

THE MANUSCRIPT RELATIONSHIPS OF RUDOLF VON EMS'S

BARLAAM UND JOSAPHAT

WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO RUBRICATION.

by

Karl August Zaenker

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of  
the requirements for the degree of  
Doctor of Philosophy

in the Department  
of  
German

We accept this thesis as conforming to the  
required standard

The University of British Columbia

March 1974

In presenting this thesis in partial fulfilment of the requirements for an advanced degree at the University of British Columbia, I agree that the Library shall make it freely available for reference and study. I further agree that permission for extensive copying of this thesis for scholarly purposes may be granted by the Head of my Department or by his representatives. It is understood that copying or publication of this thesis for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Department of GERMAN

The University of British Columbia  
Vancouver 8, Canada

Date May 2, 1974

Abstract

The medieval legend of the two Saints Barlaam and Josaphat has attracted wide attention since, in the nineteenth century, some of its roots were discovered in ancient Indic Buddha legends and parables. Our study limits itself to the German version by Rudolf von Ems, a free translation from a Latin source, written around 1225. Although this work was edited as early as 1818, it was not until the last decade that some detailed but rather opposite interpretations were devoted to it. All recent studies of Barlaam und Josaphat have been based on a reprint of Pfeiffer's edition of 1843 which, however, has grave shortcomings: it takes only a few manuscripts and fragments into account, selects their readings at random, and does not provide a reliable critical apparatus. Therefore, it seemed appropriate to work towards a new, truly critical text edition which would be beneficial to further investigations into meaning and structure of the work.

Our first step was to locate all existing manuscripts and fragments and obtain photocopies of them. For the ensuing process of assessing their relationships in order to determine their individual value for a text reconstitution, we tried an approach different from traditional practice. Instead of basing a grouping on common readings or mistakes alone, we began by comparing the paragraph

markings (rubricated initials) in the major manuscripts. We believe that they were placed originally to subdivide the narrative and that, generally, they were copied by later scribes and rubricators. During the transmission process involuntary or deliberate "misplacements" occurred which would show up in further copies and could thus indicate group characteristics. Therefore we listed all rubrication marks in a comprehensive chart and calculated the overall agreement between the major manuscripts in percentage figures.

The evaluation showed that the oldest two manuscripts C and D, as well as A and b have a very similar rubrication pattern, probably still close to the original one. This likeness makes it difficult if not impossible to determine if another manuscript is related to either of these. On the other hand, a clear affinity could be established between the hitherto overlooked manuscripts G, M, and, to a lesser extent, E, as well as between W and L in the first half of the text and C and L in the second half. We had divided the total number of initials into four even sections (covering ca. 4000 verses) to see if the "agreement figure" of one manuscript to another changes markedly. A subsequent look at individual "spurious initials" (mostly faults in rubrication) confirmed the first results and established a third definite grouping, that of DK<sup>C</sup>K<sup>a</sup> (K<sup>a</sup> is only represented by the text edition of 1818).

A comparison of the smaller fragments followed in which the main criterion was their textual agreement with other manuscripts. The rubrication was also taken into account but not overemphasized since conclusive evidence was often lacking due to the shortness of most fragments. We found that in three cases fragments belonged together to one otherwise lost manuscript (dq, mF2, and e1). Many of the fragments showed characteristics of the GEM-group, whereas only very few seemed related to either A, b, C, or D.

This sampling of common variants and text omissions throughout the work served also to verify the results gained by the "initial method." In general, the above mentioned groupings were confirmed or slightly modified. It became clear that in some cases a straightforward text transmission (as represented in a stemma) cannot be assumed. Especially in the loosely related body of manuscripts A, b, (B), C, L, and W, there is strong evidence of contamination which would make a tentative classification futile. A critical edition should, in our view, follow the old reliable Freiburg codex D as lead manuscript and confront its text consistently with the readings and paragraphs of the other two large groupings, mainly C and G.

The closing chapter outlines the spreading of Rudolf's

Barlaam und Josaphat as documented in its manuscript tradition, from its limited Alpine origin to its popularity within the Teutonic Order of Knights in East Prussia until its last flowering in Southern Germany at the end of the fifteenth century.

Contents

	page
1. Survey of <u>Barlaam</u> research to the present day	
1.1. Understanding of the text	1
1.2. The text tradition	6
2. The <u>Barlaam</u> manuscripts	18
2.1. Major manuscripts	19
2.2. Smaller fragments	22
3. Study of rubrication	
3.1. Textual criticism and comparison of initials	27
3.2. Chart of initials	38
3.3. Evaluation of the initial systems	
3.3.1. Frequency in the placing of initials	91
3.3.2. Manuscripts A, b, C, D	94
3.3.3. Manuscripts L and W	101
3.3.4. Manuscripts G, M, and E	104
3.3.5. The K-manuscripts ( $K^a$ , $K^b$ , $K^c$ )	107
3.4. Spurious initials; textual variants at the beginning of a paragraph	110
4. The smaller fragments	
4.1. Introductory remarks	117

	page
4.2. Matching fragments	
4.2.1. Fragments d and q	119
4.2.2. Fragments e and l	125
4.2.3. Fragments m and F2	130
4.3. Single fragments	
4.3.1. Fragment h	139
4.3.2. Fragment i	143
4.3.3. Fragment k	146
4.3.4. Fragment n	148
4.3.5. Fragment p	151
4.3.6. Fragment r	153
4.3.7. F1 "Basel fragment"	156
4.3.8. F3	157
4.3.9. F6 "Breslau fragment"	159
4.3.10. F7 "Freiburg fragment"	162
4.3.11. F8 "Fulda fragment" and "Prague fragment"	165
4.3.12. F9 The "Göttingen fragment"	169
4.3.13. F10 "Hannover fragment"	171
4.3.14. F11 "Oettingen fragment"	173
4.3.15. F13 "London fragment"	175
4.3.16. F18 "Berlin fragment"	177

## 5. Conclusion

	page
5.1. Final grouping of manuscripts based on text and rubrication	178
5.2. The geographical distribution of <u>Barlaam</u> <u>und Josaphat</u>	192
6. List of Works Cited	208
7. Map: Geographical distribution of Rudolf von Ems's <u>Barlaam und Josaphat</u>	213

1. Survey of Barlaam research to the present day

1.1. Understanding of the text

The story of Barlaam and Josaphat, though seemingly foreign to the literary taste of today, is one of the most widespread themes of world literature. Hiram Peri, in his comprehensive bibliography of the legend, including the few pre-Christian forerunners, cites versions in almost forty different vernaculars.<sup>1</sup> The Buddhist core of the subject matter and its complex and disputed tradition will not be considered in this study; the work of Peri gives a good introduction into this field.<sup>2</sup> We shall limit ourselves to the Middle High German version, created by Rudolf von Ems around the year 1225 after a Latin model. This so-called "Vulgata" version from which all the medieval Barlaam texts descend is itself one of two early translations of the Greek Barlaam, composed probably in the eighth century by John of Damascus according to diverse older sources.

Although both Barlaam and Josaphat are registered in the authoritative Saints' calendar of the Roman Catholic Church, the Martyrologium Romanum, the text itself does not represent a typical Saint's vita. This is indicated already

<sup>1</sup> Hiram Peri, Der Religionsdisput der Barlaam-Legende (Universidad de Salamanca, 1959), pp. 223-272.

<sup>2</sup> See also the study by Charlotte Nögler, "Studien zu Barlaam und Josaphat von Rudolf von Ems," Diss. Karlsruhe 1972, which takes into consideration the Stoffgeschichte.

by the rather unusual naming of two saints in the title: here the emphasis is not on the self-denial, martyrdom and miracle works of one heaven-inspired man, but rather on the instruction that the neophyte Josaphat receives from his God-appointed teacher Barlaam, his observance and dissemination of the Christian teachings and, finally, the reunification of teacher and disciple in a common ascetic life. We accept H. Brackert's thesis, that Rudolf's work should not be regarded as a "miracle legend" (Wunderlegende), but rather as the much rarer type of "conversion story" (Bekehrungsgeschichte).<sup>3</sup> The overcoming of heathendom and the victory of Christianity are demonstrated in several repeated instances. The conversion of the heathen prophets Nachor and Theodas (Barlaam 11030-11264 and 13179-13310),<sup>4</sup> the Christianization of his own kingdom through Josaphat and, as the crowning triumph, the conversion of his own father--all of this constitutes the glory (ruom) of the "elect" (der gotes erwelte reine, 15841) and bestows on him, in martyrdom's stead, the rank of sainthood. To this is also added a fundamental feature of most legends, the personal steadfastness of the neophyte, who must maintain himself against all worldly temptations; in the case of Josaphat, they

<sup>3</sup> Helmut Brackert, Rudolf von Ems: Dichtung und Geschichte (Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag, 1968), p. 214.

<sup>4</sup> Quoted after Franz Pfeiffer, ed., Rudolf von Ems: Barlaam und Josaphat (1843; rpt. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1965).

appear in the form of reason, love, and power.<sup>5</sup> The popularity of the Barlaam and Josaphat story in medieval times is due largely to its didactic passages in form of parables, the exempla, with which the lengthy instructions and Bible interpretations were illustrated and in which oriental fairy-tale motifs have found their way into the Western world.

The Barlaam material has been extensively studied by diverse disciplines during the past hundred years, which prompted J. Sonet to begin the preface of his book on the Latin and French Barlaam versions with the words: "Le roman de Barlaam et Josaphat a déjà fait couler des flots d'encre."<sup>6</sup> Surprisingly, on the other hand, the Germanists had treated Rudolf's work "stiefmütterlich,"<sup>7</sup> although such an authority as de Boor termed it "von der Form her . . . das reinste, klassischste Werk Rudolfs."<sup>8</sup> In fact this negligence is inexplicable,<sup>9</sup> the more so as Rudolf's Barlaam was one of

<sup>5</sup> see Johannes Erben, "Zu Rudolfs Barlaam und Josaphat," in Germanistische Studien, ed. J. Erben and E. Thurnherr (Innsbruck, 1969), pp. 34-35.

<sup>6</sup> Jean Sonet, Le Roman de Barlaam et Josaphat: Recherches sur la tradition manuscrite latine et française (Namur, 1949).

<sup>7</sup> Heinz Rupp, "Rudolfs von Ems Barlaam and Josaphat," in Dienendes Wort: Festgabe Bender (Karlsruhe, 1959), p.11.

<sup>8</sup> H. de Boor, Die höfische Literatur (Munich, 1953), p. 187.

<sup>9</sup> see Roy Wisbey, "Zum Barlaam und Josaphat Rudolfs von Ems," ZfdA 86 (1955/56), 294.

the earliest reprinted texts in the history of German medieval philology.

It was only in the last decade that Barlaam began to receive greater consideration, primarily due to the efforts of H. Rupp's two essays<sup>10</sup> and his reprint of Pfeiffer's edition. Since then there has evolved some discussion as to the literary evaluation of this work: does it manifest an inherent religious crisis of its author; is it purely contemptus mundi poetry (according to de Boor, Die höfische Literatur, pp. 177 and 181); or is the accent more on the work and effect of the Saint within the world, and does the author actually disassociate himself from the idea of asceticism presented in the Latin source, as R. Schnell postulates in accordance with Rupp's interpretation?<sup>11</sup> Does the "höfische Form" stamp the character of this religious work,<sup>12</sup> or is it to be understood almost as didactic literature (lere) and "Exemplum eines dieser lere entsprechenden Weltverhaltens," according to H. Brackert (pp. 214-220)? And how does this relate to the verdict of "Epigonentum" which has been commonly applied to Rudolf's works? Does his

<sup>10</sup> Heinz Rupp, "Rudolf von Ems und Konrad von Würzburg," Der Deutschunterricht 17, No. 2 (1965), 5-17. See also footnote 7.

<sup>11</sup> Rüdiger Schnell, Rudolf von Ems: Studien zur inneren Einheit seines Gesamtwerkes (Bern, 1969), pp. 84-115.

<sup>12</sup> Xenja von Ertzdorff, Rudolf von Ems: Untersuchungen zum höfischen Roman im 13. Jahrhundert (Munich, 1967), pp. 216 and 349.

reshaping of the Barlaam legend point into the future of this genre, and is Rudolf therefore not a mere imitator of the great medieval epic authors, but rather a forerunner of later developments, as H. Rupp sees it?<sup>13</sup> Or is there in Barlaam an ambivalent mixture of idealizing and problematizing tendencies, an unsolved conflict between legend and courtly romance, which would characterize the work as epigonal"?<sup>14</sup>

These questions must remain open in this context. In order to answer them, it would be necessary to make an intensive analysis of the text in respect to its Latin and Greek precursors,<sup>15</sup> as well as other similar literary works of the time (Saints' vitae, courtly legends and romances) to determine the specific position of Barlaam in terms of its genre. We have merely alluded here to the various facets of this work of Rudolf von Ems and to different approaches adopted by literary critics during the past decade in order to achieve a better understanding of the text and reassess the rank of its author.

<sup>13</sup> H. Rupp, "Rudolf von Ems und Konrad von Würzburg," 13.

<sup>14</sup> Ulrich Wyss, "Rudolfs von Ems Barlaam und Josaphat zwischen Legende und Roman," in Probleme mittelhochdeutscher Erzählformen, ed. P. F. Ganz and W. Schröder (Berlin, 1972), pp. 214-238.

<sup>15</sup> The study by Hannah Czizek, "Rudolfs von Ems Barlaam und Josaphat und seine lateinische Vorlage," diss. Vienna 1931 applies questionable categories and is of little use.

## 1.2. The text tradition

The aforementioned contributions, diversified as they are in their methods and interpretations, concur in one respect: they do not take into account the manuscript tradition of Barlaam. The only available edition of this work, 130 years old, seems to be tacitly accepted as presenting the "right" text and is not expressly questioned. An evaluation of the existing Barlaam manuscripts and their text versions has not been attempted so far, although it would seem important to come to positive conclusions regarding the text tradition—which also includes the text reception by later scribes—before drawing any inferences as to the intention of the author and the genre of the work. As long as the text itself does not stand on firmer ground, interpretations of it cannot be well-founded.

Let us take, for example, the discussion over the meaning of the author's digressions (the courtly "Damenpreis," 11735-870, and the "Schimpfrede," 12259-289) in the context of the entire work. None of the modern interpreters has remarked on the fact that these passages appear complete in only four of the twelve major manuscripts that we know of (in A, B, b, and E, as opposed to C, D, G, K<sup>a</sup>, K<sup>b</sup>, K<sup>c</sup>, L, and the Vienna manuscript W), and none has examined the consequences which could be drawn from this fact with regard to the reception or possibly even the conception of Barlaam

und Josaphat.

Or, to cite a lesser example, H. Rupp bases his thesis that Josaphat is summoned to be active within the world, to fulfill his position as a Christian ruler of a country partly on verses 6571-75, in which Barlaam admonishes his disciple not to follow him to his hermitage.

wis ein bredigaere gotes  
 unde ein lerer sins gebotes,  
 wan dus gar gewaltic bist:  
 alhie so kreftic niemen ist,  
 der wider dir getürre sin . . ."

H. Brackert, on the other hand, contradicts Rupp's argument as follows: "Doch vergleichen wir den Text. Barlaam sagt: 'wan dus gar gewaltec bist.' Der Genitiv bezieht sich auf die beiden vorhergehenden Substantive bredigaere, lerer. Es ist also keineswegs vom Fürstenamt schlechthin die Rede" (Brackert, p. 217). On examining the manuscripts, we conclude that Pfeiffer's reading in 6573 is based only on manuscripts E and D, strictly speaking. Manuscripts A and G come very close ("wan du des gar gewaltic bist," and "wan du is gar gewaltic bist"), and also manuscripts C, E, L, and W read basically the same ("wan du sein gar . . ." referring thus to gebote). Rupp's explanation is supported, however, by the reading of K<sup>a</sup> ("wan du gar gewaltic bist") and equally by the Berlin codex K<sup>c</sup> which omits verses 6571-74 entirely and continues by reversing lines 6575 and

6576 ("wan niemen getürre wider dir sin"), which would allude to the "Fürstenamt" rather than the "Predigeramt" which Brackert emphasizes primarily. To be sure Brackert's interpretation is supported in this case by more manuscripts than that of Rupp. However, the "correct," or rather the most probable, reading cannot be taken from a purely numerical "majority decision" from the manuscripts, as long as their relationships one to another have not been examined.

The rediscovery of Rudolf's Barlaam is connected with the names of the great literary critics of the Enlightenment, Gottsched and Bodmer. The seventh volume of the literary magazine Beyträge zur critischen Historie der deutschen Sprache (Leipzig, 1741, 406-414), edited by Johann Christoph Gottsched, contained a short description by Conrad Arnold Schmid and an extract of almost 200 verses of an incomplete manuscript found near Lüneburg (later bought by the British Museum).<sup>16</sup>

Shortly after this, Johann Jacob Bodmer printed several fragmentary passages of Barlaam und Josaphat in addition to his Nibelungenlied text.<sup>17</sup> Bodmer had received both manuscripts, the Nibelungen codex C and the Barlaam manuscript A, from the library at Hohenems Castle, and followed them

<sup>16</sup> See H. L. D. Ward, Catalogue of Romances in the Department of Manuscripts in the British Museum, II (London, 1893), 142.

<sup>17</sup> Chriemhilden Rache und die Klage, zwei Heldengedichte aus dem schwäbischen Zeitpuncte (Zürich, 1757), pp. 251-286.

in his edition. His Barlaam excerpts are headed by titles and present the following sections: "Anfang des Gedichtes" (1-62), "Eingang" (125-164), "Liturgica" (6673-6956), "Vortrefflichkeit der christlichen Religion" (10825-10950 and 12747-12894), "Hymnus" (13907-14049), "Traum" (12325-12532), "Ablegung der Krone" (14751-14904), and, finally, "Ende des Gedichtes" (16022-16164). Bodmer seemed to be interested merely in offering his public a characteristic selection of the work, and not in preparing a complete edition of Barlaam, which, after all, was only of minor interest to him compared to his Nibelungenlied studies. He did, however, take a first small step in the direction of a critical edition, in that he annotated his first passage with several variants of a Strassburg manuscript (probably the large fragment, Pfeiffer's sigle: a). This Hohenems manuscript used by Bodmer came into the possession of Freiherr Joseph von Lassberg at the beginning of the nineteenth century, who claimed it to be Rudolf's own handwritten work. Bodmer had already shown a much more enlightened judgment on the value of his two Barlaam manuscripts,<sup>18</sup> and Karl Lachmann in his letter to Jacob Grimm of March 27, 1821 dismisses Lassberg's assertion rather ironically.<sup>19</sup>

<sup>18</sup> "Es scheint, dass jeder Schreiber sich eine eigene Buchstabierart erfunden, und grosse Freyheiten genommen habe." (Chriemhilden Rache . . . , p. 253).

<sup>19</sup> Briefwechsel der Brüder Jacob und Wilhelm Grimm mit Karl Lachmann, ed. A. Leitzmann (Jena, 1927), pp. 289-290.

The first complete edition of Barlaam und Josaphat was published in 1818 by Friedrich Karl Köpke, with an appended list of corrections and commentaries contributed by the young Karl Lachmann.<sup>20</sup> Köpke, who was Gymnasialprofessor in Königsberg at that time, based his edition on two manuscripts found in the Königliche Büchersammlung at Königsberg (Pfeiffer's sigles K<sup>a</sup> and K<sup>b</sup>), as well as on a manuscript preserved in Berlin (Pfeiffer's sigle K<sup>c</sup>), of which he obtained a copy written for him by J. G. Büsching. In addition Köpke mentioned some of the variant readings of the Bodmer selections. Köpke defended the method of his edition in his preface as follows: "Es sind in den neuesten Zeiten über die Art, wie alte deutsche Gedichte herausgegeben werden sollen, verschiedene Ansichten bekannt geworden, so lange aber aus diesen noch nicht ein bestimmtes Ergebniss gezogen werden kann, schien es am gerathensten, die älteste von den Handschriften, welche zu Gebote standen [this would mean K<sup>a</sup>], zum Grunde zu legen und von dieser nur dann abzuweichen und die Lesart einer andern aufzunehmen, wenn die erste einen entschieden verderbten Text bietet; alsdann muss aber freilich in den Lesarten Nachricht davon gegeben werden. Dieses Verfahren ist bei nachfolgendem Abdrucke beobachtet worden" (Köpke, pp. VII-VIII).

<sup>20</sup> F. K. Köpke, Barlaam und Josaphat von Rudolf von Montfort (Königsberg, 1818). We quote from its second edition (Leipzig, 1838), henceforth referred to as "Köpke."

This principle of editing—following a lead manuscript—appears nowadays perfectly legitimate. It is however a long way from the method of textual criticism which became standard for medieval editions by the second half of the nineteenth century. It is understandable that Lachmann, who is regarded as having initiated this method in the field of German philology, expressed some cautious reservations in the appendix of Köpke's edition: "Übrigens ist Ihr Streben sowohl wie meines nur auf einen lesbaren Abdruck gegangen: zu einer kritischen Ausgabe fehlte es an Hilfsmitteln" (Köpke, p. 436).

Since the two Königsberg manuscripts in all probability were destroyed at the end of World War II, we remain dependent on Köpke's edition as far as our investigations into  $K^a$  and  $K^b$  are concerned. For this reason, it appears necessary to respect Lachmann's opinion, since he had compared  $K^a$  and  $K^b$  with Köpke's version. First, he makes several negative comments on the value of  $K^a$ , remarking on ". . . die ungeheure Menge von Schreibfehlern, die schlechte Orthographie, und die nur selten schöne, aber sehr ungleiche Schrift . . ." (Köpke, p. 428). While this judgment may primarily reflect Lachmann's own idealistic concept of a uniform Middle High German poetic language, his verdict on Köpke's reliability as an editor cannot be overlooked. In his correspondence with Jacob Grimm, Lachmann gives free rein to his displeasure. He not only reproaches Köpke for

being "borniert, unwissend, träge und lächerlich eitel," he also accuses him of dishonesty and deliberate deception (in another edition, Köpke had tacitly omitted several verses). He recalls ". . . wie 1816 bei meiner Ankunft sein druckfertiger Barlaam, mit dem Glossarium von 6-8 Quartblättern, aussah (es fehlten ganze Verse, von der schlechten Orthographie war eben das fehlerhafteste beibehalten, sammt allen Schreibfehlern, in der ersten Hälfte stand daz, in der zweiten das; im Glossarium kein Citat, aber enwizzen und andre Ungeheuer)." <sup>21</sup>

The only information given by Köpke which we can still verify concerns his notes to the Berlin manuscript K<sup>C</sup>. Many of its pages are not at all annotated, but at least Köpke mentions the many omissions in K<sup>C</sup>, albeit partially incorrectly: instead of 157,27 - 158,25 it should be 157,7 - 158,35, and instead of 356,31-32 it should rather be 356, 23-24 and 356,27-28 in Köpke's edition (this corresponds to 6229-6297 as well as 14307-308 and 14311-312 in Pfeiffer's edition). Neither Köpke nor Lachmann have given any information as to the placement of initials in the Königsberg manuscripts. Therefore, we can merely suppose that a paragraph in Köpke's edition compares with an initial in the text of K<sup>a</sup>.

In spite of these objections, we must naturally use Köpke's text as representative of K<sup>a</sup>, but we are entitled

<sup>21</sup> Briefwechsel, p. 223. Letter of November 5, 1820.

to some scepticism as to its accuracy. Moreover, the mere lack of a variant for  $K^b$  or  $K^c$  in Köpke's apparatus does not prove eo ipso that they share a particular reading with  $K^a$ .

Five years after the second printing of Köpke's Barlaam und Josaphat Franz Pfeiffer published his critical edition of this work. He named the author no longer after his overlord, the Count of Montfort, but rather according to his place of origin, Hohenems (thus following the continuator of Rudolf's Weltchronik). In the preface of his edition Pfeiffer sets himself apart from Köpke with self-confidence: "Seinen Zweck bloss einen lesbaren Abdruck zu geben hat er ohne Zweifel erreicht, und wenn der Abdruck auch Manches zu wünschen übrig liess, so waere es doch unbillig, den Massstab unserer Zeit daran legen zu wollen. Mein Streben gieng dahin, eine Ausgabe zu liefern, wie sie der gegenwärtige Standpunkt der Wissenschaft verlangt" (Barlaam, p. XIV). This recent stage in literary criticism to which Pfeiffer refers is embodied at its best in Lachmann's second edition of Hartmann von Aue's Iwein, which also appeared in 1843.<sup>22</sup> We can allude to this method briefly as that of classical philology, introduced by Lachmann into the field of medieval text editions. According to the usual description it consists of three steps: of recensio (critical examination of

<sup>22</sup> We used the sixth edition (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1962) which contains the original "Anmerkungen und Lesarten zum Iwein" by Benecke and Lachmann.

all manuscripts, investigation of their degree of relationship), emendatio (elimination of errors in the text tradition, securing the best text version), and conjectio (hypothetical reconstruction of the original reading in face of a corrupt passage).<sup>23</sup>

Measured against these standards, Pfeiffer certainly did not reach his goal--but the same holds true for Lachmann's own editorial work.<sup>24</sup> To begin with, Pfeiffer did not base his edition on "den gesamten damals bekannten Handschriften-Bestand," as J. Klapper maintains,<sup>25</sup> but only on the following six manuscripts: A, B, C, D, E, and b (the incomplete Heidelberg manuscript which Pfeiffer lists under his fragments). In addition, he draws on fragment a and three lesser fragments c, d, and e, as well as (for the Parable of the Unicorn only) on fragments f and g. Pfeiffer's apparatus contains also different readings of the Köpke edition (Pfeiffer's sigle K), without however passing on its variants for K<sup>b</sup> and K<sup>c</sup>.<sup>26</sup> Pfeiffer's choice of

<sup>23</sup> See Friedrich Neumann, Studien zur Geschichte der deutschen Philologie (Berlin, 1971), pp. 17-18.

<sup>24</sup> The discrepancy between Lachmann's rigorous theoretical demands and his own practice in the field of textual criticism has been pointed out convincingly by Rudolf A. Hofmeister, "Lachmann's Role in the Transmission of Parzival," Seminar X, 2 (1974), 87-100.

<sup>25</sup> J. Klapper, "Barlaam und Josaphat," in Verfasserslexikon, ed. W. Stammer, I (Berlin, 1933), p. 170.

<sup>26</sup> Except for two cases, the omission of the author's digressions in K<sup>b</sup> and K<sup>c</sup> (see Barlaam, pp. 449 and 451). Even here Pfeiffer's information is partially faulty in its details.

sigles is generally unfortunate since it does not differentiate between vellum and paper manuscripts by using capital and small letters, it does not rank b among his major manuscripts, and it confuses sigle K and K<sup>a</sup>. There were five further manuscripts which Pfeiffer should have been acquainted with, as they were already mentioned in von der Hagen's Literarischer Grundriss.<sup>27</sup> These were

G, the Gotha manuscript

H, a manuscript in Hamburg

M, the incomplete London manuscript mentioned above (p. 8)

N, a manuscript formerly owned by Raimund Krafft at Ulm

W, a former Ambras codex in Vienna.

Pfeiffer mentions G and W at one place in his apparatus (Barlaam, p. 449, concerning the author's digression), but he had apparently not consulted them himself.

Furthermore, Pfeiffer did not undertake to study in detail the possible relationships of his manuscripts; he contents himself with a categorical remark on the affinity of D and "K" as well as of B and b. On the other hand, he did not attribute an outstanding value to any of his Barlaam manuscripts which would have allowed him to follow it as a "Leithandschrift." Therefore he feels entitled to select the appropriate reading from any one of the manuscripts, depending on his own judgment alone (see Barlaam,

<sup>27</sup> Literarischer Grundriss zur Geschichte der Deutschen Poesie von der ältesten Zeit bis in das 16. Jahrhundert, ed. F. H. von der Hagen and J. G. Büsching (Berlin, 1812), pp. 282-94.

p. 409).

It cannot be expected that Pfeiffer's apparatus contains the divergent readings of all manuscripts for each verse; Lachmann himself emphasizes the need for withholding such superfluous information in his Iwein commentary.<sup>28</sup> But we cannot overlook the fact that the variants provided by Pfeiffer are frequently misleading or faulty.

As proof, let us rectify here merely some of Pfeiffer's information regarding the omission of verses. 91,21-22 are not missing in E; 120,11-12 and 120,33-34 are missing in b; 155,17-18 are omitted in E (and K<sup>b</sup>G); 230,36-38 are omitted in E; 275,32 and 277,10 are not omitted in d; three leaves are missing in C between 276,23-389,30; 402,3-4 reversed in K<sup>a</sup> and K<sup>c</sup>, but not in A. These are only a few out of many more incorrect indications, but the amount of suppressed information of that kind is even far greater in Pfeiffer's apparatus.

