

Holding It All Together: Time and Space in Wolfram's *Titirel**

I

It is Book III of Wolfram's *Parzival*, and the hero has just made off with a ring and clasp taken from the unfortunate Jeschute. Riding on downhill through the forest of Brizljan, his attention is caught by a distraught voice:

wîbes stimme er hôrte
vor eines velses orte.
ein frouwe ûz rehtem jâmer schrei:
ir was diu wâre freude enzwei.

[A woman's voice he heard, by a rock's edge. A lady was crying out, for pure sorrow—true joy had been torn in two for her.]¹

With the source of the sound, Parzival finds two figures whose story is coming to an end just as his is beginning: he discovers the grieving Sigune, and in her lap Schionatulander, killed in a joust. The solitary Sigune tells Parzival about his name, his ancestry, and his inheritance, the description of which leads into scraps of information about the dead prince: Schionatulander fought in Parzival's defence and in Sigune's service before meeting his end at the hands of Orilus. A hunting dog's leash, 'ein bracken seil',² led to his death:

nu hœr waz disiu mære sîn.
ein bracken seil gap im den pîn.

* This article originated as a paper for the Oxford medieval German graduate seminar in 2005. I am grateful to everyone who discussed the ideas in it there, and to Prof. Nigel Palmer and Dr Almut Suerbaum for commenting on drafts of the text.

¹ Wolfram von Eschenbach, *Parzival*, based on Karl Lachmann's 6th edn, trans. by Peter Knecht, with introductory essays by Bernd Schirok, 2nd edn (Berlin and New York: de Gruyter, 2003), 138,11–14. Translations of Wolfram's works are taken from Wolfram von Eschenbach, *Parzival: With Titirel and the Love Lyrics*, trans. by Cyril Edwards, *Arthurian Studies*, 66 (Cambridge: Brewer, 2004), here p. 44.

² 'Bracke bezeichnet einen kleineren Hund, wie er insbes. zur Spurjagd und Hetzjagd auf Rotwild üblich war [...]. Zugleich sind gerade Bracken als Geschenke an die *frouwe*, als Schoßtiere beliebt' (Helmut Brackert and Stephan Fuchs-Jolie, 'Stellenkommentar', in Wolfram von Eschenbach, *Titirel*, ed., trans., and with comm. by Helmut Brackert und Stephan Fuchs-Jolie (Berlin and New York: de Gruyter, 2002), pp. 173–442, here p. 391).

in unser zweier dienste den tô
hât er bejagt, und jâmers nô
mir nâch sîner minne.
ich hete kranke sinne,
daz ich im niht minne gap:
des hât der sorgen urhap
mir freude verschrôten:
nu minne i'n alsô tôten.

[Hear now how these events came about—a bercelet's leash brought this grief upon him. Serving us both, he hunted down death, and won me misery's extremity for love of him. I was foolish in my mind not to give him love, and consequently sorrow's source has cut my joy to pieces. Now I love him, dead though he is.]³

Having heard this much from Sigune, Parzival is eager to avenge the death of her lover, but she despatches him in the 'wrong' direction for fear of sending him too to his death.

So ends the first of four passages in which Parzival and the audience meet the unfortunate couple of Sigune and Schionatulander. In each case, we are presented with scraps of information about their past, but the work declines to provide a more detailed account of it. For that, we must turn to *Titirel*,⁴ Wolfram's second narrative poem—but it is no straightforward solution to the questions raised in *Parzival*, for it consists of two disconnected textual fragments and challenges familiar notions about the temporal and spatial contiguity of narrative. The significance of these issues is already apparent in the presentation of the Sigune story in *Parzival*,⁵ to which we now, as a prelude to discussion of *Titirel*, return.

³ *Parzival*, 141,15–24; Edwards translation, pp. 45–46.

⁴ Despite its title, *Titirel* is concerned primarily with the story of Sigune and Schionatulander; it was normal in the Middle Ages for works to be titled according to the first name mentioned in them, in this case the Grail king Titirel (see Brackert and Fuchs-Jolie, 'Stellenkommentar', pp. 176–77). On intertextuality and the figure of Sigune in *Parzival* and *Titirel*, see Ulrike Draesner, *Wege durch erzählte Welten: Intertextuelle Verweise als Mittel der Bedeutungskonstitution in Wolframs 'Parzival'*, Mikrokosmos, 36 (Frankfurt a. M.: Lang, 1993), pp. 265–87.

⁵ Sigune's role in *Parzival* has been extensively studied in its own right; some starting points are Birgit Eichholz, *Kommentar zur Sigune- und Ither-Szene im 3. Buch von Wolframs 'Parzival'*, Helfant Studien, S 3 (Stuttgart: helfant edition, 1987), pp. 11–67; Joachim Bumke, *Wolfram von Eschenbach*, Sammlung

Three more times Parzival encounters Sigune:⁶ holding her dead lover in her arms in a lime-tree somewhere near the Grail castle; in a forest hermitage 'ine weiz ze welhen stunden' ['I don't know at what hour'] (narrator), 'sô verre von dem wege' ['so far away from the track'] (Parzival), where Schionatulander has been buried;⁷ and finally in that same hermitage, where she is found dead. In their second conversation, Sigune tells Parzival about the castle of Munsalvæsche, Titirel, and the latter's sons, and says that Schionatulander died in a joust. During their third meeting, the narrator reminds us of Sigune's failure to show her love when she had time to do so, and she tells another version of her now familiar story to Parzival: she did not give her love in life, and Schionatulander was a good knight who died in her service. When Parzival sees the couple for the last time, the narrator reports that Sigune's mother raised Condwiramurs, Parzival's wife, as a child.

