



<http://researchspace.auckland.ac.nz>

ResearchSpace@Auckland

Copyright Statement

The digital copy of this thesis is protected by the Copyright Act 1994 (New Zealand).

This thesis may be consulted by you, provided you comply with the provisions of the Act and the following conditions of use:

- Any use you make of these documents or images must be for research or private study purposes only, and you may not make them available to any other person.
- Authors control the copyright of their thesis. You will recognise the author's right to be identified as the author of this thesis, and due acknowledgement will be made to the author where appropriate.
- You will obtain the author's permission before publishing any material from their thesis.

To request permissions please use the Feedback form on our webpage.

<http://researchspace.auckland.ac.nz/feedback>

General copyright and disclaimer

In addition to the above conditions, authors give their consent for the digital copy of their work to be used subject to the conditions specified on the Library Thesis Consent Form.

THE ENGELHARD OF KONRAD VON WÜRZBURG

ITS STRUCTURE AND ITS SOURCES

A Thesis presented to the University of Auckland
for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

by

Peter Henry Oettli

December 1972

Acknowledgements

I wish to acknowledge with gratitude the assistance and encouragement which I have received in the course of writing this thesis.

I am most deeply grateful to my teacher, Professor J. A. Asher, for his patience, encouragement and advice, and for the sympathetic interest he has taken in my work. I also wish to thank Professor Hans Eggers for his helpful comments on parts of the thesis, and for his hospitality at the Universität des Saarlandes. Thanks are also due to Professors A. T. Hatto and H. W. Nieschmidt, whose advice and assistance have been most valuable.

I am grateful to the University Grants Committee for the award of a Research Fellowship, and for financial assistance in the purchase of microfilm material. Finally, I would like to express my sincere thanks to the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation, whose generosity enabled me to pursue part of my studies in Germany.

CONTENTS

	<u>Introduction</u>	1
CHAPTER I	<u>The Structure of Engelhard</u>	7
CHAPTER II	<u>The Tradition of Amicus and Amelius</u>	60
CHAPTER III	<u>The Secondary Sources</u>	99
CHAPTER IV	<u>The Primary Sources</u>	158
APPENDIX A	<u>The Manuscripts of the Amicus and Amelius Tale</u>	206
APPENDIX B	<u>The Origins of the Amicus and Amelius Tradition</u>	223
APPENDIX C	<u>Three Unpublished German Versions of the Friendship Tale</u>	239
	MS Hannover I 239	242
	MS Salzburg M I 138	253
	MS Berlin 261	312
	<u>Bibliography</u>	332

INTRODUCTION

After more than a century of investigation into various aspects of Konrad von Würzburg's Engelhard, its source or sources are still unknown. Moriz Haupt, when he edited the poem in 1844, simply established the fact that it resembles the tale of Amicus and Amelius.¹ Haupt felt however that Engelhard was so different from those versions of Amicus and Amelius which he knew, 'dass entweder das lateinische buch nach welchem er dichtete (212. 6493) ein anderes war oder er selbst den stoff mit grosser freiheit behandelt hat.'²

¹ I am using the term 'tale' not to indicate the literary genre, but in the wider sense of 'narrative'. It will become clear in chapter II that the tradition of Amicus and Amelius includes several genres.

² Konrad von Würzburg, Engelhard. Leipzig, 1844, p. viii.

The most recent editor, Ingo Reiffenstein, can report no progress on this question. He states: 'Die lat. Version, die—nach eigenem Zeugnis—Konrad vorgelegen hatte, ist entweder nicht bekannt, oder Konrad ist mit ihr sehr frei umgegangen.'³ All commentators on the relationship between Engelhard and the Amicus and Amelius tradition have either confined themselves to the statement that such a relationship exists, or they have repeated the views of Haupt and Reiffenstein.⁴ We are thus left with an unsolved problem: is it possible that Konrad treated a known source or sources with so much freedom that it (or they) can no longer be identified?

³ Konrad von Würzburg, Engelhard, ed. Paul Gereke. 2nd ed., rev. Ingo Reiffenstein. Altdeutsche Textbibliothek, vol. 17, Tübingen, 1963, p. xi. In a footnote, Reiffenstein refers to verses 212 and 6494 f..

⁴ Cf. Gustav Ehrismann, Geschichte der deutschen Literatur bis zum Ausgang des Mittelalters. München, 1935 (reprint 1966), II, Schlussband, 49; Helmut de Boor, Richard Newald, Geschichte der deutschen Literatur von den Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart. München, 1962, III, 32.