Moreover, Pfeiffer neglected to mention that C and E insert Latin Bible quotations in certain passages. In one regard Pfeiffer went beyond Lachmann's practice, in that he included paragraph markings in his critical apparatus. But here, too, his information is so sporadic and inaccurate that it can only be considered a step in the right direction. This lack is particularly regrettable in the case of manuscripts B and a which have meanwhile been destroyed.

<sup>28</sup> Iwein, 6th ed. (Berlin, 1962), pp. 362-63.

During the past 130 years a great number of additional text witnesses have been discovered. However, a small portion of these has yet been evaluated in the context of the entire text transmission. The first and so far only published attempt in this regard was made in the dissertation by F. Söhns.<sup>29</sup> Söhns based his study mainly on Pfeiffer's apparatus which explains many of its flaws. In addition to it, he took into account one further manuscript (L) and six fragments (h, i, k, l, m, n). Regarding fragments m and n, Söhns drew his conclusions from second hand, according to the manuscript descriptions and collations of Diemer and Minzloff (see chapter 2.2). Of fragments i and k Söhns had obtained a handwritten copy, whereas he himself examined only L, h, and l. Söhns's own collations of L, h, i, k, and l are added by H. Rupp to his reprinting of the Pfeiffer edition (Barlaam, pp. 464-505). This appendix is of relatively little value however, as L shows a very corrupt text version,<sup>30</sup> and two of the fragments, i and k, rank low compared with others.

H. Rupp is well aware that his reprint can only be a temporary solution (see his "Nachwort," Barlaam, p. 512). It has become obvious that future research into the structure and meaning of Rudolf von Ems's Barlaam und Josaphat can no longer be based merely on Pfeiffer's and Söhns's

<sup>29</sup> Franz Söhns, Das Handschriftenverhältnis in Rudolfs von Ems Barlaam, Diss. Erlangen 1878 (Erlangen, 1878).

<sup>30</sup> See F. J. Worstbrock's review, ZfdA 77 (1966), 114.

readings in the last instance. For the time being, the manuscripts themselves have to be consulted in each case. This impractical and time consuming procedure would make a truly critical edition highly desirable,<sup>31</sup> but this goal cannot be reached without extensive preliminary studies. Our purpose, therefore, is to contribute to this end by making an inventory of all existing manuscripts, assessing their possible relationships, and comparing their rubrication.

## 2. The Barlaam manuscripts

The following survey proceeds from the information provided by Pfeiffer and Söhns—updated, corrected or completed whenever deemed necessary—and is based for most of the remaining fragments on the listing established by Worstbrock (see above). In order to avoid confusion, the sigles introduced by Pfeiffer and Söhns will be kept here; furthermore we follow Worstbrock's numbering of fragments (our sigles "F1" to "F18"). Deviations from this procedure will be accounted for. Information on the age and material condi-

<sup>31</sup> Apparently, a new edition is planned by Siegmund *why not unified?* Prillwitz in Hamburg (according to his note of June 2, 1973). His unprinted thesis "Rudolfs von Ems BuJ. Überlieferung und lateinische Vorlage" (list of dissertations in progress in Jahrbuch für Internationale Germanistik, II, 2, No. 1828) has not been available.

tion of manuscripts is usually taken from the pertinent library catalogues or manuscript descriptions which are only explicitly mentioned when a point is under discussion (see chapter 4).<sup>32</sup>

### 2.1. Major manuscripts

Pfeiffer's text consists of 16164 verses, but none of the existing manuscripts contains this text in its entirety. Due to text omissions or physical damage, they are more or less reduced in size and could all be called "fragmentary". Therefore it does not seem logical to list manuscript b under "Bruchstücke," as Pfeiffer does, while it has preserved nearly as much text as C. Likewise, we rank the already mentioned "London fragment" among the major manuscripts, since it presents three extensive text sections from the beginning, the middle, and the end of the work, altogether more than half of all the verses. The smaller fragments, on the other hand, consist only of very few leaves, the largest of them does not even contain one tenth of the entire text.

The major Barlaam manuscripts which we used are:

A formerly at Hohenems, now Fürstlich Fürstenbergische Hofbibliothek, Donaueschingen. Vellum, thirteenth to fourteenth century; 16122 verses. Microfilm.

?  
Handschriften be-  
schreibungen ?

<sup>32</sup> We would like to thank all the libraries mentioned in this section for their assistance in providing microfilms.

- b Universitätsbibliothek Heidelberg, Cod. Pal. Germ. 811. Paper, fourteenth century; twelve leaves are missing, 14052 verses. Microfilm.
- C Bayerische Staatsbibliothek München, Cgm. 16. Vellum, 1284; eight leaves are missing, 14292 verses (including 58 verses of the beginning which were later added). Microfilm.
- D Universitätsbibliothek Freiburg i. Br., Hs. 480. Vellum, thirteenth to fourteenth century; five leaves are missing, 15234 verses. Microfilm.
- E Bayerische Staatsbibliothek München, Cgm. 273. Paper, 1459; 16118 verses. Microfilm.
- G formerly at Gotha, now Niedersächsische Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek, Göttingen, 2<sup>o</sup> Philol. 188/10. Vellum, fourteenth century; 15966 verses. Microfilm.
- K<sup>a</sup> formerly Universitätsbibliothek Königsberg, Hs. 898, missing since 1945. Vellum, fourteenth century; ca. 15660 verses. Text taken from Köpke's edition (see above pp. 10-12). Quoted as K, unless Köpke's or Lachmann's commentary explicitly assign a reading to K<sup>a</sup>.
- K<sup>c</sup> Staatsbibliothek Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Berlin, Germ. Fol. 20. Paper, fifteenth century; 15410 verses. Microfilm.
- L Universitätsbibliothek Bonn, S 502. Vellum, fourteenth century; 15590 verses. Microfilm (loan).

- M British Museum, Additional MS 10,288. Vellum, fourteenth century. Three large sections with missing leaves in between, 9142 verses. Listed by Worstbrock as fragment No. 12. Our sigle: M. Microfilm.
- W Österreichische Nationalbibliothek Wien, Cod. Vind. 2884. Paper, fourteenth century; 16028 verses. Our sigle: W. Microfilm.

The following manuscripts are either not preserved or unavailable:

- B formerly Johanniter Bibliothek Strassburg, A 144. Vellum, fourteenth century. Destroyed in 1870. Some variants and paragraph indications in Pfeiffer's apparatus.
- K<sup>b</sup> formerly Universitätsbibliothek Königsberg, Hs. 890b. Vellum, fourteenth or fifteenth century. Missing since 1945. Some variants in Köpke's apparatus.
- H formerly Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek Hamburg, Cod. Germ. 19 (acquired from the Uffenback collection in Frankfurt). Paper, fifteenth century. Missing since 1945 (see Worstbrock, 112). Manuscript M contains a few inserted pages on which J. J. Eschenburg copied short passages from H in order to integrate the three sections of M into the context.<sup>33</sup> Our sigle: H.
- N until 1739 owned by Dr. Raymund Krafft at Ulm (see Worstbrock, 113), missing since then. Vellum. Bernhard

<sup>33</sup> John Koch, "Fragmente von Rudolfs von Ems BuJ in einer Hs. des Britischen Museums in London," ZfdPh 13 (1881), 78-89, gives short samples of Eschenburg's copy.

Docen in his review of Köpke's edition mentions ". . . die Kraftische Handschrift zu Ulm (alt und gut, aber wo jetzt?)." <sup>34</sup> Our sigle: N.

P privately owned by H. P. Kraus, New York, formerly Bibliotheca Bodmeriana, Cologny-sur-Genève. Paper, 1469. Only illustrated Barlaam manuscript with 138 full-page pen and water-color drawings from the atelier of Diebolt Lauber at Hagenau. Ca. thirty leaves (out of 379) are missing. <sup>35</sup> Our sigle: P.

## 2.2. Smaller fragments

d Zentralbibliothek Zürich C 79c I. Vellum, thirteenth century, two leaves. Photocopy.

e Bayerische Staatsbibliothek München, Cgm. 5249. Vellum, thirteenth century, one double leaf. Microfilm.

h Universitätsbibliothek Würzburg. Vellum, thirteenth century. Eight leaves, slightly damaged. Microfilm.

i Staatsbibliothek Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Berlin, Germ. Fol. 720a. Vellum, thirteenth to fourteenth century, two leaves. Microfilm.

k Staatsbibliothek Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Berlin, Germ. Fol. 720b. Vellum, fourteenth century. Three

<sup>34</sup> Docen, Wiener Jahrbücher der Literatur, XI (1820), 113.

<sup>35</sup> According to the detailed manuscript description which Mr. H. P. Kraus kindly provided.

- leaves, greatly damaged. Microfilm.
- l Bibliothek des Germanischen Nationalmuseums Nürnberg. Vellum, thirteenth to fourteenth century. One double leaf, damaged. Microfilm.
- m "Göttweig fragment," its location could not be established. Two vellum leaves, thirteenth century. Studied from Joseph Diemer's description and list of variants.<sup>36</sup>
- n M. E. Saltykov-Shchedrin State Library Leningrad, No. 2568. Two and a half leaves. Photocopy.
- p privately owned by Gerhard Eis, his signature: 153. Vellum, fourteenth century. One leaf, badly damaged. Studied from G. Eis's transcription.<sup>37</sup> Our sigle: p.
- q Staatsarchiv, Schaffhausen. Vellum, thirteenth century. One leaf, damaged. Studied from Peter Ochsenbein's transcription.<sup>38</sup> Sigle q introduced by Ochsenbein.
- r Staatsarchiv, Schaffhausen. Vellum, fourteenth century. One leaf, damaged. Studied from Ochsenbein's transcription. Sigle r introduced by Ochsenbein.
- Fl Universitätsbibliothek Basel, N.I.4 Bl. S. Vellum, thirteenth century, one leaf. Photocopy.

<sup>36</sup> J. Diemer in Sitzungsberichte der Akad. der Wissenschaften. Phil. Hist. Klasse. Vienna, xi (1853), 640-53.

<sup>37</sup> G. Eis, "Ein neues Fragment von Rudolfs von Ems BuJ," GRM 49 (1968), 448-50.

<sup>38</sup> We are much obliged to Dr. Ochsenbein (Basel) for sending a copy of his transcription.

- F2 Staatsbibliothek Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Berlin,  
Germ. Fol. 737, 16-18. Vellum, thirteenth century. Two  
leaves, damaged. Microfilm.
- F3 Staatsbibliothek Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Berlin,  
Germ. Fol. 737, 20-21. Vellum, thirteenth century. Two  
leaves, damaged. Microfilm.
- F6 University Library, Wroclaw, No. R3259. Vellum, four-  
teenth century. One double leaf, slightly damaged.  
Photocopy.
- F7 Universitätsbibliothek, Freiburg, Hs. 529. Vellum,  
thirteenth to fourteenth century, two leaves. Microfilm.
- F8 Hessische Landesbibliothek, Fulda, Hs. C4a. Vellum, four-  
teenth century. One badly damaged double leaf. Photo-  
copy.
- F9 Niedersächsische Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek,  
Göttingen, Philol. 189b. Vellum, thirteenth century.  
Two leaves. Microfilm.
- F10 Kestner-Museum, Hannover, Inv. Nr. 3979a/b. Vellum,  
thirteenth century. One and a half leaves, greatly dam-  
aged. Photocopy.
- F11 Fürstlich Oettingen-Wallerstein'sche Bibliothek und  
Kunstsammlung, Schloss Harburg, I,3,4<sup>o</sup>, I. Vellum, four-  
teenth century. One badly damaged double leaf. Microfilm.
- F13 British Museum, Additional MS 10,288, ff. 157, 158.  
Vellum, thirteenth century. One leaf, slightly damaged.  
Microfilm.

F16 National Museum Library, Prague, IE a 7. Vellum, fourteenth century. One double leaf and another greatly damaged leaf. Microfilm.

F18 Deutsche Staatsbibliothek, Berlin (DDR), Fgt. 93b. Vellum, fourteenth century. One double leaf, greatly damaged. Microfilm.

The following fragments were unavailable:

a formerly Johanniterbibliothek Strassburg, A 94. Destroyed in 1870. Vellum, fourteenth century, ca. twenty leaves. Some variants in Pfeiffer's apparatus.

c formerly owned by Gymnasialprofessor Heinrich Schreiber at Freiburg, but not to be found among his papers in the City Archives at Freiburg.<sup>39</sup> Vellum, fourteenth century, four leaves. Some variants in Pfeiffer's apparatus.

F17 formerly Königlich-Öffentliche Bibliothek, Stuttgart,<sup>40</sup> but today not registered in the Württembergische Landesbibliothek at Stuttgart.<sup>41</sup> Vellum, fourteenth to fifteenth century, one damaged leaf.

Worstbrock lists incorrectly the damaged double leaf Germ. Fol. 923 Nr. 2 of the Staatsbibliothek Preussischer Kulturbesitz which, however, represents another independent Bar-

<sup>39</sup> We are obliged to Dr. W. Hagemayer of the Universitätsbibliothek Freiburg for this information.

<sup>40</sup> Hermann Fischer, "Fragment aus BuJ," Germania 30 (1885), 102-103.

<sup>41</sup> Letter of June 12, 1973. Worstbrock's information is erroneous.

laam version together with fragment C 79c II of the Zentralbibliothek Zürich.<sup>42</sup>

Fragments which consist exclusively of one or several of the Barlaam exempla have not been considered. They were taken out of the context of the narrative and revised by various authors, among them Stricker or lesser poets in his manner (the so-called "Strickerschule").<sup>43</sup> Thus they have a tradition of their own and can hardly shed any light on the Barlaam text transmission. This is true for

f Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Wien, Cod. Vind. 2705, Nr. 87-92 ("Wiener Strickerhandschrift")

g Universitätsbibliothek, Heidelberg, Cod. Pal. Germ. 341, ff. 188b and 202d ("Heidelberger Strickerhandschrift").

F5 Staatsbibliothek Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Berlin, Germ. Oct. 137, ff. 148<sup>v</sup>-150<sup>r</sup>

F14 British Museum, Additional MS 24,946, f. 65<sup>r</sup>

F15 Bibliotheca Bodmeriana ("Nikolsburger Bispelhandschrift"), see Ute Schwab, Die Barlaamparabeln, p. 175.

<sup>42</sup> This Zurich fragment is also wrongly attributed to Rudolf in Katalog der Handschriften der Zentralbibliothek Zürich. I. Mittelalterliche Handschriften by L. C. Mohlberg (Zürich, 1951), p. 45.

<sup>43</sup> See Ute Schwab, Die Barlaamparabeln im Cod. Vind. 2705 (Naples, 1966). Unfortunately, this study also goes astray occasionally since it relies on Pfeiffer's apparatus. Example: Barlaam 118,37 (4697) reads "ein lutzel honicseimes" not only in E and f,g (as U. Schwab claims, p. 199), but also in M and i.

### 3. Study of rubrication

#### 3.1. Textual criticism and comparison of initials

"Recent studies in textual criticism mark the end of an age-long tradition. The ingenious technique of editing evolved by the great masters of the nineteenth century has become as obsolete as Newton's physics, and the work of generations of critics has lost a good deal of its value. It is no longer possible to classify manuscripts on the basis of "common errors," genealogical "stemmata" have fallen into discredit, and with them has vanished our faith in composite critical texts."<sup>44</sup>

Before we undertake to study the relationship of the Barlaam manuscripts, we must question the validity of our project in the light of Vinaver's negative judgment. Vinaver is influenced to a large degree by the arguments of Joseph Bédier.<sup>45</sup> Both articles put forward three main objections to the traditional method of textual criticism (for the sake of convenience called "the Lachmann method," although Lachmann never propounded his ideas in a theoretical treatise), which could be summed up as follows:

<sup>44</sup> Eugène Vinaver, "Principles of Textual Emendation," in Studies in French Language and Mediaeval Literature presented to M. K. Pope (Freeport, N.Y., 1939), p. 351.

<sup>45</sup> J. Bédier, "La tradition manuscrite du Lai de l'Ombre. Réflexions sur l'art d'éditer les anciens textes," Romania LIV (1928), 161-196 and 321-356.

- a) The criterion of "common errors" is declared misleading in the grouping of manuscripts. In its stead Vinaver gives a thorough demonstration of how deviations from the right version can frequently be the result of some mental slip on the part of the scribe during the copying process.
- b) The further back a genealogical stemma is traced, the more hypothetical and less meaningful it becomes. Most of these stemmas end, or rather begin, with an archetype and two major branches of text transmission descending from it, mainly because the text researcher has been carried away by the "force dichotomique." "Le système lachmannien l'a lancé dans la chasse aux fautes communes, mais sans lui donner aucun moyen de savoir à quel moment il a le devoir de s'arrêter" (Bédier, 176). However, it is highly improbable that no more than two copies were made from most of the originals.
- c) A possible interaction of several manuscripts is not sufficiently recognized by the "genealogical method," which generally assumes a straightforward transmission from a single source to a copy.<sup>46</sup> Many of the medieval manuscripts however show traces of interference (contamination) from other sources.

Bedier concludes from these and other objections that,

<sup>46</sup> The traditional textual criticism declares itself powerless, indeed, against the occurrence of contamination; see Paul Maas: "Gegen die Kontamination ist kein Kraut gewachsen." Textkritik (Leipzig, 1960), p. 30.

in editing a medieval text, the editor should follow the best-transmitted manuscript, which should be emended only in the case of obvious flaws in the text. For such emendations there is no mechanical procedure based on a stemmatic grouping of the manuscripts, the editor must let his own taste ("goût") be the ultimate judge.

As indicated earlier, Pfeiffer published his Barlaam edition before the genealogical method was at its apogee. Thus his readings are selected entirely on the basis of his personal preference and not on a systematic scheme. It was not until more than thirty years later that F. Söhns undertook to establish a stemma of Barlaam manuscripts, and this work seems to confirm Bedier's negative-ironic opinion. Söhns divided all the manuscripts into two major branches, BCLE on the one side, and ADK<sup>abc</sup> on the other, according to the criterion of common errors. Parallel readings such as waere - was, wirt - ist, ersehen - versehen are considered as proof of a genealogical relationship (Söhns, pp. 4-5). Subsequently Söhns attempts to determine the "correct" reading of one manuscript and one manuscript branch over another on the basis of "innere Gründe" and by comparing them with the Latin version. His conclusion in this respect is negative: "Legen wir diesen Masstab der Kritik an die einzelnen Handschriften, so ergibt sich im Ganzen dasselbe Resultat, das wir von den beiden Reihen behaupteten. Es ragt keine an Qualität entschieden vor den

andern hervor, es hat bald diese bald jene einmal die richtige mit der Quelle [i.e., the Latin source] congruente Lesart erhalten" (Söhns, p. 24).

The doubtfulness of Söhns's stemma was pointed out already in a contemporary review: "Der Herr Verfasser hat bei bei der Auswahl der zum Beweise angeführten Lesarten hier wie anderswo viel zu wenig erwogen, inwieweit Handschriften auch zufällig und unabhängig von einander oder von einer gemeinsamen Quelle in einer Lesart zusammentreffen können, und daher . . . in der Mehrzahl solche Stellen vorgeführt, die nichts beweisen können."<sup>47</sup> Certainly, Lambel's critique is not an attack on the method involved, but rather on its careless application in Söhns's study.

However shaky this stemma may be, it has nonetheless remained attractive enough to be reprinted<sup>48</sup> and quoted as a standard of reference, even up to this day, as shown in an article by Gerhard Eis: "Die Einordnung des neuen Bruchstückes ist mit Hilfe der Dissertation von Franz Söhns möglich. Es gehört zur Gruppe BCLE, die sich deutlich von der Gruppe ADK<sup>abc</sup> abhebt. . ."<sup>49</sup> It is not surprising that Eis's classification of his fragment fails, since Söhns's information was incorrect and incomplete (see below 4.3.5).

<sup>47</sup> H. Lambel, Germania 25 (1880), 377.

<sup>48</sup> See Paul Piper, Höfische Epik, Dt. Nat.-Lit., ed. J. Kürschner, 4. Bd., 1. Abtlg. (Stuttgart, n.d.), III, 561.

<sup>49</sup> G. Eis, "Ein neues Fragment von Rudolfs von Ems Barlaam und Josaphat," GRM 49 (1968), 448-450.

To return to our opening question: in working towards a new Barlaam edition, is it possible to renounce completely an investigation into possible manuscript groupings and to content ourselves with printing one complete good manuscript? On first glance, this appears already problematic, considering the various lengths of the transmitted versions. The most extensive manuscript, the Hohenems codex A, contains numerous obvious mistakes as well as signs of a later revision, so that even Pfeiffer made use of it "nur mit grosser Vorsicht" (Barlaam, p. 408). The other nearly complete manuscript E is of a very late date (mid-fifteenth century) with unsuitable dialectal forms, and thus not applicable. The remaining manuscripts would require the insertion of missing passages, in which case again we would have to decide to which manuscripts to refer. To some extent a complete Barlaam edition would therefore be a "composite text" in any event. In our view, a diversified text transmission such as that of Barlaam makes a preliminary study of manuscript relationships imperative.

This does not mean that we believe in setting up a complete stemma, but rather that a comparison of the manuscripts would facilitate the choice of a lead manuscript (or of lead manuscripts). Based on it (or them), one would have to consult the main representatives of the other groupings in dubious cases and weigh their divergent readings. This would not lead to a mechanical principle of

selection, but, it is hoped, towards achieving greater consistency and accuracy in establishing a text version which would be more reliable than the one resulting from Pfeiffer's purely subjective approach. F. Whitehead's remarks concerning a new edition of the Chanson de Roland could well be applied here to Barlaam: "It seems . . . as though what is needed is less a new critical doctrine than a return to old and well-tried principles of textual criticism, which seem to have been strangely neglected . . . from the days of the early eclectic editors down to our time."<sup>50</sup> A cautious return to the more traditional ways of textual criticism, without the dogmatic pretension of the late nineteenth century scholarship, has also been observed and endorsed by Karl Stackmann.<sup>51</sup> A study of the manuscript tradition of a medieval text remains an indispensable preparation for a critical edition.

The criterion of "common error" has until now been mainly applied to textual variants. It is rare that a critic draws attention to noticeable concurrences in the placement of initials or that such parallels are used as an argument for a possible relationship of manuscripts. Editors have almost traditionally neglected the exterior struc-

<sup>50</sup> F. Whitehead, "The Textual Criticism of the Chanson de Roland: An Historical Review," Studies in Medieval French presented to Alfred Ewert (Oxford, 1961), p. 86.

<sup>51</sup> K. Stackmann, "Mittelalterliche Texte als Aufgabe," Festschrift für Jost Trier (Cologne, 1964), pp. 240-267.

tural marks in manuscripts, and where they have been registered (as in Lachmann's preliminary studies to his Parzival and Willehalm editions), they usually do not appear in the critical apparatus. Only recently has structural research paid special attention to these characteristics: "To some extent indications of the structure may be found in manuscripts. It seems therefore necessary to pay greater heed not only to formal principles themselves but also to those technical details of manuscript production, which, though frequently passed over by editors, may . . . assist in the determination of this structure."<sup>52</sup> Linke's study in particular pursues this aspect and takes the paragraph markings of the manuscripts as basis for determining the "authentic" textual divisions of the works of Hartmann von Aue.<sup>53</sup> B. Schirock's dissertation follows a somewhat similar course for Parzival. Schirock, however, stands in opposition to Linke when he considers the paragraph markings in the various manuscripts depending on their place and importance in a pre-established manuscript grouping. "Erst wenn wir die Überlieferung der Gliederungszeichen auf dem Hintergrund der Handschriftenverhältnisse, der Gruppenbildungen und Kontaminationen beurteilen, lassen sich gültige Ergebnisse ab-

<sup>52</sup> M. S. Batts, "Poetic Form and Medieval German Scribal Practice," JEGP LXII (1963), 702.

<sup>53</sup> Hansjürgen Linke, Epische Strukturen in der Dichtung Hartmanns von Aue (Munich, 1968).

lesen.<sup>54</sup> For this purpose, Schirock chiefly makes use of the work of Gesa Bonath who herself is one of the few scholars to recognize the importance of initials ". . . als wichtiges Hilfsmittel zur Feststellung der Abhängigkeitsverhältnisse. . ." <sup>55</sup>

Our study will take up this idea and investigate whether a systematic comparison of initials in Barlaam manuscripts can serve as a guide through the maze of seemingly contradictory readings. We shall set out from the following hypotheses which have to be differentiated later:

- a) Initials and other paragraph markings are to be regarded primarily as structural signs and not as ornaments.
- b) Initials are generally taken over from the source manuscript by the scribe (and the rubricator) of a copy and not placed at random.
- c) A marked agreement between the initial patterns of two or more manuscripts clearly different from the practice of others indicates a "genealogical" relationship. The extent of coincidence in rubrication can be calculated in percentage figures.

Some obvious objections could be raised regarding

<sup>54</sup> Bernd Schirock, "Der Aufbau von Wolframs Parzival," diss. Freiburg 1972, p. 63.

<sup>55</sup> Gesa Bonath, Untersuchungen zur Überlieferung des Parzival Wolframs von Eschenbach. Germanische Studien, No. 238 (Lübeck and Hamburg, 1970), p. 53.

these three statements which should be discussed at this point. With regard to a): Initials also fulfill an aesthetic function by creating colourful patterns on a manuscript page, sometimes they are of decidedly artistic character (illuminated initials). Their prime purpose is nevertheless to organize the narrative into smaller units. The rare case that a scribe places initials for purely aesthetic reasons without concern for the intrinsic structure of the text is described for the Parzival codex G,<sup>56</sup> and for the Munich Tristan codex (Cgm 51).<sup>57</sup> Such manuscripts would naturally be of no value for our purpose. The same would hold true for manuscripts in which initials are set according to a mechanical principle, e.g., every thirty verses. In Barlaam manuscripts, however, there is no such regularity nor any striking visual principle in the placement of the initials; one needs only to look at the first thousand verses, which have been uniformly handed down.

With regard to b): In the field of textual criticism it is commonly acknowledged that there were wide differences in the reliability of scribes. We distinguish the "good" scribe who preserved the version of his source manuscript without wilful alterations from the "thinking" scribe who tried to improve on the original. The same distinction can be applied regarding rubrication. It is true that the

<sup>56</sup> B. Schirock, p. 97.

<sup>57</sup> M. S. Batts, 699.

execution of the initial by the rubricator can be an additional source of errors, but such flaws can usually be identified rather easily. That a scrupulous scribe overlooks, misreads, or accidentally adds an initial occurs now and then. We suggest, however, that such errors are less likely at rubricated paragraphs than in the middle of a text passage. The scribe's concentration is more challenged at these points than anywhere else, since he has to leave out the initial capital letter, indent one line or even several lines, and write the required letter minutely on the margin ("Repräsentant") so that the rubricator can execute the correct initial afterwards. Thus, the position and the reading of a paragraph beginning are more likely to be handed down through generations relatively undisturbed and can generally be considered more reliable than most text variants. Naturally, in the case of a "thinking" scribe who might introduce paragraph divisions of his own, it would be very difficult to determine his source just by looking at the rubrication. But again, other copies dependent on his manuscript would be even more easily recognized, and this would result at least in a partial grouping.

With regard to c): A coincidental agreement can occur with initials just as with readings. The scribes could set paragraph markings independently from one another at the same prominent places in the narrative (e.g., at the beginning of a speech, change of location or time), where their

sources did not have an initial. Obviously this might lead to wrong conclusions with respect to a manuscript grouping, but this coincidence factor diminishes when we compare texts of greater length. Therefore it seems reasonable to express the agreement of rubrication in percentage figures among the larger manuscripts only: in comparing the smaller fragments we shall pay special heed to the placement of initials, but only in conjunction with a comparison of textual variants.

The common variants at the beginning of a paragraph could also be of great importance, as they are usually produced by a rubricator who misinterpreted a "Repräsentant."<sup>58</sup> We concur with A. Dain's remark: "Les fautes dues aux erreurs de rubrication font la joie des philologues et sont souvent d'un secours précieux pour le classement des manuscrits."<sup>59</sup>

In spite of our statistical approach, we must not forget that we are dealing with literary products from which we cannot expect mathematical regularity. Bédier's words: ". . . le critique littéraire ne devrait jamais consentir . . . à s'effacer devant le statisticien"<sup>60</sup> should prevail

<sup>58</sup> Heinz Schanze provides some examples for the Willehalm manuscripts in "Dreissigerinitialen in der Willehalm-Handschrift G," in Wolfram-Studien, ed. W. Schröder (Berlin, 1970), pp. 174-176.

<sup>59</sup> A Dain, Les manuscrits (Paris, 1964), p. 37.