In *Parzival*, the primary function of these encounters with Sigune lies in marking stages of the hero's journey in a symbolic as well as a literal sense. The elements of chance and failure leading to the first two encounters reflect Parzival's inexperience and immaturity for his task. On both occasions, he is drawn to Sigune by the sound of her voice: he chances upon her rather than being directed to or seeking her. Furthermore, in neither case does he find the guidance he needs for the next stage of his journey. The first time, his precipitate desire to avenge Schionatulander means that he is sent away in the 'wrong' direction. The second time, Sigune's anger at his failure to ask the redeeming

Metzler, 36, 8th edn (Stuttgart and Weimar: Metzler, 2004), pp. 58, 69, 87–88, 120, 161; Robert Braunagel, *Wolframs Sigune: Eine vergleichende Bearbeitung der Sigune-Figur und ihrer Ausarbeitung im 'Parzival' und 'Titirel' des Wolfram von Eschenbach*, GAG, 662 (Göppingen: Kümmerle, 1999), pp. 6–29, 70–76.

⁶ Parzival's four meetings with Sigune are as follows: *Parzival*, 138,9–142,2; 249,11–255,30; 435,2–442,26; 804,21–805,9.

⁷ *Parzival*, 435,5; 438,24; Edwards translation, pp. 140–41.

question at Munsalvæsche means that she refuses to say more to him and leaves him to ride away and happen upon the trail of the disgraced Jeschute. The last two encounters, on the other hand, point to Parzival's growing readiness to fulfil his destiny. For him, the third meeting takes place by chance, but we know that it is actually brought about by God's care for him ('sîn wolte got dô ruochen. / er vant ein klôsnærinne' ['God then deigned to take his part. He found a hermitess']).⁸ Still, though, he has not quite thrown off his old faults: he is fascinated by Sigune's ring and cynically doubts the piety of her existence. But he is moved to pity once he realizes who she is. And this time, after Sigune has raised the possibility that there is yet hope, he is sent away on what might be the right track: that of Cundrie, the Grail messenger. When Parzival, now Grail king, sees Sigune for the fourth and final time, he does so because he asks to of his own volition, and, though it is dark, he and his companions have no difficulty in finding the way on to Munsalvæsche after laying the two dead lovers side by side in their tomb.

The four scenes also reflect the progress of Sigune's spiritual journey: starting in Brizljan (a forest, but not with a strong sense of remoteness—Parzival subsequently finds a road 'gestrîcht unde breit' ['paved and broad']),⁹ she becomes more and more isolated as her piety increases. On her second meeting with Parzival, she is in the unfamiliar region surrounding the Grail castle, where, in her own words, 'ez [ist] widerzæme / daz iemen an sich næme / sîne reise in dise waste' ['it is not fit that anyone should take on himself a journey into this waste land'],¹⁰ and during the last two she is in her hermitage in the heart of a wild forest. For her, it is the place of the encounters that is significant; for Parzival, his movement through space towards and away from them.

⁸ *Parzival*, 435,12–13; Edwards translation, p. 140.

⁹ *Parzival*, 142,5; Edwards translation, p. 46.

¹⁰ *Parzival*, 250,3–5; Edwards translation, p. 80.

Parzival's meetings with Sigune and Schionatulander, then, serve to mark stages in his story and to show hers drawing to its close,¹¹ rather than functioning as jumping-off points that Wolfram could use to provide a more complete picture of the story behind the unhappy couple. There is little to suggest that Parzival himself would have wished to know more about it—Sigune does indeed speak about her relationship in response to questions from him on two occasions, but those questions are actually about the knight who slew Schionatulander (first meeting) and the ring she is wearing (third meeting). Parzival is interested in the themes of her story (chivalry and love), but not, it would seem, in the story itself. And so the audience is left with scattered fragments of that story, related, and in many cases repeated, by Sigune and the narrator at disparate places in the narrative world and the narrative text, and at widely spaced intervals in narrated time and narrative time.¹² The temporal and spatial dimensions are carefully structured and contribute to the meaning of the narrative about Parzival and Sigune. Sigune's past, though, like that of Schionatulander, remains nebulous.

To recap: we have a potted picture of a genealogy in which Sigune and Schionatulander are linked to Parzival, his wife, and the rest of the Grail family; we know that Schionatulander died serving Sigune (and Parzival), and that he was killed by Orilus in a joust; and we also know that Sigune regrets not having shown her love for Schionatulander while he was alive. There is also a strong suggestion, though it is never explicitly stated, that this made Sigune responsible for her lover's death. The result is a

¹¹ On withdrawal from the world as a marker of narrative closure, see Corinna Biesterfeldt, *Moniage—Der Rückzug aus der Welt als Erzählschluß: Untersuchungen zur 'Kaiserchronik', 'König Rother', 'Orendel', 'Barlaam und Josaphat', 'Prosa-Lancelot'* (Stuttgart: Hirzel, 2004).

¹² The internal chronological structure of the *Parzival* world is complex, particularly in its detail, involving astrology and the liturgy as well as more familiar ways of reckoning time. See Hermann J. Weigand, *Wolfram's Parzival: Five Essays with an Introduction*, ed. by Ursula Hoffmann (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1969), pp. 42–63; Arthur Groos, *Romancing the Grail: Genre, Science, and Quest in Wolfram's Parzival* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1995), pp. 130–32.

basic outline of past events (lady loves knight, knight dies jousting, lady grieves) and present closure (withdrawal from the world) that would be unlikely to have left an audience bemused, confused, or eager to know more.¹³ But we have also learnt that another factor was involved in Schionatulander's death: the 'bracken seil' ['bercelet's leash'].¹⁴ Because of this piece of knowledge, gaps in what we know appear—how, for example, did a dog's leash cause the death of a knight? What would otherwise have been an unproblematic auxiliary plot known in outline and supporting the story of Parzival becomes, in Wolfram's hands, a source of questions, an ending without a story—a story that *Titirel* may

well have been written to provide. Its challenges present themselves first on the level of the fragmentary text. Accordingly, it will be well to begin by reviewing some basic facts about that text and the way audiences medieval and modern have responded to its difficulties and those of the seemingly disjointed narrative it contains.

