

Genealogical Analysis of an Unpublished *Tristan*-Fragment, *Cod. vindob.* 15340

CON KOOZNETZOFF

There are eleven known, more or less complete manuscripts and sixteen fragments of Gottfried von Strassburg's *Tristan*. Of the fragments, *b* is amongst those that have caused editors and commentators considerable text-critical difficulties. It consists of two parchment leaves dating from the fourteenth century, contains 320 lines of the text (in Ranke's edition, lines 13353-13512 and 13833-13996) and is written in a dialect that has been described as "ost-mitteldeutsch" (that is to say, it was written in the area corresponding to present day southern D.D.R. and northern Czechoslovakia). It is preserved in the *Österreichische Nationalbibliothek* in Vienna as *Cod. vindob.* 15340, and has not yet been reproduced or published *in extenso*.¹

In 1874, Julius Zupitza collated the text of *b* with that of Massmann's 1843 edition of Gottfried's *Tristan*, and published the variant readings of the fragment.² Zupitza came to the conclusion that *b* was closely related to the three *Tristan* manuscripts M, F and B, but that *b*'s relationship was closest to B (hence its present designation), so that B either derived from *b* or *vice versa*. Over thirty years later, in the preface to his 1906 *Tristan* edition, Karl Marold agreed with Zupitza's findings, but added that *b* also had close affinities with a fourth manuscript, E.³

In his epoqe-making article of 1917, Friedrich Ranke claimed on the basis of his own extensive collations that the transmission of manuscripts within the MFBE*b* family was far more intricate than had been previously suggested. According to him, there existed many hitherto unobserved cross-connections within the group. He came to the conclusion that conflation or contamination had occurred. As a result, it was virtually impossible to establish manuscript relationships: "Da *b* bald mit B, bald mit E enger zusammengeht, ist seine klare Einordnung zwischen diese Handschriften nicht möglich, sondern wir haben auch in dem kleinen Kreise B*b*E durch Collation undeutlich gewordene Verhältnisse."⁴

The aim of the present study is to present the results of my own investigations of that part of the *Tristan* text which is commonly preserved by the MFBE*b* group, that is, the 320 lines contained in *b*. An attempt will be made to show that the genealogy of the above manuscripts is not as blurred and ill-defined as

Ranke and his predecessors have suggested. Conflation has undoubtedly occurred, for there is evidence that in the transmission of this family of manuscripts at least one of the scribes had more than one exemplar of the work before him. It will be demonstrated that conflation, where it occurred, was of an editorial, and not correctional, nature and that it is possible to isolate the places where the scribe switched from one exemplar to the other.⁵

The general impasse that *Tristan* textual criticism finds itself in today is due, to a large degree, to incomplete and defective collations. Friedrich Ranke's collations, which form the basis of present scholarship, were in part second-hand and incomplete. He made his own comparisons of W,B,N,O and P and of most of the fragments, but for M,F and H he used the collations of other scholars. He had no access to manuscripts E and R and did not use the youngest and now missing manuscript S. He was working moreover under conditions which were hardly conducive to scholarly accuracy, as he himself admitted in a postscript to his article:

Die Correctur der Capitel III bis V wurde im Herbst 1914 auf Lazarettzugfahrten gelesen, das Manuscript zu Cap. VI im September 1915 während eines Erholungsurlaubs abgeschlossen, den ich nach einer leichten Verwundung in Göttingen zubringen durfte. Aus diesen erschwerenden Umständen bitte ich die mir selber wolbekannte Ungleichmäßigkeit in der Sauberkeit und Durcharbeitung der letzten Capitel zu entschuldigen.⁶

Ranke, moreover, never published his own critical apparatus in full, either separately or in his 1930 *Tristan* edition and its numerous reprints. His chief contributions to textual criticism are his 'Verbesserungen und Zusätze zu Marolds Variantenapparat', published in the above mentioned article of 1917, and the 'Lesartenapparat' to his 'Auswahl' of *Tristan und Isold*, which appeared in 1946 in the 'Altdutsche Übungstexte' series. Both of these were incorporated, rather uncritically, into Marold's apparatus in the third edition (1969) of the latter's *Tristan*.⁷ This hybrid 'Marold-Ranke' apparatus eliminates some of the errors of the earlier editions. It nevertheless leaves a lot to be desired where degree and comprehensiveness of collation is concerned, as will be demonstrated.