In spite of this lack of knowledge about the source or sources of Engelhard, students of the poem refer to Konrad's treatment of his source by pointing to the 'tradition' of the friendship tale, and to those aspects of the tradition which Konrad 'altered'.⁵ A knowledge of

⁵ Cf. Brigitte Morgenstern, 'Studie zum Menschenbild Konrads von Würzburg', Diss., Tübingen, 1962, p. 10: 'Bei der noch herrschenden Unsicherheit über Konrads direkte Vorlagen ist nicht sauber zu trennen zwischen "Eigenem" und "Übernommenem" im Werk des Dichters. Soweit das bisher bekannte Material vollständig ist, wären seine "Zutaten" die folgenden:' Morgenstern then lists six 'additions' and three 'abbreviations', and continues; p. 13: 'Es sollen nun vor allem die Elemente besprochen werden, die die Minnehandlung in Konrads "Engelhard" den Quellen voraus hat.'

Morgenstern's method is criticised by Karl-Heinz Göttert, Tugendbegriff und epische Struktur in höfischen Dichtungen. Kölner Germanistische Arbeiten, vol. 5, Köln Wien, 1971, p. 143, note 22. Even though Göttert is aware of the problem, he dismisses it too lightly when he says, p. 147:

this tradition and of the place of Engelhard within it is essential before Konrad's own contribution may be assessed.

In this study, I hope to show that the Amicus and

'Diesen leicht zu vermehrenden Übereinstimmungen oder Varianten in kleinen und kleinsten Motiven steht dagegen eine jeweils in sich geschlossene und als selbständige Leistung anzuerkennende Gesamtkonzeption gegenüber. Wir können sagen, dass Konrad im wesentlichen zwei Motiven eine herausgehobene Bedeutung gegeben hat: indem er die Geschichte des Freundespaares in das mære von hōhen triuwen verwandelte, gab er einmal dem Gedanken der triuwe einen neuen Sinn: jenseits der romanhaften Auffassung des Radulfus Tortarius sollte sie mehr sein als weltliche Tugend, jenseits der legendären des Amicus et Amelius mehr als trotz Verfehlung in der Heiligkeit aufgehobene überweltliche.' Are the two versions of the Amicus and Amelius tradition which Göttert cites representative of the entire tradition? Are there versions which Göttert has overlooked and in which Konrad's 'Gesamtkonzeption' is pre-figured?

Amelius tradition has three distinct branches, and that Engelhard has close affinities with only one branch, represented by the tale Amici in the Vaticinium section of the Historia Septem Sapientum Romae. In addition, and in particular, I shall show that the source of Amici (or a version closely related to it) was also the principal source for Konrad's Engelhard.

It will be necessary to extend the scope of the examination beyond the versions of the Amicus and Amelius tale. Hans Herzog's article on the influence of Chrétien de Troyes's Cligés on Engelhard,⁶ and Moriz Haupt's references to textual parallels between Hartmann von Aue's Der arme Heinrich and Engelhard⁷ demonstrate that Konrad did not confine himself to one source only. A distinction must be made, therefore, between primary sources (the Amicus and Amelius tradition) and secondary sources (any other material Konrad may have used in the composition of Engelhard).

⁶ 'Zum Clîes und Engelhard', Germania, XXXI (1886), 325 - 326.

⁷ In the critical apparatus of his Edition.

There are, then, three major areas which must be examined in the search for the sources of Engelhard. The first is the poem as an artistic creation in its own right. Chapter I will therefore be devoted to an examination of the structure of Engelhard. This examination will allow certain conclusions to be drawn about Konrad's method of composition. The second area is the Amicus and Amelius tradition. A survey of this tradition will be attempted in chapter II. A discussion of the third major area, the secondary sources, will follow in chapter III.

The attempt to determine Konrad's primary source will be made in chapter IV. The first step will be a two-fold process of reduction. The plot of Engelhard will be reduced to those motifs which Konrad must have taken from the Amicus and Amelius tradition. From this tradition, on the other hand, all versions will be eliminated which Konrad could not have used as a source for Engelhard. The second step will be an attempt to trace the relationship between the versions which are not eliminated. In this way I hope to show the point where Engelhard fits into the tradition of Amicus and Amelius.