II

Wolfram von Eschenbach, perhaps a knight, probably from Ober-Eschenbach in Franconia, renamed Wolframs-Eschenbach in 1917, is believed to have composed *Titirel* after *Parzival* and after or during *Willehalm*.¹⁵ The only evidence for an absolute dating

¹³ Compare, for example, the *joie de la curt* episode in Hartmann's *Erec*, in which the knights of the eighty widows at Brandigan have all been slain by Mabonagrín: no further elaboration of the details is provided for the audience by the narrator or desired by Erec himself. (The widows' story is ended not by withdrawal from the world but by reintegration into the Arthurian court, expressed in the replacement of mourning dress with joyful courtly clothing.)

¹⁴ *Parzival*, 141,16; Edwards translation, p. 46.

¹⁵ See Bumke, *Wolfram*, pp. 1–21; Joachim Bumke, *Geschichte der deutschen Literatur im hohen Mittelalter*, dtv, 30778, 4th edn (Munich: Deutscher Taschenbuch Verlag, 2002), pp. 162–63.

of *Titirel* occurs in strophe 87 of the most recent edition,¹⁶ according to which Hermann of Thuringia is no longer alive, meaning that the passage in question must have been composed after the Landgraf's death in 1217. The strophe, however, is found only in the Munich manuscript, and requires considerable editorial intervention in order to be legible at all.¹⁷ The transmission of *Titirel* is problematic in many more ways than this. The work as we know it consists of two fragments, of which the first covers the youth of the two lovers and the second the *bracken seil* incident, and is preserved in three manuscripts. *G* (mid-thirteenth century) includes both fragments; *H* (early sixteenth century) and *M* (c. 1300), include only parts of the first, not always the same as those in *G*.¹⁸ In *G* and *H*, fragment 1 begins with a strophe that tells of how Titirel, the progenitor of the Grail family, used to lead his followers into battle and reports the beginning of a speech he later made in his old age. A prologue is lacking; suggestions about the loss of preceding text and its content can only be speculative. The *M* version, on the other hand, leaps into the action at strophe 31 of the critical edition, containing part of a dialogue between Sigune and her father before she is sent away to her aunt (Herzeloide). The end

¹⁶ *Titirel*, ed. by Brackert and Fuchs-Jolie (see note 2 above). Unless otherwise stated, references are to this *Titirel* edition rather than its 2003 paperback reprint, which has an introductory essay by Stephan Fuchs-Jolie and shorter commentary. Note also that the strophes in these editions are numbered differently in the Edwards translation.

¹⁷ We cannot even be sure if the name Hermann of Thuringia, the reading suggested by the editors, was actually present in the 'original' wording now obscured by lacunae. The strophe in question is preserved only in manuscript *M* (strophe 27), a transcription of which can be found in *Titirel*, pp. 159–68. The strophe is also transmitted in Albrecht's *Jüngerer Titirel*, although even here the manuscript evidence is far from unequivocal (see strophe 761 and the accompanying critical apparatus in *Albrechts von Schafenberg Jüngerer Titirel*, ed. by Werner Wolf, vol. 1, DTM, 45 (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1955), p. 199). See Brackert and Fuchs-Jolie, 'Stellenkommentar', pp. 321–22.

¹⁸ *G*: Bayerische Staatsbibliothek München, Cgm 19; *H*: Österreichische Nationalbibliothek Wien, Ser. nova 2663 (the *Ambraser Heldenbuch*); *M*: Universitätsbibliothek München, 8° Cod. ms. 154 (= Cim 80^b). On transmission, see Helmut Brackert and Stephan Fuchs-Jolie, 'Editorisches Vorwort', in *Titirel*, ed. by Brackert and Fuchs-Jolie, pp. 1–62, here pp. 6–40; Bumke, *Wolfram*, pp. 249–55; Siegfried Christoph, 'Authority and Text in Wolfram's *Titirel* and *Parzival*', *Deutsche Vierteljahrsschrift für Literaturwissenschaft und Geistesgeschichte*, 73 (1999), 211–27, here pp. 211–13; Wolfram von Eschenbach, *Titirel: Abbildung sämtlicher Handschriften mit einem Anhang zur Überlieferung des Textes im 'Jüngerer Titirel'*, ed. by Joachim Heinzle, Litterae, 26 (Göppingen: Kümmerle, 1973).

of fragment 1 in *G* arguably coincides with a natural break in the story: Sigune rejoices that Herzeloide has approved her love for Schionatulander (strophe 136 of the edition). In *H* and *M*, though, fragment 1 ends more abruptly, in the middle rather than at the end of a dialogue. In *H*, it ends with strophe 67 of the edition,¹⁹ during the *Minnegespräch* between Sigune and Schionatulander; in *M*, it ends with strophe 119 of the edition, at the beginning of Sigune's speech in the discussion of love which she has with Herzeloide. Fragment 2, being transmitted only in *G*, is more easily described: it begins *in medias res* with 'sus lägen si [Sigune and Schionatulander] unlange' ['they did not lie thus there long'],²⁰ and it ends with Schionatulander having pledged to recover the dog's leash for Sigune.

Summarizing this rather convoluted situation, we can say that *G* is the most extensive version, with *H* and *M* supplying additional internal material for the first fragment (they have eleven more strophes than *G*).²¹ Even if fragment 1 ends at a more natural point in *G* than in *H* and *M*, there is still an obvious gap between it and the beginning of fragment 2, which begins suddenly in a forest where the two lovers are encamped. We cannot know what might have been contained in any bridging passage.²²

¹⁹ Note that the edition modifies the order of the final strophes of *H*: *H* 67 = edition 68; *H* 68 = edition 66; *H* 69 = edition 67.

²⁰ *Titirel*, 137,1; modified version of the Edwards translation, p. 278 ('They did not lie thus encamped there long.').