The degree of collation, that is, the degree of detail with which variants are recorded, is a matter of some importance in text-critical theory, and one could perhaps note W.W. Greg's words of advice on this matter:

If we confine our attention to the more important variants, we can be fairly certain, provided we are dealing with the work of a naive scribe, that the readings are meant to be those of the exemplar, and are evidence of the descent of the manuscript in which they occur. . . If, however, we make our collation very detailed, we are met with difficulties. . . For, whereas, in major matters, a scribe will, as a rule, follow his exemplar, in the minor points of spelling and grammatical form he will be largely led by his fancy. Consequently, the more minute we make our collation, the

greater the number of non-evidential variants we shall be recording, and the greater the risk of chance coincidences between the manuscripts.⁸

If we examine the Marold-Ranke apparatus, we will see that it makes little distinction between non-evidential and genetically significant variants. Moreover, far too frequently collations are incomplete, thus not only failing to give full information, but also giving information that is actually false. Again, we could quote W.W. Greg, this time on the matter of comprehensiveness: "The total failure to record a variant reading is comparatively harmless; to specify some of the manuscripts containing it and not others can only lead to disaster."⁹

These shortcomings become particularly apparent in the collations that are offered for the sixteen fragments. By way of illustration, the F,B,E and *b* variants recorded for the first twenty-one lines (13357-13377) in the Marold-Ranke apparatus are first reproduced and then corrected on the basis of my own collation.

- und gibe dir ouch alhie zehant
dinen geheiz und din gewant,
daz aller beste, daz ich han."(336)
- 13360 Tristan sprach: "herre, deist getan."
Der spilman huob aber an:
sin harphenspil er aber began
so rehte suoze bringen, (5)
daz Gandin sinen dingen
- 13365 vil flizeclichen ore bot
und sach ouch wol, daz Isot
sere an die harphen was verdaht.
nu der leich was vollebraht, (10)
Gandin der nam die künegin
- 13370 und wolte hin ze schiffe sin.
nu was diu flieze und der floz
vor der schifbrucken also groz,
daz nieman an der stunde (15)
an ein vil hoch ors kunde
- 13375 zer schifbrucken komen in.
"waz getuon wir nu", sprach
Gandin,
"wie kumet min frouwe dar an?"

The Marold-Ranke apparatus records the following F,B,E and *b* variants for the above lines:¹⁰

- | | |
|----------------------------|--|
| 13358. din geh. Nb, den B; | 13360. Tristan B, daz
ist get. FBbEP; |
| 13361. der sp. der NB; | 13362. h'phen Hb, |

13367. harphe FWBNOE, herpfen bH;
 13371. der vlieze (!) FN;
 13376 und 78 haben Kapitelzeichen B;

harphe F;
 13369. der *fehlt* NBOP;
 13372. von FBEB, so Bb;
 13376. tu(n) FBbNERS.

There are a number of observations that could be made here. First of all, the variants recorded for 13362, 13367 and 13376 are clearly non-evidential, dealing as they do with orthographical minutiae and minor points of grammar. The first variant reading in 13358 and the second one in 13360 can similarly be classified as non-substantive. One could also have certain reservations about the variant recorded for 13371 and the first one for 13360. In short, close to half of the variants recorded for these twenty-one lines in the Marold-Schröder edition can be regarded as genetically non-evidential. Their relative insignificance becomes all the more apparent when we consider that the date and provenance of the manuscripts in this group (FBEB) range from early 14th century Bohemia to 15th century Alsace.

