

UCLA

Comitatus: A Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies

Title

"Mit grôzen listen wart gestalt": The Element of List in Thirteenth-Century Courtly Romances, with Emphasis on Heinrich Von Dem Tûrlin's Diu Crône

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/4d44q4rv>

Journal

Comitatus: A Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 31(1)

ISSN

0069-6412

Author

Shockey, Gary C

Publication Date

2000-10-01

Peer reviewed

**“MIT GRÖZEN LISTEN WART GESTALT”: THE
ELEMENT OF *LIST* IN THIRTEENTH-CENTURY
COURTLY ROMANCES, WITH EMPHASIS ON
HEINRICH VON DEM TÜRLIN’S *DIU CRÔNE***

by Gary C. Shockey

Within the greater corpus of courtly romance in the thirteenth century, the concept of *list*, or cunning, assumes a particularly alluring position. Poets and philosophers throughout the whole of the Middle Ages were clearly fascinated by the notion of a knight, a king, a lady of the court, a seneschal, or a scoundrel twisting others in such a manner as to achieve remarkable success in some venture. The ambiguities of the human condition most likely led men and women to exploit weaknesses in others for personal or professional gain, as well as for the benefit of the realm or sovereign. Clever cunning, guile, and the substance of the quick-thinking man or woman proved to be riveting material for both courtly audiences and the emerging bourgeoisie in the cities and towns, and we are blessed with a variety of texts which demonstrate the art of perspicacity in a myriad of forms. Cognizant of their influence, poets readily employed many of these attributes as socially acceptable vehicles of change, both in a positive and negative sense. The individual bard deliberately chose a path for his protagonists: he or she could use guile in a decidedly evil way, or perhaps in a manner designed to effect a positive outcome. Thus, arguments on the moral underpinnings of *list* remained the domain of the writer; the poets themselves offer a variety of views on this subject. Finally, the spectrum of works is rather broad, and ranges from Gottfried von Straßburg’s *Tristan* to the irrepressible, anonymous tales of *Til Eulenspiegel*. Whatever the audience, artfulness contributed to the rich and varied texture of medieval and early modern literature.

The substance and form of *list* in thirteenth-century texts have been the objects of several fascinating treatments in the last thirty years.¹

¹See, for example, Wolfgang Jupé, *Die “List” im Tristanroman Gottfrieds von Straßburg. Intellektualität und Liebe oder die Suche nach dem Wesen der individuellen Existenz*, Germanische Bibliothek (Heidelberg 1976); Werner Schröder, “Text und Interpretation: Das Gottesurteil im ‘Tristan’ Gottfrieds von Straßburg” in *Sitzungsberichte*

Studies by Wolfgang Moelleken, Ingeborg Henderson, and Wolfgang Jupé, among others, have cast a critical light on the importance of this valuable characteristic of the protagonist as a poetic thread in courtly romance, especially with respect to *Tristan* and *Daniel von dem Blühenden Tal*. The *list* of Gottfried's *Tristan* differs from that of Stricker's *Daniel* and, as we shall see, from Heinrich von dem Türlin's *Diu Crône*. Owing to the scope and essence of this subject, I have chosen to remain within the realm of courtly romance. The thematics associated with *list* in heroic epic, together with their possible influences on Heinrich's romance, remain a field worthy of further study.

The gap of perhaps ten years between the composition of Gottfried's poem and Stricker's *Daniel* casts an interesting light on variations of the theme of *list* and even alludes to new modalities in application. *Daniel* appears to reflect knightly prowess, resourcefulness, and faith in the skills of the individual protagonist, while Gottfried's protagonists Tristan and Isolde depend on adroitness to compensate for King Marke's machinations, including the exertions of courtiers Melot and Marjodo. Our endeavors, while incorporating and reflecting both classical and post-classical works of medieval German courtly romance, will be focused on *Diu Crône*, a poem which, together with Wirnt von Gravenberg's *Wigalois* and Der Stricker's *Daniel*, figures prominently in the genre of post-classical courtly romance.²

In examining Heinrich's *opus magnum* under the aspect of *list*, we should recall that the poet's work has been the subject of a number of

der wissenschaftlichen Gesellschaft an der Johann Wolfgang Goethe-Universität Frankfurt am Main (Frankfurt 1976) 47ff.; Wolfgang W. Moelleken and Ingeborg Henderson, "Die Bedeutung der Liste im 'Daniel' des Strickers," *Amsterdamer Beiträge zur Älteren Germanistik* (henceforth *ABÄG*) 4 (1973) 187–201; and Evelyn Jacobson, "The Liste of Tristan," *ABÄG* 18 (1982) 115–128. All translations of original texts are mine.

²All references to *Diu Crône* are taken from the Scholl text: Heinrich von dem Türlin, *Diu Crône*, ed. Gottlob Heinrich Friedrich Scholl (1852; repr. Amsterdam 1966); all references to Wolfram's *Parzival* are based on the Leitzmann text: Wolfram von Eschenbach, *Parzival*, ed. Albert Leitzmann, 7th ed., 3 vols., *Altdeutsche Textbibliothek* (Tübingen 1961); all references to Gottfried's *Tristan* are based on the Ranke/Krohn text: Gottfried von Strassburg, *Tristan*, ed. Friedrich Ranke and Rüdiger Krohn, trans. Rüdiger Krohn, 3 vols. (Stuttgart 1990). Finally, all references to Wirnt's *Wigalois* are based on the Kapteyn edition: Wirnt von Gravenberg, *Wigalois, der Ritter mit dem Rade*, ed. J. M. N. Kapteyn, *Rheinische Beiträge und Hilfsbücher zur germanischen Philologie und Volkskunde* 9 (Bonn 1926); all references to Stricker's *Daniel* are based on the Resler text: Der Stricker, *Daniel von dem Blühenden Tal*, ed. Michael Resler, *Altdeutsche Textbibliothek* 92 (Tübingen 1983).

extensive investigations in the last twenty years.³ However, none has ever offered a substantive explication of *list*, except under the guise of elaborating on the *magus*, or magician-figure, Gansguoter.⁴ In the latter instance, the essence of research has been on the efforts of a magician working on behalf of or against the protagonist, together with the tools associated with these efforts.

