and Reading: The Primary Reception of German Literature, 800–1300* (1994). (For a thorough and critical review not only of GREEN's work but also its place within that strand of research, see: David F. TINSLEY, *Speculum* 71 [1996]: 952–54.)

Medieval German Studies – actually German Studies in general – in North America, as in other countries in the diaspora, was dominated by text-critical, philological methodology until well after World War II. (For a brief overview of the establishment of German Studies, in general, and Medieval Studies, in particular, in the United States see: Francis G. GENTRY, "Medieval German Literary Research from the Late Nineteenth Century to the Present," *German Studies in the USA: A Historical Handbook*, ed. Peter Uwe HOHENDAHL, 2003, 275–84.) Colleagues in the area of modern German literary studies, however, were able to emancipate themselves much earlier, due, in part, to the emigration of many literary scholars from Germany in the 1940s, 1950s and into the 1960s who were able to convey to their students the excitement of literary research then in full swing in Europe and to train them correspondingly. But the post-WWII years did not see an influx of such scholars interested in Medieval German Studies to this country – prominent exceptions would be Julius SCHWIETERING who spent part of 1954 at the University of Chicago (Illinois) and Joachim BUMKE who spent several years at Harvard (Cambridge, MA) in the 1960s. Thus, the comparable catalyst for much of the change in modern German Studies research in the 1950's

and 1960's was missing. Some German colleagues did, of course, come to America and enjoy distinguished careers, e.g., Otto Springer (Tübingen, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia), Michael Curschmann (Munich, Princeton University, Princeton), Ingeborg Glier (Munich, Yale University, New Haven), and Ernst Dick (Münster, University of Kansas, Lawrence).

"Medieval German Studies in the United States had to travel a long road from its beginnings as a field in which only research into the structure of the language counted, a view which continued well into the second half of the 20th century. And even though by the late 1950s/early 1960s when the discipline had managed to free itself of its philological shackles, American medieval scholarship was, by and large, conservative and quite provincial" (Gentry, 282). However, by the 1980s and especially 1990s, Gender Studies, Queer Studies, consideration of the body, and the problem of the "other," all these and more became part and parcel of the critical apparatus of those who were in the first "medieval wave" as students in the 1960s and which they passed on to their students, who, likewise, continue to pass on to theirs. The contact and cooperation with German colleagues, long lost, has been restored and significant research impulses (precisely in the areas just mentioned) are emanating from this side of the Atlantic and are stimulating research endeavors in German-speaking areas of Europe. Medieval German research in North America has come of age.

J. Postscriptum

One of the great accomplishments on medieval German research has been the almost continuous production of one-volume or multi-volume literary histories. These are valuable handbooks for the present-day student and scholar alike. Some of the more useful ones are:

(1) Gustav Ehrismann, *Geschichte der deutschen Literatur bis zum Ausgang des Mittelalters*, 2 vols. in 4 parts (1918–1935; rpt. 1965/1966) – still an indispensable reference work – the bibliographies are complete until the date(s) of publication, all known manuscripts and manuscript fragments are recorded.
(2) *Die deutsche Literatur des Mittelalters: Verfasserlexikon*, ed. Wolfgang Stammler and Karl Langosch, 5 vols., (1933–1955; has been superseded by no. 7 below. But it is still of historical interest).
(3) Julius Schwietering, *Die deutsche Dichtung des Mittelalters* (1932; rpt. 1957);
(4) *Gechichte der deutschen Literatur*, ed. Helmut de Boor and Richard Newald, 4 vols. in 5 parts (1949–1987; de Boor: vol. 1–3/1; I. Glier: vol. 3/2; H. Rupprich: vol. 4/1).

(5) *Geschichte der deutschen Literatur von den Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart*, ed. Ewald Erb, 2 vols. in 3 parts (1963/1964; of historical interest – presentation from a Marxist viewpoint).
(6) Karl Bertau, *Deutsche Literatur im europäischen Mittelalter*, 2 vols. (1972/1973).
(7) *Die deutsche Literatur des Mittelalters: Verfasserlexikon*, ed. Kurt Ruh et al., 14 vols. (complete 2nd rev. ed. 1978–2007; an enormous undertaking, completely revising the earlier edition, adding new authors and works as well including the Latin literature produced in Germany during the Middle Ages).
(8) Joachim Bumke, *Mäzene im Mittelalter: Die Gönner und Auftraggeber der höfischen Literatur in Deutschland 1150–1300* (1979).
(9) Max Wehrli, *Geschichte der deutschen Literatur vom frühen Mittelaiter bis zum Ende des 18. Jahrhunderts* (1980; the best, in my opinion, one-volume literary history available).
(10) *Geschichte der deutschen Literatur von den Anfängen bis zum Beginn der Neuzeit*, ed. Joachim Heinzle, 3 vols. in 6 parts (1984–2004; Wolfgang Haubrichs: vol. 1/1; Gisela Vollmann-Profe: vol.1/2; L. Peter Johnson: vol. 2/1; Joachim Heinzle: vol. 2/2; Johannes Janota: vol. 3/1; Werner Williams-Krapp: vol. 3/2).

Of course the list can be expanded almost infinitely. The above represent, however, the best of the literary *histories* that are available, that is, literary histories that provide literary, historical, and cultural material in a coherent context. There are, to be sure, many "companions" or essay collections, but since Heinzle few, if any, literary histories that are worthy of note.

Select Bibliography

Jacob Grimm, *Reden und Abhandlungen* (Berlin: Dümmler, 1864, 2nd ed.1879); Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Geschichte der Philologie* (Leipzig: Teubner,1921); Hugh Lloyd-Jones (trans.), *History of Classical Scholarship* (London: Duckworth,1982); *Germanistik und deutsche Nation 1806–1848*, ed. Jörg Jochen Müller et al. (Stuttgart: Metzler,1974); Jürgen Forhmann, *Das Projekt der deutschen Literaturgeschichte* (Stuttgart: Metzler, 1988); *Wissenschaftsgeschichte der Germanistik im 19. Jahrhundert*, ed. Jürgen Fohrmann, and Wilhelm Vosskamp (Stuttgart and Weimar: Metzler, 1994).

Francis G. Gentry