<sup>60</sup> J. Bédier, Romania LIV (1928), 329.

as a warning. Nonetheless, a statistically evaluated comparison of rubrication could provide textual criticism with information which, properly interpreted, could shed more light on the text tradition of Barlaam und Josaphat.

### 3.2. Chart of initials

The following chart of initials sets out from the paragraphs in Pfeiffer's text (in the verse count of the reprinted edition), in order to show on which manuscripts Pfeiffer based his subdivision. The manuscripts are subsequently listed in alphabetical order with the exception of M which follows after G for the sake of a better perspective. In the few cases where Pfeiffer's apparatus notes initials for B, these will be mentioned on the right hand margin, together with the initials of all fragments which will be dealt with in chapter four. Initials which match a paragraph in Pfeiffer's edition are marked as x on the same level, or as X in the case of a large initial. Initials at other places are indicated by the verse number (last three digits) for the first manuscript, underlined if it is a large initial. A straight vertical line symbolizes a loss of text in a manuscript due to physical damage, irregular vertical line indicates an omitted text passage.

The numerous paragraph titles which can be found in some manuscripts (mainly in E, titles such as "hie chumbt

barlaam zue Josaphat") are not mentioned in the chart. They are usually added on the margin of the manuscript and do not constitute genuine structural marks. However, we indicated where there is a capitulum sign instead of an initial (in our chart as \*). Probably the scribe had overlooked an initial in his source and afterwards marked the paragraph by a capitulum sign on the margin.

In a few cases it is doubtful whether there was meant to be an initial or not. Places where the rubricator clearly forgot to draw an initial—where a "Repräsentant" or an indentation give evidence of the scribe's intention—are represented in the chart in parentheses. This is more difficult to decide in the case of the initial J (occurring very often with the name Josaphat). This letter is mostly drawn out on the margin and by its particular shape does not require any indentation at the beginning of the lines. It is not surprising to see that all large initials in the Barlaam manuscripts (with the exception of the very first initial "Alpha" and 3045 in L) are capital J's. For this reason alone, as well as for their very haphazard occurrence, we do not believe that these large initials constitute the remains of an authentic major structure of the work ("Grossgliederung"), comparable to the one that B. Schirock tried to establish for Parzival on this basis. Nevertheless, we will keep the distinction between regular and large initials since it might be another aid for esta-

blishing relationships. At places where a marginal initial J was most likely forgotten (e.g., "Osaphat"), we set an (X).

The size of "regular" initials is sometimes not consistently maintained by the scribe (who allotted the free space) and the rubricator (who executed the design). In the beginning of manuscript D, initials vary between one and two lines height. In L the standard size of initials is increased after verse 1287 from two to three lines. The scribe of W, on the other hand, seems to have been fond of drawing out the shafts of capitals at the beginning of a line, mainly at predominant places where one might otherwise expect an initial (e.g., 11603 and 12435). Here only a comparison with the usual practice of rubrication in W can tell which one is a true initial and should be taken into the chart. It would be of great help in some doubtful cases to check with the original manuscripts themselves as coloration and variations in ink do not show sufficiently on microfilms. But these few exceptions, even if misinterpreted, could not seriously distort the overall statistical results.



	A	b	C	D	E	G	M	K	K <sup>c</sup>	L	W	
335	x	x	x	X	x 341	x			x	x	x	
369	x		x	x						x	x	
401	x		x	x	x	x		x		x	x	
431	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x	F2
475	x	x	x	x	x	x		x		x	x	F2
509	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x	F2
545	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x		x	F2
577	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x	F2
617	x	x	x	x							x	F2
659	x	(x)	x	x	x	x			x	x	x	F2





	A	b	C	D	E	G	M	K	K <sup>C</sup>	L	W
1317	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
1347	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
1379	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x
									392		
1423	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x
1455	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x
1491	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
1513	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x
1545	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x
1585	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x
1619	x		x	x	x	x					

	A	b	C	D	E	G	M	K	K <sup>c</sup>	L	W	
1651	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x	
1691	x	x	x	x	x	x			x			
1729	x	x	x	x	x	x			x	x	x	
1765	x	x	x	x		x		x	x	x	x	
1795	x	x	x	x								
					815	x			x			
1837	x	x	x	x	x	x			x	x		
1863	x	x	x	x	x	x				x	x	
1897	x		x						x			
1937	x	x	x	x	x	x			x	x	x	p
1981	x	x	x	x	x	x			x		x	p

	A	b	C	D	E	G	M	K	K <sup>C</sup>	L	W	
2019	x	x	x	x					x		x	
2051	x	x	x	x					x	x	x	F7
2089	x	x	x	x					x		x	F7
2131	x	x	x	x	x	x			x	x	x	F7
2161	x		x	x	x	x						F7
2196		195	x	x					(175)	x		B:2195
2241	x	x	x	x					x		x	B
2281	x	x	x	x	x	x			x	x	x	
2311	x	x	x	x	x	x			x	x	x	
2351	x	x	x	x	343	x			x		x	

	A	b	C	D	E	G	M	K	K <sup>c</sup>	L	W	
2387	x	x	x	x					x	x	x	
2429	X		X	x	x	x			x		X	B
2463	x	x	x	x	x	x			x		x	
2493	x	x	x	x	x	x			x		x	
2529	x	x	x	x	x	x			x	x	x	
2569	x	x		x						567	x	B
2615	x	x	x	x					x	x	x	
2649	x	x	x								x	B
2693	x	x	x		x	x		x	x	x	x	n
2729	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x	n

	A	b	C	D	E	G	M	K	K <sup>c</sup>	L	W
2761	x	x	x		x	x			x	x	x
2797	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x
2837	x	x	x	x	x						x
2881	x	x	x	x				x		x	x
2914	915		x	x							
		933				937	x				B:933
2947	x		x	x					x	x	x
2985	X	x	X	x				x			X
					009	x					
3019	x	x	x	x						x	x
											B
3045	x	x	039 x	x	x	x			x	X	x
3083	x	x	x	x	x	x		x			x
					101	x					



	A	b	C	D	E	G	M	K	K <sup>C</sup>	L	W	
3425	x	x	x	x	x	x			x	x	x	m
3459	x	x	X	x		X		X	x			
3511	x	x	x						x	x	x	B
3541	x	x	x	x	X	x		x	x	x	x	
3573	x	x		x						x	x	B
3603			x	x				x	x			
3643	x	x	x	x	x	*			x	x	x	
3675	x	x		x				x			x	
			679									
3701	x	x	x	x				x		x	x	
3733	x	x	x	x	x	x		x			x	



	A	b	C	D	E	G	M	K	K <sup>c</sup>	L	W	
4067	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	F8
4105	x	x	x	x				x	x	x	x	
4137	x	x	x	x				x	x	x	x	
								147				
4175	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	F8
4207	x			x				x				
			211									
4233	x	x	x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
4269	x	x	x						x		x	
4301	x	x	x					x	x		x	
					311	x	x					
4341	x	x	x		325	x	x			x	x	B
			355									
4375	x	x	x					x	x			1

	A	b	C	D	E	G	M	K	K <sup>c</sup>	L	W	
4391			X	} }	x	(X)	X			X	X	
4413	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	1
4457	x	443	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	B:443 1
4491	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x		x	1
4527	x	x	x	x					x	x	x	1,B
4565	x		543 x	x	x	(x)	x	x	x	x	x	1
4597	x	x	x	x	603	x	x	x	x			
4629	x	x	x	x								
4663	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	*	i
4705	x	x	X					x		X	X	

	A	b	C	D	E	G	M	K	K <sup>c</sup>	L	W	
4737	x	x	x	x					x			
4767		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	i
775								x				
4797	x	x	x	x					x			B
4829		x	x					x	x	x	x	
4861	x	x	x	x				x	x			
4895		x		x	x	x	x			x	x	
897												
4931	x	x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
4963	x	x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
4991	x	x		x				x	x	987		i:987
					5009	x	x			x	x	i
5027	x	x		X	x	X	x	x	X	X	X	<u>i</u>
					041							

	A	b	C	D	E	G	M	K	K <sup>c</sup>	L	W	
5059	x	x		x					x	x	x	B
5091	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	i
5121	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	i
					143	x	x					i,k
5151	x	x	x	x				x	x	x		
5189	x	x	x	x				x	x	x	x	F13
5223	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x	x	x	k,F13
5265	x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	k,F2,F13
					273							
5307	x		X	x	x	X	x	x	x	X	X	<u>k</u> , (F2)
					321							
5337	x		x	x				x	x			
5369	x		x	x				x	x	x	x	F2
					375							
					381	x	x					k

	A	b	C	D	E	G	M	K	K <sup>c</sup>	L	W	
5396	x		x	x				x	x			
5437	x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	k, F2
					447							
5467	x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
					479							
5497	x		X	x	x (X)	x	x	x	x	X	X	<u>F2</u>
5525	x		x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	
5555	x		x	x	x	x	x					
5585	x		x	x					x			
					599							
5615	x		x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	k, n
					631	x	x			x		k, n, B
5649			x	x				x		x	x	
653					663	x	x					k, B
5679			x	x	x			x	x	x	x	
					689							
					695							

	A	b	C	D	E	G	M	K	K <sup>c</sup>	L	W	
5713	x		x	x		x	x	x	x	703	x	k
5745	x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	k
5785	x		x	x				x	x	x	x	
5817	x		x	x					x	x		
					825	x	x					B
5855	x		x	x					x			
5893	x		x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	F18
5933	x		X	x				x	x	(X)	X	
5965	x		x	x				x	x	x	x	
					973	x	x					B, F18
5995	x		x	x	x	x	x			x	x	B
6031	x		x	x		x		x	x	x	x	n,q



	A	b	C	D	E	G	M	K	K <sup>c</sup>	L	W		
6397	x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	m,q,F11		
6427	x		x	x				x	x	x	x	m	
6459	x		x	x		467	x	x	x		x	x	m
6491	x		x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	m,q,F16	
6521			x	x	x	X	x	x	x	x	x	m	
6551			x	x	x	x	x	x	x				
		553											
										567			
6587	x		x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x		
6613	x		x	x		x	x			x	x		
6645	x		x	x				x	x	x	x		
6677	x		x	x				x					
						697	x	x	x			F11	





	A	b	C	D	E	G	M	K	K <sup>c</sup>	L	W
7351	x	x	x	x				x	x	x	x
					365	x	x				
7383	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x
7415	x	x	X	X				x	} (X)	X	
7447	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
7473		x	x	x	467	x	x		x	x	
7503	x		x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x
7537	x	x	x	x	541	x	x	x		x	x
7569	x	x	x	x							B
7599	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
7637	x	x	x	x	625	x	x	x	x	x	x

	A	b	C	D	E	G	M	K	K <sup>C</sup>	L	W
7667	x		x	x							
7699	x	x	x	x							
7729	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x	x	x
7759	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
7789	x	x	x	x		x	x	x		x	x
7817	x	x	x	x	x	x	x				
7847	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x
7877	x	x	x	x				x	x	x	x
					887	x	x				
7907	x	x	x	x		x	x	x		x	x
7939	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x

	A	b	C	D	E	G	M	K	K <sup>c</sup>	L	W
7969	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x
8003	x	x	x	x							
8033		x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x
035											
8063	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		
					085	x	x				
8101		x	x	x		x	x	x		x	x
8137	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x
8165	x	x	x	x							
8195	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x
8223		x	x	x							B
8255	x	x	x	x						x	x



	A	b	C	D	E	G	M	K	K <sup>c</sup>	L	W	
8602	601	x	x	x					590			B:601
8631	X		X	x					x			B
8659	x	x	x	x								
8693	x	x 703	X	X	x	X	X	x	x	X	X	F6
8729	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	F6
8761	x	x	x	x	x	x	x					F6
8791	x	x	x	x						x	x	
8819		x	x	x					x			
8851	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
8881	x	x	x	x					x	x	x	
			869							869		
			895		x	x	x			x		

	V	b	C	D	E	G	M	K	Kc	L	W
8911	x	x	(x)	x	x	x	x	x	x		
8943	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	F6
8975				x	x						
979											
9005	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
9035	x	x	x								
9065	x	x	x	x							
9099	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
9129	x	x	x	x							
139											
9159	x	x	x	x							
9189	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	

207

	A	b	C	D	E	G	M	K	K <sup>c</sup>	L	W
9220 219		x	x	x							
9247	x	x	x	x		x		x	x	x	x
9277	x		x	x	x	x		x	x		
9313	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x
										331	
9343	x	x		x		x		x	x	x	x
										353	
										367	
9373		x		x						379	x
											B
9403	x	x		x	x	x		x	x	x	x
9433		x		x							B
9463	x	*		x	x	x			x	x	x
9495	x	x		x		x		x		x	

	A	b	C	D	E	G	M	K	KC	L	W
9527	x	x		x		X		x	x	X	X
9557	x	x		x							x
					567	x				x	
9591	x	x		x							X
					599	x				x	
9629		x		x	x	x		x	x	x	
					647			x		x	x
9665	x	x		x		x		x	x	x	x
					679			x			
9701	x	x		x	x			x	x	x	x
					707	x					
9735	x	*		x	x	x				713 721 x 741 747 757	x
9765	x	x		x						x	x
						777					
9799	x	x	x	x						x	x
9829	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x

	A	b	C	D	E	G	M	K	K <sup>c</sup>	L	W
9859	x	x	x	x	x	x				x	x
9891	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x
9923		*	x	x					x		X
9945	x		x		x	x			x		
	957	x		x							<u>961</u>
9987	x	*		x	x	x					x
10017	x	x		x							x
10047	x	x		x	x	(X)		x	x		X
					071	X		x			
10083	x	x		x	x	x		x	x		x
10117	x	*		x	x	x		x	x		x
10153	x	x		x	143	x		x			x
					x	x		x			

	A	b	C	D	E	G	M	K	K <sup>c</sup>	L	W
10185	x	x	}	x	x	x		x		}	x
						207	x		198 x		
10217	x	x	}	x	x	x		x	x	}	x
						229	x		x		
10251	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x
						267					
10289	x	x	x	x	x			x		x	
						307		x			
10325		x	x	x	x	x		x		x	x
10359	x	x	X	x				x	x	X	X
					373	x		x		x	B
10395	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x
10419					x	x		x		415 x	x
	425	x	x	x							
10457	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x
10493	x	x	x	x						x	x
					501	x					B: 501

	A	b	C	D	E	G	M	K	K <sup>c</sup>	L	W
10525	x	x	x	x						x	x
10563	x	x	x	x		x		x		x	x
10593	x	x	x	x		x			x		x
10629	x	x	x	x				x		x	x
10657	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x
10685	x	x	x	x	681	x		678			
10717	x		x	x						x	x
10747	x	x	x	x					x	x	
10791	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x
10825	x	x		x		x		x		x	x

	A	b	C	D	E	G	M	K	K <sup>c</sup>	L	W
10855	x	x		x		x				x	x
10885		x		x	x	x		x	x		x
10921	x	x		x	x	x		x	x	x	929
10951	x	x		x						x	h
					969						
10983	x	x	X	x	x	(X)		x	x	X	x d,h,F10
					999						x F10
11013	x	x	x	x		x		x		x	x d
					029	x					
11043	x	x	X	X	X	X		x	x	X	X <u>d</u>
11073	x	x	x	x					x		x d,h
11103	x	x	X	x					x		h
11133	x	x	x	x	x	x		x		x	x h

	A	b	C	D	E	G	M	K	K <sup>c</sup>	L	W
11161		x	x	x							
11191	x	x	X	x	x	(X)		x	x	X	X <u>F3</u>
11223	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x h,F3
11257	x	x	x	x		x		x		<u>x</u> <u>265</u>	x
11287	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x
11317	x	}		x	x	(X)		x	x		X <u>F3</u>
11345	x		x	x				x	x	x	x
11375	x	x	x	x		x		x			x d
					387						
11407	x	x	X	x					x		X <u>d</u>
11441		x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x d

	A	b	C	D	E	G	M	K	K <sup>c</sup>	L	W
11475	x	x	x	x	x	x		x		x	x
11507	x	x	x	x		x				x	x
					521						
11549	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x
11581	x	x	x	}						x	
11613	x	x	x	x		(623)		x		<u>603</u> x	x
11643	x	x	x	x						x	
									645		
11671		x	x	x						x	663
11701	x	x	x	x	x	x				x	x
11735	x	x	}	}				}		}	}
11769	x	x	}	}				x		}	}

	A	b	C	D	E	G	M	K	K <sup>c</sup>	L	W
11807	x	x			x						
11841	x	x									
11871	x	x	x	x		x		x	x	x	x h
11901	x	x	x	x				x		x	x h
11931	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x h
11961 (x)		x	x	x		x		x	x	x	x
			975								
11991	x		x	x				x		x	x h
12023	x	x	x	x	x	x		x		x	x h
12053	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x h
12087	x	x	x	x						x	x h
								111			B:111

	A	b	C	D	E	G	M	K	KC	L	W
12119	x	x	x	x		x				x	x h
12149	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	
											<u>164</u>
12187	x	x	x	x	191	x		192		x	x
12215	x	x	x	x	223	(X)		x		X	x
12247	x	x			x	(X)		x		(X)	X
12289	x	x	x	x	x	x		x			x
								307	291	290	
12325	x	x	x	x		x			x	x	x h
12357		x	x	x						x	x h
12391	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x h
12421	x	x	X	x				x	x		x h
					435	X	X	x		(X)	

	A	b	C	D	E	G	M	K	K <sup>C</sup>	L	W	
12453	x	x	X	X		(X)	x			X	X	h
12487	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	h
12517		x		x					x			h
			523			533	x	x				
12551	x	x	x	x	541				x	541	x	h
					573			x				B
12581	x	x	X	x					x		X	h
12613	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
12643		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
12673	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	F10
											<u>679</u>	
12701	x	x	x	x						x		
12731	x	x	x	x		x	x	x		x	x	

	A	b	C	D	E	G	M	K	K <sup>c</sup>	L	W	
12765	x	x	x	x					x	x		
12797	x	x	x	x								799
12829	x	x	x	x		x	x			x	x	
12859		x	x	x						x		
12895	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	F3
12933	x	x	x	x	x			x	x	x	x	h
12963	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	h
												981
12993	x	x	X	X	x	(X)	X	x	x	(X)	X	(F16)
13023	x	x	x	x							x	h
13053	x	x	x	x				x	x	x		h

	A	b	C	D	E	G	M	K	K <sup>c</sup>	L	W	
13087	x	x	x	x						x	x	h
13119	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x	x	x	h
13147		x	x	x	x					x	x	
13179	x	x	x	x	175 x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
13213	x	x	x	x					x	x	x	h B:221
					231	x	x			x		
13247	x	x	x	x						x		
13281	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	
13311	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x	x	x	
13343			x							x	x	B:353
13375	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	371 x	x	x	x	

	A	b	C	D	E	G	M	K	K <sup>c</sup>	L	W
13407	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
13437	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x	x	x
13467	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
13499	x	x	x	x				x	x	x	x
13529	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
13561	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
13591	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x	x	x
13621		x	x	x				x		x	x
13651	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
13681	x	x	x	x				x	x	x	x

	A	b	C	D	E	G	M	K	K <sup>C</sup>	L	W	
13711	x	x	x	x				x		x		
						731						
13745	x	x	x	x				x	x	x	x	
13775	x	x	x	x			781	x	x	x		x
13811	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x	x	x	F16
13841 (x)	*	x	x						x	x		
13873	x	x	x	x					x		x	
13907	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		F9
						929						
13937		x	x	x								945
13969	x	*	x	x					x	x	x	
14001	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x	

	A	b	C	D	E	G	M	K	K <sup>c</sup>	L	W	
14033	x	x	x	x		x	x	x		x	x	
					055							
14065	x	x	x	x				x		x		
					079							
14097	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
14127	x	x	x	x		x	x	x				x
14157		x	x	x				x	x	x	x	B:14162
14187	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	
14219	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	r
14251		x	x	x		(241)	X			(X)	X	r
14283	x	x	x	x		(x)	x	x	x	x	x	r
14315	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
					327			x				





	A	b	C	D	E	G	M	K	K <sup>c</sup>	L	W
14969	x	x	x	x				x		x	x
					973	x	x				F9
14999	x	x	x	x		x	x	x		x	x
					029				x	x	x
15035		x						x			
						045	x			<u>039</u>	
15061	x	x		x	x			x	x	x	x
15091	x	x		x		x	x			x	x
15117	x	x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
15147	x	x		x	x	x	x	x		x	x
15183	x	x		x	x	x	x		x	x	x
15211		x		x		x	x		x	x	x
15241	x	x		x		x	x	x		235	x

	A	b	C	D	E	G	M	K	K <sup>c</sup>	L	W
15275	x	x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
					287						
15305	x	x		x		317	x			x	x
15337	x	x		x				x	x		x
15367	x	x		x	x	x	x			x	x
15397	x	x		x		x	x	x	x	x	x
15425	x	x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
15459		x		x		x	x		x	x	x
15497	x	x		x		x	x	x	x	x	x
15527	x			x	519					x	(x)
					547						
15557	x	x	x	x		553	x	x		x	(x)
					569						
									581		

	A	b	C	D	E	G	M	K	K <sup>c</sup>	L	W
15593		x	x	x		x	x			x	x
15623	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
					645						
15653		x	x	x		x	x	x		x	x
15687	x	x	x	x	691	x	x	x	x	x	x
15717			x	x						x	x
15747	x				x				x	X	x
					769	761					
15779	x	x	X		x			x		(X)	X
15793					x	x		x		x	
15809	x	x	x						x	x	x B
15839	x	x	x		x	x		x		x	x

	A	b	C	D	E	G	M	K	K <sup>C</sup>	L	W
15869	x	x	x		x	x		x	x	x	x
15899		x	x			x		x		x	x
15927	x	x	x		x	x		x			x
15959	x	x	x			x		x		x	x
15993	x	x	x		001	x		x	x	x	x
16029			x		x			x	(X)	x	x
16057	x		x			(x)		x	x	x	x
16089	x								x		x
16129	x		(		x	x		x	x	)	x
16151	x		x		x	x				x	
16158	x		x		x					x	x

### 3.3. Evaluation of the initial systems

#### 3.3.1. Frequency in the placing of initials

Before we attempt to calculate the agreement of the manuscripts with each other on the basis of their initials, we should bear in mind that some scribes place initials more frequently than others and that this factor might lead to wrong conclusions. The first four listed manuscripts, notably D and C, have paragraph markings at fairly regular intervals, here and there omitting one initial or inserting an additional one. But they never come close to those clusters of initials such as occasionally shown by L and others (e.g., chart p. 69/70) or to long passages free of initials common to K<sup>C</sup> and others (e.g., chart p. 65). To indicate the frequency of paragraph divisions in the manuscripts we will simply divide the number of verses by their number of paragraph signs. Thus, there is a new paragraph in

C	every 33 verses (14292 verses, 434 paragraph signs)
D	every 33 verses (15234 verses, 460 paragraph signs)
b	every 35 verses (14052 verses, 403 paragraph signs)
A	every 35 verses (16122 verses, 457 paragraph signs)
L	every 39 verses (15590 verses, 402 paragraph signs)
W	every 39 verses (16028 verses, 411 paragraph signs)
G	every 43 verses (15966 verses, 369 paragraph signs)
M	every 44 verses ( 9142 verses, 206 paragraph signs)
E	every 46 verses (16118 verses, 347 paragraph signs)

K<sup>a</sup> every 48 verses (15712 verses, 327 paragraph signs)<sup>61</sup>

K<sup>c</sup> every 50 verses (15410 verses, 310 paragraph signs)<sup>62</sup>

Pfeiffer's text with its 16164 verses has a paragraph approximately every 32 verses (501 paragraphs) and thus comes close to the average frequency in C and D. Although Pfeiffer's critical remarks concerning the various manuscripts (Barlaam, p. 408) might suggest that he followed E more than any other source, his selection of paragraph divisions disproves his own words. His reference in this matter is the practice of D, C and A (probably B as well, more so than b). It is only in a few cases that he abandons this procedure and follows the paragraph markings of other manuscripts or his own conception of what is appropriate for the narrative. Thus he begins a new paragraph on the second verse of a couplet in 2196, 2914, 8602 and 9220, and inserts a paragraph at 3177 (with EG), 3993 (with E), 10419 (with EGK), 15035 (with bK) and 15793 (with EGKL).

Pfeiffer was certainly well advised in following mainly A, D, and C. A comparison with the age of the Barlaam manuscripts (see pp. 19-21) shows that the younger ones tend to place their initials less frequently and, more

<sup>61</sup> Köpke's edition (K) consists of 16060 verses and 332 paragraphs. If these paragraphs correspond to initials in K<sup>a</sup> is doubtful, however, and will be discussed further.

<sup>62</sup> The figures concerning the number of verses are mostly approximated. Even with slight adjustments the overall picture would hardly change.

important, less regularly. We can assume that the older texts represent a more authentic system of initials which has undergone considerable changes and omissions at a younger stage. Consequently, the absolute number of initials in which a younger manuscript (Y) agrees with an older one (X) might not be very indicative of their actual relationship since Y might have omitted a great number of its source X. However, if we calculate the percentage that these common initials constitute in relation to the total number of initials contained in Y (as well as X), then the relationship would become more obvious.

To clarify this further, let us look at the agreement of  $K^C$ , a relatively young manuscript (fifteenth century), with D (thirteenth century).  $K^C$  has 284 initials in common with D. This constitutes only 61.5% of all the D-initials, a rather low percentage. But we have to keep in mind that  $K^C$  has only two thirds as many initials as D. This fact is accounted for by the second percentage figure which indicates that these 284 common initials constitute 96% of all the initials existing in  $K^C$ , very few of  $K^C$ 's initials do not have a counterpart in D. This would suggest that  $K^C$  either derives from D or that they have a common source. For the sake of brevity we write down the agreement of  $K^C$ 's initials with those of D simply as

$$K^C: 96\% - D - 61.5\%$$

Furthermore, we can obviously compare two manuscripts only

in those passages extant and legible in both. Wherever one of them has a gap in its text transmission due to extrinsic causes (straight vertical lines in our chart) we exclude the corresponding initials of the other manuscript from the count, so the percentage figure will not change. On the other hand, when one manuscript has deliberately left out certain passages or inherited such cuts from its source (waved lines in our chart) whereas the other manuscript shows the full text we include the latter's corresponding initials into the count; thus, the dissimilarity of the two manuscripts is reflected in the percentage figure as well.

### 3.3.2. Manuscripts A, b, C, D.

As mentioned before, A, b, C and D show a high degree of congruence in their initials. The statistical figures indicate this fact very clearly.

A	b	C	D
95.5%-D-90%	95.5%-D-92%	94.5%-D-94%	94% -C-94.5%
91.5%-b-90%	90% -A-91.5%	88% -A-91.5%	90% -A-95.5%
91.5%-C-88%	92.5%-C-89%	89% -b-92.5%	92% -b-95.5%
77.5%-W-86.5%	79% -W-87.5%	76% -W-89.5%	77% -W-91.5%
62.5%-K <sup>C</sup> -92%	60% -K <sup>C</sup> -91%	61% K <sup>C</sup> -94.5%	61.5%-K <sup>C</sup> -96%
71% -L-80.5%	72% -L-83.5%	72.5%-L-90%	72% -L-87%
(59% -K <sup>a</sup> -81.5%	59% -K <sup>a</sup> -82.5%	58.5%-K <sup>a</sup> -83.5%	59% -K <sup>a</sup> -86.5%)
61% -G-75.5%	62.5%-G-79%	59.5%-G-78%	61.5%-G-81%

A	b	C	D
59% -M-75%	60.5%-M-81%	56% -M-81.5%	60.5%-M-82.5%
52.5%-E-69%	51% -E-70%	51.5%-E-71%	51.5%-E-72.5%

The strong affinity that A, b, C and D show in their placing of initials sets them apart from the other manuscripts. Their next closest manuscripts W, L and K<sup>C</sup> have a considerably lower percentage of agreement with any one of the four, and the last three manuscripts G, M and E even much less so. Does that mean that the first four manuscripts belong to one genealogical branch or even that they copied from one another? The percentage figures do not give a clear answer. In any case, there are no two manuscripts which have a noticeably higher agreement with each other which would suggest that one is a direct offshoot of the other. C and D have the greatest congruence in this group but it is only slightly higher than that of the other combinations.