Leaving the topic of sorcery aside, our interests dwell, instead, on the thoughts and actions of the knightly protagonist. In the case of Heinrich’s Gawein, the reader will conclude that the poet adroitly renders changes to the Gottfriedian notion of *list* as a potential servant of both men and women (Tristan and Isolde; King Marke and Marjodo), and instead uses *list* as a means of both undergirding positive chivalry and blocking negative chivalry in combat, primarily at the tilt. In doing so, the bard seeks to anchor his work in the traditions of Gottfried and Wolfram, among others, while preparing his readership for the textual permutations of *Der Stricker*, whose *Daniel* appears to have emerged prior to the full completion of *Diu Crône*. Finally, I would argue that Heinrich’s intentions remain rather clear with regards to *list*: his man Gawein needs, indeed requires, *list* as a means of evening the odds, overcoming both natural and man-made obstacles, and checking the forces of debauched, anti-Arthurian, knighthood. And thus freed of startling deficiencies in cunning, the protagonist is able to overpower his foes by way of old-fashioned chivalry.

DEFINITIONS

The term *list* appears in a variety of thirteenth-century works and reflects both commonalities and differences in poetic intent. Matthias Lexer defines the term as follows: “weisheit, klugheit, schlaueit; weise, klug, schlaue absicht od. handlungallgem.” (wisdom, intelligence,

³For a current list of studies on *Diu Crône*, see Gary C. Shockey, “Homo Viator, Katabasis, and Landscapes in Wolfram von Eschenbach’s *Parzival* and Heinrich von dem Türlin’s *Diu Crône*” (Ph.D. diss., UC Davis 1998) 1–23 and 172ff.

⁴See especially Ernst S. Dick, “The Hero and the Magician. On the proliferation of Dark Figures from *Li Contes del Graal* and *Parzival* to *Diu Crône*” in *Genres in Medieval German Literature*, ed. Edward R. Haymes and Stephanie Cain Van D’Elden, Göppinger Arbeiten zur Germanistik (henceforth GAG) 448 (Göppingen 1986) 128–150; and Stephan Maksymiuk, “Knowledge, Politics, and Magic: The Magician Gansguoter in Heinrich von dem Türlin’s *Crône*,” *The German Quarterly* 67.4 (1994) 470–483.

cleverness; wise, smart, clever intention or behavior in general).⁵ In addition, Lexer identifies a number of fascinating addenda to the definition provided above: he recalls that *list* may also mean “auf schlaue weise, arglist, unaufrichtigkeit, hinterlist, wissenschaft, kunst [und] zauberkunst” (in a clever manner, guile, dishonesty, treachery, science, art, and magic).⁶ For purposes of categorization, we should also note the variety of sources Lexer quotes. These include, but are not limited to, *Wigalois*, *Parzival*, *Das alte Passional*, *Das Leben der heiligen Elizabeth*, *Karl der Große*, *Trojanischer Krieg*, and *Albrecht von Halberstadt*, among others.⁷ By using the ample inventories available in Heinrich’s main sources—*Parzival*, *Wigalois*, and *Tristan*, we should be able establish credible reasons for the poet’s continuation of and alterations to established patterns of use.

TECHNIQUES OF APPLICATION IN *PARZIVAL*, *TRISTAN*,
AND *WIGALOIS PARZIVAL*

According to the *Mittelhochdeutsche Begriffsdatenbank*, *Parzival* contains twenty-three direct references to *list*. In addition, Wolfram’s poem has four examples of *listen*.⁸ These particular word registries suggest a variety of uses and highlight practices considered by many experts to be standard for classical courtly romances of the early thirteenth century.⁹ Wolfgang Jupé observes that *list* can also be associated with “Kunst”

⁵For an extensive treatment, see Matthias Lexer, *Mittelhochdeutsches Handwörterbuch*, 3 vols. (1878, repr. Leipzig 1992), vol. 1, col. 1936. Hereafter, this reference work will be referred to as “Lexer.”

⁶Lexer, vol. 1, col. 1936. Note as well the extensive commentaries of Benecke, Müller, and Zarncke in Georg Friedrich Benecke, Wilhelm Müller, and Friedrich Zarncke, *Mittelhochdeutsches Wörterbuch*, 4 vols. (Leipzig 1866) 1.1010–1012.

⁷Lexer, vol. 1, col. 1936. See also Lexer, vol. 1, col. 1937 for references to “liste-baere” (cunning) and “listec” (clever). Finally, note as well the extensive listings as found in *Findebuch zum Mittelhochdeutschen Wörterbuch*, ed. Kurt Gärtner et al. (Stuttgart 1992) 226.

⁸For particulars, see “List,” *Mittelhochdeutsche Begriffsdatenbank*, ed. F. Debus, Horst Puetz, and Klaus Schmidt, Dept. of German, Russian, and East Asian Languages, Bowling Green State University (Ohio), 7 June 1999 <<http://www.bgsu.edu/departments/greal/MHDBDB.html>>. Hereafter, the *Mittelhochdeutsche Begriffsdatenbank* will be referred to as *MHDBDB*. The *MHDBDB* uses the concordance of Clifford Hall as a basis for its treatment of *Parzival*. See Clifford D. Hall, *A Complete Concordance to Wolfram von Eschenbach’s Parzival* (New York 1990). Note that the *MHDBDB* does not employ the verse blocks of Leitzmann.

⁹See esp. Jupé (n. 1 above) 34ff.

(art) and “moraliteit” (morality).¹⁰ The very use of the terms “art” and “morality” provides us with ample grounds for speculation on the nature and substance of protagonists (and perhaps poets) who, for various reasons, employ wiles to achieve particular goals.