The second, and in Greg's view, far more devastating, criticism that can be levelled at the Marold-Ranke apparatus is that it is not complete in its collations. Not only does it omit to record substantive variant readings, but it also specifies manuscripts as containing a variant and others incorrectly as not. My own collation, for example, revealed the following omissions, indicated below in rounded brackets, the reading before the square bracket in each case being the lemma:

13357 gibe] (gen B)
 13358 dinen geh.] din geh.Nb(WE)
 13360 Tristan] Tristan B(NOERP). herre *fehlt* NP(RE)
 13361 spilman] (spiler Eb)
 13368 der] (der FBNERb, daz der HOP, waz der W)
 13371 was] (waren E)
 und] (und ouch b)
 13372 also] so Bb(E)
 13374 vil] (*fehlt* NE)
 13377 dar] (hin Eb)¹¹

From the above sample corrections, it will become evident that the Marold-Ranke apparatus of variants is of limited value in determining the relationships of the manuscripts in question. The manner in which the apparatus was compiled sets limits to its reliability. It is not the work of one man, but a conglomeration of the individual collations of at least four scholars, working neither co-operatively nor contemporaneously, nor according to any definite uniform principle.¹² Not only is a new collation necessary, but in collating, clear guidelines must be set down and consistently adhered to.

The criteria for variation which have been used in this collation for purposes of the present study were as follows: substitution, addition, omission and

transposition of a word or words, but also of a line or lines. All other variations (dialectal variations, minor points of spelling and grammatical form) were regarded as non-evidential and ignored. Quasi-substantive variants were also not recorded (e.g., *ersach-gesach*; *sprengte - sprancte*; *vie - vienc*; *wizze - weiz*; *dirre - dise*; *nimere - niht mer*; *swer - wer*; *enhabent dekeiner - haben keiner*; *ern ist nie - er ist nie*, etc.). In this rather parsimonious procedure Greg's postulate has been followed: "The minuter the collation the greater will be the number of abnormal variants, not only absolutely but relatively."¹³ On the other hand, to specify readings as variants which in their time and place were, or could well have been, regular alternatives or equivalents of the original reading is simply to court disaster. By applying the principle of parsimony and holding the number of variants to a minimum, a collation will produce more reliable evidence of the descent of the manuscripts in question.

For the purpose of the present investigation, the method of recording variants was modelled on the formula system used by Greg in his *Calculus of Variants*.¹⁴ The eleven extant states (ten manuscripts and one fragment) were compared not only amongst themselves, but also with Ranke's text. Ranke's text and all its supporting manuscript readings were then regarded as the basis and the others as being divergent from it. The letter Σ was used to signify the basis, the colon (:) to mean "differs from". If a line is omitted in one manuscript, say M, then in recording variants among the other manuscripts for the line in question, the sign Σ was replaced by a qualified symbol Σ_M . The method is best illustrated by a few concrete examples, with the following limitation. Since we are interested only in the MFBEb family of manuscripts, data from the other manuscripts have been disregarded. For line 13462, the various readings are as follows:

Ranke: si gaben beide ein ander muot
M: (11603-13578 missing)
F: si gaben beide einander mvt
B: si gauen beide einander muot
E: sy gaubent anainander mutt
b: sie gabn an ein ander mvt

The variant recording for the above line would accordingly read $\Sigma_M : Eb$.

For line 13908, the readings and variant recordings are as follows:

Ranke: der geloubege Marke
M: der gelovbege marke
F: der gelovbete marke
B: wan der gelovbte marke
E: der geloubet marcke
b: der gelovbet marke
 $\Sigma : B$
 $\Sigma : FBEb^{15}$

A chonil sie beten ihre wam
 an lei sie harte lichte wam
 nd wi so sie ten zwifel sihe
 da von euschender sie sich miha
 ar an ist ir nod und gach
 dem get sie lagende nach dar
 nd inder noch mehr durch das
 das sie ir hertzen leit erwar
 en durch die lust die sie dar an
 er vinnen und gehalten han
 dem selben sinnelosen sie
 dem gind och manke vake in
 ir was spat und vru
 allen sinen sin dar zu
 ar er ten zwifel und ten wam
 gemhete hin getan
 und das er mit der warheit
 vst sin hertzenliches leit
 il gern komen were
 tes was er geure
Iber kom es eines nachtes sa
 als er von maria
 ma hem zu geleit
 das er aber sin konikeit
 foren er leit
 vnd sie mit konikeit
 er in hen ewigen bes
 so vkers sich dar
 en stuck ten er ir richte
 vnd vst ir schoten ahte
 a me die koniginne
 ten kunne ir herten nue
 in bringamen leit
 da half bringame seu
 a stumen in beuten sinu dar hi
 witer list geferet ist
 konic der wack die konig
 vil nahen an das hertze sin
 nd vst sie zu mangel sinu
 in ir ouge und in ir munt