²¹ These 'extra' strophes (here listed according to their numbering in the edition) have a variety of functions: (i) 30 (*H* 35) and 31 (*H* 36 / *M* 1) supply a dialogue between Kiot and Sigune; (ii) 33 (*H* 38 / *M* 3) and 34 (*H* 39 / *M* 5) provide descriptions praising Sigune and Herzeloide; (iii) 36 (*H* 41 / *M* 4) and 53 (*H* 13) are descriptions more closely tied into the narrative, of Sigune's growing maturity and the couple's secret love respectively; (iv) 81 to 84 (*M* 19 to *M* 22), in their editorially emended form, relate how Gahmuret leaves Herzeloide; (v) 87 (*M* 27) is the problematic strophe that may refer to Hermann of Thuringia. The 'extra' strophes of *H*, that is to say, tend towards description/showing rather than narration, but those of *M* make use of both modes.

²² The *Jüngerer Titirel* goes some way towards linking the two fragments of its predecessor: Schionatulander journeys to the East, visits Parzival and Herzeloide with Sigune, and sets up camp with her in a forest, which becomes the scene of Wolfram's second *Titirel* fragment. Albrecht's linking narrative is described perfunctorily in Andrea Lorenz, *Der Jüngere Titirel als Wolfram-Fortsetzung: Eine Reise zum*

Nor do we not know what might have followed the end of the second fragment,²³ which, curiously after the numerous predictions of doom in the preceding strophes,²⁴ ends on a note of suspense ('daz freischet wol der tumbe unt ouch der grîse / von dem verzageten sicherboten [Schionatulander], obe der swebe oder sinke an dem prîse.' ['That the young fool, and the greybeard too, will hear from the daunted pledge-bearer—whether he swims or sinks in fame.']).²⁵ Contemporaries, it would seem, found all this just as puzzling as modern audiences. Around 1270, a certain Albrecht rounded the story off by drawing it into his massive *Jüngerer Titirel*, which has been described as a 'Schionatulander-Parzival-Artus-Gral-Roman von riesigen Dimensionen [...], dessen Handlung über Schionatulanders und Sigunes Tod hinaus bis zur Überführung des Grals nach Indien reicht'.²⁶ Assuming that *Titirel* was written to provide a pre-history of the Sigune and Schionatulander whom we met in *Parzival*, its textual transmission thus turns out to have a discontinuity and fragmentariness equivalent, albeit on a different level, to those of the *mære* it was meant to complete.²⁷ Can the same be said of the *Titirel* narrative itself?

Mittelpunkt des Werks, Deutsche Literatur von den Anfängen bis 1700, 36 (Berne: Lang, 2002), p. 170; Herbert Guggenberger, *Albrechts Jüngerer Titirel: Studien zur Minnethematik und zur Werkkonzeption*, GAG, 566 (Göppingen: Kümmerle, 1992), p. 100.

²³ The *Jüngerer Titirel* goes on to describe, among many other things, how Schionatulander met his death at the hands of Orilus.

²⁴ See Volker Mertens, 'Kontstruktion und Dekonstruktion heldenepischen Erzählens: "Nibelungenlied"—"Klage"—"Titirel"', *PBB*, 118 (1996), 358–78.

²⁵ *Titirel*, 175,3–4; Edwards translation, p. 282; see also p. 282 n. 719: 'It is not clear whether the *verzagete sicherbote*, the "daunted pledge-bearer" refers to Schionatulander, or to Wolfram himself as the guarantor of the story; *von* might mean either "from" or "about".'

²⁶ Joachim Bumke, *Wolfram von Eschenbach*, Sammlung Metzler, 36, 7th edn (Stuttgart and Weimar: Metzler, 1997), p. 257. This formulation has been removed from the most recent, eighth edition of Bumke's book (which is the edition otherwise cited in this article; see note 5 above).

²⁷ Sigune in *Parzival*, 141,15: 'nu hoer waz disiu mære sîn' ['hear now how these events came about'] (Edwards translation, p. 45). This (plural) form of *mære* has been defined as 'die meistens rythmisch abgefasste erzählung einer denkwürdigen begebenheit, einer *âventiure*' (Georg Friedrich Benecke, Wilhelm Müller, and Friedrich Zarncke, *Mittelhochdeutsches Wörterbuch*, 3 vols (Leipzig: Hirzel, 1854–66; repr. Hildesheim: Olms, 1963), vol. 2.1, p. 74. As with other such terms, it has not proved possible to

Critical opinion would seem to be in little doubt as to the answer. In 1974, Max Wehrli, drawing together earlier work, described the character of *Titirel* as one of 'Verrätselung und Zerrüttung'.²⁸ In 1980, Walter Haug wrote: 'Es werden immer wieder Details aus dem Zusammenhang herausgerissen [...]; dazwischen gesetzt aber sind Erklärungen, Exkurse, Rückgriffe, Vorwegnahmen, kommentierende Einschübe aus den verschiedensten Perspektiven. Es kommt, bei aller Anschaulichkeit der Einzelmomente, zu einer solchen Zersplitterung des Erzählkontinuums, daß man immer wieder anhalten, die Bruchstücke zusammensetzen, sich vergewissern muß, wo man nun eigentlich steht.'²⁹ Christian Kiening and Susanne Köbele noted in 1998 that the narrative—when, that is, it is not displaced by dialogue, reflection, or commentary—is assembled in such a way that comprehending the text becomes a problem requiring constant effort on the part of the recipient.³⁰ Finally, in 2003, Stephan Fuchs-Jolie's introductory essay mentions the 'Reflexivität und Gebrochenheit des Erzählens' as one of the main features of *Titirel*.³¹ Yet despite this insistence on the discontinuity of the narrative, relatively little attention has been given to the specifically narrative factors that give rise to it. For example, only two pages of Haug's sixteen-page essay tackle the difficulties presented by the narrative itself before he moves on to matters of language and plot construction,³² and the essay by

associate the Middle High German word with a clearly defined literary genre; the most important study in this respect is Hanns Fischer, *Studien zur deutschen Märendichtung*, 2nd edn, ed. and rev. by Johannes Janota (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1983), pp. 29–92.