In our search for a closer grouping within this group we should now look for individual cases of parallel initials. We shall disregard all the other manuscripts for that purpose and limit ourselves to those text passages common to A, b, C and D. Are there striking deviations in the placing of initials in two manuscripts against the other two? D has 3 in common with C (3603, 8975, 15717), 3 in common with A (3883, 4207, 11317) and one with b(12517). C has one in common with b (4829) and two with A (1897, 9945). The greatest congruence exists between A and b which

in contrast to the others contain both Autorreden (11735 - 11870 and 12247 - 12288), and it is only there that they have five initials in common against the other two manuscripts. Furthermore, is there evidence for a closer grouping of three manuscripts against one? A, b and C have common initials against D only in 5 cases (2649, 2693, 3511, 4705, 11581). A, b and D stand against C in 4 cases (691, 887, 2569, 8911), but since C omits a lengthy passage (9949 - 10047 and 10083 - 10251) there are an additional 9 cases of common initials in AbD. It is remarkable, though, that the grouping CD plus either A or b appear in many more instances: 23 times ACD without b (396, 401, 1191, 1619, 2161, 2429, 2914, 2947, 3969, 3991, 4043, 4457, 4565, 7287, 7503, 7667, 8631, 9277, 10717, 11991, 14375, 14627, 14691) and 24 times bCD without A (2195, 4767, 7473, 8033, 8101, 8223, 8819, 9923, 10325, 11161, 11345, 11441, 11671, 12357, 12643, 12859, 13147, 13621, 13937, 14157, 14251, 14527, 15595, 15653).

Based on this evidence, one would tentatively group CD and Ab together and assume that C and D have the most authentic initials but that they are not dependent on each other. Whenever a C-initial contradicts a D-initial we would check with the other branch in order to assess which paragraph sign can be trusted. C and D, moreover, share the omission of the author's excurses. On the other hand, each of the two has major gaps in its text which are not

shared by the other one, C as mentioned above and D from 4213 - 4396 (the scribe probably skipped a leaf of his source). A and b, although in major respects different from CD, cannot be directly dependent on each other, either. Otherwise, it would be surprising that they have no common initials differing from the other two manuscripts (except for those in the author's excursus). Pfeiffer had noticed that b was alternately written by two scribes. He suggests that the first scribe was following B and the second one another source closer to A (Barlaam, p. 408). According to Pfeiffer, manuscript b was written as follows:

part 1 until page 38<sup>V</sup> (7332), first scribe (between page 37 and 38 a whole quire of 12 leaves is missing)

part 2 page 39 to 64<sup>V</sup> (10765), second scribe

part 3 page 65 to 77<sup>V</sup> (12944), first scribe

part 4 page 78 to 90<sup>V</sup> (14893), second scribe

part 5 page 91 to 97<sup>V</sup> (16039), first scribe (final leaf is missing).

F. Söhns adopts this theory in principle but modifies it somewhat. According to him, the second source "discovered" by the second scribe was A. A and B together were used as source by both scribes between 7941 and 14608, for the rest, both scribes again copied only from B, "wahrscheinlich aus Lässigkeit."<sup>63</sup>

<sup>63</sup> F. Söhns, Das Handschriftenverhältnis, p. 37-38. Söhns claims erroneously that verses 7332 to 7941 are missing, instead of 5239 to 7167. Söhns does not give any reasons for choosing 14608 as a turning point.

Pfeiffer's assumption that each of the two scribes followed a different source is highly unlikely and should be rejected on the basis of extrinsic evidence alone. It would make sense only if each scribe within a scriptorium were in charge of one or several quires which were to be written simultaneously in order to speed up the copying process. In manuscript b, however, there are only two cases (at the transition from part one to two and three to four) where a change in handwriting coincides with a new quire. The signatures (Kustoden) are perfectly legible on the lower margin of the last page in each quire, so we can tell that a new quire begins with page 13, 25, 37, 39 (the missing leaves, probably more than 12, are not counted in the modern pagination; 51, 66, 78 and 90. The change in handwriting is sometimes difficult to recognize but, judging by our microfilm reading, Pfeiffer's division is correct. The first scribe writes his cursiva more evenly and within his pre-drawn sets of lines, whereas the second one usually exceeds them or completely forgets about them and generally shows more irregularities in his writing and in the number of lines that he fits into one column (from 29 lines to 40 lines). This latter circumstance would make it very difficult for a scribe to keep track of the number of written verses and calculate the remaining space so that his part would perfectly match the beginning of the next quire.

At one instance, however, at the transition from part

one to two, a peculiar gap in the text occurs which could very well be interpreted as "mismatching" of two simultaneously written quires. On page 38<sup>va</sup> the text continues normally until 7277 on the bottom line but then, with the first line of the right column, the scribe abruptly jumps to 7301 without even completing the rhyme. Did he at this point calculate the remaining space and attempt to fit his verse material into it by conveniently cutting out the necessary number of verses? If so, he slightly miscalculated it and ran out of his shortened text (7332) two lines above the bottom. Instead of leaving some blank space the scribe filled it with two random verses that he had skipped before: 7293 - 94. Such a mutilation of the text seems to be deliberate, different from simple "human errors," e.g., the omission of a couplet at the beginning of a new page or quire (such as 11037 - 38 at the beginning of page 66<sup>r</sup> in b where the same scribe continues).

While it is likely that in this one mentioned case the second scribe of b began his copying work before the first scribe had finished his part, it does not mean at all that they necessarily followed two different sources. The source-manuscript may have been chopped up into several parts given to the two scribes. If the text handed down by the second scribe was taken from A or a closely related manuscript and the rest from B, there should be a noticeable difference in the agreement of initials. We calculated the

agreement of b with the other manuscripts for each of these five parts individually and could not ascertain a major change in its relation to A or any other manuscript other than those fluctuations due to the different length of the compared parts. It is unfortunate that we no longer have the testimony of B, all that remains are the notes in Pfeiffer's apparatus. Thus we shall never know with absolute certainty if b was in fact copied from B by the first scribe; but there is room for doubt. Among the few initials of B that Pfeiffer has passed on to us there are several that do not conform to the pattern of b but agree with other manuscripts (E, G or K<sup>a</sup>) or stand alone, e.g., at 7237, 12111 and 12573 in those passages written by scribe I. B and b do have a close affinity (their parallel initials at V2933, 4443 and 14613 being one of many indications), but it is not likely that b is a direct copy from B, not even in parts. A later look at common and divergent text omissions and some textual variants should confirm this assertion. It is more likely that B and b were dependent on a common source \*Bb, b probably through intermediaries. \*Bb must have been related to A as the high percentage of common initials and the preservation of the author's excurses suggest. Thus we assume that \*Bb and A on the one side and CD on the other side represent two old branches of the Barlaam text tradition.

## 3.3.3. Manuscripts L and W

The Bonn and the Vienna codexes L and W both date from the fourteenth century and show a similar frequency in their paragraph divisions, every 39 verses on the average. Other than that, they seem to have little in common, being of different provenance (L from Middle-Franconian territory, W from the famous library at Ambras / Tyrol and of different intrinsic value.

Since the oldest manuscripts C and D and, by extension, A and b are relatively close together in their paragraph agreement it is difficult, if not impossible, to assign any younger text to one of them just by looking at the overall statistical figures. Going through the chart for AbCD one discovers a remarkable likeness in the correspondance of the younger manuscripts with any of the four above mentioned. Judging by the statistics alone, W would tend slightly more to D: 91.5% of its initials correspond with parallel ones in D (89.5% with C, 87.5% with b and 86.5% with A). L, on the other hand, has a higher congruence figure with C: 90% (87% with D, 83.5% with b, 80.5% with A). The agreement with the other manuscripts is much lower, for W between 68% with GM and 57% with E and for L between 65% for GM and 53% for E, therefore, these manuscripts have no importance for L and W in this regard.

A comparison of W and L makes it evident that the two

have a high degree of affinity. This is especially noticeable for L where 84% of its initials are congruent with those in W (L: 84% - W - 82%), thereby nearly equalling the agreement figures with C and D and surpassing those of A and b. L has a somewhat erratic method of setting its initials, frequently they are not concurrent with any other manuscript. However, there are a few cases in which L and W alone show common paragraph markings: 2175, 2567, 5703, 8707, 9379, and together with manuscripts other than AbCD (mainly E) at 4325, 5009, 7237, 8417, 9647.

Surprisingly enough, these parallels occur only in the first half of the text, whereas later, L follows more the practice of C. The two parallel initials of C and L in 8869 and 8895 (divergent from the AbCD pattern) seem to mark a turning-point. Indeed, the percentage figures corroborate our impression. Up to 8850, L shows an agreement of 92.5% in its initial system with W and 88.5% with C. After that the agreement with C increases up to 91.5%, while that with W drops sharply to 76%. This is a very unusual change which does not affect L's relationship with any other manuscript. Moreover, the chart shows parallel text omissions in C as well as in L in the second half which may partly account for the strong statistical concurrence of the two.

Thus, we are led to assume that the scribe of L after using a source closely related to W (or even W itself) for more than the first half of his copy changed to another

source more closely related to C. It is also possible that he followed one single manuscript based on the two different sources. We believe that he could not have worked concurrently from two different sources, relying at first more on the \*W manuscript and later more on \*C. His many scribal errors and text distortions of which a glance at Söhns's apparatus gives a sufficient impression make him appear as rather inept. The best one can say of him is that he wrote a very pleasant textura script.

The position of W in the text tradition cannot be ascertained by consulting the initial system alone. It could derive from D or a related manuscript since 9 out of 10 initials might have been taken from that source. However, unlike D and most other manuscripts (except ABbE), W has preserved the text of one of the author's two digressions (the "Schimpfrede", 12247 - 289). Yet W does agree with D and most other manuscripts (again except AbBE) in the omission of the first digression (the "Damenpreis", 11735 - 870). Does W represent an ancient branch different from the ones that we have tentatively established so far, or is it dependent through various stages on a common source with D, a source that must have presented the full text? We shall have to leave this question open at this point and refer it to a later study of textual variants and text omissions.

## 3.3.4. Manuscripts G, M, and E

Like W, the Gotha codex G and the large London fragment M have been disregarded by Pfeiffer's text edition and by any detailed manuscript study so far. Their inclusion into a new edition seems timely since they offer interesting perspectives.<sup>64</sup> Although M contains only slightly more than half of the entire verse material of Barlaam, its three sections cover representative parts of the beginning, the middle and the end of the narrative. For this reason we have incorporated it into our statistics.

Of all manuscripts, G and M show by far the highest agreement in their paragraph division. There is not one initial in M that does not have its counterpart in G (100% congruence), and the common initials with M account for 98% of G's number of comparable initials. This nearly total congruence would suggest that one text might have been copied directly from the other, and the question arises as to which one was the source. Both manuscripts date from approximately the same period, and we therefore have to look for internal evidence. G has a total of four initials which M does not share (#4043, 6031, 7123, 14001) but which

<sup>64</sup> See Worstbrock's remark in *AfdA* 77 (1966), 114: "Wenn schon eine Ausstattung des Neudrucks durch zusätzliche Materialien zur Textkritik erwünscht war, hätten zuerst die Gothaer Hs. und die grossen Londoner Fragmente die Ehre verdient."

are in agreement with most of the other manuscripts. Therefore it is appropriate to assume that M omitted these paragraphs rather than to think that G inserted them on its own. We surmise that M is a copy of G; however, at this point, we cannot rule out the possibility that G and M are two very faithful copies of one manuscript (\*G).

The Munich codex E offers the youngest complete Barlaam version that we know. Written in 1459, its Bavarian dialectal forms as well as its Bastarda script give it an appearance very different from that of the much older manuscripts G and M of Middle German provenance. The scribe of E seems to take more liberty in structuring his work: at numerous spots there are paragraph markings different from all the other manuscripts. But in many more cases E shows a basic agreement with the practice of G and M as demonstrated by some statistical figures:

84% - G - 79.5% ; 80.5% - M - 79% ;  
72% - CD - 51% ; 67% - W - 57%.

The affinity of G, M and E is particularly recognizable in our chart since the three differ in many instances from the AbCD pattern. G or rather \*G has altered the initial system which we believed to be tantamount to the "authentic" one and has introduced or omitted a great number of paragraph divisions. The \*G-group does not show a different trend of setting its paragraph marks from the very beginning, but a change takes place only after the first quarter

of the text. Before 3000 there are only very few cases of diverging initials in G and E (1815, 2343, 2937), between 3000 and 4000 the number increases and after that it occurs very frequently. This gradual break with the tradition makes it impossible to tell by a mere study of the initial agreement which (if any) of the older manuscripts known to us might have been used as source. In the first 4000 verses the congruence with ACD is about equally high, around 90% for G, somewhat less for E. After that the agreement figure drops sharply, giving G an overall agreement factor of 81% - D - 61.5%; 78% - C - 59%; 78.5% - b - 62%; 75.5% - A - 61%; 76% - W - 68%; 71% - L - 65%; 56.5% K<sup>C</sup> - 67%. (The figures for E see above.)

The manuscripts of the \*G-group do not share any of those initials of D, C or A which deviate from the "mainstream" (the consensus of DC and Ab), thus there is no indication here of a closer relationship to the one rather than the other. Among the paragraphs in B given in Pfeiffer's apparatus we find a few coinciding with one or all manuscripts of the \*G-group: 4443, 5631, 5825, 5973, 7237, 10373, 10501, 12573. This would suggest either that the scribe of B used a manuscript belonging to the \*G-group besides the one he followed mainly (\*Bb, see p. 100), or even that B originated the deliberate modification of the old initial system to some extent. At this stage, we cannot be certain if the \*G-group derives from B or any other

manuscript or if it represents an independent, original branch of text transmission.

### 3.3.5. The K - manuscripts ( $K^a$ , $K^b$ , $K^c$ )

As mentioned above (p. 10-12, 20-21), the only one of the three K-manuscripts still available for scrutiny is the Berlin codex  $K^c$  of the fifteenth century.  $K^c$  has relatively few initials but the ones preserved are well in agreement with the oldest manuscripts, foremost with D, as outlined on p. 92. Here are the percentage figures showing  $K^c$ 's agreement:

96% - D - 61.5%; 94% - C - 61%; 92% - A - 62.5%;  
 90% - b - 59%; 81% - W - 61.5%; 75.5% - L - 58%;  
 67% -  $K^a$  - 62%; 66% - G - 56%; 59.5% - E - 53.5%.

This high percentage of congruence with D as well as parallel text omissions make it very likely that  $K^c$  stands in the tradition of D. There is no noticeable affinity between  $K^c$  and the \*G-group, nor with  $K^a$ .

If we assume that the paragraphs in Köpke's edition (K) faithfully correspond to paragraph divisions in the first Königsberg codex  $K^a$ , our statistics do not give a clear picture of its relationship to other manuscripts. Its agreement with D is, relatively speaking, the highest, but not at all comparable to the closeness of  $K^c$  and D. In contrast to  $K^c$ ,  $K^a$  has a number of initials in common with

GM and also WL but not enough to warrant a closer relationship.

86.5% - D - 59%; 83.5% - C - 58.5%; 81.5% - A - 59%;

82.5% - b - 59%; 78% - W 63%; 73.5% - L - 61%;

73% - G - 66%; 73.5% - M - 66.5%; 63% - E - 59.5%.

While it is not impossible that  $K^a$  could have shown a rather different initial system, due either to the intention or carelessness of its scribe or to a contaminated source, we feel justified in doubting that Köpke's paragraphs reflect the initials in  $K^a$ . Neither he nor his collaborator Lachmann ever claimed they did; they do not mention this aspect at all. Köpke, who consulted  $K^b$  and  $K^c$  in addition to  $K^a$ , certainly did not use  $K^c$  for his paragraphs, the low agreement figure speaks against it. Furthermore, in one instance where two leaves are missing in  $K^a$ , Köpke filled in the text according to  $K^c$  after comparing it with  $K^b$ .<sup>65</sup> However, Köpke does not follow the initials of  $K^c$  in this particular passage (1910-2132): he leaves out four of  $K^c$ 's nine initials, setting paragraphs only at 1815, 1837, 1937, 1981, and 2131. These long paragraph units of up to 150 verses correspond nearly perfectly to the divisions in E and G with their initials at 1815, 1837, 1863, 1937, 1981 and 2131. For an editorial whim, this seems an unlikely coincidence. Probably Köpke followed the paragraphs of  $K^b$ , finding them

<sup>65</sup> Köpke, p. 408: "Der Text ist nach C [i.e.,  $K^c$ ] mit Vergleichung von B [i.e.,  $K^b$ ] gegeben, und die Schreibung der von A [i.e.,  $K^a$ ] gleich gemacht."

more suitable for the narrative.

Is there any further evidence that K<sup>b</sup> might have been associated with the \*G-group? K<sup>b</sup> seems to have been a codex recentior in which text omissions and alterations abound. Since we have no information on its initial system, we have to look for textual variants provided by Köpke's apparatus in order to support our theory. The strongest evidence in our favour is that K<sup>b</sup> and manuscripts of the \*G-group share in three cases the omission of a couplet and in one instance the addition of a couplet. Missing are 3721-22 (with GE, section missing in M), 6157-58 (with GEM), and 13631-32 (with M; E has changed the order of verses, G has the regular text with CD and the other manuscripts). More important even is the additional couplet in K<sup>b</sup> and GE after 9400 (section missing in M) in which K<sup>b</sup> and E have a blatant misreading in common. In the disputation between Nachor as involuntary spokesman for the Christians and the representatives of other religions, the Chaldean priests end their speech by saying to Nachor: "Nobody else but deceitful people would choose your Christian life-style, people such as you and your kind. What could be more guileful?"

} warum die  
inbrachtung?

9399 an diz leben sich ergebent

9400 die mit valscher trüge lebent

GEK<sup>b</sup>: als du und die genozen din

G: waz mochte gouclicher sin ("more guileful")

EKb: waz mochte gotlich' sin ("more godly")

Thus, we may conclude that  $K^b$  must have belonged to the \*G-group, probably closer to E or M than to G. Going one step further now, we suggest that in many cases where the K pke edition has paragraphs in agreement with those of the \*G-manuscripts, they are most likely to have been taken over from  $K^b$ . This means that our approach to establish the position of  $K^a$  on the basis of its paragraph division is not viable. We have to study the text variants of K pke's edition and hope that K pke has shown more accuracy in transcribing the wording than he has done in preserving the textual divisions of  $K^a$ .

#### 3.4. Spurious initials; textual variants at the beginning of a paragraph

So far we have made it a principle to study only the position of paragraph signs and disregard all textual readings (with the exception of  $K^b$ ) in order to achieve a first grouping of the Barlaam manuscripts. When we now look at textual variants at the very beginning of a paragraph and see if they support or contradict our provisional grouping we seem to fall back on the traditional textual method. And yet, there is a difference due to the fact that mis-readings or rather different readings can be caused by the scribe himself or by the rubricator. It is sometimes clear who is to blame: in cases where there are blatantly nonsen-

sical forms of distortions of names, the rubricator, most likely unfamiliar with the text, executed a wrong initial (Initialenfehler). We found several examples for this type of mistake, such as "Alofernus" instead of Olofernus (in b, 2387), "Doboam" instead of Roboam (in b, 2311), "Brachis" instead of Arachis (in A, 7759)<sup>66</sup> or "Polus" instead of Eolus (in E, 10229). It is obvious that such striking mistakes would not likely be taken over into a dependent copy and therefore these cases hardly ever shed light on the relationship of manuscripts.

In some instances, however, the change of an initial can modify the sense of the phrase without making it meaningless. It must be remembered that, because of their ornamentation, some initials look very much alike although they are different capital letters. Thus the change could have been caused by the misreading of the scribe or by the carelessness of the rubricator. In such cases it is improper to label them as "false initials" (Initialenfehler) since the original reading is undetermined.

The beginning of the paragraph at 1981 provides a good example. In the preceding passage, Barlaam praises the Christian God and the trinity and contrasts them with the pagan idols. The new section continues the praise.

<sup>66</sup> There is an occasional confusion between the names of the two counsellors "Barachias" and "Arachis" in other manuscripts, especially in L.

Pfeiffer reads with manuscript K<sup>C</sup>: "Einen got vil lobesamen/geloube ich, einen in drin namen . . ." The Bonn codex L shows the same variant without an initial. The other manuscripts read "Disen got" : C, "Dinen got" : DW, "Minen got" : AbGp, "Ainen got" : E. The only version that does not make sense is that of DW, since Josaphat is still a heathen at that point of the dialogue. The most satisfying form is indeed "Einen got", underlining the contrast between the one almighty God and the many powerless idols; however, only the more recent manuscripts E, K<sup>C</sup> and L support this version. It seems as if the initial in D had actually been altered, but it is impossible to discover which one might have been the original capital letter. This gives room for speculation. W either followed D—our statistical study showed that W could probably depend on D or a common source—or the rubricator of W could have made the same mistake independently from D. C could have found this form in its source and have tried to correct it by altering the "Dinen" into "Disen." On the other hand, "Disen" might represent the original reading distorted into "Dinen" by DW. The third version "Minen got" is perfectly possible and could be the original reading also. The four manuscripts presenting it are related in pairs, fragment p belonging to the \*G-group and b coming forth from a source close to A (see above). Was there any interaction between these two groups or do we have independent attempts to

correct an obviously faulty variant "Dinen?"

These considerations aptly demonstrate the difficulties in evaluating such divergent forms in order to determine which one might be the authentic version, if we assume there was only one. The editor, in such a case, will most likely resort to his taste, just as Bedier had suggested, unless the Latin text gives strong support for one theory. Here, in this instance, the Latin version, as presented by Migne's Patrologia latina, t.73, p. 464, fully justifies Pfeiffer's choice: "Neque enim ex eorum numero sum qui multos hos et petulantes deos colunt . . . verum unum Deum agnosco et confiteor qui in tribus personis . . ." <sup>67</sup>

Fortunately, such cases are rare. One single common variant of that kind cannot be regarded as evidence for a closer relationship between manuscripts: it needs a more frequent occurrence or cases where there are altogether different words or phrases at the beginning of a new paragraph which could not be ascribed to an inattentive rubricator. This third type, the proper textual variant, is probably the final result of a copying process in which errors of rubrication were tentatively amended at a later stage.

Thus they stand as a different version of their own and are

<sup>67</sup> For a more detailed comparison Migne's text—a later translation from the Greek—would not suffice and the preserved Latin manuscripts of the "vulgate" version of Barlaam should be consulted. Sonet lists 62 such manuscripts (Le Roman de BuJ, I, 74-88); whether Rudolf's source is among them is unknown.

usually conducive to recognizing closer groupings of manuscripts.

The comparison of the various paragraph beginnings in the Barlaam-manuscripts yields no surprises; it confirms mainly two clear groupings which were shown already by our statistical survey: a) the \*G-group (GEM) and b) the close relationship between W and L.

- a) 1455 Pf. Er hate daz wol ervarn<sup>68</sup>  
       GEM Barlaam hatte wol ervarn
- 4325 Pf. Noch wil ich dir künden; Doch . . . L  
       GEM Aber wil ich . . . (initials in GEM LW), text  
       missing in D
- 7123 Pf. Nach dirre lere wart getan  
       GEM Nu diz wart alsus getan (no initial in M)
- 7287 ACKK<sup>C</sup> Noch la dich des durch got gezemen  
       GEM Doch la . . . ; So la . . . D  
       BWL Nu la . . . (no paragraph); no text in b
- 7503 Pf. Als er des boten rede vernam  
       GM Da Zardan die botschaft vernam; Zardan . . . E
- 14315 Pf. Alsus nahet im der tot  
       GEM Hiemit nahete im . . .
- b) 165 Pf. Hie vor in der gnaden zit  
       WL Die in der gnaden zit

<sup>68</sup> Pfeiffer's text (Pf.) represents the variants of all the other unmentioned manuscripts. The spelling is unified.

- 431 Pf. Do vuogte sich . . .  
 WL Nu fugete ez sich . . .
- 3541 Pf. Ouch hat uns bispel gegeben; Doch hat . . . b  
 WL Nu hat uns . . .; Ich han uns geleuchniz  
 . . . E
- 3991 Pf. Dar an merke minen rat  
 WL Heran merke . . .
- 8477 GEMAb Noch waer min rat also getan; Doch . . . D  
 WL Nu wer . . .; Joch . . . K; Ouch . . . K<sup>C</sup>

In the second half of the text, there are no further common variants in the paragraph beginnings of W and L. This would confirm our findings in the study of initials, namely that L changes its source after approximately the first 8850 verses and follows C or a common source. Since C is usually reliable in its initials and paragraph beginnings, L and C do not show any striking variants from thereon. At 16029, the scribe of L must have misread the line "In kriechisch man diz maere schreip" and changed it into "Zŕ krichin man." An even greater misinterpretation occurs in W: "Ein kriechschen man dis schreip" and in E: "Ain krieche ditz maere schraip." However there is no further evidence for the above mentioned possibility that W and D might belong to one group.

On the other hand, the theory that K<sup>C</sup> and D are closely related to one another is supported by the paragraph at 1009 where D, K<sup>C</sup> and K read "Do was bi im . . ." instead

of "Nu was . . ." as all the others do. Two further examples are 8477 as mentioned above (D, K and K<sup>C</sup> have slightly different forms from the rest, but not quite congruous with each other), and 10359 where D and K read "An alsus getanes leben" instead of "In alsus . . ." like the other manuscripts including K<sup>C</sup>. Thus, it seems that both K<sup>C</sup> and K<sup>a</sup> (which could not be assessed on the basis of its initials) are derived from a manuscript very close to D, but probably not D itself. D shows a few particular misreadings which are not found in K<sup>C</sup> or K: 1039 "Der sprach" instead of "Er sprach"; 7287 "So la dich des durch got gezemen" instead of "Noch la . . ." in K and K<sup>C</sup>, "Doch" in GEM and "Nu" in BWL; or 9129 "Sit vride wart gevestent dort" (shared by b) instead of "Mit vride wart . . ."

The relationship of the two major manuscripts C and D is as yet the least clarified. The study of their initials showed great likeness, however the comparison of their paragraph beginnings did not provide us with any further clues. When we now proceed to analyse the Barlaam-fragments in their relationship to the complete manuscripts, we hope to gain more material whereby we might be able to assess more accurately their rank within the framework of the text tradition.

#### 4. The smaller fragments

##### 4.1. Introductory remarks

The following chapter takes into account all available smaller Barlaam fragments and attempts to assess their importance for a reliable new text edition. A considerable amount of confusion is noticeable in this matter. As mentioned before, Pfeiffer used only very few fragments for his edition and Söhns's thesis added information on six further fragments, albeit some of it from second hand. Since then, a number of further Barlaam fragments have been discovered and some have disappeared; even since the last and so far only list of fragments after Pfeiffer and Söhns, that of Worstbrock in 1966 (see chapter 1.2), three further fragments p, q, and r have been made known. Worstbrock justly corrects the errors contained in H. Rupp's Nachwort to the reprinted Pfeiffer edition, but his own indications are not completely free of mistakes. Worstbrock does not update Pfeiffer's and Söhns's information and he does not deal with the intrinsic value of the fragments he lists.

Various figures for the overall number of manuscripts and fragments have been suggested; Worstbrock claims: "In der Tat lassen sich mindestens 45 Textzeugen nachweisen." For our purpose, such figures are irrelevant. What we are concerned about is to learn which fragments have preserved an independent version of the Barlaam text and could be con-

sulted for a re-edition. That means we have to find out first which fragments are "matched," are part of the same, otherwise lost manuscript and have to be considered as one text witness. The next step is to assess how the fragments relate to each other, to the major manuscripts and manuscript groupings and which of them deserves special attention in view of a text reconstruction. During this process we gather material concerning not only the fragment under study but also having a bearing on other manuscripts. This evidence is needed for a critical look back upon the tentative results gained in chapter three and hence for a final evaluation of the initial method applied there.

An attempt to group manuscripts on the basis of textual variants is constantly confronted with the problem of selection and credibility and thus open to the reproach of subjectivity. This is sometimes unavoidable, a detailed justification for the citation of common variants or the omission of others cannot be expected in this framework. For convenience's sake, the slightly different spelling of various manuscripts showing parallel readings has been disregarded, abbreviations are spelled out and obsolete letters (the two different forms of -s-, -r-, and -z-) or diacritical marks modernized or given up. Whenever Pfeiffer's text represents the consensus of all manuscripts the sigle Pf can stand alone in their place.

## 4.2. Matching fragments

## 4.2.1. Fragments d and q

The Zurich fragment d is among the few that Pfeiffer used for his edition. He ranked it above the others ("Von den Bruchstücken wüsste ich keines auszuzeichnen ausser d, das gut und alt ist." Barlaam, p. 409), without for that reason always following its reading. These two vellum leaves of the thirteenth century contain 242 verses (10967 - 11084 and 11331 - 11454), neatly written in two columns of 29 to 31 lines with initials alternating in red and blue. The seven initials in d agree with those in CDb with two exceptions: d does not have a paragraph at 11345 as all the others do and at 11407 the rubricator set the marginal initial I one line too low: Ich bin durch daz her zuo dir komin / Ich han uon dir ain tail uirnomin. The scribe had clearly meant it to be drawn in front of the first Ich as the capital follow-up letter indicates. Therefore, the rubricator's slip could have easily been recognized and corrected by scribes copying from this manuscript.