S chone sprach er zu ist n
 mha herten heber ten
 v nd ich von er zu scheuer
 das wetz got von hmel v
 Das minet mir tam sinne
 die geleite koniginne
 Die sie sin wacker sin
 svtzende sprach sie wider
 O me mir minenlichen owe
 owe zu wama ich alles e
 Das ditz viane more
 durch schimpf gesprochen w
 n v hore ich und wes es wol
 das es em erntt efer tal
 Sie hyp an und begunde
 mit ougen was mit wun
 I eichich dage er schemen
 so clegechen wemen
 Das sie tem emvalten man
 sin zwifel allen an gewan
 v nd wol gesworen herte
 das sie von hertzen tere
 w an an ten vromen allen
 vst meiere fallen
 A lo man vst ir munde gibt
 nach erntt abem trage niht
 n och aller vltzhe beiten
 wem das sie konnen wemen
 A ne minne und me gut not
 als offte so sie dumber got
 so die wemre kirche
 der gelobet manke
 S chone sprach er faget mir
 was wurdet er was wemmet n
 Ich mach wol wem sprach pfa
 dage ich das von mir miche
 Ich bin em elientes vng
 vnd han niht wem er er
 v nd so vil sinne ist ich hin
 die zwei han ich so got vlt



A third and final example, line 13932:

Ranke: war umbe schoene sprach er do
M: warumbe schone sprach er do
F: warvmme schone sprach er do
B: war vmbe sprach er schone do
E: warumb sprach er schone do
b: war vmbe sprach er schone do
 Σ :BEb

When all the simple variants had all been recorded for the 320 lines, they were sorted into similar classes. The results were as follows:

Σ :M recorded 12 times; Σ :F recorded 5 times; Σ :B, 16 times; Σ :E, 6 times; Σ :b, 3 times; Σ :Eb 10 times; Σ :BEb, 8 times; Σ :MBEb, 5 times; Σ :FBEB, 8 times.

In addition, there was a number of variants of a complex nature which had to be resolved into simpler components. In complex variants the groups are more than two in number. They can be illustrated by the following examples:

Line 14000

Ranke: iuwer neve min her Tristan
M: iwer neve der herre tristran
F: iwer neve min her tristran
B: ur neue her tristan
E: uwer neue her tristan
b: ew neve her tristran
 Σ :M :BEb

As Greg has demonstrated, "variants of complex types arise as the product of simple types, into which, therefore, they may, on sufficient evidence, be resolved".¹⁶ If, as we have assumed for the purposes of the present investigation, Σ preserves the reading of the archetype,¹⁷ it is clear that that of M must have arisen from it, and that of BEb, by further variation, from the reading of M. In other words, we have here an instance of successive variation, for the direction of variation would have been: iuwer neve, min her Tristan \rightarrow iuwer neve, der her Tristan \rightarrow iuwer neve, her Tristan. The complex variant Σ :M:BEb is thus the product of the original simple variant Σ :MBEb and a further variation of BEb from MBEb. Since variation in BEb could well have occurred without the previous variation in MBEb, the variant Σ :M:BEb can be written as Σ :BEb. Thus Σ :M:BEb, when factorized becomes (Σ :MBEb). (Σ :BEb).

Another illustration of a complex variant is afforded by line 13417:

Ranke: vriunt ir stat an des gouches zil
M: (line missing)
F: vrvnt ir stat ans govches zile
B: vruent ir steit uf gouches zil

E: vriund ir stand an gouches zill
 b: vrvt ir stet an gouches zil
 $\Sigma_M : F : B : Eb$

Successive variation is in evidence here too, and following the principle outlined above, this variant was re-written: $(\Sigma:FBEb) . (\Sigma:BEb) . (\Sigma:Eb)$

A second type of complex variants consisted in one or more manuscripts of the group sharing a reading with a manuscript or manuscripts outside the group. Take, for instance, line 13939:

Ranke: die wile ouch ich bin under wegen
 M: die wile och ih bin vnder wegen
 F: di wile ich ovch bin vnderwegen
 B: die wile ich ouch bin vnderwegen
 E: die wil ich auch bin vnderwegen
 b: die wile ich ovch bin unterwegen
 R: die wile ich ouch bin vnderwegen

For purposes of the present study, the variant recording for the above line, $\Sigma:FBERb$ was written $\Sigma:FBEb$, since the relationship of the manuscripts under scrutiny to others outside the group does not fall within the scope of the present study. Similarly, complex variants of the type $\Sigma:Eb : x$ (where x represents a manuscript extraneous to the group), was written as a simple variant $\Sigma : Eb$.

The resolution of the complex variants confirmed the pattern produced by our collection of simple variants. These, as indicated above, were $\Sigma :M$, $\Sigma:F$, $\Sigma :B$, $\Sigma :E$, $\Sigma :b$, $\Sigma :Eb$, $\Sigma :BEb$, $\Sigma :MBEb$, $\Sigma :FBEb$.

Having thus delimited all the variational groups and reduced them where it was necessary, we now have to take the important step from variational to genetic groups, that is, to infer from the observed affinities of the five manuscripts the ancestral grouping. We will postulate with Greg that every act of transcription introduces variants and that some of these are transmitted during subsequent transcription.¹⁸ From our data we can draw the following conclusions. Firstly, because of the presence of variants of the type $\Sigma :M$, $\Sigma :F$, $\Sigma :B$, etc., it can be assumed that no manuscript of our collection is an immediate descendant of any of the other extant manuscripts; furthermore, since in all of the above $\Sigma :x$ cases the readings are not those of the archetype, all of the extant states are collateral, that is, each state is terminal and represents the end of a line of descent.

Secondly, the presence of simple Eb and the total absence of simple Mb , Bb , Fb variants, indicate that E and b are collaterals and that both have an exclusive common ancestor, that is, an ancestor that is common to them and to no other extant manuscript. For purposes of the present study, we shall call this inferential manuscript α .

Thirdly, from the absence of simple BE and the presence of simple BEb (or $B \alpha$) variants, we can infer the former existence of another node in the

genealogical tree, a manuscript which was the common ancestor of B and α . We shall designate this further inferential manuscript β .

Fourthly, the occurrence of MBEb (or M β) and FBEB (or F β) variants shows that β had two immediate ancestors, which we shall designate γ and δ , respectively. Obviously, it is here that conflation occurred. The scribe of β had two exemplars before him, γ and δ , the ancestor of M on the one hand and that of F on the other.

The question that now arises is when and why did the scribe switch from the one to the other. The answer is not hard to find. The variants of the type Σ :MBEb occur in lines 13869, 13928, 13953, 13969-72, 13974, 13980, 13982 and 14000, that is, in the last 130 lines of the text under investigation. The variants of the type Σ :FBEB, on the other hand, occur more frequently and are more evenly distributed throughout: 13368, 13372, 13376, 13386, 13405, 13417, 13429, 13446, 13469, 13496, 13498; 13908, 13931, 13939, 13948, 13985. It appears therefore that the scribe of β (BEb) switched from δ (FBEB) to γ (MBEb) with line 13869 and thereafter jumped at random from one exemplar to the other, but showing an increasing preference for γ , the ancestor of M. The reason for his consulting a second manuscript is likewise clear. M has a number of lacunae, the largest being one of nearly 2000 lines (11603-13578), which overlaps by some 200 lines the segment of the text under present investigation. Since M could not possibly be one of the exemplars in question,¹⁹ we must assume that this large lacuna existed in γ , the exemplar common to both M and β . The scribe noticed the gap and filled in the missing sections from his second exemplar (δ), the ancestor of F.²⁰ From line 13869, he consulted both of his exemplars, but, as we have observed above, relied more heavily on γ , the ancestor of M.