²⁸ Max Wehrli, *Wolframs 'Titirel'*, Rheinisch-Westfälische Akademie der Wissenschaften: Vorträge, G 194 (Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1974), p. 17, quoted in Walter Haug, 'Erzählen vom Tod her: Sprachkrise, gebrochene Handlung und zerfallende Welt in Wolframs "Titirel"', in *Wolfram-Studien VI*, ed. by Werner Schröder (Berlin: Schmidt, 1980), pp. 8–24, here p. 17.

²⁹ Haug, 'Erzählen', p. 17.

³⁰ Christian Kiening and Susanne Köbele, 'Wilde Minne: Metapher und Erzählwelt in Wolframs "Titirel"', *PBB*, 120 (1998), 234–65, here p. 239.

³¹ Stephan Fuchs-Jolie, 'Eine Einführung', in *Titirel*, Wolfram von Eschenbach, *Titirel*, ed., trans., and with comm. by Helmut Brackert and Stephan Fuchs-Jolie (Berlin and New York: de Gruyter, 2003), pp. 3–24, here p. 3 (this is the paperback *Titirel* edition with abbreviated commentary).

³² Haug, 'Erzählen', pp. 14–17.

Kiening and Köbele is concerned primarily with the consequences of the use of metaphor. In what follows, I examine the narrative's structure in more detail, giving special attention to the handling of time and space, in order to show whether and how the world of its two fragments is held together. Unless otherwise stated, my deliberations are based on the strophes of the *G* text.

III

Fragment 1 has two parts.³³ The first (strophes 1–42) sets the scene for the story of Sigune and Schionatulander. The background it provides is primarily genealogical: we begin with Titirel's abdication to Frimutel (1–12), and are then told about Sigune's ancestry (13–24) and youth (25–35; 36 is absent from *G*). The new focus on Sigune as a character is accompanied by continued interest in the genealogy of the Grail family. When attention shifts to Schionatulander's ancestry and youth (37–42), the tendency to focus on individual characters increases (in strophe 37, for example, the narrator reminds us of the story of Gahmuret, Ampflise, and Herzloyde), but still genealogy plays a role (41–42). The second part of fragment 1 (47–136) has a narrower scope; it recounts the growth of love between Sigune and Schionatulander, their parting, and the effect this has on them. The two parts are bridged by a short passage (43–46) that sets the scene for what follows; it praises the nobility of the Grail family and its members wherever they may be, in the city of Kanvoleiz, for example, scene of the subsequent action.

At first, the cohesion of the fragment depends on its relationship with another text rather than the direct link to the real world suggested by genealogy, which is

³³ The following structural breakdown draws on the commentary on fragment 1 in Brackert and Fuchs-Jolie, 'Stellenkommentar', pp. 175–387.

characteristic of historical writing.³⁴ The recipient acquainted with *Parzival*, that is to say, will be able to use the information given about Titirel and his family to fill in details of the picture drawn by the earlier work, to draw on its world as a source of cohesion. Without the foil of *Parzival*, though—and in some cases even with it—the opening strophes raise several questions. What exactly are the deeds in battle to which Titirel refers (strophe 2)? What exactly has Titirel done involving *minne* (3), a particularly pressing question given the injunction of chastity to which the Grail king is subject? What exactly was the content of the 'orden' ['order'] that Titirel found written on the Grail (6)?³⁵ And what exactly is being said about Frimutel's past in the cryptic strophe 8? Rather than easing us into the story, these opening strophes assume prior knowledge, raising questions that are answered neither in *Parzival* nor in the rest of *Titirel* as we know it. In one sense there is no need for clarification: Titirel's speech would not have presented any of these difficulties to its audience within the text, the 'rîter unt frouwen' ['knights and ladies'] of the Grail community,³⁶ among them Frimutel, the 'du' ['you'] addressed in strophes 8 to 10. The speech looks both forward, initiating the genealogical progression to come, and backward, to events in Titirel's past. For the audience in the text, the future is unknown and the past known; for the audience outside it, the future is, at least in part, knowable (in one way because we know from *Parzival* what happens to

³⁴ I shall use 'cohesion' to refer to the way in which a narrative world is held together as a conceptual whole (content, or, in Genette's theory, *histoire*), and 'coherence' to refer to the way in which a narrative is held together linguistically (form, or *discours*). See, for example, Elisabeth Stuck, 'Kohärenz', in *Reallexikon der deutschen Literaturwissenschaft*, vol. 2, ed. by Harald Fricke (Berlin and New York: de Gruyter, 2000), pp. 280–82: 'Kohäsion (oft auch *Syntaktische Kohärenz*, *Grammatische Kohärenz* genannt)' is described as the 'satzinterene und satzübergreifende syntaktische Verknüpfung von Textteilen' (p. 280), contrasting with 'Kohärenz', which is generally used in the study of literature to refer to 'eine gewisse Geschlossenheit von Texten aus dem Zusammenhang von Handlung, Wirklichkeitskonzeption und Beschreibung' (p. 281). It is of course not always clear where the boundary between the two lies in practice.

³⁵ *Titirel*, 6,3; Edwards translation, p. 267.

³⁶ *Titirel*, 11,1; Edwards translation, p. 268.

Schionatulander, in another because we have access to the *Titirel* text) and the past unknown. From the outset, *Titirel* restates the problem that led to its existence: stories can always give rise to new stories, can create fresh gaps in our knowledge even as they fill others.³⁷

The disorientating effect recedes only when the genealogical structure begins to unfold (from strophe 9 onwards), supplying a relative chronological framework with the help of which the recipient can process the narrative. The development of cohesion is further aided when a place name is mentioned for the first time at the end of *Titirel*'s speech ('Frimutel besaz dâ werdeclîche / den grâl ûf Muntsalvâtsche' ['in Munsalvæsche Frimutel nobly took charge of the Grail']),³⁸ giving concrete shape to the spatial/geographical dimension of the narrative. Further geographical information is provided in subsequent strophes of the fragment. For example: Schoysiane marries Kiot in Katelangen; Sigune grows up in Katelangen, in Brobarz, and then with Schionatulander in Kanvoleiz; and Gahmuret passes through Sibilie on his fateful journey. In general, then, Wolfram takes care to make clear the spatial settings of the first fragment as it progresses, using proper nouns to specify the location of events. Yet the relationship between these locations and the real world is not entirely clear. Sibilie is Seville, might be Catalonia, and Kanvoleiz is probably a town in Wales or North Wales;³⁹ but Brobarz is to be found only in *Parzival* and, perhaps, in *Erec*.⁴⁰ The implications of this ambivalence

³⁷ There is an obvious parallel between *Titirel*'s speech and Sigune's *mare* in *Parzival*: in both cases, an intradiegetic narrator tells a story that is unproblematic for its recipient(s) in the narrative but problematic for the audience outside it.