The text in d is reliable, indeed, there are only a few cases in which d does not show a meaningful variant, such as 11009: Do gibot der kunic sa / Daz sich schiede des knappin strit, instead of "des kamphes strit," or at 11033 the singular form instead of the correct plural: Sinen maister nam er do / Die schiedin dan mit im unvro.

Pfeiffer claims erroneously in his apparatus that verses 10972 (275,32) and 11030 (277,10) are missing; however, there are no text omissions at all in d.

Söhns, who dealt with the position of d in relation to the other manuscripts, associated it correctly with the  $DK^aK^c$ -group (obviously giving up his initial claim that this Reihe consists of A as well as  $DK^aK^c$ ). He supported his statement by four textual variants, the last of which is invalid (11408 "von dir ein teil" is read not only in d and  $DK^aK^c$ , but also CGWlb. Pfeiffer follows A and E which read "ein teil von dir."). It seems adequate, therefore, to offer our own brief selection of common readings in order to establish the affinity of d with the  $DK^aK^c$ -group.

- 10976            Pf: (ein riche daz niemer zergat/)  
                   unde an ende vreude hat  
                   d: daz anegande vröude hat; und anegende  
                   . . .  $DK^aK^c$
- 10992            Pf: got lobte solher güete  
                    $K^c$ d: got lobter siner güeti; got lobte siner  
                   güete  $DK^aE$
- 11001            Pf: Swenne er gen im kerte  
                   Ld: Swenne er sich gein im k.; S. e. gen im  
                   sich kerte  $DK^aK^c$
- 11336            Pf: so disiu veste wart erkant; disiu hoch-  
                   gezit W  
                    $DK^aK^c$ d: so diu feste wart irkant

- 11348 Pf: daz der künec belibe alvro  
 DK<sup>a</sup>K<sup>c</sup>bd: daz der kunic belibe vro
- 11369 Pf: und waz Nachor in haete getan; u. w. in  
 N. . . . EGb  
 DK<sup>a</sup>K<sup>c</sup>d: und was N. im hette getan  
 C: und was N. hete getan
- 11371 Pf: ir sic ir saelde ir ere  
 DK<sup>a</sup>K<sup>c</sup>d: ir saelde ir sige ir ere

In conclusion, one could agree with Söhns' statement that d as well as DK<sup>a</sup>K<sup>c</sup> originated from a common source, although other possibilities could be suggested. It is notable that d shares a common variant alone with K<sup>c</sup> in two instances:

- 11028 Pf: . . . daz tuon ouch ich  
 dK<sup>c</sup>: . . . daz tuon ich
- 11431 Pf: (und ander hövesche liute guot//)  
 die den goten machen / . . . / die hohgezit  
 . . .  
 d: die dem liute machin; den luten machen K<sup>c</sup>

It seems that K<sup>c</sup> is probably even more closely related to d than D and K<sup>a</sup>, although it could not have descended from it in a direct line. Their different age and dialect make a more definitive judgment on the basis of these few verses impossible.

In 1972, attention was drawn to two formerly unknown Barlaam fragments kept in the federal archives (Staatsarchiv)

Schaffhausen/Switzerland. P. Ochsenbein described them minutely, included two facsimile samples, and attempted to compare their version to that of the other manuscripts (see p. 23, footnote 38).

We concern ourselves here with q, the first one of these two fragments, consisting of two partly damaged vellum leaves which contain most of the text between 6017 and 6137 and on the other leaf 6385 to 6415 and 6475 to 6504, altogether about 180 verses (some of them cut in half). Contrary to Ochsenbein's assumption that q is an independent witness of the Barlaam text tradition, we could establish that q actually is a part of the same otherwise lost manuscript to which the Zurich fragment d belonged.<sup>69</sup> A comparison of the facsimile sample of q with a photocopy of d proved that the arrangement of the text, the measurements of the columns, the handwriting and the execution of initials are identical. Furthermore, both fragments show the same alemannic dialect features (" . . . im östlichen hochalemanischen Raum entstanden," Ochsenbein, p. 323) and a similar relation to other manuscripts.

P. Ochsenbein's statement that a reliable grouping (Einordnung) of this fragment is not possible cannot be upheld. His scepticism towards the rigid, yet questionable

<sup>69</sup> Dr. Ochsenbein kindly confirmed our findings in a letter of May 14, 1973.

stemma of Söhns is commendable, however in this particular case, especially after matching q with d and thus having a larger basis of comparison, we can positively conclude that q belongs to the  $DK^aK^c$  group. The few initials in q are not clearly indicative of this affiliation, but the following three common variants should suffice in support of our theory.

6051 ACLW: do wart er guotes richer

$DK^aK^c$ q: der wart guotis richir

GMn: sus wart er g. r.; also wart er . . . E

6112 Pf: dich sihe so wol gehorsam sin

$DK^a$ q: dich sihe so gar g. s.; dich sihe und gar  
. . .  $K^c$

6125 Pf: sist in siner wünne groz

$DK^aK^c$ q: sist in sinen wunen groz

Ochsenbein mentions two striking parallel readings in q and C which in his view make all attempts at grouping q futile. In 6091 C and q use the verb dulten instead of liden, and in 6116 they both avoid the repetition of got through its relative pronoun:

". . . ze gote willeclichen muot / daz er din ende mache guot." We hold that this latter example could very well be an independent, spontaneous smoothing of style in both manuscripts. Such alterations occur here and there, the opposite appears e.g. in 6045 where only q has a repeated noun der sweher within two verses and all other manuscripts use

the personal pronoun instead. As to the first example, we noticed that the expression arbeit dulden does not occur anywhere else in Barlaam, arbeit liden, however, is used several times in all manuscripts (5318, 8221, 12447). The author uses both terms in very similar phrases, dulden appears in rhymed position at 3486 and 15248 and seems to be treated as synonym to liden in the sense of "to suffer, to bear." The dialectographical study by G. de Smet<sup>70</sup> shows that the two words co-existed in German dialects the thirteenth century and that the preference of the one over the other was fluctuating for a while until finally liden became predominant. We found another example of this fluctuation in A and h at 12035, where muoste dulden rat is replaced by muoste liden rat. Thus, we suggest that at 6091 C and q could have substituted liden by dulden independently from one another due to the scribe's dialectal preference and in accordance with the author's usage in other passages. The affinity of dq with the DK<sup>a</sup>K<sup>c</sup> group is not called in question by these two parallels between q and C.

<sup>70</sup> Gilbert de Smet, "Die Ausdrücke für leiden im Altdeutschen," Wirkendes Wort 5 (1954), 69-79.

## 4.2.2. Fragments e and l

At a perfunctory glance it seems unlikely that e and l should be part of one otherwise lost manuscript. The two leaves of the Nuremberg fragment l contain the text in a continuously written form whereas in the Munich fragment e one verse is assigned to each line. Furthermore, the indications as to age and size of the fragments differ somewhat: e is dated from "Middle of the thirteenth century" to "fourteenth century" (see chapter 2.2.), and it is described as "Grossoktav" as well as "small quarto;" l, on the other hand, is written at the end of the thirteenth or beginning of the fourteenth century and is in octavo, according to F. Pfeiffer's description.<sup>71</sup> For his Barlaam edition Pfeiffer used fragment e only in form of a transcript, fragment l was sent to him after the appearance of his edition. So Pfeiffer never compared both fragments in the original or commented on their possible connection. The same holds true for Söhns who does not go substantially beyond Pfeiffer.

The two fragments were used for bookbinding and so they are both cut down to different sizes as befitting the purpose. However, in both e and l the carefully drawn set of lines for the two columns of each page has a height of

<sup>71</sup> F. Pfeiffer, "Bruchstück aus Barlaam und Josaphat von Rudolf von Ems," Anzeiger für Kunde der deutschen Vorzeit (1854), 108-109.

14.5 cm, a width of 4.4 cm, the free space in the middle between the columns is of 0.6 cm and all lines are 0.45 cm apart.<sup>72</sup> Both fragments show the same handwriting with some characteristic features such as the capital S, D and N and have the same abbreviations. The Alemannic dialectal forms are mainly the same as much as one can tell from such a short sample (e has altogether only 138 verses, moreover both scribes vary in their spelling). It is certainly unusual to find a manuscript where the scribe starts out writing his text continuously and later changes to writing in verse lines, but it does not seem to be impossible. The small format of the vellum makes it difficult for a scribe to fit a whole verse into one line of each column. In fragment e, which has preserved only the major part of the epilogue, a special effort seems to have been made, and yet in one instance a verse (16057) has to be spread over two lines as well. Possibly only the epilogue was written in verses to set it off from the narrative part of the work, but there is no proof for such an assumption.

The Nuremberg fragment l with its text between 4368 and 4612 agrees in five of its six initials with K<sup>C</sup> and A (D having a text omission until 4396) and diverges to a stronger degree from those in other manuscripts. Pfeiffer had noticed already that the text of l resembles mostly that of D. Söhns took this theory up and supported it by four

<sup>72</sup> All measurements are taken from the microfilm copy.

common variants, one of them incorrect: 4585 mit vreuden ir slaf inphiengen (instead of Pf: mit vreuden slaf . . .) can be found in GEM as well as DK<sup>a</sup>K<sup>c</sup>. He overstrains the argument however by suggesting that DK<sup>a</sup>K<sup>c</sup> might have been directly copied from l; the opposite case ("oder umgekehrt . . .," Söhns, p. 41) does not make any sense at all since K<sup>a</sup>K<sup>c</sup> are younger than l by at least a hundred years. - The following examples should provide sufficient evidence for the close affinity between l and DK<sup>a</sup>K<sup>c</sup>:

4465 Pf: ir lip ir muot wurden bekleit

DK<sup>a</sup>K<sup>c</sup>l: ir lip ir leben wart becleit

4556 Pf: und mügen leider doch niht komen

DK<sup>a</sup>K<sup>c</sup>l: omission of leider

4560 Pf: mit ir gezierde trügelich

DK<sup>a</sup>K<sup>c</sup>l: mit ir geheizen trugelich

4585 Pf: Swer sich uf si slafen leit

DK<sup>c</sup>l: Swer sich uf slafen leit

W: Swer sich si s. l.; Swer sich slafen leit L

4595 Pf: den lat si ligen in der not

DK<sup>c</sup>l: den lat ligen in der not

In these last two cases, Köpke's text agrees with Pfeiffer's and he does not give any information in his apparatus of a different reading in K<sup>a</sup>. It is possible, though, that Köpke tacitly corrected K<sup>a</sup>'s version in his edition.

4492, only l and D share a common reading:

Pf: die dirre welte minne bot

1D: die dirre wunne bot; die dirre welte wunne bot  $K^a K^c A$ .  
 These variants would support the view that there might have been a common source for  $K^a K^c$  on the one hand (possibly connected with dq) and another one for 1D. In any case, they all belong to one branch definitely different from the other manuscripts. A does not share any of the other common variants of this group in the above quoted passage and can therefore not be counted. In the paragraph before 4492, both expressions "die welt minnen" (4445) and "der welte wunne" (4451) occur: thus, the agreement of A and  $K^a K^c$  in 4492 could be accidental or due to contamination.

Going back to Söhns' suggestion that D and 1 might have been copied from one another, the following counter-arguments must be raised: D has a text omission between 4213 and 4396 in which 1 seems to have contained the text (1 begins at 4368). On the other hand, D has not likely been copied from 1. The gap in D which leaves out the parables of the Prodigal Son and the Good Shepherd and jumps from the middle of Barlaam's speech into Josaphat's response must have been caused by accident. The most likely explanation is that the scribe of D accidentally turned two pages. The missing amount of 184 verses would indicate that the source of D was written in two columns of 46 verses, which is obviously not the case with 1 (its verse 4396 being in the middle of a page).

Once the position of 1 has been established we can look



16160 AEGWK<sup>a</sup>: hilf uns daz wir von schame rot; daz wir  
niht von . . . C

K<sup>c</sup>e: hilf uns daz von schame rot

The last two scribal errors could possibly be found in K<sup>a</sup> as well and have been tacitly corrected in Köpke's edition.

Fragment e shows two or three minor variants of its own (the most important: 16071 "an suozer rede" instead of lere), just as K<sup>a</sup> or K<sup>c</sup> do (K<sup>c</sup> leaves out 16055-56), but the strong overall agreement between e and K<sup>a</sup>K<sup>c</sup> is beyond any doubt. It must be remembered that K<sup>c</sup> is a very late manuscript with numerous cuts, thus the affinity is the more striking.

In conclusion we maintain that the fragment consisting of the two parts e and l belonged to a reliable manuscript of the DK<sup>a</sup>K<sup>c</sup> -branch, similar to dq, and should be consulted whenever a reading in D is in doubt or non-existent.

#### 4.2.3. Fragments m and F2

The so-called 'Göttweig fragment' (m) owes its name apparently to a misunderstanding. It was described for the first time by the nineteenth century Austrian germanist Joseph Diemer, director of the University Library in Vienna, who began his article with the somewhat ambiguous words: "Zwei Pergamentblätter in Folio aus dem Ende des 13. Jahrhunderts, deren Mittheilung ich der zuvorkommenden Güte

des hochwürdigen Herrn Bibliothekars and Subpriors des Benedictinerstiftes zu Göttweig, P. Gottfried Reichardt verdanke."<sup>73</sup> Söhns who based his study of m on Diemer's description concluded from the above quoted word "Mittheilung" that this fragment was actually located in the monastery of Göttweig (Söhns, p. 4). Since then fragment m is known and referred to as the "Göttweig fragment."

However, within the past two centuries there have never been any Barlaam fragments in the monasterial library at Göttweig and it might be assumed that P. Reichardt acquired these two leaves from a private owner and forwarded them ("mitteilen") to J. Diemer.<sup>74</sup> Unfortunately, their whereabouts are unknown since then.

It would seem a fruitless endeavour to analyse a lost fragment on the mere basis of a collation, if it were not for two reasons.

a) m must have been one of the oldest known manuscripts and Diemer's description and catalogue of variants is very extensive

b) we discovered a matching fragment to m which broadens the basis for our analysis and allows us to take outward criteria such as handwriting, execution of initials into

<sup>73</sup> J. Diemer, "Kleine Beiträge . . .," p. 650.

<sup>74</sup> We are much obliged to P. Petrus van Aalst of the Stiftsbibliothek Göttweig and Dr. Otto Mazal of the Osterreichische Nationalbibliothek in Vienna for their kind information.

consideration as well. This other fragment containing parts of the same otherwise lost manuscript is presently kept at the Staatsbibliothek Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Worstbrock lists it as No. 2. The four features proving that m and F2 belong to the same manuscript are

- a) both fragments consist of vellum folio leaves and date of the late thirteenth century,
- b) their pages contain three columns of 58 lines each, altogether 174 verses per page, a very high number,
- c) their marked dialectal forms are the same (Tyrolian, according to Diemer who lists the particularities of m),
- d) m and F2 show an identical relationship to other manuscripts, foremost to C.

Taking m and F2 together now, a total amount of 1210 verses is at our disposal: more than half only in Diemer's variants (3107-3448 and 6203-6548) but the remaining 522 verses extant in F2 (411-758 on the first complete leaf, and on the second one with its upper half cut off 5193-5220, 5251-5278, 5309-5336; 5367-94, 5425-52, 5483-5510).

A glance at the paragraphs of m and F2 in comparison to the other manuscripts gives the first clue as to their grouping: m and F2 show the same pattern as AbCD, yet, more precisely, F2 shows the same large initials in length and in shape as C (we cannot judge for m since Diemer did not differentiate). The I initial at 5497 ("Ich horte sagen . . .") is nine lines high both in F2 and C and at

5307 ("Josaphat sprach . . .") it is five lines high in both (the upper two lines are cut off in F2 but one can easily calculate the initial's full height). The three other manuscripts which place large initials at these same spots are L and W and to a much lesser extent G where the rubricator forgot the execution of the marginal I at 5497. Therefore, one has to study the relationship of mF2 with C in the first place before widening the scope.

The closeness of m and C was pointed out already by Söhns (Das Handschriftenverhältniss, pp. 41-43). Of the eight examples given by him to prove mC's common stand against the other manuscripts two are incorrect, however: 82,27 (not 82,17 as Söhns mistakenly writes) reads hohist in A as well as in mC and 164,14 reads dir volgen und diner lere in all manuscripts except DK<sup>a</sup>K<sup>c</sup>. The following common variants of m and C are a few out of many, the sigle m will be applied also for F2 from hereon.

439/440        the two verses are interchanged in Cm (WL read completely different, see Söhns' Anhang)

590        Pf: ob er so reinet sinen sin  
          mC: ob er so raine wil hie sin

711        Pf: nu hilf ich dir alrgernest  
          mC: nu hilf ich alrgernest

742        Pf: (daz er der genaden gotes/) gar vergaz . . .  
          mC. omission of gar

- 3448 Pf: nu mac niht geschehen daz  
mC: nu kan niht . . .
- 5392 Pf: man vert die witen straze gar / diu gen des  
- 94 todes porte gat / der enge stic verwahsen stat  
mC: plural forms gant / stant, die engen stige
- 6312 Pf: zeinem huse hat gegeben  
mC: ze ainem huze ist gegaeben
- 6366 Pf: guote bruoder dar ir brot  
mC: guote bruoder ander brot; gute bredigaere ir b.  
WL
- 6539 Pf: doch nach dem tage . . . ; da nach tage . . . mC  
In some instances a common reading of mC is shared by  
WL, in other cases it is similar but not quite identical:
- 477 Pf: er dachte helfen im durch got  
mCWL: er gedahte hilf ime dur got
- 682 Pf: ich wil dir alsam ein kneht / . . . / iemer  
dienen  
mC: ich wil dir helfen als ain knaecht  
WL: ich wil dir dienen . . .
- 5272 DKAG: den iemer mere staeten hort; d. i. streten hort  
E  
MmC: den iemer maere waerenden hort  
L: den ymer werndin stedin hort; W omits stedin
- 6494 Pf: von der gesihte er sere erschrac  
mCWL: von der geschicht . . .

The great likeness of m and C makes it quite possible

that one is the direct copy of the other, but since they both date from the same period, the internal evidence alone will have to decide. In the text covered by the "Göttweig fragment" two bible quotations occur after 3204 and 6206 which the scribe has left first in their Latin original before translating them (the Latin words are included by Diemer in his list of variants). Based on this evidence, Söhns concludes that C must have been copied from m as it allegedly does not have the Latin version. He even suggests a reason for this omission: ". . .viel wahrscheinlicher wird bei der Flüchtigkeit und dem Leichtsinne, mit dem C gemacht ist, dass sein Schreiber diese lateinischen Citate in seiner Vorlage m sehr unnütz gefunden, ja vielleicht nicht einmal verstanden und deshalb weggelassen habe" (Söhns, p. 42). Unknown to Söhns, manuscript C does have both Latin quotations in their entire length, just as m, only Pfeiffer did not bother to remark on it in his apparatus. Thus, Söhns's argument for a direct dependence of C from m collapses.

After sifting through the textual variants of m and comparing them to C and the other manuscripts, two positive statements can be upheld:

- a) m cannot have been copied from C, but
- b) C could have been copied from m.

In regard to a) C has several readings of its own which m does not share, where m agrees with the other manuscripts

(represented by Pfeiffer's text), such as

- 429 CD: in manegem hohem stein; in m. hoben stain mPf
- 464 C: vor der wunden arbeit; von der w. a. mPf
- 488 CE: alsus hast hie funden; alsus hie hast f. mPf
- 5256 C: ob ich sein ane waere; obe ich ez ane w. mPf
- 5329 C: ain reicher man bat christ; a. r. m. der bat c.  
mPf
- 5384 C: danne man tuo die enge / durch . . . dringen  
Wm: danne man die enge ; dan daz man die e. Pf
- 5428 C: und im vil chlaine bezzert sein muot  
mPf: und kleine b. s. m.
- 5430 C: und im sein lieht; und ime daz lieht mPf
- 6474 and 6482 C: ze naehst; instead of ze liche: mPf

In regard to b) C is so close to m that, in addition to the common variants cited above they share also some obvious mistakes and gaps:

- 3405/3406 Pf: . . . klagen / . . . getragen  
mC: . . . klagen / . . . begraben (impure rime)
- 6208 Pf: (gotes gūenlicher gewalt/)  
von den himeln ist gezalt  
mC: in their translation of the preceding Latin quotation "celi enarrant gloriam dei" omit  
himeln
- 6423 Pf: dem neven wart er heinlich  
m: dem wart do er viel h.; dem wart er do v. h. C

6537 Pf: und gie mit in vil balde

mC: omit gie

Furthermore, we pointed out that m and C have strikingly identical initials, with one exception: at 691 m has an initial together with AbDEGLW which C has left out. In this context, this would speak also in favour of C being dependent on m.

Lastly, there are only five cases in which m shows a reading slightly different from C and the other manuscripts:

589 CPf: der vindet ez man lat in drin; . . . wan lat mD

3304 CPf: so der lip mit der sele erstat

m: . . . mit sele . . .

5214 CPf: wir müezen un han wol bewart

Gkm: wir müezen unz han wol bewart

6394 CPf: unde ein vreuden richer ruom

m: unde an froide richer r.

6433 CPf: daz ich mit gotes rate

m: daz ich mich gottes rate.

Do these five divergent readings in m and C rule out the possibility that C was copied from m? The third example (5214) alone is not strong enough to prove or disprove a grouping since the syntactic position of adverbs such as wol is highly fluctuating in all manuscripts of the time. The remaining variants are quite clearly scribal errors, misreadings which any alert scribe copying from that manu-

script could have easily corrected. Therefore, in our opinion the evidence is convincing enough for the claim that C was indeed copied from m; Söhns' theory is proven right in spite of his faulty arguments.

In conclusion it should be stressed again that the "Göttweig fragment" m and the Berlin fragment F2 taken together deserve the greatest attention for a new critical edition. It is clear that m cannot be considered the archetype from which all manuscripts could be traced, its text omissions speak against it. But m is certainly one of the three oldest, if not the oldest text witness of Rudolf's Barlaam, older and more reliable than C. Moreover, it sheds some light on the relationship between C and LW which will be discussed in chapter five. It seems possible that the two leaves of the "Göttweig fragment" are still hidden somewhere in Austrian archives and will be unearthed in the future. Then we would gain additional information on those parts where up to now we had to rely on Diemer's collation.

## 4.3. Single fragments

## 4.3.1. Fragment h

The Würzburg fragment h, consisting of eight leaves in quarto, is about as long as m and F2 combined. It covers a major part of the text between 10933 and 13214, with seven leaves missing: four after leaf two (leaving out 11237-11852), one after leaf four (leaving out 12148-12307) and two after leaf six (leaving out 12604-12909). Moreover, some leaves are slightly damaged or have been partially cut, so that a total of approximately 1150 verses are preserved. Söhns's list of variants is included in the Anhang of the reprinted Barlaam edition, pp. 501-502. The first mention of fragment h was made by Karl Roth<sup>75</sup> and a few years later by Eduard Reuss.<sup>76</sup> Pfeiffer does not seem to have known this fragment although he refers to Roth for fragment e (Barlaam, p. 408).

In his thesis Söhns devoted a short paragraph to h claiming that h is a direct copy from A and that, wherever they differ, ". . . dann hat A gewöhnlich die richtige Lesart, die von h flüchtig und falsch abgeschrieben ist." His conclusion as to the value of h is very negative: "h ist daher bei etwaigen Textfeststellungen ebensowenig Werth

<sup>75</sup> K. Roth, Deutsche Predigten des XII. und XIII. Jhdts. (Leipzig, 1839), p. 6.

<sup>76</sup> E. Reuss, ZfdA 3 (1843), 446.

beizulegen wie b" (Söhns, p. 40). In the evidence produced by Söhns to support his assertions, he managed not only to misread Pfeiffer's apparatus frequently, but he even contradicted himself blatantly: in his own variants (see Barlaam, p. 501) he indicated correctly that verse 277,10 (11030) had initially been left out by the scribe of h but afterwards been inserted in the bottom line of the same column -probably, we may add, with an omission sign in accordance with the scribal practice of the time (since the margin of the page is cut off, we cannot tell, but 11030 is put in parentheses). However, in his paragraph on the relationship of h, Söhns claims that this particular verse is missing in h and since it is extant in A, the latter could not be dependent on h!

The Würzburg fragment gives proof of a careful scribe: its clean and regular handwriting, its initials indented over three or four lines and the meticulously drawn set of lines produce a remarkable contrast to manuscript A. There is reason to believe that h was written before 1300 which would make it one of the oldest text documents we have. Its thirty recognizable initials agree with those in A (28), C (29), b (29), and mostly with D (30). Both h and D have preserved the old paragraph pattern equally faithfully, but, as the textual variants show, they are not closely related.

Söhns was right in pointing out the strong affinity between A and h, even though he was led to wrong conclu-

sions. The following list of major common readings in A and h should be sufficient to prove their relationship:

13081-32 omitted in Ah

10979 Pf: da lebet diu gots essentia

Ah: da lebet gots essentia

10984 Pf: ein also vreuderichez leben

Ah: ein also vrolichiz leben

11084 Pf: der gar vervluochten diete

Ah: der gar virworhten diete

11861 b: daz zeigte ich gerne baz möhtich; das zaigte  
was mocht ich E

Ah: daz zeigt ich gerne moht ich

(the "Damenpreis" passage 11735-11871 kept only by AhbE [B],  
h carries the text from 11853 on)

11986 Pf: behielt er luter als ein glas

Ah: bihielt er als ein luter glas

12035 Pf: dulten; Ah: liden (see also p. 124)

12073 Pf: twanc si nach dem geheize han; . . . wan Cb

Ah: twanc si nach dem geheize an.

It cannot be concluded from these common readings that h was copied from A, as Söhns proclaimed. In a number of places A presents a version of its own where h agrees with the other manuscripts and Pfeiffer's edition.

11003 hPf: daz er belibe sigelos; d. er wurde s. A

11198 hPf: swenn er din reinez herze siht

A: swenn er din herze reine siht

- 11230 hPf: des got an dir begunnen hat  
 A: d. g. an dir gegangen hat
- 12054 hPf: des küneges kint von Syria; . . . assyria C  
 A: d. k. k. von persia
- 12080 hPf: din liehtiu jugent  
 A: d. l. varwe
- 12452 hPf: behalten gote und sünden bar  
 A: behalten und s. b.; behalten reine und s. b.  
 DK<sup>a</sup>K<sup>c</sup>

These examples being only a few out of many, there can be no doubt that A offers a much less reliable text than h and that it presents a later and possibly contaminated stage. Fragment h contains hardly any scribal errors, apart from 12090: daz muoz iemer mich; instead of: müet, and 12538: the omission of wolte.

In conclusion, we believe that A and h represent an individual branch or subgrouping of the Barlaam text tradition, clearly different from the DK<sup>a</sup>K<sup>c</sup> group or any other version. The Würzburg fragment would fully deserve the attention of a new Barlaam editor, but regrettably it is A and not h that has preserved the text in its entire length.

## 4.3.2. Fragment i

The Berlin fragment i consists of two vellum leaves in quarto with two columns of 46 lines per page. The text preserved extends from 4607 to 4790 and 4975 to 5158 (one leaf is missing in between). The outward appearance of the manuscript is very neat and the text is legible in nearly all parts. Söhns dates it as of the thirteenth century (Söhns, p. 3), but the catalogue of the Preussische Staatsbibliothek is more credible in assigning it to the fourteenth century.<sup>77</sup> Söhns places i in his "Reihe CLBE" and maintains that i is most closely related to L. All of the five examples cited by him as common readings of iL alone are not only insignificant but can also be found in other manuscripts.

Before screening the textual variants, the paragraph divisions in i should be considered. Out of its eight initials, there are three different from the ABCD pattern: at 4987, i has a common initial with L, at 5009 with GEMWL, and at 5143 with GEMk. Furthermore, i has capitulum signs in the margins at 4707, 4756, 4775, 5041 and 5105 which have no equivalent in any other manuscripts (there is a paragraph at 4775 in AK and at 5041 in E, however). These marginal signs occur at the beginning of a parable (in

<sup>77</sup> H. Degering, Kurzes Verzeichnis der Germanischen Handschriften der Preussischen Staatsbibliothek, vol. I (Graz 1970), p. 95.



i: d. sp. die reine J.; d. sp. der reine J.

GEMDK

4776 Pf: der drier vriunde nam sich an

CGEMfi: der nam sich d. v. an

5126 Pf: sie sluogen in vil sere

GEMi: sie zogen in v. s.