The objection could perhaps be raised that γ did not share the large lacuna of its descendant M, and that the scribe used both of his exemplars simultaneously throughout, for obviously there would not be any evidence of MBEb variants for the lines where M has gaps. In other words, it could be argued that some of the variants of the type Σ :BEb could well have been MBEb, but for the lacunae in M. And indeed, present scholarship has accepted the view that the large lacuna in M (11603-13578) originated in that manuscript and was not present in its exemplar.²¹ Yet the even distribution of Σ :BEb type variants militates against such a view. M resumes the text with line 13579. If the BEb variants prior to this line were indeed concealing some MBEb variants, then we would expect far fewer BEb variants after the lacuna. This is not the case. The scribe of β seems to have been consistent and introduced variants at approximately the same rate before as well as after the lacuna in M.²² Far more conclusive evidence that the lacuna was already present in M's ancestor (γ) is provided by the following set of circumstances, which had already been observed by Ranke:

Der Schluß scheint nicht zu umgehn, daß M in dieser Partie für BE über-

haupt nicht als Vorlage diente, d.h. daß BE die erste Lücke in M schon vorfand. Stützen ließe sich diese Annahme durch Hinweis auf den ungewöhnlich engen Anschluß von BE and F während der Lücke, sowie auf das schrittweise Engerwerden des Anschlusses an M in der auf die Lücke folgenden Partie. .BE wäre also durch die Lücke in M zum vollständigen Anschluß an seine α - Vorlage gezwungen worden, wäre ihr auch nach der Lücke zunächst noch treugeblieben und erst allmählich zur älteren Vorlage M zurückgekehrt.²³

Ranke had however made the mistake of assuming that M was the exemplar of β , the common ancestor of BEb. But as stated above, this could not have been the case, because of the presence of Σ :M type variants. The lacuna was already there in M's exemplar.

Before we can come to the conclusion of our investigation, there is a small number of anomalous groupings which we have to examine to see if they invalidate our inferences as to relationship, or reveal further instances of conflation.

Although the text under consideration is preserved in more than ten states, transmission is relatively uniform. For nearly one third of the 320 lines, manuscript readings do not vary at all; and for approximately one half of the total number of lines, variation has not advanced beyond the single Σ :x type variant per line. Occasionally, however, one encounters a line of verse where variation has progressed to such a degree that there are almost as many readings as there are manuscripts. Divergent readings of this nature are the product of what Greg calls 'conditioned variants':

Most variants are spontaneous, that is to say that they are not in any way conditioned by variation in the exemplar: on the other hand some are conditioned, since a slip in one transcription often leads to emendation (correct or not) in the next.²⁴

As concrete examples let us take the following two lines:

Line 13384

Ranke:	ich waenez ouch wol so hoch si
M:	(line missing)
H:	ich wenez ovch wol so hoh si
F:	ich wen ez wol so hoh ez si
W:	ich wenez ovch so hoch si
B:	ich wene id wal so hoch sie
N:	ich wene wale so ho id si
O:	ich meyne daz daz wol so ho si
E:	ich wenes wol so hauch sy
R:	ich wene es ouch wol so hoch sy
P:	ich wene es auch wol so hoch sey

b: ich wene wol so hoch ez sei

Whichever way one records the variants for this line, an anomalous grouping occurs. One could, for example, take a piecemeal approach and record the variants as follows:

$\Sigma_{M:O}$ (substitution of "waene")
 $\Sigma_{M:Nb:O}$ (omission:substitution of "ez")
 $\Sigma_{M:FBNEb:O}$ (omission:substitution of "ouch")
 $\Sigma_{M:W}$ (omission of "wol")
 $\Sigma_{M:FNb}$ (addition of "ez")

Alternatively, one could use a single formula:

HRP:W:F:BE:Nb:O,(-M)

In each case there is an anomalous grouping, FN*b* and BE. However, it seems highly unlikely that all, indeed any, of the above variants are spontaneous or unconditioned by variation in their respective exemplars. If scribal emendation did indeed occur, as seems probable, then the variant groupings would not give a true picture of descent. As long as this risk exists, it seems safer to regard all of the variants as genetically non-evidential and exclude them from our present investigation. Again we would repeat Greg's postulate: "The *total* failure to record a variant reading is comparatively harmless."