The aforementioned characteristics offer us a wealth of insights into Wolfram’s (and Gottfried’s) treatments of *list*. For Wolfram, we can thus divide the compilation into a series of categories: (a) *list* and necromancy; (b) mental, “geistige” cleverness; (c) manly *list*; and (d) clever, “handelne” (*active*) *list*. The bard dwells at some length on the first point—vv. 453:17, 453: 20, 617:12, and 658:02. These notations reflect Wolfram’s preoccupation with the negative nature of sorcery, a point Ernst Dick and Stephen Maksymiuk raise in their vigorous disputations regarding Heinrich von dem Türlin’s decidedly sympathetic approach to the black arts.¹¹ The remaining elements—spiritual wisdom, virile cunning, and clever *list*—are occasionally used by the poet to underscore the protagonist’s need to function with at least a partial acknowledgment of *list* as a proper form of courtly behavior. We read of “menschlichen list” (human guile) (v. 457:30) and “gein werder minne valscher list” (evil cunning placed against true love) (v. 172:15); we observe as well that characters other than Parzival deploy or reject *list*: “sô diu maget âne valschen list” (this guileless maid did thus) (v. 464:24).

Wolfram appears to emphasize various aspects of cunning which have decidedly secondary, and clearly not vital, influence on the protagonist’s search for self, reaffirmation in the Arthurian realm, and the apex of personal existence in the Grail world of Munsalvaesche. Parzival’s own use of *list* as a *modus operandi* is limited to vv. 548:06 and 786:11, while other figures, Clinschor, for example, utilize cleverness as a counterweight. For the bard, *list* remains an interesting sideshow, but one not exploited to any great extent. Parzival continues to be “traecliche wîs” (the man slowly wise); he must fail, descend, learn, and rise again.

GOTTFRIED’S *TRISTAN*

In his trenchant commentaries on guile in Gottfried’s romance, Wolfgang Jupé reports that “[d]as Wort list erscheint an 76 Stellen im Text”

¹⁰Jupé (n. 1 above) 34.

¹¹See Dick (n. 4 above) 128–150; Maksymiuk (n. 4 above) 470–483.

(the word *list* appears seventy-six times in the text).¹² He then categorizes the use of *list*, noting that: “. . . davon an vierzig in synonymer Bedeutung zu Kunst, das an vierzehn verwendet wird, jedoch nur bis V. 8005, bis zum Abschluß der Ausbildung Isoldes durch Tristan in moraliteit” (of these appearances, forty have synonymous meanings with art, which, by itself, is used fourteen times, but only until v. 8005, that is, the conclusion of Isolde’s education by Tristan, and that in connection with morality).¹³ In addition, he observes that “Kunst” (art), “list” (guile), and “moraliteit” (morality) are then sublimated by the poet, who chooses, instead, to deploy *list* as “geistig, durch Wissen geschulte und Talent geförderte, vorausberechende und vorausplanende Fähigkeit . . .” (a mental talent fostered by knowledge and learned ability).¹⁴ Finally, Jupé argues that Gottfried attempts to divide his poem by means of word usage: “Es ergibt sich eine Zäsur im Sprachgebrauch, aus der man schließen kann, daß dem Sinngehalt von ‘list’ und ‘Kunst’ eine Bedeutung im Tristanroman zukommt” (There is a division in linguistic application from which one can conclude that the meaning of cunning and art achieve a special status in *Tristan*).¹⁵

The remarkable number of occurrences of *list* within Gottfried’s romance insinuates that the term enjoyed a unique status in the bard’s estimation. In fact, the bard designates three forms of the *list*-oriented protagonist: Tristan the artist (see Jupé 34, n. 2); Tristan and Isolde as figures of “moraliteit” (morality) (Jupé 34, n. 3); and Tristan the clever trickster (vv. 8654–18907). Other figures also profit from *list* as an active component of the poem. Blanscheflur suspects “zouberlist” (magical guile) (v. 1003) on the part of Riwalin; Rual attempts to hold Tristan’s ancestral lands “mit listen” (by subterfuge) (v. 1882).¹⁶ According to Gisela Hollandt, Isolde, too, exhibits varieties of cunning on a number of occasions, including abilities as a *medicus* and *magus* (vv.

¹²Jupé (n. 1 above) 34.

¹³Jupé (n. 1 above) 34, esp. 34, n. 1-4.

¹⁴Jupé (n. 1 above) 34.

¹⁵Jupé (n. 1 above) 34. Note as well Gisela Hollandt, *Die Hauptgestalten in Gottfrieds Tristan, Wesenszüge, Handlungsfunktion, Motiv der List*, Philosophische Studien und Quellen 30 (Berlin 1966); Gertrud Hermanns, “List, Studien zur Bedeutungs- und Problemgeschichte,” (Ph.D. diss., Univ. of Freiburg 1953); and C. Stephen Jaeger, “The testing of Brangaene: Cunning and innocence in Gottfried’s *Tristan*,” *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 70 (1971) 189–206.

¹⁶Jupé (n. 1 above) 34 and 50; Hollandt (n. 15 above) 22 and 51, esp. note 15, p. 51.

7955 and 9298). “Wîsheit” (wisdom; understanding) dominates her thoughts and actions, a property Hollandt connects with *list*.¹⁷

The various protagonists in Gottfried’s poem face off using *list* and *Gegenlist*. King Marke exhibits cleverness via tests: Marjodo and Melot the dwarf create turbulence in the lovers’ relationship and attempt to stymie their joys. Tristan alternately switches from *list* to *muot* (courage) in the dragon-episode,¹⁸ implying taut parallel phenomenology of courage and action without deception in conjunction with stratagems on behalf of the pair.¹⁹ In keeping with the above, Hollandt concludes her study of Tristan the protagonist by arguing:

Der Erfolg von Tristans List beruht immer auf seiner Leistung. Das listige Vorgehen dient jeweils nur der Herbeiführung einer Lage, in der er seine Fähigkeiten entfalten und anderen dienstbar machen kann. . . . In seiner Leistung äußert sich sein Wesen.²⁰

(The success of Tristan’s cunning is based on its accomplishments. Cunning activity serves the introduction of a situation in which Tristan can reveal his abilities and offer them to others. . . . In his accomplishments, Tristan reflects his being.)