The common variants with L and also with W are of a less significant nature, parallels such as

4620 iLW: boumes; boumelines Pf

4675 iL: an sinen grozen noeten; in sinen g. n. Pf

4716 iW: vertaget; verzaget L; betaget Pf

Moreover, L and W do not share any of the above cited variants of i and GEM but have numerous readings of their own: e.g., 5045; vremeder liute; against Pf: vremeder site, at 4745-56 the order of verses is inverted and 4772-73 are omitted. Finally, judging by the number of missing verses between leaf one and two, i cannot have omitted any text. In LW, however, as well as ABb and probably C four verses between 4883 and 4886 are missing. Thus, Söhns theory of a close relationship between i and L cannot be upheld.

Fragment i gives proof of how the wording preserved by more reliable manuscripts has been watered down through the continuous copying process. More easily understood phrases replace older ones or rather unusual ones, e.g., the roaring of the Unicorn sin lüejēn (4608) is changed in i

into sin don (likewise in G: sin stimme), at 5074, instead of in ein vremedez einlant, i reads in ein verre vremedes lant, and at 5134, instead of von maneges mangels arbeit, i reads an manigen dingen arbeit. Fragment i alone does not offer any alternatives for a text reconstitution other than those in common with GE and more so with M.

#### 4.3.3. Fragment k

Fragment k consists of three vellum leaves, one leaf is missing between the second and third leaf. Its text covers 5129 to 5448 and 5609 to 5768; it is written in two columns with 40 lines each. Unfortunately, this fragment is in very poor condition, several pages are hardly legible due to chemical stains and two pages have been reduced in size by a vertical cut. Söhns used a transcript for his list of variants (Barlaam, Anhang) but does not attempt to group k: "k ist in Folge seiner zu geringen Ausdehnung unbestimmbar" (Söhns, p. 41).

In the case of k, a look at the paragraph divisions proves advantageous since even at places where the words can no longer be deciphered, the position of initials can still be made out. The initials in k agree entirely with those in GEM, notably at 5143 (as well as i), 5381, 5631 (as well as Bln), and 5663 (as well as B).

A comparison of k's textual variants with the other

manuscripts confirms the first impression that there is a constant agreement with the versions of GEM.

5142 Pf: die im si brahten . . .  
GEMk: di si im brachten; die sy brachten . . . E

5174 Pf: uns den burgaeren git  
GEMk: von den b. g.

5213 Pf: dar han wir eine lange vart  
GEMk: dez han wir . . .

5305 Pf: daz er dir ewicliche git  
GEMk: daz dir ewiclicke g.

5665 Pf: daz wort hat er vil schiere vernomen  
GEMk: daz wort het er schiere vernomen

5677 Pf: daz ich hie von vernam niht e  
GEMk: daz ich vernam hie von nicht e

Within the GEM-group, k is most closely related to the "Gotha manuscript" G as shown by several common variants with it alone, such as

5183 Pf: und iemer leitlich ungemach  
kG: und iemerlich ungemach

5273 Pf: bi gotes dürftigen hant  
kG: di gotes d. h.

5286 Pf: dirre broeden welte gelt  
kG: dirre snoeden w. g.; dirre ploden . . . E  
C: diser werlde broder gelt

5645 Pf: da kumber arbeit jamer zorn; d. k. arbeit und zorn WL

kG: da kumer iamer arbait zorn

5764 Pf: sin vater mahelt im ein wip

k: s. v. vreyet im . . . ; s. v. vrigete im . . . G

Both k and G were written in the fourteenth century but are not dated more precisely. G cannot have been copied from k as k has a few divergent readings of its own:

5292 k: swaz man durch in den alten git; instead of:  
armen

5624 k: und swaz man ir zu warhait giht; instead of:  
richeit

5658 k: mit worten wol erkennen; instead of: werken

On the other hand, k could have been derived from G, but the basis for such definite grouping is not large enough.

#### 4.3.4. Fragment n

This vellum fragment of the fifteenth century, the "Petersburg fragment," was described by the curator of the former Imperial Library at St. Petersburg, S. Minzloff.<sup>78</sup> It consists of three leaves in quarto and each page contains two columns with 28 lines each on which the text is written continuously with periods separating one verse from another. One leaf has lost two thirds of its inner column

<sup>78</sup> S. Minzloff, Die altdeutschen Handschriften der kaiserlich öffentlichen Bibliothek zu St. Petersburg (Petersburg, 1853), p. 34 was unavailable to us. Söhns quotes from it, p. 43.

due to a vertical cut. Since Söhns' information as to the preserved text is incorrect, a rectification is appropriate.

First leaf: 2670-2756. I<sup>ra</sup> (2670-90) and I<sup>vb</sup> (2734-56)

have retained only one third of the full width.

second leaf: 5555-5645.

third leaf: 5999-6084.

The paragraph divisions are sometimes marked by alinea with initials of two lines height (2729 and 5631) or they are merely indicated by a paragraph sign and an initial within the line (2693, 5615, 6031, 6061), probably set off in a different colour.

Minzloff and Söhns were unable to group this fragment using Pfeiffer's and Köpke's editions, but there are nevertheless, some group characteristics to be found in n. The first hint is given by the initial at 5631 which occurs only in GEMkLB. The text of fragment n shows primarily a number of omissions of its own (e.g., 6025-26, me 6034, gülte 6081, and others), as well as divergent readings not shared by others (e.g., hole instead of loche 5555, richeit instead of schonheit 5617). However, there is definitely a much stronger agreement with the GEM-branch than with any other manuscript as the following variants show:

2683 ADEKW: als ein prophete hat enbart; erbart BbC

n: (text cut off) at ge (. . .); geoffenbart G

K<sup>b</sup>L: offenbart; (no text for M)

5590 Pf: und in der hoehsten armuot swebent

- GMBn: und in der grosten armuot swebent; in grosser  
a. E
- 5623 Pf: den dunket gar diu welt ein niht; 5623-24  
omitted LW
- GEMn: omission of gar; ein wicht n
- 6037 Pf: bi grozen schrinen ligen vol
- EMn: dy grozen schrine l. v.; so grozen . . . G
- 6038 Pf: swaz er dar inne hate hol
- GEMCn: omission of er

There are also several cases in which n apparently shares a reading with B, in addition to the common initial at 5631.

- 5631 Pf: der künic vraget in vürbaz; omission of  
in nBC
- 5638 Pf: da richeit armuot in niht lat  
nB: do richeit armut nicht enlat; . . . nit  
inlat L
- 6020 Pf: min zunge hat mir niht verjehen  
ABn: myn zunge hat des nicht v.
- 6065 Pf: du volgest minem rate  
nG: du envolgest m. r.; dune volgest m. r. ABM

To draw positive conclusions from these common readings would be unwise since we depend entirely on Pfeiffer's notes as far as B is concerned. The text parallels between n and B could be of a genealogical nature or merely accidental. The first possibility cannot totally be

brushed aside, as the congruence of initials had indicated that B might have been influenced in some way by the GEM-branch (see chapter 3.3.4.). In any event, n is a small fragment of no importance whatsoever for a text revision, most likely a very late offshoot of the GEM-branch.

#### 4.3.5. Fragment p

This fragment which consists only of the remnants of one damaged vellum leaf was described in detail by its present owner G. Eis. The following remarks are based on his text transcription covering the passage from 1933 to 1992. We have to take issue with Eis's final paragraph in which he follows the stemma and the variants given by Söhns and groups his fragment together with B and E, but mainly with B.<sup>79</sup>

A close look at the one and only variant on which Eis based his assertion shows how mistakes have been perpetuated in this field: "Von den unterscheidenden Gruppenmerkmalen fällt eins in die erhaltene Partie: in 51,11 [=1991] lesen (nach Söhns, S. 36) die meisten Handschriften unzalhaft, nur B und E unzellig wie das neue Fragment" (Eis, 450). The fault lies not with Eis who quotes correctly but with Söhns whose information on B—as well as on any other manuscript except L—is taken entirely out of

<sup>79</sup> G. Eis, GRM 49 (1968), 448-450.

Pfeiffer's apparatus (incidentally, B had been destroyed seven years before Söhns's thesis appeared). Pfeiffer's text reads 1991 (51,11) *sin kraft unzalhaft unvürbraht* and Pfeiffer annotates for this particular verse: 51.11 unzellich DKEb. There is no mention of B. The correct and complete information should be, however: unzalhaft ACLW; unzallich DGK<sup>C</sup>; unzellich Ep; sin kraft unz Überdaht b (on the margin); no text in K<sup>a</sup>M.

There is no textual evidence at all that fragment p should belong to the Strassburg manuscript B. However, there are indications in the text that it can be assigned to the GEM group.

- 1960 Pf: heilic eine reine  
EGK<sup>C</sup>p: heilic und reine
- 1975 Pf: die hoerent . . .  
EGp: Sie horent . . .; sie enhorint L
- 1981 Pf: Einen got . . .  
GAbp: Minen got . . .; Ainen got . . . E (see above, p. 112)

It was argued before that K<sup>b</sup> must have belonged to the GEM-group, albeit as a codex recentior. In the text passage covered by p, there is one outstanding common variant between K<sup>b</sup> and p which would further confirm this theory.

- 1936 Pf: daz müeze dir ze heile ergan; zuo guote Bb  
p: [ ] daz was wol getan (first word cut off)  
K<sup>b</sup>: herre das was wol getan

Consequently, we suggest that K<sup>b</sup> might have descended from the manuscript of which fragment p has preserved a tiny section, or that, at least, they both belonged to the same subgrouping of the GEM-branch of text tradition.

#### 4.3.6. Fragment r

The second of the two recently discovered "Schaffhausen fragments" is less spectacular than the first one (q): it is a younger document of the fourteenth century, it has suffered more physical damage, and it presents more problems concerning its position within the manuscript tradition. Its two leaves cover the text between 14192-14314 and 14559-14680 which we consulted in a transcript made by P. Ochsenbein.<sup>80</sup> Ochsenbein's attempt to group r (based on Pfeiffer and Söhns) fails, but rather than offer an arbitrary solution, he leaves this question open and presents the contradictory common variants (which would require a number of rectifications and additions, nonetheless).

The paragraph divisions in r are indicative of a grouping only insofar as they are different from GEM as well as from LW. In three instances, r omits a couplet: 14201-202 and 14307-308, both times together with K<sup>c</sup>, and 14583-584

<sup>80</sup> For further information on r, see P. Ochsenbein, "Zwei neue Bruchstücke zum Barlaam und Josaphat des Rudolf von Ems," ZfdA 101 (1972), 322-326.

together with b (none of which is given by Pfeiffer). As mentioned before,  $K^C$  abounds in text omissions throughout the entire work, and even here, in the passage under study,  $K^C$  has two more cuts (14199-200 and 14311-312) which r does not share.  $K^C$  belongs, as suggested before, to group  $DK^aK^C$ . This shows clearly in our passage as well:  $DK^aK^C$  change the order of verses in 14577-578, and in 14577 they read iuwers landes krone instead of des riches krone as do all the others, including r. Thus, there is little reason to believe in a group affinity between r and  $K^C$ . A common reading in both such as

14284 Pf: von sinem zwivel schiere erlost;  $K^Cr$  omit  
schiere

14632 Pf: des landes krone und ouch das lant;  $K^CAr$  omit  
ouch

must consequently be dismissed as accidental. Likewise, parallel omissions of a couplet do not necessarily prove the interdependence of the two or more manuscripts in question. They are sometimes triggered independently by the nature of the text itself: a couplet written in verse lines with a rhyme identical or very similar to the preceding one is more likely to be overlooked by a scribe than any other, and also the rhetorical repetition of certain key-words can easily produce a mental slip on the scribe's part. These reasons could be responsible for the common verse omissions in r and  $K^C$  as well as b.

On the other hand, there are also some noticeable text parallels between r and b, apart from the common omission.

- 14572 Pf: gen sinen hulden missetan  
rb: gegen ime missetan
- 14290 Pf: do du der welte wünte kunt  
rb: daz du der werlte ie w. k.
- 14234 Pf: diu vorhte die sin sünde im bot  
rb: d. v. die ime sin sünde bot

Moreover, owing to Pfeiffer's apparatus we know that B, the destroyed Strasbourg manuscript closely related to b, shared some variants with r at

- 14236 Pf: wan owe mir armen we  
ErB: owe mir armen und owei
- 14311 Pf: du hast mir versüenet got; d. h. mir gesüenet  
g. AbCWL  
rB: du hast mich gisuenit got
- 14312 Pf: des lone er dir  
rB: dez lone dir

On the basis of this sparse evidence it seems possible that fragment r was remotely affiliated with Bb, but on both sides there are also several particular deviations.

## 4.3.7. Fl "Basel fragment"

This single octavo vellum leaf presents the text from 3903 to 4062 in carefully written double columns of 40 verses. On the margin, the rubricator added ornamental designs into which the initials at 3915, 3941, 4013 and 4043 are interwoven. A. Gessler in his brief notice of this fragment dated it from the end of the thirteenth century and claimed that it agreed mostly with the variants of B.<sup>81</sup> However, the examples given by him cannot support this statement.

It is remarkable that Fl does not subdivide the passage between 3941 and 4013 (the end of a lengthy speech by Barlaam and his disciple's response and next question), where ACD have two paragraphs. This brings the Basel fragment in line with G, the Fulda fragment (F8), and also with b (the text of M begins again with 3996). In its textual variants, Fl gives proof of being close to the GEM-group.

3909 Pf: nach aller unser guottat

GEF8Fl: nach unser aller g.

3917 CDWL: diu boteliche lere

GEKK<sup>c</sup>BbFl: diu gotliche lere

3950 Pf: und leidez zil . . .

GEK<sup>b</sup>F8Fl: und leidez ende

It is not possible to determine the place of Fl within the GEM-branch more precisely because M and F8 do not have

<sup>81</sup> A. Gessler, "Bruchstück einer Barlaamhandschrift," AfdA XIV (1888), 147.

a concurrent text with Fl. But the Basel fragment seems to be closer to the latter ones, especially F8, than to the Gotha manuscript G which has a few variants of its own:

- 3910 FlF8Pf: gedienet; viridinet G  
 3912 FlF8Pf: daz du . . . solt; must G  
 3929 FlF8Pf: mit staete; mit vlize G  
 4030 FlMPf: er nennet; der nennet G  
 4052 FlF8MPf: . . . ie niuwe; omission of ie G

If the basel fragment Fl is correctly dated as of before 1300, it is one of the earliest representatives of the GEM-branch.

#### 4.3.8. F3

The first of these two vellum leaves has its outer column reduced to one half by a vertical cut, thus the text between 11209 and 11289 is incomplete. The total text passage covered by F3 extends from 11169 to 11330 and 12753 to 12914. Each column contains 40 verses with initials set in over three lines at 11223 and 12895 or, in the case of I-initials, drawn out over ten lines on the margin at 11191 and 11317 (due to the vertical cut we do not know if F3 had initials at 11257 and 11287). The fragment is dated as of the (probably late) thirteenth century by Degering's catalogue (see footnote 77).

F3 shows a relatively high number of errors and read-

ings of its own, such as

11184 Pf: do kerte ich mine meisterschaft

F3: do hatte ich

11208 Pf: in buoze

F3: im buoze

11255-56 Pf: sich schieden gotes degene / mit bruoder-  
lichem segene

F3: (. . .) zu lebene / (. . .) gotes degene (rest  
cut off)

12821-822 are reversed in F3.

Of the two verse omissions occurring in F3 (11325-26 and 12787-88), the first one is shared also by K<sup>a</sup> which then rearranges the sequence of the following verses.

Throughout F3, there are congruent readings with G and E, and on its second leaf also with M (the text in M begins again at 12351), although these variants may be more convincing by their number than by their quality.

11210 Pf: daz du bist ein alter man

GEF3: omission of daz

11215 Pf: und zeigt dir demüete / durch sine reine  
güete

-216 DKK<sup>C</sup>GEF3: und z. mit demüete / dir sine r. g.

11313 Pf: daz er da vor selten lie

GEF3: daz er davor doch selten lie

12779 Pf: er ist swie du machest in; . . . als du A

F3: er ist swere man machet in; swie man

. . . GEMF10

12789 ACDKW: ein vihe gehoert ez siht ez gat

F3: ein vie daz horet daz sitzet daz stat

GEMF10: . . . iz sihet iz stat

12854 Pf: . . . ein toubez hor; ein tummes hor

GMWF3

Finally, at 12765, we find an interesting variant in

F3: Ey dem du dich ergist; instead of

ACDEKW: Din got dem du dich ergist (initials in AbCDK<sup>C</sup>L).

This misreading could have originated from a rubricator's mistake whereby the logically correct form Din got was altered into Ein got as in G or into Eyn got as in M. This latter form seems to be the base for the corrupt reading in F3.

Thus, we assume that F3 belongs to the GEM group but, due to the small extent of the fragment, a more precise grouping is not possible.

#### 4.3.9. F6 "Breslau fragment"

These two vellum leaves contain the Barlaam text from 8477 to 8804, but since the second leaf was cut down in size, its top verses are missing (8644-48, 8684-88, 8725-29, and 8765-69). P. Pietsch described this fragment and gave its variants from Pfeiffer's edition but he did not attempt to

assess its position within the manuscript tradition.<sup>82</sup>

F6 does not set paragraphs at any unusual places and yet it is significant that the passage containing the long speech of Avenier to his son Josaphat (8571 to 8693) is not subdivided (whereas ACD have three paragraphs), but that it is left in one coherent block just as in GEM. W and L have no subdivision in this passage, either, but their other initials do not agree with those in F6. G and M, on the other hand, show a total congruence in their initials with F6, and also E with the one exception at 8561.

The scribe of the Breslau fragment is presumably responsible for a few slips of the pen, e.g.,

8522 the repetition of the rhyme-word sere instead of mere  
 8505 the impure rhyme werde (instead of werbe) / sterbe  
 8711 and 8712 are contracted into one verse:

(daz ein ieglich kint geste/)

ze sines vater lere unde muter ere; instead of

Pf: ze sines vater lere / vater und muoter ere.

In a number of cases F6 has common variants with GEM as the following selection shows:

8579 Pf: den reinen Josaphaten

GEMF6: sinen sun Iosaphaten

8586 Pf: so denken aber vürbaz

GMF6: so denke wir aber v.; so gedenken wir a. v.

E

<sup>82</sup> P. Pietsch, "Fragment einer Hsft. von BuJ," ZfdPh 13 (1881), 163-164.

- 8637 Pf: sie sint mir alle noch gelegen  
 GEF6: si sint noch under gar gelegn; gar is  
 omitted in M
- 8704 Pf: vür die welt vür guot vür lip  
 GMF6: vor alle di welt vor gut un lip; . . . welt  
 gut und l. E
- 8721 Pf: min sele mir vil lieber ist  
 GEMBBF6: omission of vil

It is obvious that F6 is an offshoot of the GEM-branch. In one reading, though, it differs from the other manuscripts of this group:

- 8562 Pf: (diz gebet erhorte got /) im erzeigte gotes  
 gebot/ (einen vreuderichen trost)
- GEMK<sup>b</sup>: im erzeigete sin gebot
- F6: im erzeigte got sin gebot

Apparently, the scribe of F6 found the GEM version (replacing the repetitious got by sin) in his source, but he reiterated got accidentally or on purpose without deleting sin, thus altering the grammatical construction of the phrase. This composite form, however, does not contradict our assumption that F6, through its paragraph divisions, its variants, its middle German dialect and its age (fourteenth century) is closely related to manuscript G.

## 4.3.10. F7 "Freiburg fragment"

F7 consists of a vellum double leaf containing the text from 1081 to 1216 and 2043 to 2178. It is quite legible in most parts, only page 1<sup>v</sup> and 2<sup>v</sup> show some discolouring. The handwritten catalogue notice by Richard Newald dates it from the thirteenth century whereas Worstbrock lists it as thirteenth to fourteenth century. The latter indication seems more likely judging by internal evidence alone. F7 gives proof of a relatively large number of variants from the other manuscripts. In some instances these variants must be scribal errors:

2129 Pf: daz mit des ungelouben naht / reht geloube wart  
bedaht

-130 F7: . . . ungelouben craft / . . . wart bedaht

2149 Pf: drivalten mit der gesiht; drivalentikait . . . F7

2171 Pf: (die drie patriarchen sint /) hüetaere  
gewalteclich

F7: . . . / hüetet er waltecliche

In some cases, a look at the Latin source might help to decide whether a meaningful but isolated variant in F7 could possibly be considered authentic in spite of the testimony of most other manuscripts or whether it is just one out of various different versions. On three occasions within our passage, this seems a reasonable approach:

a) In the brief medical explanation on the roots of sickness

(1192-1202), line 1200 reads in most manuscripts like

Pf: und ir materje ersterben; as opposed to

WF7: und ir nature ersterben; das ir nature mus verderben b

(b jumbles up the lines, the above quoted is 1199). The term materia, however, occurs at this particular spot in the Latin text and can therefore be regarded as authentic:

"illi has humanas calamitates esse responderunt quae ex corruptae materia . . ." (Migne, t. 73, p. 458).

b) 1117 Pf: ich wolde gerne vür diu tor

bLF7: ich wolde gerne vur daz tor

The Latin text suggests the plural form as authentic:

"etenim gestit animus ea quae extra has ianuas sunt perspicere . . ." (Migne, p. 457).

c) 1094 Pf: hant dich beswaeret die hie sint

F7: Beswerent dich . . .

Only in this case, the Freiburg fragment is supported by the

Latin text which shows a present tense: "quisnam sit hic moeror qui te obsidet . . ." (Migne, p. 457).

These samples should make clear that F7, in spite of its given age and its numerous deviations from Pfeiffer's text, is by no means closer to what might be considered the "authentic" version.

The few paragraph markings in F7 do not show any noticeable group characteristics but seem to agree more with AbCD which, differently from G and E, set paragraphs at 2051 and 2089. The divergent readings are manifold and contra-

dictory in F7. However, there is one important variant in F7 and b which gives a lead:

2175 Pf: Jacob zwelf süne do gebar / von den daz  
-77 geslähte gar / kam der israhelschen diet

bF7: Jacob zwelf süne do gewan / von den daz  
geslehte kan / der israhelschen diet.

(b omits 2177-78)

This speaks very strongly for a genealogical affinity between F7 and b of which, there are further indications, such as the variants at 1200 and 1117 (see above). To what extent the destroyed Strasbourg manuscript B might have shared these parallels can no longer be determined.

But there is evidence that Bb as well as WL have some common characteristics. All four manuscripts omit the couplet 2177/78 and also 1209/10. For the latter omission, we do not have any information on B, and WL leave out the preceding couplet 1207/08, too.

F7 does not share any of these omissions, but in a few common readings one could detect some wider relationship between F7 and LW along with bB.

1111/12 bLF7: . . . erden / . . . werde

1192 Pf: der smaehen siecheit ungemach

AWF7: der smehen siechen ungemach

3113 Pf: macht er im sa ein bilde; omission of sa  
in F7bL

The picture does not become entirely clear. The only

conclusion we can draw is that the Freiburg fragment was part of a manuscript belonging to the same branch or sub-grouping as b, probably B, and in a wider sense WL. Assuming some form of dependence, Bb and WL could have been derived from a source related to F7. That source would have had the gaps common to WL and Bb where F7 has the full text. The Freiburg fragment does not offer any valuable alternatives to Pfeiffer's text.

#### 4.3.11. F8 "Fulda fragment" and F16 "Prague fragment"

The Fulda fragment consisted of a vellum double leaf which was cut into strips for bookbinding purposes. E. Schröder succeeded in partially reassembling it and thus restoring some of its text.<sup>83</sup> In his description of the fragment, he gives its measurements and main variants but refrains from grouping it. Schröder concludes: "Das bruchstück hat keinen textkritischen wert und kaum textgeschichtliches interesse. es mag nur als weiteres zeugnis für die grosse verbreitung des werkes dienen . . .: es mögen gut 40 handschriften und fragmente bekannt sein. ein fragment, das wie das unsere 36 zeilen auf der spalte hat, ist, soviel ich sehe, nicht darunter." This last statement, however, is not correct, Schröder must have overlooked an article by

<sup>83</sup> E. Schröder, "Fuldaer Bruchstück von Rudolfs von Ems Barlaam," ZfdA 54 (1913), 23-24.

V. E. Mourek in which the author presented a Barlaam fragment kept in the former Bohemian Museum in Prague (our sigle: F16).<sup>84</sup>

Both fragments, F8 and F16, show many similarities: they are written in two columns of 36 lines with nearly the same measurements (width: 11 cm; F8 seems to be somewhat longer than F16: 20 cm instead of 17) and the handwriting and rubrication present a very similar picture. Both fragments date from the fourteenth century. Their dialectal provenance is hardly different, either: F8 is, according to Schröder, "oberdeutsch, alemannisch," but he admits that it does have Middle German forms as well. He mentions forms such as sal for sol, saltu for solt du, e for Alemannic ae in words like swere, and he could have named several others, e.g., monophthong u for Upper German iu and üe in buzen for büezen or stete ruwe for staetiu riuwe, -ld- for Upper German -lt- in forms like werlde. The Prague fragment F16 on the other hand shows Middle German forms more consistently, but has preserved a number of Upper German forms as well.

Consequently, it is difficult to decide whether the Fulda and the Prague fragment belong to the same otherwise lost manuscript or not, the very limited text sample provided by F8 makes a comparison by photocopy nearly impos-

<sup>84</sup> V. E. Mourek, "Prager bruchstück einer pergamenthandschrift des Barlaam und Josaphat von Rudolf von Ems," Sitzungsberichte der Königl. Böhm. Ges. der Wissenschaften, (1893), 1-16.

sible. It seems, though, that the differences between the two outweigh their common features: the different height of the column, Fl6 having a second vertical line to separate the capitals at the beginning of a verse (perhaps bleached out in F8?), and some slight differences in handwriting (e.g., the capital D) and dialect forms. Thus, it seems doubtful that F8 and Fl6 were parts of the same manuscript. However, they must have been written at approximately the same time and not far from each other (according to their linguistic features), and they belong to the same branch of text tradition, namely that of GEM.

The Fulda fragment covering very sporadically the passage from 3894 to 4181 cannot always be compared with the London manuscript M, which has a gap until 3995, but F8 partly overlaps with the Basel fragment Fl. Of the GEM-group characteristics, it is sufficient to name the long sections without paragraph markers in GF8Fl between 3941 and 4013 and again between 4067 and 4175 in GEMF8 (Fl ends with 4061) and to recall the two textual variants given before (see p. 156): 3909 nach unser aller guttat, and 3950 und leidez ende.

The Prague fragment Fl6, which consists of less than half a leaf and one double leaf, contains the text between 6483-6554, 12969-13112 and 13691-13834. It provides a long text passage, a speech by Josaphat (12993-13112), without any paragraph divisions, just as G and M

do. Moreover, the rubricator in G and Fl6 forgot the marginal initial J at 12993. Likewise, the passage between 13681 and 13811, which is subdivided in AbCDL by three common paragraphs, is left in one piece in Fl6, whereas E and GM have only one initial in this whole section (E at 13731 and GM at 13781). Thus, in its paragraph pattern, Fl6 appears to be in line with the GEM-group, just as the Fulda fragment was.

This is also documented by the following variants:

- 6506 Pf: wan du so kumberliche; sit du s. k. Fl6GEM
- 12994 Pf: sinneloser Theoda; vil sinneloser t. Fl6GEM
- 13029 Pf: diner gote werdekeit  
 K<sup>b</sup>Fl6: mit siner gute werdekeit; gote M;  
gotlichen G
- 13032 Pf: die liute twungen . . . ; di lute trugen  
 . . . Fl6GM
- 13089 Pf: der sūeze der gewaere Krist .  
 GMFl6: der suze und der gewere crist; . . . geware  
 c. E
- 13097 Pf: von gotes kreften sprichet sus  
 GMFl6: von gotes Worten sprichet sus; von des  
 sp. alsus E
- 13754 Pf: der unheil der andern heil; der ain  
 unhail . . . C  
 GEMFl6: dirre heil der andern unheil

The Fulda and the Prague fragment deserve little

attention in themselves; they both show signs of how the text at this younger stage in a different dialectal form gradually loses its precision. Blatant mistakes are rare, e.g.,

13695-696 swer umbe gelt gevangen wart / (instead of: lac)

daz gelt er balde vür in wac

but slight alterations and omissions occur frequently. F8 and F16 enhance the impression that the Barlaam text as represented by the GEM-group must have been widely spread in Middle Germany in the fourteenth century.