The second example presents a similar problem:

Line 13406

Ranke: mich envüere der spilman
M: (line missing)
H: mich envure der spilman
F: mich envure dirre spilman
W: mich en fuere der spilman
B: mich vuere dan der spilman
N: mich in vore der speleman
O: mich enfuir dan der spilman
E: mich fure denn dirre spilman
R: mich fure denne der spilman
P: mich enfür denn der spilman
b: mich enfvr dir spilman

In this case a single formula recording (HWN:F:BR:OP:E:*b*, -M) eliminates anomalous groupings. However, as in the preceding example, scribal emendation has undoubtedly occurred and these variants must likewise be regarded as genetically non-evidential.

There are three further cases of abnormal groupings. In line 13873 ("der künec der twanc die künigin"), FBNOER omit the second "der" to produce an anomalous group Σ^b :FBNOER. In line 13950 ("der tuot ez durch iuch

und durch mich”), BNE leave out the second “durch”; and in the following line (“Her Tristan? sprach diu schoene Isot”) MF omit “diu schoene” which B substitutes with “duo”. For all of these groupings to be rendered normal, one would have to explain why *b* does not share the variant readings in the first two instances, and Eb one of the variant readings in the third example. This is not easy. There is no evidence of emendation. Chance coincidence is a possibility: a number of scribes could have independently deleted a word or words that are clearly redundant (syntactically and semantically, if not metrically), as is the case in the above examples. What militates against such an explanation however, is the fact that the groupings FBNOER and BNE are not uncommon elsewhere, outside the section of the text under investigation. If, on the other hand, these three cases are indeed intractable, as they seem to be, the solution can hardly lie in conflation: it seems highly improbable that a manuscript extraneous to the MFBE*b* family should be consulted randomly for a mere three lines. In short, these three lines present a mystery which seems to defy explanation, but one which even Greg’s severely mathematical treatise had to admit can exist in textual criticism. His *Calculus of Variants* does not demand that variant groupings adhere *exclusively* to a definite pattern, but “*almost exclusively*.”²⁵

The results of our investigation may be summarised as follows.

1. The Marold-Ranke critical apparatus as it appears in the third edition of Marold’s *Tristan* (1969) is based on defective collations and is demonstrably unreliable as an instrument for determining textual relationship. There is a need for a new collation of all manuscripts, which is complete, consistent and based on clearly defined criteria.
2. The genealogy of fragment *b* is not as obscure as Ranke and his predecessors have maintained. Its relationship to the other members of the MFBE*b* family of manuscripts can be established with a clarity adequate for editorial purposes. Its present designation is not totally appropriate, since its relationship to B is not as close as it is to E with which it shares an exclusive ancestor, that is, an ancestor that is common to *b* and E and no other extant manuscript.
3. Higher up in the genealogical tree, conflation had occurred. But, as has been demonstrated, this was of an editorial and not correctional nature: it is possible not only to distinguish the two exemplars involved, but also to account for the scribe’s seemingly vagarious behaviour.
4. Finally, our investigation has confirmed K. Marold’s theory concerning M (*Cod.germ.* 51 in the *Bayerische Staatsbibliothek*, Munich), one of the most important of the *Tristan* manuscripts. Present scholarship holds the view that the lacuna in M of nearly 2000 lines originated in the manuscript itself. Our investigation has shown that the lacuna was already present in

M's exemplar.