The accomplishments to which Hollandt refers, of course, were oftentimes the by-products of guile and thus underscore the important dynamics of dichotomous evaluations of figures in courtly romances. The didactic act, together with its manifestation, measures the accomplishments of the protagonists.

Finally, we recall that Tristan, Isolde, their allies, and their foes employ *list* as a means of effecting change, annulling the acts of others, and buttressing their respective positions. However, as both a knight and courtier, Tristan eschews the use *list* as a means of defeating opponents imbued with *zouber* (magic), special physical attributes, or skills capable of compelling the lovers to surrender. He nevertheless remains an arresting figure in the corpus of medieval German courtly romance

¹⁷Hollandt (n. 15 above) 39.

¹⁸Hollandt (n. 15 above) 97.

¹⁹Consider the actions of Tristan in his battle against the dragon (vv. 8920ff.) and the commentaries of Hollandt (n. 15 above) 96ff. Compare these to the trickery practiced vis-à-vis Marke and his court (Hollandt 112ff.).

²⁰Hollandt (n. 15 above) 116.

devoted to artfulness.²¹

WIGALOIS: TRANSFORMATION OF LIST AND THE PROTAGONIST

Wirnt von Gravenberc's *Wigalois* represents something of a watershed effort in its movement away from the Staufian traditions engendered by its parent romances, *Parzival* and *Tristan*. Discernable influences of both classical works, as well as the use of *list* by Wolfram's and Gottfried's immediate predecessor, Hartmann von Aue, suggest a symbiotic relationship of *treditio* and creativity woven into the text by the troubadour.²² The text presents us with some thirteen examples of *list*, a fact that in turn highlights a tempered approach to subtlety by the bard and his protagonist.²³ Wigalois the Arthurian knight has clearly defined roles: he need not use *list* to compete with a rival for a queen; he does not challenge a powerful wizard as Gâwân does in Wolfram's poem (Clinschor). Instead, Wigalois hears (v. 3783), employs (v. 7154), or invokes (v. 9506) *list* to achieve his aims: the destruction of the heathen, King Rôaz, and the rejuvenation of Korntin.²⁴

Aside from a few singular instances of cleverly designed magical accoutrements (v. 6955), most of Wigalois's foes, Rôaz and the Wild Woman, for example, are equipped with elements of black magic—*zouberkunst*—which, as Ingeborg Henderson observes, are checked by the knight's remarkable talents and redemptive qualities.²⁵ Walter Haug, Henderson, Moelleken, and Christoph Cormeau, among others,

²¹Hollandt (n. 15 above) 96. Hollandt argues that "Tristans Abenteuer unterscheiden sich hinsichtlich dieser beiden Motive [list und aventure]. Reine Kampfthaten sind der Morolt—der Drachen—und der Riesenkampf" (Tristan's adventures can be differentiated in light of these two motifs [guile and knightly adventure]. The fights with Morolt, the dragon, and the giant are pure battles.) (96).

²²For particulars on this concept, see Christoph Cormeau, *'Wigalois' und 'Diu Crône': Zwei Kapitel zur Gattungsgeschichte des nachklassischen Aventiureromans*, MTU 57 (Munich 1977); George Edward Harding III, "Tradition and Creativity: Narrative Elements in Wirnt von Gravenberg's *Wigalois* and Heinrich von dem Türlin's *Diu Crône*" (Ph.D. diss., Univ. of Tennessee 1985). See as well Walter Haug, *Literaturtheorie im deutschen Mittelalter von den Anfängen bis zum Ende des 13. Jahrhunderts*, 2nd ed. (Darmstadt 1992).

²³Wigalois's qualities reflect a pronounced redeemer function. See Ingeborg Henderson, "Dark Figures and Eschatological Imagery in Wirnt von Gravenberg's *Wigalois*" in *The Dark Figure in Medieval German and Germanic Literature*, ed. Edward R. Haymes and Stephanie Cain Van D'Elden, GAG 448 (Göppingen 1986) 99–113.

²⁴For details, see Henderson (n. 23 above) 99–113.

²⁵Henderson (n. 23 above) 99–113.

have clearly demonstrated the poet’s fascination with the fantastic, the magical, debased chivalry, and the necessity of reaffirming positive chivalry via a champion of Arthurian preeminence (v. 8580).

Guile on the part of the protagonist does, however, indicate a discernable interest in setting particular parameters. We see that Wigalois acts in accordance with “guoten list” (positive guile), “gotes listen” (heavenly artifices), and against negative *list*: “gesigt er dīnen listen an” (he has stymied your wiles). Rôaz comes “mit zouber” (with magic) and remains “ein tievel” (a devil), one condemned by Wirnt as an instrument and incarnation of Satan himself. The motivations of the bard may ultimately have been tied to several disparate factors: territoriality (vv. 8593ff.), poetic license (vv. 130ff.), the defense of “werlte vreude” (worldly pleasure) (vv. 11680), knightly skills, or salvation (vv. 11700ff.).

In the main, *list* and all its variants remain subsumed in Wirnt’s romance. Cognizant of its relative value in plot development and conflict, the minstrel does not stress a pivotal position for this characteristic. This particular tendency, a valuable strand in the whole of (post)classical courtly romance, remains a delicate matter for Wirnt’s successor, Heinrich, who clearly approved of Wigalois’ redemptive qualities. Von dem Türlin’s man will, in turn, exhibit *list* in a manner that beguiles audiences and readers and reflects a conscious effort to assimilate previous contributions.