#### 4.3.12. F9 The "Göttingen fragment"

These two vellum leaves of a late thirteenth century manuscript contain the Barlaam text between 13811-13946 and 14903-15038. It is written in two columns with 34 lines each and quite legible, with one faded passage on page 1<sup>r</sup>. Its initials at 13811 and 13907 (thus not subdividing the section presenting Avenier's letter to his son), as well as 14905, 923, 973, 999, coincide entirely with those in G and M. The text in F9 is written with great care, there are no obvious scribal errors and hardly any deviations from Pfeiffer's edition other than:

13876 Pf: min herze ein kleine erliuhtet ist

GMBF9: m. h. e. k. entluhtet ist; m. h. ein lutzel  
erlaucht ist E

- 13927 Pf: siner güete lobetin do /  
 -28 sin munt sin herze er sprach also  
 GMLWF9: Siner guete lobeter in do / s. m. s. h.  
 sprach also
- 13944 Pf: (daz der verhertet adamas / . . . /)  
 dir vorgeweichet süezèr krist; gewichen AB  
 GEMbF9: von dir geweichet suezer crist
- 14938 Pf: und niht mit dem rehten gant  
 GMF9: daz si niht mit rehten gant; . . . mit  
 dem r. g. E
- 14959 Pf: bi einem alten armen man  
 GMWbF9: bi einem armen alden man
- 14973 Pf: sus truoc er dan sin haerin kleit  
 GEMF9: sus truoc dan s. h. k.
- 15015 Pf: ze gote schrei er alle stunt; z. g. rief  
 er DK<sup>a</sup>K<sup>c</sup>  
 F9: ze got screi er zaller stunt; zu aller  
 st. GMb

There can be no doubt that the Göttingen fragment belongs to one branch with G and M and to a noticeably lesser extent with E (also WLBB show occasional agreement with F9). F9 could not have depended on either G or M. G has two divergent readings of its own where F9 and M agree with the other manuscripts:

- 13854 MF9Pf: unde im rehter volge jach; rehter warheit G  
 13884 MF9Pf: die min lip gevrumet hat; begangen G

On the other hand, the London manuscript M leaves out 14934-937 where F9 and G have the full text, thus ruling out the possibility that F9 might have been copied from it. The opposite, however, that G or even more so M might have descended from F9 or a very closely related manuscript, seems rather likely, although the evidence to prove such a suggestion is far too slim. This would also be in accordance with the fact that F9 is dated slightly earlier than M and G.

#### 4.3.13. F10 "Hannover fragment"

This fragment consists of only one and a half leaves in quarto, the verso of which is so badly destroyed that it is not worth photocopying. The description by Wolfgang Stammer lists a number of variants on which we have to rely for the verso parts.<sup>85</sup> Stammer dates the fragment as of the second half of the thirteenth century, but the form of some letters seems to point to a later period, presumably after 1300. The text covered by F10 is: 1<sup>r</sup> 10965-11006, 1<sup>v</sup> 11091-132; 2<sup>r</sup> 12643-726, 2<sup>v</sup> 12727-810. Thus, the text of the first leaf overlaps with the Zurich fragment d and the Würzburg fragment h, the second leaf with F3; M can be compared only for the text of the second leaf.

Stammer concludes from his collation of variants:

<sup>85</sup> W. Stammer, "Bruchstücke einer Barlaamhandschrift," Beiträge zur Gesch. d. dt. Sprache u. Lit. 43 (1918), 554-55.

"Die handschrift steht mit ihren lesarten keiner der bekannten nahe, sondern stellt offenbar einen besonderen zweig der Überlieferung dar. Eine reihe kleiner besserungen und Änderungen zeigte einen späteren selbständigen Überarbeiter an." Stammer's assumption points in the right direction. The hitherto unknown branch of text tradition to which F10 belongs is the one represented mainly by G and M, to a lesser degree by E, and by a number of fragments.

One indication of this affinity is given by the paragraph sign in F10 at 10999 which it shares only with G and W (W shows a different initial pattern in the rest of the comparable text and can therefore be disregarded). The following textual variants support our theory sufficiently:

- 10965            Pf: mit dienstlichem werde / . . . uf der  
erde
- 966            GF10: mit dinstlichen werden / . . . uf der  
erden
- 10986            Pf: lachte sin, herz unde muot  
GEdF10: lachete herze und mut
- 10996            Pf: der warheit ie verkerte  
GEdF10: der di warheit i verkerte
- 11104            Pf: daz ich dich wise uf daz leben  
F10: daz ich wise uf d. l.; daz dich wise uf  
d. l. G
- 11124            Pf: wirf durch den guoten got von dir  
GF10: omission of guoten

- 11127            Pf: unz an dines libes zil  
                  GEF10: biz an d. l. z.
- 12681            Pf: do sie gesazen an den rat; sie gesazen  
                  . . . E  
                  GF10: do gesazen an d. r.; di gesazen . . . M
- 12747            Pf: du vervluochter alte unwis; . . . alter  
                  greys E  
                  GF10: der vervluchter alder u.
- 12789            Pf: ein vihe gehoert ez siht ez gat  
                  GEMF3F10: . . . iz stat                    (see p. 159).

It follows that the Hannover fragment F10 is part of the GEM-group and stands closest to the Gotha manuscript G. It is too small and too badly damaged to be of any value for a critical text reconstitution.

#### 4.3.14. F11 "Oettingen fragment"

This vellum fragment of the fourteenth century consists of a double leaf in quarto. The text has become scarcely legible in large parts; it is written in two columns of 32 lines each and covers the text between 6285-6412 and 6670-6796. Its initials are placed at 6297, 6329, 6361, 6397 and 6697, 6733 which already gives a hint as to its possible group characteristics: at 6697, only manuscripts GEM plus K (which could mean: K<sup>b</sup>) set a paragraph.

A comparison of the textual variants that F11 shares

with other manuscripts points into the same direction:

- 6287 Pf: rehte leben daz ist daz leben  
 GEMF11 : r. l. daz ist leben
- 6295 Pf: so sol daz tot ouch heizen niht  
 EF11: so sol der tot doch h. n.; so sol daz t.  
 doch h.n. GM
- 6301 Pf: so wirt des libes ende erkant  
 GF18F11: so wirt des ende erkant; s. w. daz ende e.  
 ME
- 6347 Pf: unser koch ist gotes segen  
 GEMF11: unser koch ist der g. s.
- 6348 Pf: sunne tou hitze regen  
 GMF11: s. t. hitze unde regen
- 6357 Pf: swie vil ir der eine hat  
 GEMF11: swie vil der eine hat
- 6765 Pf: in broeder menschlicher maht; in broeder  
 m. m. M  
 EF11: in bloder m. m.; in snoder m. m. G
- 6768 Pf: do vraget er in aber sa  
 GMF11: omission of in; do sprach er und fragt in  
 aber sa E

The Oettingen fragment F11 can be considered a further member of the GEM-group. It has a few minor textual differences with either G, M, or E, but because of its large deletions it cannot be determined more precisely.

## 4.3.15. Fl3 "London fragment"

Together with the larger incomplete London manuscript M, one leaf of another vellum manuscript unrelated to the first one has been preserved. This leaf has lost three lines in the middle of each column due to its being cut in half, but other than that the text between 5174 and 5295 is well preserved. John Koch in his article on both London fragments<sup>86</sup> seems to be more fascinated by this small piece than by M, probably because of its age (he dates it from the middle of the thirteenth century). On the other hand, Koch states rightly that its variants are of little interest, so he contents himself with giving a mere transcript of the text. In it, he accidentally leaves out one verse: 5210 frumet dc vor hin wirt gesant / (in daz gedende lones lant).

A fragment of such great age would deserve particular attention since it might promise a version closer to the original one. However, in the case of Fl3 any such hopes are unfounded. The variants which Fl3 offers as opposed to the other text witnesses seem deteriorations rather than improvements. There are two clumsy additional verses by which a scribe intended to bridge the abrupt change of speaker after 5272:

"Barlaam der sprach do / Der frage waz er vil fro."

<sup>86</sup> J. Koch, "Fragmente von R.v.E. Barlaam . . .," ZfdPh 13 (1881), 78-89. On Fl3 in particular pp. 87-89.

The true indication for the change in speaker comes after 5276 in all manuscripts, however ("sprach des herren lerer do"); in F13 this phrase has become redundant after the additional scribe's verses. Further examples of a deterioration in the text of F13 are

5175 von den werden wir erslagen; instead of geslagen Pf  
as required by the context ("beaten," not "slain")

5225 (die lebent als ain tube tuot /)

als sie ain her besezen hat; instead of ein ar Pf

5249 sint ein wol in solher not; instead of eine wile Pf.

The three initials in F13 at 5189, 5223 and 5265 are in line with all manuscripts except GEM which leave out 5189. Only the following variants can be compared with other manuscripts:

5196 AbCWLi: wie disiu welt sol zergan

DKK<sup>C</sup>GEMF13 : w. d. welt muoz zergan

5272 ADKK<sup>C</sup>GF13 : den iemer mere staeten hort

MCm: den iemer maere waerenden hort

(see p. 134)

5275 ADKK<sup>C</sup>: daz almuosen dest daz guot

CGEMWLkmF13 : daz almuosen ist daz guot

The picture is not clear at all. F13 could be related to virtually any manuscript or grouping, its 112 verses simply do not contain sufficient evidence for any theory.

## 4.3.16. Fl8 "Berlin fragment"

The two quarto leaves of this fourteenth century fragment are in a very poor state: not only was the lower half of both leaves cut off for bookbinding purposes, but pages 1<sup>v</sup> and 2<sup>r</sup> have become virtually illegible in part due to the imprint of another strip of the same otherwise lost manuscript, with which our fragment had been affixed to the inside cover of a volume. Since P. Strauch gave a detailed description of its physical condition and of the text preserved,<sup>87</sup> it may suffice to say that the two leaves would have covered 5881 to 5992 and 6215 to 6326. Due to the damage sustained by Fl8, not even half of the text material has survived and even less is still legible.

Strauch remarks justly that Fl8 shows little deviation from Pfeiffer's text and indeed, nearly all of the variants listed by him are negligible. The only exception is at 6301 ACDKK<sup>C</sup>LW: so wirt des libes ende erkant

GF11Fl8: so wirt des ende erkant; s. w. daz ende EM

Furthermore, Fl8 shows an initial at 5973 together with GEMB, whereas ACDKK<sup>C</sup>LW set their initial at 5965 (b has no text). Based on this evidence, the common paragraph and the common variant, we can assume that Fl8 probably belonged to the GEM-group, probably more closely to manu-

<sup>87</sup> P. Strauch, "Fragment aus Rudolfs Barlaam," ZfdA 52 (1910), 354-356.

script G and the Oettingen fragment F11. One objection could be raised: Strauch noticed that the missing leaf between the two of F18 could have contained only 222 verses (5993 to 6214) instead of 224 (eight columns with 28 verses each), and he concludes that F18 must have left out 6159-60, just as ABC did (Strauch erroneously adds E as well). However, since GEMK<sup>b</sup> omit the preceding couplet 6157-58, we can assume that the Berlin fragment F18 would have shared this omission.

## 5. Conclusion

### 5.1. Final grouping of manuscripts based on text and rubrication

Having studied the relationship of the larger manuscripts on the basis of their rubrication and that of the smaller fragments using a more textual approach, we shall now attempt to sum up our results, verify them by taking into account common text omissions throughout the work, and discuss the value of the "initial method." A parallel text omission can indeed be highly indicative of a manuscript relationship, but it is not the ultimate criterion of manuscript grouping. It can be caused, just as a common reading or a common initial, independently by a sometimes psychologically explicable error of the scribe (see above, section 4.3.6.). Thus, one has to note whether parallel text omissions occur

repeatedly and how they relate to data gained by other methods.

The first grouping which can be established without any doubt is that of  $DK^aK^c$ . In three instances, at 2817/18, 12243/44 and 13487/88, these manuscripts leave out a couplet (mentioned neither by Pfeiffer nor by Söhns). Furthermore, after 376  $DK^aK^c$  leave out a verse and read differently as follows:

(umb daz iemer wernde guot/) Daz dir din leben gevromidet hat/

Daz dir unlange in vröden stat.

Pfeiffer follows the other manuscripts which read:

daz iemer wert und hiht zergat/

daz dir din lebn gevremdet hat.

A similar case at 14577/78 was cited already (see p. 154). As far as the reversal of 16023/24 in  $K^a$  and  $K^c$  is concerned, D can no longer be compared, it ends at 15743. D does not share any omissions with other manuscripts, and presents a very reliable, early text version with only one major omission of its own (4213-4396, see p. 128) and three reversed couplets in a short sequence at 13563/64, 13571/72, 13593/94. In these instances,  $K^a$  and  $K^c$  have the "normal" text, that of the consensus of manuscripts, therefore they cannot have been derived from D. Also, the source of  $K^a$  must have contained the author's digressions, since  $K^a$  has cut out only parts of the courtly praise of

ladies, whereas it is altogether missing in  $DK^C$ .  $K^a$  and especially  $K^C$  have a number of individual text omissions which do not indicate any other affiliation. The only fragments that we found related to this group are dq and e1 (see 4.2.1 and 4.2.2).

The study of initials helped only partially in determining this group of manuscripts, it is true. As far as the position of  $K^a$  is concerned, the fault lies with the unreliable paragraph transcription in Köpke's edition which distorts the agreement figures. However, the high congruence of initials between D and  $K^C$  indicated a close relationship between those two manuscripts. As we extended our scope and took into consideration divergent readings at places of rubrication, we found cases which pointed in the right direction (see pp. 115-16), which suggested that  $K^a$  as well as  $K^C$  belong to one group together with D, but that they could not have been copied from D itself.

Söhns had claimed that one class of manuscripts (Handschriftenreihe) was constituted by  $ADK^{abc}$  as opposed to the BCLE-class. However, neither the study of initials nor textual comparisons yielded any conclusive evidence that A should belong to  $DK^aK^C$  (as to  $K^b$ , see pp. 109-10). A does not show any consistent agreement with any manuscript other than the Würzburg fragment h (see 4.3.1). A has left out a verse or a couplet on its own here and there, but only the following omissions and reversals are shared

by other manuscripts and appear to be significant:

4215/16 omitted in ALW. These verses have the same rhyme words as the preceding couplet.

4883-86 omitted in ABbLW; C has a missing leaf here on which four verses must have also been left out. These verses are plainly redundant. 4885/86 repeat the rhyme words of 4881/82.

6159/60 omitted in ABC (b has missing leaves). The preceding passage leads to a rhetorical repetition of key-words and a double rhyme at 6157/58 which is left out by GEMK<sup>b</sup>.

6863/64 reversed in ACGLW, with C having a slightly different reading.

All these examples would range A on the side of Bb, LW and C rather than of DK<sup>a</sup>K<sup>c</sup>.

One rather interesting omission should be mentioned here. A leaves out verses 7863-66, again repetitious in contents and rhyme, whereas L omits 7862-65. It is intriguing to see that codex C had initially left out the same verses as A, but that they were later added on the margin. Were they added by the same scribe or his corrector at the time of the manuscript production, or were they filled in at a considerably later date? And could the faulty version, in the meantime, have been copied by other manuscripts? At a few places C does indeed show corrections and additions of a later stage, which partly coincide with gaps in other manu-

scripts. Firstly, C had left out the first two paragraphs of the prologue; the overly large and illuminated initial at 63 proves that this is where the scribe started his work. The missing section (with the omission of 33-36) was later added on the inner cover, according to Pfeiffer "von anderer nicht viel spaeterer Hand" (Barlaam, p. 407). There is no parallel for this omission in any other manuscript. On the other hand the Heidelberg codex b has omitted verses 3237-40, and so had C originally; however, they were later added on the margin "von anderer Hand" (Barlaam, p. 421). In this case, just as in the above cited common omissions, the gap in Cb could also be explained as independent scribal error: 3235/36 have the same rhyme words as 3239/40, and so the scribe's eye could have easily slipped down four lines and taken up the text from there. But it would seem unlikely that this type of scribal error should have occurred repeatedly only in some manuscripts and not in others. It is more convincing to assume that C and ABbLW might have drawn some of these omissions from a common source or, for that matter, that they do not show repetitious verses filled in by later scribes which the other manuscripts contain (this alternative is admissible especially at 4883-86 and 6159-60, see above).

The information which we gained from the study of the above mentioned manuscripts is too contradictory to establish a stemmatic relationship. It seems that not only C

but also other manuscripts were later corrected from other sources and that this contamination cannot be disentangled. To quote two more examples: C has left out 9275/76 at the end of a paragraph; in W line 9276 is initially omitted and later added at the bottom of the page. Likewise A has left out 2542; W also did so originally, but has added the missing verse at the bottom again. Coincidence or a sign of interdependence? We believe that the versions of A, b, C, L, and W have absorbed some interference and that, in spite of their loose group relationship, they cannot be traced in a straight line from one source. The "Göttweig fragment" m is too close to C to be considered a key element for this conglomeration. The problem of dependence could not be solved by the comparison of initials, either, which showed only the same basic paragraph pattern in AbCD.

Before abandoning this group altogether, we shall attempt a conclusive assessment of WL and Bb. The comparison of the rubrication had also indicated that L and W have a strong similarity in the first half of the work, but that afterwards this special relationship ceases entirely and L follows the pattern of C. We considered the two parallel initials in CL at 8869 and 8895 to be a likely turning point. Taking now common text omissions into account, our tentative judgment appears fully corroborated. There are parallel omissions in LW at 1207-10 (1209/10 also in b), 1281/82, 2177/78 (also in Bb), 2295-98 (also in a),

3775-80, 3784/85, 4113/14, 4215/16 (also in A), 4772/73, 7616/17 (also in B), 8320 (W leaves out also 8321, L reverses 8321/22) and 8721. Furthermore, there are several couplets with reversed lines, in one case, at 1709/10, together with Bb.

The dividing line in L, however, shifts by about 300 verses. W and L show the last noticeable parallel at 9195/96, where both reverse the order of lines. It is only after this point, that L and C share the same text omissions, namely 9949-10046, 10055-58, 10065/66, 10083-250, 10333-54, 11587-94, 11921-24, 12235-38, 12259-90, 16089/90, 16105-110 and 16129-45. Furthermore, it is only in this second part of the work, that L contains some of the Latin bible quotations which C has preserved after 13065, whereas its Latin verses in the first half of the text (between 2449 and 3785, at 6191, 6207, and 6930) do not occur in L.

The question was raised earlier (see p. 103) whether W might have ultimately been derived from D, as the agreement between their initials is slightly higher than that of W and C. A look at their text omissions, however, rules this possibility out. W and L share common text omissions with ABb and C (all of which occur in the first half, see above), but none with the DK<sup>a</sup>K<sup>c</sup>-group. As we pointed out earlier, C does not always represent the old paragraph pattern as carefully as D and sets initials of its own. Also, the major text omissions in the second half of C,

where W has the full text, would account for the lower agreement figure between C and W.

On the basis of a textual comparison, we can now definitely reject Söhns's claim that the Heidelberg codex b was alternately copied from B and A. The study of the rubrication in b and of the relationship between the alternation of the two scribes and the various gatherings of the codex suggested that b does not follow two different sources, but rather that B and b originated from one source which was loosely related to A (see p. 100). This preliminary statement has to be modified to some extent. It appears that within the first 5000 verses B and b are closely related, but not dependent on each other (e.g., B leaves out 1697/98 where b has the full text). Their common omissions consist of 733-36, 1369, 2064, 2971, 4157-60, 4411/12, 4752/53, 4774/75. There are also several parallel cases of reversed lines, the last such reversal occurring in B and b at 5289/90. Hereafter, the parallelism between the two manuscripts ceases completely and both have omissions entirely of their own. Codex b continues its regular paragraph pattern in agreement with that of ACD, whereas B seems to join the GEM-group in a number of common initials. However, in the final 1500 verses of the work, the parallelism between B and b is re-established (recognized correctly by Söhns, p. 37). Again, they have a common initial different from all other manuscripts at 14613, they reverse two

lines at 14821/22 and omit others at 15371/72, 15481/82 (double rhyme, also omitted in LK<sup>a,b</sup>), 15729/34 and 15985/86. The most plausible explanation for this change in the relationship between B and b is to assume that the lost Strassburg manuscript B (and not the Heidelberg codex b) might have drawn its middle part from a different source, a source that obviously had some of the rubrication of the GEM-group. A great handicap in further pursuing this hypothesis is the fact that for all information on B we are completely dependent on Pfeiffer's sketchy and not very reliable apparatus.

It seems hardly necessary to compile further evidence in order to establish a third manuscript group, which we called after its three surviving codices the GEM-group. A number of fragments had to be included in this group, as well as the second Koenigsberg manuscript K<sup>b</sup>, known to us through Köpke's few variants. As mentioned before (see p. 109), K<sup>b</sup> shows important criteria by which it can be associated with this group, several verse omissions with GEM and also one additional couplet after 9400 with EG (section missing in M). While it is clear that the incomplete London manuscript M and the Gotha codex G are much more closely related with each other than with E (e.g., G and M omit paragraph 12933-62), it should be stressed that E does indeed belong to this group, albeit to a lesser extent. This affinity is suggested by the agreement of its

initials as well as several cases of divergent readings at rubricated paragraphs (see p. 114). E was written considerably later than G and M and its scribe treated the text with some liberty, inserting a whole didactic poem, the Magezoge, into it and adding occasional paragraph titles. Apart from some text cuts of its own (e.g., 7729-58 and 15466-75) E shares the following omissions with other manuscripts, 3895 with b, 9176-78 with C, and 16089-90 with CL. It seems that E or its source could have also used a manuscript related to the C-group. Besides these omissions E would have derived from this source the text of the two author's digressions which are otherwise not documented in the GM-group (with the exception of the Schimpfrede in K<sup>b</sup>, according to Köpke, p. 416). E has also preserved some of the Latin quotations which appear only in CmL, but they do not correspond entirely with those in C. The only Latin verses in E occur towards the end, after verse 13065; they are missing in the earlier passages, after 2449, where C and m abound in them. Moreover, E contains one Latin quotation which is left out in CL: 13250 "Vivo ego dicit dominus nolo mortem peccatoris etc." Thus, there could have been no direct influence of C and E. And yet E gives proof of an amalgamation of two different text versions, that of the GM-group which prevails and that of the C-group.

In view of the nearly total agreement in the paragraph divisions of G and M, the possibility that one manuscript

might have been copied from the other had to be left open (see pp. 104-05). G could not have descended from M, since the latter has several omissions where G shows the full text (5641-42, 6067-68, 6135-36, 8171-72, 8247-48, 13163-64, 13497-98, 14117-18 and 14934-37). M, on the other hand, cannot have been copied from G either, for the following reason alone: the Latin bible quotation which C and the "Göttweig fragment" m insert after 6206 ("celi enarrant gloriam dei et opera manuum ejus annunciant firmamentum") appears also in M but not in G. It is the only Latin verse in M; none of the others which we encountered in Cm, E, or L have been preserved in M. Certainly M cannot be derived from C or m, otherwise it would have copied their faulty omission of himeln at 6208, in the German translation of this Latin quotation (see p. 136). Consequently both M and G can merely be derived from one source.

This brings us to a final point. We noticed that G shares a common omission with A at 1197 (a redundant couplet with word repetition), and that it reversed the order of verses at 6863-64 together with ACLW and at 16141-42 together with ABEW (CL have omitted the paragraph). M, in spite of its close affinity to G, does not coincide with it in the first two instances and has no text for the last one. With respect to these common readings, to the Latin quotation in M, to E's occasional parallels with bCLW and to its Latin verses, should we regard the GEM-group as a sub-group-

ing within the larger conglomerate group represented by manuscripts such as C, m, A, B, b, L and W? Or should GEM be rather considered an independent "branch" with its own original readings? If we rigidly adopted the first position, we would have to account for the preservation of 4883-86 which is omitted in ABbLW (and most likely in C), whereas these verses appear in DK<sup>a</sup>K<sup>c</sup> as well as in GEM (see p. 181). If we adopted the other position, we would have to assume an archetypal source of the GEM-group, which would have contained the Latin quotations as well as the two authorial digressions. The few parallel text omissions in GEM and manuscripts of the \*C-group would have to be explained as coincidental scribe's errors.

Let us, at this point, recall Bédier's warning, that, the further back an investigation into a text tradition is pushed, the more it becomes mere speculation. Throughout our study, we found manuscripts GEM plus a number of fragments to be a group clearly distinct from all the others, not only by a different rubrication pattern (which we consider as of a more recent stage), but also by textual criteria, common variants, omissions, and additions. It would serve no purpose to draw a stemma that pretended to trace the genealogical relationship of all manuscripts back to an archetype. The image of a tree with larger and smaller branches would, in our view, be a mirage rather than a useful model. After all, we know only very few

surviving manuscripts out of a probably far greater number, and we do not always know them in their original form. Therefore, whether GEM and their related fragments ultimately go back to an ancient text version equivalent to that of the \*D- or the \*C-group, or whether their source is already the product of a mixture of these two groups, cannot be established. In any case, it is an important group in its own right within the Barlaam text tradition and should be given credit accordingly.

In our attempts to group and assess all existing Barlaam manuscripts and fragments, in order to help pave the way for a new text edition, we found the method of tabulating and comparing the position and reading of all rubricated paragraphs very useful. As shown in the individual cases, this method has its limitations. Sometimes the percentage values did not constitute clear indication of a manuscript's group affiliation, and they certainly do not determine a genealogical relationship. But which other methodical approach in this field is free of ambiguities? On the other hand, adopting it as one of several methods, it draws attention to parallels between manuscripts, it indicates when a manuscript changes its paragraph pattern and thus possibly its source, and it can channel, support, or contradict results gained by a comparison of textual variants. Moreover, it provides data which can hence be used in structural studies. We hold that an inquiry into

the manuscript relationship of a medieval work, which ignores the transmission of its rubrication, is incomplete. Moreover, such an evaluation of the paragraph agreement could be efficiently organized in order to save time, the mechanical work could be delegated to assistants, the data computerized. Naturally the figures would have to be interpreted, but the basis for a division into groups would become broader and more solid. And that means also: the areas, in which a positive judgment cannot and should not be ventured, would be more clearly defined.

Finally, what principles for a new Barlaam edition can be derived from our study? We have come to the conclusion that a new edition should follow the Freiburg codex D as a Leithandschrift. Wherever D has a text omission or an obvious mistake, the reading of the manuscripts and fragments belonging to its group (dq, el, K<sup>C</sup>, and Köpke's edition representing K<sup>a</sup>) should be given priority for the necessary emendations; their different dialectal forms would have to be adapted to those in D. Only when the group as a whole has a gap or an obvious misreading would the main representatives of the two other groups be used, namely C (and m) on the one side, and G (or M) on the other. Ideally the variants of C and G would be continuously given together with the text of D, either in the margin or at the bottom of the page, while the readings of the other manuscripts could be printed in an appendix.

The passages containing the author's digressions would have to be filled in according to the text in A and b.

One of the advantages in following D would be that D gives a reliable, early version of Rudolf's Barlaam in the author's own Alemannic dialect; another, that D has best preserved the early paragraph pattern. The greatest weaknesses of Pfeiffer's edition are, in our opinion, his inconsistent text selection (with undue consideration given to E) and the inaccurate and sometimes confusing material in the apparatus. If these shortcomings are successfully avoided, H. Rupp's sceptical remark that a new Barlaam edition might not be able to improve much on Pfeiffer's (Barlaam, p. 512), would consequently be proven wrong.

## 5.2. Geographical distribution of Barlaam und Josaphat

Judging by the number of its preserved manuscripts, Rudolf von Ems's Barlaam und Josaphat must have gained a considerable popularity throughout the German speaking territories between the thirteenth and fifteenth century. This impression becomes the more convincing by contrast with the two other Middle High German Barlaam versions written in the thirteenth century, the so-called Laubacher Barlaam by bishop Otto of Freising, of which just one manuscript is

preserved,<sup>88</sup> and the so-called Zürcher Barlaam, known to us only in two short fragments.<sup>89</sup> An attempt to outline the spreading of Rudolf's Barlaam version on the basis of its manuscript tradition meets with grave obstacles. It is a rare exception that the manuscripts themselves give any direct information as to the date and the place of their origin; this occurs only in the cases of manuscripts

C—written by a scribe Chunrat in 1284

E—written in 1459 for Veit von Egloffstein

P—the illuminated manuscript of 1469, produced in the atelier of Diebolt Lauber in Hagenau (Alsace).

For all other manuscripts and fragments we depend on secondary information as provided by catalogue descriptions and articles, or even, in several instances, on our own dialect definition of a text. In the case of shorter fragments, such probing into dialectal characteristics could yield questionable results, due to the inconsistent spelling of most scribes and the shortness of the sample. Furthermore, some subtler aspects of such a linguistic analysis (e.g., the differentiation between the dialect of the source, the native dialect of the scribe, and the target dialect of the copy) could not be studied within the framework of this outline.

<sup>88</sup> See Adolf Perdisch, Der Laubacher Barlaam: Vorstudien zu einer Ausgabe (Marburg, 1904).

<sup>89</sup> See J. Klapper "Barlaam und Josaphat," in Verfasserlexikon, I, 171.