³⁸ *Titirel*, 12,3–4; Edwards translation, p. 268.

³⁹ On Katelangen, see Joachim Heinzle, *Stellenkommentar zu Wolframs Titirel: Beiträge zum Verständnis des überlieferten Textes*, Hermaea NF, 30 (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1972), p. 30; on Kanvoleiz and *Parzival*, 494,23–24, see Brackert and Fuchs-Jolie, 'Stellenkommentar', p. 210.

⁴⁰ 'Brûbarz' may be derived from the place name 'Brebaz' in Hartmann von Aue, *Erec: Mit einem*

The fragility of cohesion is also evident in the way in which Sigune and Schionatulander enter the narrative. The narrator explains that he introduced Sigune first because her membership of the Grail family demanded it (43)—showing, by the way, that he *is* concerned with chronological issues, that problems of coherence cannot be dismissed as the result of technical carelessness. The narrator's explanation, however, relates only to the order in which the stories of the two in their youth are presented (Sigune: 25–35; Schionatulander: 37–42; 36 is absent from *G*), not to the order in which they occurred, which is not clarified; they would seem in all likelihood to be simultaneous. The same could well be the case with the conversations that Schionatulander (97–112) and Sigune (113–36) have with their mentors after parting in strophe 78. The story of the couple splits into two strands again here, and the switch from one to the other is again void of narratorial clarification about the chronological relationship between those strands. The narrator does, though, provide a smooth transition from one character to the other ('ouch sule wir der grôzen nôht niht vergezzen, / die Kîôtes kint truoc unt Schoysîânen / sâmen.' ['Nor should we forget the great distress that Kyot's child and Schoysiane's seed bore.']).⁴⁴ Consider also the contrast between the genealogical framework that provides effective points of reference for the story of Sigune's youth, on the one hand, and the juggled order in which Schionatulander's youth is presented to us on the other. First we learn that he was given to Ampflise and then later to Gahmuret as a child, then about his parents and how he lost his father. Intuitively, we

⁴⁴ *Titirel*, 113,2–4; Edwards translation, p. 276. On narrative strands and switches, see Almut Suerbaum, "'Entrelacement?'" Narrative Technique in Heinrich von dem Türlin's *Diu Crône*', *Oxford German Studies*, 34 (2005), 5–18, here pp. 7–9. On simultaneity see Hans-Hugo Steinhoff, *Die Darstellung gleichzeitiger Geschehnisse im mittelhochdeutschen Epos: Studien zur Entfaltung der poetischen Technik vom Rolandslied bis zum Willehalm*, *Medium Aevum: Philologische Studien*, 4 (Munich: Eidos, 1964), esp. pp. 7–18 on the theoretical background and pp. 44–66 on the synchronization of strands of the *Parzival* story.

might think that he was given away after his father died, but the narrative does not make clear whether this is the case. The Grail family genealogy cannot provide chronological orientation for the story of a character who is not part of it. Finally, the version of *Titirel* in the Heidelberg manuscript produces an open contradiction in the spatial cohesion of the narrative world. When Sigune's mother dies in childbirth in Katelangen, her father Kiot withdraws from the world (22), and he weeps when she is taken away to grow up in Brobarz (25, 28)—where he then appears, with no explanation, to have a brief dialogue with her about dolls and *Minnedienst* (strophes 30 and 31 of the edition).⁴⁵

Another combination of chronological and geographical information, somewhat different from that in strophe 28, can be found in strophe 73:

Diz was der anevanc ir [Sigune and Schionatulander's] geselleschefte
mit worten an den zîten, dô Pompeirus für Baldac mit krefte
het ouch sîne hervart gesprochen
unt Ipomidôn der werde. ûz ir her wart vil niwer sper zebrochen.

[This was the beginning of their companionship in words, at that time when Pompey had proclaimed his campaign before Baldac, with his forces, together with noble Ipomidon. By their army many new spears were shattered.]⁴⁶

In conjunction with strophes 45–47, this strophe frames the dialogue in which Sigune and Schionatulander confess their love for one another. Strophes 45–47 highlight the fact that Kanvoleiz is the scene of the dialogue; strophe 73 supplies a precise point in time for it: the couple speak of their relationship to each other at the time when Pompeius and Ipomidon declared war on Baldac. The historical reference implicit in the naming of Baldac (Baghdad) and Pompeius (Pompey) is immediately obvious, and Ipomidon

⁴⁵ *H* contains strophes 30 and 31; 31 is also the first strophe in *M*. Neither strophe is present in *G*.

⁴⁶ *Titirel*, 73,1–4; Edwards translation, p. 273.

appears to have been drawn from poetry on historical material.⁴⁷ The reference to an (alleged) event in the real world potentially supplies a much firmer, historical source of orientation than the literary allusions of strophe 28.