HEINRICH VON DEM TÜRLIN’S *DIU CRÔNE*

Diu Crône reflects particularly significant crosscurrents in the genre of thirteenth-century courtly romance. Concomitant with increased interest in the poem, recent scholarship has tended to dwell on structural modalities and ancillary issues germane to the work’s genesis, composition, and meaning. Wiles of the protagonist, his allies, and his foes have, to a certain extent, proven fertile grounds for analyses of Heinrich’s efforts. However, *list* as a novel phenomenon of the text remains a largely ignored topos.²⁶ Our poet mentions *list* some forty-

²⁶See Shockey (n. 3 above) 1–23 and 172ff. on treatments of *Diu Crône*. Although we lack both a critical edition and a concordance of this poem, we can use Gülzow’s and Keefe’s treatments as cornerstones for word-lists. See Erich Gülzow, *Zur Stilkunde der Krone Heinrichs von dem Türlin*, Teutonia, Arbeiten zur germanischen Philologie 18 (Leipzig 1914); and Francis Edward Keefe, “Landschaft und Raum in der Crone

one times within the confines of 30,000 verses. While other terms may be of greater import, the sheer number of occurrences suggests that Heinrich used *list* with ease and purpose.

The first half of the romance reflects standard usage of the concept in a Wolframian sense, on the whole connoting cleverness on the part of the bard (v. 81), the fashioning of magical accoutrements (vv. 1090–1193), magicians (Gansguoter the *magus*), and the face of an evil knight (Lohenis, v. 5993). In addition, we note the utilization of cunning as a component of necromancy (vv. 8309 and 8513). Finally, we discern the adroit deployment of knightly acumen (v. 10694) and the artifices of Gasozein, the embodiment of anti-Arthurian knighthood (vv. 10995 and 11305). Both reader and audience thus ascertain the poet's intentions vis-à-vis *list*: he makes no claim to divergences from the trodden paths of his predecessors Wolfram, Hartmann, Gottfried, and Wirnt. In fact, the substance of the first half of *Diu Crône* embodies a fairly placid reproduction of earlier characterizations of this property—the sorcerer, the evil protagonist, the weaponry of demonic forces, and so forth. We see no effort made to elucidate or buttress Gawein's position as a "listec mann," a clever hero, during vv. 1–13901, the first part of the romance. Indeed, our minstrel much prefers a safe, almost pedestrian, articulation of wile. *Tristan*, in stark contrast to Heinrich's work, is revolutionary in its discussions of guile. Tristan's education lays the foundation of his numerous talents, and his guardians frequently resort to trickery as a counterweight to evil intent.²⁷

Thus far, our bard remains anchored to tradition, and it seems likely that Wirnt's limited interest in cunning may well have initially influenced Heinrich. The protagonist's function as a redeemer will, however, become more apparent in the second half.²⁸ For Wigalois, foes, evil

Heinrichs von dem Türlin" (Ph.D. diss., Univ. of Kentucky 1982).

²⁷Hollandt (n. 15 above) 81, notes that "Mit anderen Worten: die Ausbildung die Tristan erfährt, ist Voraussetzung für den Erfolg der List" (In other words, the education which Tristan experiences is a precondition for the success of his wiles.) No such sentiment could apply to Gawein, who, in the first half of *Diu Crône*, rarely resorts to *list*.

²⁸Dietrich Homberger argues on behalf of Gawein as a savior of the Grail family and ancillary characters: Dietrich Homberger, "Gawein. Untersuchungen zur mittelhochdeutschen Artusepik" (Ph.D. diss., Univ. of Bochum 1969). Lewis Jillings takes strong issue with this position. See Lewis Jillings, *Diu Crone of Heinrich von dem Türlin. The attempted emancipation of the secular narrative*, GAG 258 (Göppingen 1980). Johannes Keller makes a case for a central position of the Grail sojourns and the subsequent

forces, and restoration figure prominently as factors in his numerous sojourns; *list* remains part of the subplot. Heinrich’s Gawein, in turn, is tethered to traditional *aventiuren* affiliated with Arthurian romance. Subterfuge simply does not determine outcomes to any significant degree in the first half of the poem.

DIU CRÔNE: PART TWO

The second part of Heinrich’s romance represents a break with many, but not all, of the tendencies we have discussed thus far. The troubadour evaluates his protagonist’s position and the use of *list* in a different light.²⁹ We can easily compare the frequency of usage between the two sections of the poem—fourteen in part one, twenty-seven in part two—and conclude that the higher degree of frequency suggests a heightened interest in shrewdness. Crafting a new focus, one that strongly hints at a remolded, altered, knight, Heinrich grapples with *list*, producing a mesmerizing alteration in the realization of courtly wholeness.

In examining the substance of Heinrich’s new direction, it would behoove us to recall the tenets of *list* as explicated by Hollandt and Jupé with respect to Gottfried’s *Tristan*. Tristan’s exercise of cunning was, we remember, based on *Ausbildung*, *Kunst*, *moraliteit*, and *Erfolg* (education, art, morality, and success).³⁰ Education (*Ausbildung*) begets the latter dimensions of Tristan the artist and Tristan the “moral” man, thus underscoring the nature of Tristan’s successes. Our poet seizes on this assessment of Tristan as the educated practitioner of a craft, an artisan of clever behavior, a knight, courtier, and lover capable of great deeds on behalf of his lady, Isolde, but alters the course of the protagonist such that he is not focused on anti-courtly department.

Tristan enjoys enormous advantages from a practical standpoint. He

rehabilitation of the Grail family: see Johannes Keller, *Diu Crône Heinrichs von dem Türlin: Wunderketten, Gral und Tod*, Deutsche Literatur von den Anfängen bis 1700, 25 (Zürich 1997). Finally, Arno Mentzel-Reuters offers a particularly strong defense of the thesis of Gawein as the leading champion of Arthurian supremacy: Arno Mentzel-Reuters, *Vröude. Artusbild, Fortuna- und Gralkonzeption in der ‘Crône’ des Heinrich von dem Türlin als Verteidigung des höfischen Lebensideals*, Europäische Hochschulschriften 1134 (Frankfurt am Main 1989).