It has been established by various scholars that Barlaam und Josaphat was written about 1225, at a time when Rudolf lived at Hohenems in the alpine Rhine valley as a Ministeriale of the Lords of Montfort. One major aid in determining when the work was composed is its reference to the Cistercian monastery of Cappel near Zurich and its abbot Wide who provided the author with the Latin source (Barlaam, 144-149 and 16057-16074).<sup>90</sup> It is most likely that Rudolf at the beginning of his career was known only in his home territory, the area south of Lake Constance, if we judge by the literary patrons whom he mentions in his earlier Der guote Gerhard and in his Barlaam. "Rudolfs Horizont ist gleichsam noch alpin begrenzt, seine Auftraggeber leben in der unmittelbaren Umgebung seiner Heimat."<sup>91</sup>

There are no manuscripts left that could be ascribed to this early period. A, which was kept at the castle of Hohenems until the nineteenth century (see pp. 8-9), is definitely of a much later origin and was transferred to Hohenems at a later stage.<sup>92</sup> The only remaining witnesses to a Barlaam text tradition in this area, although dating from about half a century later, are the two matching

<sup>90</sup> See X. v. Ertzdorff, Rudolf von Ems, pp. 80-89.

<sup>91</sup> H. Brackert, Rudolf von Ems, p. 29.

<sup>92</sup> See Edward Schröder, "Rudolf von Ems und sein Litteraturkreis," ZfdA 67 (1930), 211: ". . . unser Rudolf hat damit nichts zu tun."

fragments kept at Zurich and Schaffhausen, d and q. We can expect that literary works at that time would be propagated along the upper Rhine valley with its close interrelations between courts, cities and monasteries. The Freiburg manuscript D which belongs to the same group with dq but does not show their marked Swiss-Alemannic features would illustrate this point. Other, younger documents of the greater Alemannic area including Alsace and Swabia are the two destroyed Strassburg manuscripts B and a, the above mentioned Hohenems codex A, the second Schaffhausen fragment r and the (missing) Stuttgart fragment F17, all of the fourteenth century. However, as indicated in chapter 5.1, these manuscripts have not, or not primarily, derived their text versions from dq or D.

In this context, the two fragments e (in Munich) and l (Nuremberg), which in our opinion belong together, pose a problem. K. Roth, in his reference to e, states that the dialect is "alamannisch (schweizerisch)."<sup>93</sup> This assertion is probably provoked by the handwritten notice of a later owner (Roth suggests of the fifteenth century) underneath the final verses: "Wer dys buch findet, der sol es Hans von Wintertur wyder geben." The dialectal features of these 138 verses, however, show some unmistakably Middle German characteristics: the Umlaut is not

<sup>93</sup> K. Roth, Deutsche Predigten, p. xxii.

indicated in words such as vrolliche, horen, luge, truge, the Upper German diphthong ae is not differentiated from e, and an occasional d for t occurs in initial position (er det). The same features can be found in the Nuremberg fragment l which Söhns classified correctly as Middle German. On the other hand, this fragment l, just as e, contains also a few minor Alemannic traces, e.g., the grapheme ch for k within the word (dunchet, bechant, gechundet). In one case in l, there is apparently even a remnant of the Old High German strong adjective declension which, with its full final vowels, was kept on in Alemannic dialects:

4598 unde disem valschan bi gestant.

Pfeiffer mentioned that he received fragment l from a friend (Wilhelm Wackernagel) in Basel (see footnote 71). There is not information on its former owners, but one might assume that l was kept in the Alemannic-Swiss area. Could it have belonged, together with e, to the same "buch" which was owned in the fifteenth century by a certain Hans of the town of Winterthur (between Zurich and the Rhine), before it was cut up and its parts dispersed? Whatever the answer may be, both fragments, e and l, give proof of an early transition from the Alemannic dialect to the prevailing Middle German forms. The close relationship to D would account for this influence.

By the second half of the thirteenth century, Rudolf's Barlaam had apparently spread not only to the North-West,

but also eastwards into the Bavarian region. The Munich codex C, written by a Bavarian scribe in 1284, was already preceded by a manuscript in Tyrolian dialect of which the "Göttweig" and the Berlin fragment m and F2 bear witness. C was usually downgraded by nineteenth century scholars because of its several text omissions; Pfeiffer called its scribe "fahrlässig" (Barlaam, p. 408), which is a mild reproach compared to K. Roth's verdict: "Er änderte, strich oder schob ein, was ihm gut dünkte . . . Wenn es Alle machten, wie Chunrat . . . so würden wir von den alten guten Texten bald Nichts mehr haben" (Deutsche Predigten, p. xxii). It seems to us, however, that the text omissions in C, whether they were introduced by the scribe Chunrat or already existed in his source, are not a sign of negligence, but rather of vigilance. What is left out are elements foreign to a typical saint's legend, everything that detracts from its otherwise religious and edifying nature: the author's praise of ladies, his rather flippant digressions (schimphrede) and even the brief mention of courtly love and aventiure in the epilogue (16105-09), the reference to the Guote Gerhard where the author addresses his literary public, and also the explicit description of pagan love and of the ungodly conduct of the Greek gods (9949-10047, 10083-251 and 10333-54). These cuts bear the stamp of a clerical censor; moreover, the preservation of the Latin bible quotations in the text could also point

to a monastic sphere. Helm and Zieseemer<sup>94</sup> quote a passage of the Apocalypsis by Heinrich von Hesler in which the author encourages the reciter to skip the following paragraph if he deems it too offensive for his audience. It would even seem conceivable that Rudolf himself might have written or authorized a version for a monastic audience (since "von Kapelle der abbet und al diu samenunge" encouraged his work), as well as one for a courtly circle.<sup>95</sup>

Rudolf's Barlaam is otherwise very scarcely documented in the Bavarian area, with the exception of the two later fragments k, Fl1 ("Oettingen fragment"), and the above mentioned Munich codex E, all derived from the GM-group. It is possible that the slightly earlier Barlaam poem by bishop Otto of Freising with its more churchly character hampered the dissemination of Rudolf's work in this area. Nevertheless, the early Bavarian documents M and C do not constitute a dead end in the text transmission, but, as we showed before, they exerted a direct influence on the Middle Franconian manuscript L in its second half. Furthermore, they are loosely related to ABbW, perhaps descending ultimately from one common source. We assume that by the fourteenth century, manuscripts of this "Bavarian line" had spread west, into the Rhenish regions, and that their

<sup>94</sup> K. Helm and W. Zieseemer, Die Literatur des Deutschen Ritterordens (Giessen, 1951), p. 29.

<sup>95</sup> X. v. Ertzdorff admits only the latter possibility pp. 88-89.

text versions merged with others. Where this influx took place (if as far south as Strassburg where B and a were preserved) and through which channels, we do not know. Manuscript W, formerly of the famous Ambras library, did not originate there, but displays Middle German characteristics, just as the Würzburg fragment h, which might have used the same source as A.

Approximately a hundred years after the composition of Barlaam, the mainstream of its text tradition had moved northwards into the Middle German regions. These various linguistic areas, heterogeneous as they may be, share certain overall dialectal features, which set them apart from the Upper German areas, e.g., the trend towards monophthongisation, the lacking of Umlaut, the lesser impact of the High German Sound Shift. Regarding this Middle German area for our purpose as one large unit, it appears that the number of Barlaam manuscripts and fragments originating from there is about equal or even superior to those known of Upper German origin.

In the West, codex L must have been written at that period; its later owners up to the eighteenth century were the lords of Blankenheim in the Eifel. Two further manuscripts of which only parts have been preserved show Middle-Franconian features. One is the brief fragment Fl0, kept at Hannover, which Stammer defines as Middle

German, perhaps Middle Franconian (see p. 172). The other one is the incomplete London manuscript M which in the eighteenth century was rediscovered in a monastery near Lüneburg.<sup>96</sup> Whether it was actually written there or not is impossible to say, but it should be noted that even in regions where the vernacular was Low German, poetic texts of Middle German dialect were copied and understood at that time.

Most of the Middle German Barlaam manuscripts, which we know mainly in the form of fragments only, do not come from the Western parts of the territory but rather from Central Germany (north of the Main River) and from the Northeastern boundaries of the Hohenstaufen empire. The best preserved representative of this category is manuscript G, formerly kept at Gotha, which proved to be a very important factor for the determination of the GEM-group. However, G is not the oldest manuscript of its group from which the others descended, fragments such as F1 (now in Basel) or F9 (now in Göttingen) have probably preceded G. It is remarkable that by far the greatest number of Middle German Barlaam texts belong to the GEM-group, namely i, n, p, F1, F3, F6, F8, F9, F10(?), F16 and F18.

One of the reasons that might account for the existence of so many Middle German manuscripts is the popularity which Rudolf's Barlaam apparently enjoyed within the Order

<sup>96</sup> See J. Koch, ZfdPh 13 (1881), 80.

of Teutonic Knights in the easternmost parts of the Holy Roman Empire. Inventories made around 1400 list a Barlaam manuscript in the libraries of the Teutonic Order at Königsberg, Elbing, Osterode, and two at Marienburg.<sup>97</sup> Of this heritage, K<sup>a</sup> and K<sup>b</sup> survived until the end of the Second World War at Königsberg, and only K<sup>c</sup>--which by virtue of its close affinity to K<sup>a</sup> and its dialect must have sprung from the same tradition--is still preserved intact. The other manuscripts have perished or were dispersed after the order was incorporated into Prussia; probably one or another of the above mentioned Middle German fragments might have belonged to such a manuscript.<sup>98</sup>

The esteem in which Rudolf's Barlaam must have been held among the influential circles of the Teutonic Order is easily understood. Since the order's mission was to carry on the ideals of the earlier Crusades, subjugate the pagan population of Eastern Europe, and convert them to the Christian faith, there was a strong need to strengthen the motivation within its own ranks. Religious literature, at the same time entertainment (miracles and saints' legends) and instruction, played an important role in that respect. Lectures and recitations from suitable works were

<sup>97</sup> See K. Helm and W. Ziesemer, p. 34.

<sup>98</sup> The official written language of the Teutonic Order was Middle German, see G. Ehrismann, Geschichte der deutschen Literatur bis zum Ausgang des Mittelalters (Munich, 1935), II, 2.2., 669.

prescribed for various occasions, such as communal meals, and the libraries were well provided with manuscripts. Not only must the ideal of asceticism in Barlaam und Josaphat have been considered very appropriate for this community of men (E. Kantorowicz characterized the Teutonic Knight as a mixture of monk and warrior),<sup>99</sup> but also the theme of overcoming heathen beliefs and ways of life would have appealed to them. The passage in which Josaphat's activity as a Christian ruler over a formerly pagan country is described (13467-13755), reflects very well the idealized role which the Teutonic Order believed itself to play, and which was depicted in its own chronicles.

Another factor, which could also account for the existence of Barlaam manuscripts within the Teutonic Order of Knights, is a political one. Rudolf in his later years is known to have been closely associated with the Hohenstaufen party and with Konrad IV in particular to whom he dedicated his Weltchronik. Since the Hohenstaufen rulers, from the days of Frederick II on, were the greatest benefactors of the Teutonic Order, Rudolf's position at the court would have facilitated the introduction of his work. The fact that the Koenigsberg manuscript K<sup>a</sup> is so closely related to the Alemannic manuscripts D and dq, despite the difference in time and place, would suggest that a reliable

<sup>99</sup> E. Kantorowicz, Kaiser Friedrich der Zweite (1927; rpt. Düsseldorf, 1963), pp. 81-88.

manuscript close to Ddq might have been transmitted directly to the Order and copied there.  $K^b$ , on the other hand, shows signs of a long copying process by which the text greatly deteriorated.  $K^b$  has derived from the GEM-group, and it is possible that the readings of the DK-group and of the GEM-group mingled within the Teutonic Order ( $K^b$ , as much as we know of it, has a common omission of a verse with  $K^a$  at 5088 and with  $K^c$  at 8341).

The final major offshoots of the Barlaam manuscript tradition occur in the Southern German area again. It is not established whether Rudolf's composition lived on in the Bavarian region after its early appearance there, or whether it was reintroduced with E which drew its text primarily from the Middle German GM-group. E, as mentioned before, was written in 1459 for a nobleman in Northern Bavaria, Veit von Egloffstein. With self-assurance, he names himself on the first page: "Das puech hab ich Veit von Eglofstain pfleger zue Vochburg mir schreibn lassen yn dem LVIIII jar der gepurt Xpi."

A decade later, in 1469, the atelier of Diebolt Lauber in Hagenau (Alsace) produced the last known handwritten manuscript of Rudolf's Barlaam. While we were unable to study its text, it is obvious that the emphasis was entirely on the pictorial side; the manuscript is richly illustrated with 138 full-page water-colour drawings. The commercial and yet sometimes highly artistic

production of codices such as this one presupposes a particular clientele. Diebolt Lauber's advertisements appealed to a more traditionally oriented aristocracy who still cherished the overcome courtly values and the old German literature. In a notice which Lauber addressed to his lord "hertzog Ruprecht" (who, according to Konrad Burdach, had become bishop of Strassburg in 1439 and died in 1478),<sup>100</sup> Lauber praised his illustrated copies of such works as Wilhelm von Orlens by Rudolf von Ems, Parzival and Iwein.<sup>101</sup> At about the same period, the interest in classical philosophy and literature was awakening in Southern Germany through the influence of Italian poets and scholars. The list of book acquisitions of the Heidelberg library ("Palatina") reflects this swift change in literary taste which was summed up by Burdach as follows: "um und vor 1440 steht die alte mittelhochdeutsche Litteratur auch im Südwesten, im Elsass, in Baden, in der Pfalz bei Adel und Fürsten in Beliebtheit und Ansehen: um 1460, kein Menschenalter danach, ist sie dort bereits von der modernen, durch neue Einflüsse Frankreichs, der Niederlande und Italiens bestimmten Litteratur zurückgedrängt and ver-

<sup>100</sup> K. Burdach, "Die pfälzischen Wittelsbacher und die altdeutschen Handschriften der Palatina," Centralblatt für Bibliothekswesen, 5 (1888), 126.

<sup>101</sup> See Rudolf Kautzsch, "Diebolt Lauber und seine Werkstatt in Hagenau," Centralblatt für Bibliothekswesen, 12 (1895), 5.

dunkelt" (loc. cit.).

Furthermore the poetic attraction which the rhymed couplets with their fixed metre had held for more than two hundred years had finally waned by force of stereotyped repetition. Prose versions were taking the place of the original rhymed versions. For the Barlaam, such an anonymous prose version of the late fifteenth century is preserved in Berlin (Staatsbibliothek Preussischer Kulturbesitz, MS. Germ. Fol. 1259).

Another very obvious reason for the abrupt ending of the Barlaam manuscript tradition lies in the rapid spreading of book printing. As far as we know, Rudolf von Ems's work was never printed at that time. On the other hand, only seven years after the completion of the Diebolt Lauber manuscript (1469) the first incunabulum of a prose version of the Barlaam story (independent of Rudolf's text) appeared in Augsburg under the title: "HIE vahet ann eyngar loblich unnd heylsam christglaubigen cronica. Sagend von eynem heiligen künig mit namen Josaphat. wie der ward bekeret von eynem heyligen vatter unnd aynsideln genant Barlaam." A second printing followed shortly thereafter.

While Rudolf's composition had fallen into oblivion, the Barlaam story with its characteristic parables stayed alive in Germany as a Christian legend over the following centuries. New translations from later, abridged Latin

versions were published, probably in connection with the Counter Reformation, around 1600. But this subject did not stimulate in Germany such rich a literary output as in Spain, where several Baroque Barlaam dramas were written and produced by, among others, Lope de Vega. Performances of various Barlaam plays by Jesuit seminaries or schools are also documented in Germany until the middle of the seventeenth century, but these texts were usually in Latin.

In the German vernacular no further adaptations of the Barlaam and Josaphat story seem to have existed in the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, with the exception, perhaps, of a rhymed Jewish-German version.<sup>102</sup> It was not until the early nineteenth century philologists and their fore-runners Bodmer and Gottsched rediscovered the Middle High German Barlaam und Josaphat, that interest in this work and its author was revived. For a short time, this rediscovery produced nearly euphoric reactions from some literary scholars.<sup>103</sup> Rudolf von Ems was held in such great esteem that he was widely credited with the creation of the Nibelungenlied. Such extreme praise could not fail to draw adverse critique on the work itself and further its subsequent downgrading as "epigonal." This may partly

<sup>102</sup> We were able to consult fragments of a Hebrew manuscript (Cod. hebr. monac. 347) in the transliteration by Dr. M. S. Patts. This interesting version does not seem to have drawn its material, mainly parables, from the known Christian sources and can therefore be disregarded in this context; see also H. Peri, pp. 234-35.

<sup>103</sup> See e.g., K. Roth, Deutsche Predigten, p. 6.

explain why, after its editions in the first half of the nineteenth century, so little research has been done on it. A better founded and more balanced judgment on Parlaam und Josaphat, as mentioned before, would necessitate a new, reliable text edition. Our study has attempted to contribute to this aim.

List of Works Cited

- Batts, Michael S. "Poetic Form and Medieval Scribal Practice." Journal of English and Germanic Philology, 62 (1963), 697-702.
- Bédier, Joseph. "La tradition manuscrite du Lai de l'Ombre. Reflexions sur l'art d'éditer les anciens textes." Romania, 54 (1928), 161-96 and 321-56.
- Bodmer, Johann J. Chriemhilden Rache und die Klage: Zwey Heldengedichte Aus dem Schwäbischen Zeitpunkte, samt Fragmenten aus dem Gedichte von den Nibelungen und Aus dem Josaphat. Zurich: C. Orell, 1757.
- Bonath, Gesa. Untersuchungen zur Überlieferung des 'Parzival' Wolframs von Eschenbach. Germanische Studien, 238/239. Hamburg and Lübeck: Matthiesen, 1970/71.
- de Boor, Helmut. Die höfische Literatur: Vorbereitung, Blüte, Ausklang, 1170-1250. Geschichte der deutschen Literatur, vol. II. 6th ed. Munich: C. H. Beck, 1964.
- Brackert, Helmut. Rudolf von Ems: Dichtung und Geschichte. Heidelberg: C. Winter, 1968.
- Burdach, Konrad. "Die pfälzischen Wittelsbacher und die altdeutschen Handschriften der Palatina." Centralblatt für Bibliothekswesen, 5 (1888), 111-33.
- Czizek, Hannah. "Rudolfs von Ems Barlaam und Josaphat und seine lateinische Vorlage." Diss. Vienna, 1931.
- Dain, Alphonse. Les manuscrits. 2nd ed. Paris: Belles-Lettres, 1964.
- Diemer, Joseph. "Kleine Beiträge zur älteren deutschen Sprache und Literatur. XI. Bruchstücke von Barlaam und Josaphat des Rudolph von Hohenems." Sitzungsberichte der Akademie der Wissenschaften, Vienna. Philosophisch-Historische Classe. XI (1853), 650-53.
- Docen, Bernhard J. Review of Barlaam und Josaphat. Ed. Friedrich K. Köpke. Jahrbücher der Literatur, Vienna, 11 (1820), 110-38.
- Ehrismann, Gustav. Geschichte der deutschen Literatur bis zum Ausgang des Mittelalters. 2. Teil: Die mittelhochdeutsche Literatur. 1935; rpt. Munich: C. H. Beck, 1959. II, 2.

- Eis, Gerhard. "Ein neues Fragment von Rudolfs von Ems Barlaam und Josaphat." Germanisch-romanische Monatsschrift, 49 (1968), 448-50.
- Erben, Johannes. "Zu Rudolfs Barlaam und Josaphat." Germanistische Studien, ed. J. Erben and E. Thurnher. Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Kulturwissenschaft, 15. Innsbruck, 1969.
- von Ertzdorff, Xenja. Rudolf von Ems: Untersuchungen zum höfischen Roman im 13. Jahrhundert. Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 1967.
- Fischer, Hermann. "Fragmente aus Barlaam und Josaphat." Germania, 30 (1885), 102-03.
- Gessler, Albert. "Bruchstücke einer Barlaamhandschrift." Anzeiger für deutsches Altertum und deutsche Literatur, 14 (1888), 147.
- von der Hagen, Friedrich H. and Büsching, Johann G. Literarischer Grundriss zur Geschichte der Deutschen Poesie von den Ältesten Zeiten bis in das sechzehnte Jahrhundert. Berlin: Duncker und Humblot, 1812.
- Helm, Karl and Ziesemer, Walther. Die Literatur des Deutschen Ritterordens. Giessener Beiträge zur deutschen Philologie, 94. Giessen, 1951.
- Hofmeister, Rudolf A. "Lachmann's Role in the Transmission of Parzival." Seminar, 10 (1974), 87-100.
- Kantorowicz, Ernst. Kaiser Friedrich der Zweite. 1927; rpt. Düsseldorf: Helmut Küpper, 1963.
- Kautzsch, Rudolf. "Diebolt Lauber und seine Werkstatt in Hagenau." Centralblatt für Bibliothekswesen, 12 (1895), 1-113.
- Klapper, Joseph. "Barlaam und Josaphat." Die deutsche Literatur des Mittelalters: Verfasserlexikon. Ed. Wolfgang Stammer. Berlin und Leipzig: de Gruyter, 1933. I, 167-72.
- Koch, John. "Fragmente von Rudolfs von Ems Barlaam und Josaphat in einer Handschrift des Britischen Museums in London." Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie, 13 (1881), 78-89.
- Köpke, Friedrich K., ed. Barlaam und Josaphat von Rudolf von Montfort. 2nd ed. Leipzig: Gebhardt, 1838.

- Lachmann, Karl, ed. Iwein. Eine Erzählung von Hartmann von Aue. 6th ed. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1962.
- Leitzmann, Albert, ed. Briefwechsel der Brüder Jacob und Wilhelm Grimm mit Karl Lachmann. Jena: Frommann, 1927.
- Linke, Hansjürgen. Epische Strukturen in der Dichtung Hartmanns von Aue: Untersuchungen zur Formkritik, Werkstruktur und Vortragsgliederung. Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 1968.
- Maas, Paul. Textkritik. 1927; 4th ed. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1960.
- Migne, Jacques P. Patrologiae cursus completus. Series latina. Paris: Garnier 1844-80.
- Mourek, Vaclav E. "Prager Bruchstück einer Pergamenthandschrift des Barlaam und Josaphat von Rudolf von Ems." Sitzungsberichte der Königlich Böhmisches Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften. Classe für Philosophie, Geschichte und Philologie, Jahrgang 1893. Prague, 1894, pp. 1-16.
- Nägler, Charlotte. "Studien zu Barlaam und Josaphat von Rudolf von Ems." Diss. Karlsruhe, 1972.
- Neumann, Friedrich. Studien zur Geschichte der deutschen Philologie. Berlin: E. Schmidt, 1971.
- Ochsenbein, Peter. "Zwei neue Bruchstücke zum Barlaam und Josaphat des Rudolf von Ems." Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum und deutsche Literatur, 101 (1972), 322-26.
- Perdisch, Adolf. Der Laubacher Barlaam: Vorstudien zu einer Ausgabe. Marburg: Elwert, 1904.
- Peri, Hiram. Der Religionsdisput der Barlaam-Legende: Ein Motiv abendländischer Dichtung. Acta Salmanticensia, Serie de Filosofia y Letras, vol. XIV, 3. Universidad de Salamanca, 1959.
- Pfeiffer, Franz, ed. Barlaam und Josaphat von Rudolf von Ems. Mit einem Anhang aus Franz Söhns, Das Handschriftenverhältnis in Rudolfs von Ems 'Barlaam,' einem Nachwort und einem Register von Heinz Rupp. Deutsche Neudrucke. Reihe: Texte des Mittelalters. 1843; rpt. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1965.
- Pfeiffer, Franz. "Bruchstücke aus Barlaam und Josaphat von Rudolf von Ems." Anzeiger für Kunde der deutschen Vorzeit. N.F. 2 (1854), 108-09.

- Pietsch, Paul. "Fragment einer Handschrift von Barlaam und Josaphat." Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie 13 (1881), 163-64.
- Piper, Paul. Höfische Epik. 3. Teil. Nachahmer Wolframs und Gotfrids. Kleinere Epen und Chroniken. Deutsche National-Literatur, ed. J. Kürschner. 4. Bd., 1. Abtlg. Stuttgart: Union, n.d.
- Reuss, Eduard W. "Beiträge zur deutschen Handschriftenkunde." Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum und deutsche Literatur, 3 (1843), 432-46.
- Roth, Karl, ed. Deutsche Predigten des XII. und XIII. Jahrhunderts. Bibliothek der gesamten deutschen National-Literatur, XI, 1. Leipzig: G. Basse, 1839.
- Rupp, Heinz. "Rudolf von Ems und Konrad von Würzburg." Der Deutschunterricht, 17, No. 2 (1965), 5-17.
- Rupp, Heinz. "Rudolfs von Ems Barlaam und Josaphat." Dienendes Wort: Festgabe für Ernst Bender. Ed. Walter Franke. Karlsruhe: G. Braun, 1959, pp. 11-37.
- Schanze, Heinz. "Beobachtungen zum Gebrauch der Dreissigerinitialen in der Willehalm Handschrift G (cod. sang. 857)." Wolfram-Studien. Ed. Werner Schröder. Berlin: Erich Schmidt, 1970, pp. 170-87.
- Schirock, Bernd. "Der Aufbau von Wolframs Parzival." Diss. Freiburg, 1972.
- Schnell, Rüdiger. Rudolf von Ems: Studien zur inneren Einheit seines Gesamtwerkes. Bern: Francke, 1969.
- Schröder, Edward. "Fuldaer Bruchstück von Rudolfs von Ems Barlaam." Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum und deutsche Literatur, 54 (1913), 23-24.
- Schröder, Edward. "Rudolf von Ems und sein Litteraturkreis." Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum und deutsche Literatur, 67 (1930), 209-51.
- Schwab, Ute. Die Barlaamparabeln im Cod. Vind. 2705: Studien zur Verfasserschaft kleinerer mittelhochdeutscher Gedichte. Istituto Universitario Orientale di Napoli. Quaderni della Sezione Germanica degli Annali III. Naples, 1966.
- de Smet, Gilbert. "Die Ausdrücke für leiden im Althochdeutschen." Wirkendes Wort, 5 (1954), 69-79.

- Söhns, Franz. Das Handschriftenverhältniss in Rudolfs von Ems 'Barlaam.' Diss. Erlangen, 1878. Erlangen: Junge, 1878.
- Sonet, Jean, S. J. Le Roman de Barlaam et Josaphat. Vol. 1: Recherches sur la tradition manuscrite latine et française. Bibliothèque de la Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres de Namur, Fascicule 6. Paris: J. Vrin, 1949.
- Stackmann, Karl. "Mittelalterliche Texte als Aufgabe." Festschrift für Jost Trier. Eds. W. Foerste and K. H. Bock. Cologne: Böhlau, 1964, pp. 240-67.
- Stammler, Wolfgang. "Bruchstücke einer Barlaamhandschrift." Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur, 43 (1918), 554-55.
- Strauch, Philipp. "Fragmente von Wolframs Willehalm und Rudolfs Barlaam." Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum und deutsche Literatur, 52 (1910), 351-56.
- Vinaver, Eugene. "Principles of Textual Emendation." Studies in French Language and Mediaeval Literature presented to M. K. Pope. 1939; rpt. Freeport, N.Y.: Books for Libraries Press, 1969, pp. 351-69.
- Ward, Harry L. D. Catalogue of Romances in the Department of Manuscripts in the British Museum. Vol. 2. London: 1893.
- Whitehead, Frederick. "The Textual Criticism of the Chanson de Roland: An Historical Review." Studies in Medieval French presented to Alfred Elwert. Oxford: Clarendon, 1961, pp. 76-89.
- Wisbey, Roy. "Zum Barlaam und Josaphat Rudolfs von Ems." Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum und deutsche Literatur, 86 (1955/56), 293-301.
- Worstbrock, Franz J. Review of the reprinted edition of Barlaam und Josaphat von Rudolf von Ems. Ed. F. Pfeiffer. Anzeiger für deutsches Altertum und deutsche Literatur, 77 (1966), 111-15.
- Wyss, Ulrich. "Rudolfs von Ems Barlaam und Josaphat zwischen Legende und Roman." Probleme mittelhochdeutscher Erzählformen: Marburger Colloquium 1969. Eds. P. F. Ganz and W. Schröder. Berlin: Erich Schmidt, 1972.

Geographical distribution of  
 Rudolf von Ems's  
Barlaam und Josaphat

The dialect division follows in its major outlines the map "Schriftdialekte in mittelhochdeutscher [-1350] und mittelniederdeutscher [-1600] Zeit," contained in Herm. Paul, Mittelhochdeutsche Grammatik, 18th ed. (Tübingen, 1960).