Notes

- 1 A detailed description of fragment *b* is to be found in H. Menhardt, *Verzeichnis der altdeutschen literarischen Handschriften der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek*, 3 vols., Berlin 1960-61, Vol. 3, p. 1401, under the rubric 15340 (Suppl. 2717). See also List of Plates. Grateful acknowledgement is hereby expressed to the Director of the *Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek* for making a micro-film of the fragment available for the purposes of the present article.
- 2 J. Zupitza, "Zu Gotfrids *Tristan*", *ZfdA* 17 (1874), pp. 409-414.
- 3 K. Marold, ed., *Gottfried von Straßburg : Tristan*. Erster Teil : Text, Teutonia, Heft 6, Leipzig 1906, p. LII. (Repeated in the subsequent editions of 1912, 1969, 1977).
- 4 F. Ranke, "Die Überlieferung von Gottfrieds *Tristan*", *ZfdA* 55 (1917), p. 383.
- 5 Editorial conflation occurs when the scribe has two or more manuscripts of the same work open before him while writing. Correctional conflation, which would appear to be much more prevalent, happens when a manuscript is "corrected", that is, when it is collated with, and absorbs reading from, some other manuscript or manuscripts. On the problem of conflation, see W.W. Greg, *The Calculus of Variants. An Essay on Textual Criticism*, Oxford, 1927, pp. 56-58. See also L. Okken, "Die Iwein-Handschriften a,p,r,l und E in ihrem Verhältnis zueinander", *GLL* 23 (1969-70), pp. 234-243.
- 6 Ranke, *op.cit.*, p. 438.
- 7 W. Schröder's *Nachwort* gives an excellent survey of the text-critical history : K. Marold, ed., *Gottfried von Straßburg : Tristan*. Dritter Abdruck mit einem durch F. Rankes Kollationen erweiterten und verbesserten Apparat besorgt und mit einem Nachwort versehen von Werner Schröder, Berlin 1969, pp. 283-303.
- 8 Greg, *op.cit.*, pp. 17-18.
- 9 p. 59. (The emphasis is mine).
- 10 Lines 11603 - 13578 are missing in M. (Marold's line numbering differs from that of Ranke's. Unless otherwise stated, the present article follows the former.)
- 11 "13376 tu(n) FBbNERS" as given in the Marold-Ranke apparatus is also incorrect, since R reads "getun" with the lemma.

- 12 See Marold-Schröder edition, p. 291.
- 13 Greg, op. cit., p. 44.
- 14 Greg, op. cit., pp. 14ff.
- 15 In the first instance there is addition, in the second substitution of a word. In the latter case, this particular formula is used rather than $\Sigma :M$, since Σ represents not only Ranke's, but also the readings of MHWNOR*h*.
- 16 Greg, op. cit., p. 30.
- 17 The archetype is the common ancestor of all the extant manuscripts and is not necessarily identical with the original. The variant recording for all the eleven extant states of 1. 14000 reads HFWRP (min her tristan) : M (der herre tristan) : BNE*b* (her tristan) : O (min herre her tristan).
- 18 This is what Greg calls the postulate of 'universal variation' (p. 8f).
- 19 The presence of $\Sigma :M$ variants is the proof of this.
- 20 The scribe evidently did not notice all of the other lacunae in his exemplar. Apart from the large lacuna of 1976 lines, M has five more in the segment of the text before us: 13817-13856, 13899-13906, 13937-38, 13993-13998 and 13969-13972, the last of which it shares with BE*b*.
- 21 See K. Herold, *Der Münchener Tristan. Ein Beitrag zur Überlieferungsgeschichte und Kritik des Tristan Gottfrieds von Straßburg*, Straßburg, 1911, pp. 75-76; F. Ranke, op. cit., pp. 230-233; P. Gichtel, "Die Bilder der Münchener Tristan-Handschrift (Cod.germ 51). Eine Bestandsaufnahme", *Festschrift für Gustav Hofmann*, Wiesbaden, 1965, pp. 398-399. Marold, on the other hand, was correct: ". . . die Lücke (war) in der Vorlage vorhanden und bemerkbar", op. cit., p. LV.
- 22 BE*b* variants occur in the following lines: 13372, 13392, 13422, 13442, 13444, 13482, 13494, 13504, 13506; 13915, 13921, 13932, 13957, 13963, 13976, 14000. The Marold-Ranke apparatus omits or gives incomplete readings for all but two (13506, 13963) of these lines.
- 23 Ranke, op.cit., p. 233.
- 24 Op. cit. pp. 8-9.
- 25 W.W. Greg, "Recent Theories of Textual Criticism", *Modern Philology* 28 (1930), p. 402.

List of Plates

Cod. vindob. 15340 (formerly *Suppl.* 2717), *Österreichische Nationalbibliothek*, Vienna; Gottfried von Straßburg, *Tristan* (fragment *b*); 2 parchment leaves, bound in incorrect sequence, 290 x 218; Gothic book-script, 14th

century, dialect *ostmitteldeutsch*.

Plate 1 : 2r (Ranke 13833-13912)

Plate 2 : 2v and 1r (Ranke 13913-13996, 13353-13432)

Plate 3 : 1v (Ranke 13433-13512)