²⁹For particulars, see Shockey (n. 3 above) 172ff. on the focus of the poet’s sensibilities. On the relationships between Wolfram’s Gawan and Heinrich’s Gawein, see Shockey, 327ff.

³⁰See n. 9 and n. 16 above.

is first a child, then a man (see vv. 200ff. and 7870ff.). Gawein, already a full-grown knight, must alter his heretofore restless, chevalier-errant lifestyle, reestablish the self, and revive a struggling Arthurian world. He does so by observing, calculating, and utilizing guile in a manner that determines the outcome of the poem.³¹

Our protagonist first observes *list* in a number of settings which demonstrate *zouber* (sorcery). On the whole, these scenarios are the direct results of actions by his opponents (vv. 15302 and 15352). Lohenis, the Türlinesque version of Wolfram's Urjans, the rapist-knight, utilizes cunning as a means of evil trickery. He steals Gawein's steed (vv. 19495 and 20022). Here, the poet utilizes *list* in conventional fashion: the hapless knight is foiled by base guile.

However, Heinrich the craftsman and "werltkint" (man of the world) gainsays the feats of his own sinister characters: he employs an artful cleverness to clear the path for Gawein's own rehabilitation. This foil manifests itself in a variety of forms. We observe the creation of a castle based on *list* (vv. 20406 and 20602), one that resembles Clinchschor's Schastel Marveille. Our protagonist overcomes the wiles of a (good) necromancer and begins to display cunning as a positive force in blunting negative chivalry (v. 21487). The critical act of incapacitating evil knighthood by means of *list* represents an apex of positive trickery; Gawein seizes the initiative, and his foes are left to flail aimlessly at an indefatigable, unyielding, champion.

Eager to create instability, Heinrich reintroduces the evil protagonist—the Piebald Knight of the Goat—and again inserts negative *list* (vv. 24748, 24831, and 24915). These conditions of insecurity at court are, in turn, fertile grounds for Gawein. As sole champion of the Arthurian world, he alone can act with resolve in an environment devoid of the niceties of the Round Table.

Gawein's laudatory oration of vv. 25600ff. suggests that a true king (and knight) possesses "mannes muot," "êre unde guot," "lîp," "liute," "lant," "und tugende" (manly courage, honor and generosity, a wholesome disposition, courtiers, land, and knightly mores), characteristics

³¹I have previously argued on behalf of a renewed, altered, Gawein, one thus capable of restoring Arthur's dominions (Shockey [n. 3 above] 238ff.). For an opposing view, see Fritz Peter Knapp, *Chevalier errant und fin'amor. Das Ritterideal des 13. Jahrhunderts in Nordfrankreich und im deutschsprachigen Südosten*, Schriften der Universität Passau. Reihe Geisteswissenschaften 8 (Passau 1986).

that both transcend and constrain the malevolence of a Fimbeus, Giramphiel, Giremelandz, or Gasozein. Gawein exploits cleverness to the extent that *list* can save lives—his own and those of his companions (vv. 26383 and 26504). Tristan, in contrast, is solely concerned with two persons—Isolde and himself. Gottfried adroitly weaves the guile of Tristan and Isolde into the larger tapestry of King Marke’s countervailing trickery, thus blending and negating *list*, but not with the expressed aim of a greater sum. Heinrich asserts an entirely different corollary: his man Gawein should fight wiles with cunning and thus reintroduce Arthurian hegemony.

While underway to a meeting with Fimbeus, another foe of King Arthur, Gawein furthers the collective interests of his compatriots by noting the comments of the Knight of the Swan (v. 26610). The dragon to which this figure refers can only be defeated by swift action; the protagonist reacts accordingly and saves his friends. Magic, the poet reports, could not vanquish the beast (vv. 26642 and 26740). With such a clear renunciation of the black arts and trickery, the poet seeks to give his validation of the hero a decisive imprimatur, one intertwining the complexities of the other world with the Arthurian realm, but one in which a man’s sagacity resides in feats of strength and fortitude combined with intelligence.

A complex interval follows, dominated by the appearance of the wizard, Gansguoter. Ernst Dick and Stephen Maksymiuk offer contrasting views on the merits of this individual, with Dick arguing on behalf of an emancipatory function and Maksymiuk stressing the vital importance of the *magus*.³² While each dwells at great length on the caliber of Gansguoter’s remarkable abilities with necromancy, neither considers Gawein’s own formidable skills with *list*, a strength that in this instance is devoid of the negative connotations of *zouber* (magic). Gawein demonstrates facility in foiling demons by means of positive guile; his adroitness precludes the complete necessity of Gansguoter being the “Regisseur der Handlung” (director of the production).³³ The

³²For particulars, see Dick (n. 4 above) 128–150 and Maksymiuk (n. 4 above) 470–483. See as well Maksymiuk (n. 4 above) 481 n. 9. Maksymiuk’s argument is rather flawed. Textual evidence strongly suggests that Gawein is responsible for his friends’ welfare; Maksymiuk’s contention that “[t]he knights survive only because of Gansguoter’s help” (481) is erroneous.