Before the dialogue framed by the strophes discussed in the preceding paragraph, the stories of the two partners have been defined by movement. We have traced Sigune's journey above; Schionatulander's takes him to Ampflise in France, and from Ampflise to the heathen lands and then Waleis (Wales) with Gahmuret. Thus, the treatment of hero and heroine is dominated by movement that leads to them both being brought under Gahmuret's wing in Kanvoleiz, which remains a stable location just long enough for them to confess their love to one another before movement returns when Gahmuret and Schionatulander depart for the heathen kingdoms. The cohesion established for the dialogue begins to break down with the renewed appearance of movement. To be sure, we know that Gahmuret (and with him Schionatulander) go from Norgals (perhaps North Wales) to Sibilie (Seville; 86,1–2),⁴⁸ and on to Baldac (Baghdad; 85,4). But we do not know when or where Gahmuret's conversation on love with Schionatulander takes place, apart from the fact that 'er nam in sunder ûf daz velt von der strâze' ['he took him aside, in the field, off the road'],⁴⁹ after Schionatulander had been pining for an unspecified

⁴⁷ See Heinzle, *Stellenkommentar*, pp. 118–19; Eberhard Nellmann, 'Kommentar' in Wolfram von Eschenbach, *Parzival*, based on Lachmann's edn, rev. and comm. by Eberhard Nellmann, trans. by Dieter Kühn, Bibliothek des Mittelalters, 8 (Frankfurt a. M.: Deutscher Klassiker Verlag, 1994), vol. 2, pp. 411–790, here p. 462). The passage can also be read as an intertextual reference to *Parzival*, in which Pompeius and Ipomidon both feature (14,3–7; 101,25–101,22) (Brackert and Fuchs-Jolie, 'Stellenkommentar', pp. 305–6). We return to this problem below.

⁴⁸ 'Norgals' is derived from Old French *Norgales*, probably referring to North Wales or Cumbria (see G. D. West, *An Index of Proper Names in French Arthurian Verse Romances (1150–1300)*, University of Toronto Romance Series, 15 (University of Toronto Press, 1969), p. 123; G. D. West, *An Index of Proper Names in French Arthurian Prose Romances*, University of Toronto Romance Series, 35 (Toronto, Buffalo, and London: University of Toronto Press, 1978), pp. 235–36). This derivation is of course unlikely to have been clear to a German audience.

⁴⁹ *Titirel*, 97,3; Edwards translation, p. 275.

length of time ('er kal et al die mânen, swie sich diu zît huop, den winder unt den summer.' ['He was, indeed, in torment throughout the months, whatever season came, winter or summer.']).⁵⁰ And, although we can assume Sigune is still in Kanvoleiz with Herzeloide, we do not know when their discussion about love takes place either.

Despite the difficulties and ambiguities of the first fragment, it nonetheless unfolds (in) a world with temporal and spatial dimensions, however precarious at times, generated by means of a genealogical framework, references to quasi-historical events in the real world, and points of reference in other texts. Its structure is clearest when the lovers are together and happy, less so when they are not.

IV

Considered as a whole from a distance, the second fragment might appear to be easier for the recipient to manage than the first. It contains an account of how Schionatulander captures a hunting dog that eventually escapes, at which point the fragment breaks off: Schionatulander promises to find the dog again so that his lover can finish reading the story on its leash. The chronological sequence of events is clearer, and they are more tightly bound into a narrative than those of the frequently disjunctive first fragment. The use of 'die wîle' in 'Schoynatulander mit einem vederangel / vienc aschen unt vorhenne, die wîle si las' ['Schionatulander, with a feathered bait, was catching perch and grayling, while she was reading'],⁵¹ for example, makes clear the relative chronology of the actions of the two figures, which, as we have seen, is often left unspecified in the first fragment. Furthermore, the events of the second fragment take place in a relatively

⁵⁰ *Titurel*, 93,4; Edwards translation, p. 274.

⁵¹ *Titurel*, 159,1–2; Edwards translation, p. 280.

self-contained space: a forest encampment. There is even an embedded narrative (149–58), inscribed, perhaps, on the dog's collar and leash, explaining that it was sent as a gift from Clauditte to Ehkunat. 'Perhaps', because it is not always clear whether in these strophes we are reading with Sigune, or being informed about the past by the narrator—but that is a question of voice and perspective, not of coherence and cohesion.

The initial impression given by the second fragment narrative, however, is deceptive. Recall first of all that we have no indication of when the events happened: we are simply taken straight into them with a 'sus' ['thus'] and a 'dô' ['there'] ('Sus lâgen si unlange. dô gehôrten si schiere [...]') ['They did not lie thus there long. Suddenly they heard [...]']).⁵² We also do not know where the action takes place, and the components of the scene fall into place gradually: a forest (138,1), a thicket (140,4), a stream (159,1–2, 164,3), and a tent (160,1)—generic objects, all very different from the place names used in fragment 1. These markers of static position are themselves subordinate to motion, which plays a prominent role right from the opening strophe (137), in which the couple hear a dog approaching. In the first fragment, spatial/geographical information provides the framework within which movement takes place, but in the second, it is rather the case that descriptions of movement are primary and that we build up a picture of space from them—the movement of the dog and Schionatulander, usually in pursuit of it, is most prominent, and places are mentioned only when man or dog moves to or from them. The unsettling effect is intensified by means of several linguistic techniques. The definite article is used with the forest and the tent (specifically a tent pole) when they are first mentioned (138,1, 160,1), and the use of articles and pronouns in strophes 140 to 142

⁵² *Titirel*, 137,1; modified version of the Edwards translation, p. 278 ('They did not lie thus encamped there long. Suddenly they heard [...]').

makes it hard to tell who or what (prince, dog, and the creature hunted by the dog) is where.⁵³ In the case of the stream, meanwhile, we identify the presence of water from the fact that Schionatulander is fishing (159,1–2); only later is it identified as a 'bach[e]' ['brook'].⁵⁴

With movement comes the love-story on the collar and leash that so fascinates Sigune; it is not so much one she chooses to read as one that grasps her, brought by a dog that comes 'hôchlûtes zuo zin [the two lovers] iagende' ['barking, coming on the hunt towards them'].⁵⁵ From what we can tell, its story of Clauditte and Ehkumat appears to have been heading for a happy ending.⁵⁶ Sigune reads (or the audience learns) that 'si [Clauditte] selbe wîplîcher verte hûeten wolte' ['she herself desired to keep to the womanly trail'] and that her lover 'phlac sîner verte vil schône' ['kept to his trail most splendidly'],⁵⁷ and so followed the injunction borne on the collar (see 149) and encoded in the name of the dog, Gardeviaz, 'daz kiut tiuschen "Hüete der verte!"' ['That means in German: "Keep on the trail!"]'.⁵⁸ Sigune, however, is unable to follow the story to its end: the leash has been used to tie the dog to a tent pole (159–60). We now realize that Sigune has been in one particular place while reading the love story, and that the dog has not been moving during this time. Schionatulander, unaware of the calamity in store, has also been in one place, fishing in the stream, while the story is going well (159, 164).