³³Mentzel-Reuters (n. 28 above) 179.

protagonist, together with his friends, is fully capable of cunning while defending himself and Arthurian interests. Knightly combat, at least in the eyes of our poet, is “arebeit . . . harte grôz” (a difficult task) (v. 27108), but it also involves *list* (vv. 27109 and 27114). In a further development of guile, fellow-courtier Kei actively utilizes cunning in his own sojourns near the Grail Castle as well (vv. 29010ff. and 29825ff.).³⁴

Gansguoter, the putative director of the various *aventiuren*, remains a particularly intriguing element in the unfolding conflict between the forces of good and evil. His exact position, delineated in part by both Dick and Maksymiuk, among others, remains something of a mystery. Gansguoter’s lands and possessions achieve quasi-mythic proportions; they are further heightened by “sô grôzen zouber” (such great magic) with “alsolhen listen” (such cunning behavior) and “mit grôzen listen” (with great guile).³⁵ Moreover, the troubadour refers to this individual as “ein vil guot kneht” (a good fellow), one possessing “hövescheit” (courtliness) (vv. 13035 and 20381). These characteristics, though, do not correspond to other emblems of his person: “ein pfaffe . . . “ (a cleric) and “. . . ein pfaffe wol gelêrt” (a learned cleric) (vv. 8308 and 13025). Contrary to the position of Maksymiuk, priests rarely achieved the status of a knight (or sovereign) in the estimation of courtly society, and this cleric makes ample use of “nigromancie” (sorcery) (v. 20404).³⁶ On the whole, he remains an influential mentor, one who chooses to aid Arthurian knighthood, but an individual who never achieves the status of Gawein, champion of positive chivalry.

The closing series of *aventiuren* in the campaign against Fimbeus

³⁴Maksymiuk (n. 4 above) argues that “only his [Gansguoter’s] superior magical ability saves them from death” (475). This statement is accurate only inasmuch as it pertains to *one* segment of the journey. VV. 26383, 26610, 26740, and 27109 tell a far different story: Gawein and one compatriot (Kei) demonstrate *list* in combat. Magical devices are simply not in evidence.

³⁵Maksymiuk (n. 4 above) 475ff. Dick (n. 4 above) refutes Maksymiuk’s contentions (146ff.).

³⁶Note as well v. 20398, where Heinrich speaks of possible incongruities in the tale of the courtly sorcerer: “und betriuet uns niht valscher list” (if false or evil cunning does not cause us to err). The “minne” (courtly love) of “ein vil guot kneht” (a good fellow) (Maksymiuk’s hero-knight Gansguoter) could as well be false. Finally, note the observations of Joachim Bumke on the characteristics of a knight in: Joachim Bumke, *Höfische Kultur* (Munich 1994); and Joachim Bumke, *Studien zum Ritterbegriff im 12. und 13. Jahrhundert*, Beihefte zum Euphorion 1 (Heidelberg 1977).

and Gîramphiel signal the last application of cunning in *Diu Crône*. Although the bard has exploited *list* for a variety of reasons during the course of the poem, his efforts now dwell on manifestations of guile coupled with knightly prowess. As Dick and Mentzel-Reuters record, positive chivalry and trickery go hand-in-hand in the attempt to reestablish Arthurian seigniory.³⁷ The instruments of artfulness (one cannot consider other members of his entourage as recipients of Gansguoter’s largess) perform vital, but subordinate, functions as guarantors of parity and vehicles for the *manheit* (manliness) of the protagonist. Magical boxes, swords, shields, and the like are, in the final analysis, only as good as their owners’ requisite skills: they check evil necromancy, but necessitate the implementation of manly courage. Therefore, the bard’s man must neutralize the final foe of Arthurian chivalry with skilled swordplay.

Heinrich remains very clear about knightly skills and the outcome of this final struggle. He recognizes, in turn, that an overreliance on magical devices signals weakness. The poet thus remarks:

Beide verlust unde gewin
 Muose an ir manheit ligen;
 Swelher under in solt sigen,
 Dem wart zoubers helfe verzigen. (vv. 27365–27368)

(Both defeat and victory thus lie in their hands; the winner among both of these two heroes would be denied the aid of magic.)

The immediacy and poignancy of this statement reflects poetic sensibilities which were not in evidence in the middle of the poem. In bold fashion, Heinrich demands that his man (and any legitimate champion) exhibit personal bravery reflecting wholesome knightly virtues. In this last struggle for court preeminence, we cannot deny the intrinsic quality of Gansguoter’s succor (vv. 27603, 27620, and 27645ff.), but we must also weigh the accompanying matter of “mannes kraft” (manly strength) (v. 27787).

³⁷Mentzel-Reuters (n. 28 above) 1ff. and Dick (n. 4 above) 146ff. Keller (13) maintains: “. . . daß die Wunderketten in ihrer Einmaligkeit für das Verständnis der ganzen ‘Crône’ grundlegende Bedeutung haben” [. . . that the Chains of Marvels have, in their singularity, concrete meaning for the understanding of the entire *Crône*], a position that Mentzel-Reuters, Jillings, Dick, and I reject.

In the past, Gawein combined a variety of elements in his battle to return Fortune's trophies—"hantschuoeh beide" (both gloves), "vingerlîn" (ring), and "stein" (stone) (vv. 28226 and 28227)—to their rightful owner, Arthur. As such, the poet sought to underscore a sometimes circumspect position on wile. However, the capstone event of the protagonist's struggle with Fimbeus portrays an entirely different image—single combat based on individual proficiency with sword and shield. *Sichern* and *wichen* (parrying and dodging), combined with *slahen* and *stôzen mit listen* (striking and stabbing with guile), produce the desired results, and we may conclude that Heinrich's man epitomizes the finest traditions of positive chivalry: his image is stellar; his skills are impeccable—and clearly enriched by healthy shrewdness.

Finally, *list* does not figure prominently in the Chains of Marvels or the Grail episodes of von dem Tûrlin's romance. In stark contrast to the scenes of combat, Grail visits and the accompanying *Wunderketten* (chains of marvels) stress other behaviors: avoidance of sleep, drink, or food; asking about the symbolism of the Grail; and denying the temptations associated with *verligen*, the soft life of the sexualized knight most often associated with Hartmann's *Erec*. Obedience, the query regarding the Grail, and abstinence are hallmarks of these passages, and not *zouber*, *list*, or *mannes muot* (magic, cunning, or manly courage).