Hoping to read on, Sigune unties the leash—but Gardeviaz runs off and takes the story

⁵³ I am grateful to Dr Almut Suerbaum (Oxford) for pointing this out.

⁵⁴ *Titirel*, 164,3; Edwards translation, p. 281.

⁵⁵ *Titirel*, 137,3; Edwards translation, p. 278.

⁵⁶ We can assume that the story did have an ending, as it escaped not from the sender but from the recipient, Ehkumat (*Titirel*, 162).

⁵⁷ *Titirel*, 158,4; 156,4; Edwards translation, p. 280.

⁵⁸ *Titirel*, 148,4; Edwards translation, p. 279. Whether Ehkumat and Clauditte's tale actually ended happily, irrespective of what Clauditte may have written, is less certain; we hear ominously (*Titirel*, 162,1) that the dog had escaped from Ehkumat on the same day—perhaps, depending on the how the relevant passage is read (see Brackert and Fuchs-Jolie, 'Stellenkommentar', p. 419), in the very same manner.

away from her with him. Schionatulander hears the barking and sets off in pursuit again (164), but fails to catch the dog; he is then despatched to recover the animal, with the promise of 'genâde unt al daz imer maget sol verenden / gein ir werdem clâren friunde' ['favour and all that a maiden ever ought to fulfil for her noble, radiant beloved'] if he succeeds.⁵⁹ As Wolfram's narrator puts it, 'nu wil sich diz mære geunsüezen' ['now this tale will turn sour'].⁶⁰ The pattern is not unfamiliar: love becoming problematic is accompanied by a breakdown of cohesion, particularly spatial cohesion.⁶¹ While Sigune is reading the happy story, there is a stable sense of location—but before that, when the fateful dog enters the life of the two lovers, the narrative frustrates attempts to construct a spatially cohesive world. And when the escape of the dog, returning movement to the narrative, triggers Schionatulander's ill-fated departure from Sigune, the temporal cohesion of the world is called into doubt by the contradiction noted above between the ambivalence of the final strophe (175,3–4) and the earlier grim predictions regarding the future.

V

Despite the sudden beginning of the first fragment, the *Titirel* narrative is soon given chronological and geographical structure by means of a genealogical framework and place names. But, just as this sense of security becomes established, the function of cohesion changes. Rather than being a framework for the content, it becomes a reflection of it. Movement and the absence of relative chronological clarity dominate the treatment

⁵⁹ *Titirel*, 173,1–2; Edwards translation, p. 281.

⁶⁰ *Titirel*, 168,2; Edwards translation, p. 281.

⁶¹ Compare *Titirel*, 173–75 with *Titirel*, 76–78: mutual declarations of love, narratorial misgivings, she stays and he sets off on a quest.

of Sigune and Schionatulander when apart; when they are together and open in their love, we know when and where to place the narrative. The treatment of space in the second fragment takes this technique a step further: not only is spatial stability necessary for the story of the lovers to be a happy one (for the fleeting initial moment when they are lying together, and when they are reading and fishing respectively); it is also necessary for Sigune, the reader within the story, to follow a tale of happy love. Finally, *Titirel*, this narrative that emerged out of a need to know more, yet again disrupts our notions of temporality by questioning the nature of the future, the ending that we know, or thought we knew. Puzzling in *Parzival*, fragmented in transmission, ambiguous in the constitution of its world, and unstable in the construction of its narrative—the story of Sigune and Schionatulander continually eludes our grasp, reflecting the difficulties of love in form and content alike. As when Sigune tries to find the end of a narrative of perfect love, so when the reader tries to untangle one here, it escapes her, or him.⁶²

Yet there is also a more hopeful message, springing from one of the very techniques that makes the work so difficult, the question exemplified by the discussion of strophes 28 and 73 above: is *Titirel* to be seen as part of the real world, or as part of an intertextual fictional world? Or might it be both, a contribution to a literary world that lies somewhere between fictionality and history, towards which *Parzival* and *Willehalm* tend respectively? These are questions that cannot be answered here, but it is worth noting that

⁶² Unlike Sigune, Schionatulander shows no interest in the story on the leash, choosing to go fishing instead. Perhaps the two are interested in different kinds of text: Schionatulander remarks 'brieve, buoch, en franzoise— ich weiz wol. solch kunst ist mir niht diu belibene: / dâ læse ich an, swaz dâ geschriben wære' ['I am well acquainted with letter-books *en franzoys*. Such skill I do not lack—I can read all that may be written in those'] (*Titirel*, 169,2–3; Edwards translation, p. 281), whereas Sigune insists on the importance of the story, saying 'dâ stuont âventiure an der strangen' ['there was adventure written on the rope'] (*Titirel*, 170,1; Edwards translation, p. 281). See Brackert and Fuchs-Jolie, 'Stellenkommentar', pp. 430–31; Heinze, *Stellenkommentar*, p. 211; 'âventiure', in Benecke, Müller, and Zarncke, *Wörterbuch*, vol. 1, pp. 67–72.

the two literary points of reference depict relationships that do work out. In one case, a naïve knight and a besieged then abandoned queen become king and queen of the Grail; in the other, the love between a converted heathen and a Christian prince provides a counterweight to the carnage of religious war. If read as (pseudo-)historical, *Titurel* presents a pessimistic picture of love as representative of reality—but if read as a contribution to Wolfram's intertextual literary world, it becomes a warning, one side of the coin in a universe in which happier outcomes and more cohesive stories are possible.