DER STRICKER'S *DANIEL*: NEW DOMAINS FOR *LIST*?

Stricker's *Daniel* forms the basis of our final examination of *list*, as it reflects permutations of certain characteristics found in the previous works examined, including *Tristan* and *Diu Crône*. The poem itself has been the subject of numerous studies pertaining to guile, including treatments by Wolfgang Moelleken, Ingeborg Henderson, Hedda Ragotzky, Dorothea Müller, Wolfgang Schmidt, and Johanna Reisel, among others.³⁸ Before addressing themes germane to trickery, it would

³⁸For details, see Moelleken and Henderson (n. 1 above) 187–201; Hedda Ragotzky, "Das Handlungsmodell der list und die Thematisierung von guot. Zum Problem einer sozial-geschichtlich orientierten Interpretation von Strickers 'Daniel von dem blühenden Tal' und dem 'Pfaffen Amis'" in *Literatur-Publikum-historischer Kontext*, ed. Gert Kaiser, Beiträge zur Älteren Deutsche Literaturgeschichte 1 (Bern 1977) 183–203; Dorothea Müller, 'Daniel von dem Blühenden Tal' und 'Garel von dem Blühenden Tal.' *Die Artusromane des Stricker und des Pleier unter gattungsgeschichtlichen Aspekten*, GAG 334 (Göppingen 1981); Wolfgang Schmidt, *Untersuchungen zu Aufbauformen und Erzählstil im 'Daniel von dem blühenden Tal'*, GAG 266 (Göppingen 1979); and

seem appropriate to note issues surrounding the chronology and topology of *Daniel*, as both Der Stricker and Heinrich von dem Türlin react differently to the notion of cunning, perhaps, as we shall see, in opposition to each other’s efforts.

The complexities of dating Stricker’s first major poem have challenged scholars for generations. We note that a wide discrepancy exists between the various dates offered. Similarly, we observe serious debates about the exact location of its composition. Michael Resler calculates that the work emerged parallel to, if not earlier than, Heinrich’s *Diu Crône*—ca. 1210 to 1225.³⁹ Resler argues that: “Man kann nun mit ziemlicher Gewißheit sagen, daß der *Daniel* vor den *Karl* anzusetzen ist, daß er also im Zeitraum von 1210 (nach dem *Wigalois*) bis 1225 (vor dem *Karl*) entstanden sein muß.” (One can say with a high degree of certainty that *Daniel* appeared before *Karl*, which means that *Daniel* had to have been written in the time frame between 1210 (after *Wigalois*) and 1225 (before *Karl*).⁴⁰ Other scholars maintain that the poem was written “zwischen 1225 und 1240” (between 1225 and 1240), while some remain anchored to the date of 1220.⁴¹ The topic of location, an issue far beyond the scope of our treatment, focuses, in turn, on four settings—Austria and the Lower Main region, as well as Loon and Thuringia. All of these regions could have implications for Heinrich’s *opus*.⁴²

Johanna Reisel, *Zeitgeschichtliche und Theologisch-Scholastische Aspekte im ‘Daniel von dem Blühenden Tal’ des Stricker*, GAG 464 (Göppingen 1986).

³⁹See Michael Resler, “Zur Datierung von Strickers Daniel von dem Blühenden Tal,” *Euphorion* 78 (1984) 17–30, esp. 29. See as well Werner Schwartzkopf, “Rede und Redeszene in der deutschen Erzählung bis Wolfram von Eschenbach,” *Palaestra, Untersuchungen und Texte aus der deutschen und englischen Philologie* 74 (1909) 104–119. Scholarship on Heinrich’s poem lags badly in this respect. To date there has been no effort made to identify the time of production of *Diu Crône*.

⁴⁰Resler (n. 39 above) 29. Resler concludes that *Daniel* contains archaic elements of Germanic poetic style, and maintains that *Karl*, based on the far older *Rolandslied*, assumes the “modern fashion” of Hartmann, Wolfram, Gottfried, and Wirnt.

⁴¹Compare Reisel (n. 38 above) 223, who argues on behalf of the later date; and Schmidt (n. 38 above) 1, who locates the poem around the year 1220. Neither examines this issue in the manner that Resler does.

⁴²Reisel (n. 38 above) locates the poet at the time of writing in Mainz and Thuringia, and believes that connections existed with the counts of Loon (1ff.). On Austrian dimensions of the poem, see Helmut Brall, “Strickers Daniel von dem Blühenden Tal. Zur politischen Funktion späthöfischer Artusepik im Territorialisierungsprozeß,” *Euphorion* 70 (1976) 222–257. The most current examination of issues relating to Heinrich’s

Equally as perplexing to the modern scholar are the various works which evolve into the corpus of courtly literature known as post-classical courtly romance, of which Stricker's *Daniel* is an important part. Like Heinrich's poem, *Daniel* ". . . ruft das Positiv-Übernatürliche auf den Plan" (brings the positive supernatural into perspective),⁴³ thus laying the foundations for a dramatic turn away from more traditional elements of courtly romance. Expanding on this notable change, Walter Haug's seminal treatment of the disparate hero-types ponders various alterations of the protagonist. He cites three forms of the post-classical hero:

1) der glückliche Held in einer bald mehr dämonisierten und bald mehr fantastischen Welt

(the fortunate protagonist within a sometimes demonic, sometimes more fantastic world)

2) der listig-kluge Superheld in einer fabulös-grotesken Welt, die spielerisch über die Stränge schlägt

(the cunning and wise superhero in a fabulous-grotesque world which hides all traces of itself)

3) der ethische Held, dessen aventuren in einen neuen übergreifenden Sinnzusammenhang gestellt und jenseits von äußerem Erfolg oder Mißerfolg an diesem gemessen werden⁴⁴

(the ethical hero whose adventures are posited in a new, overarching structure of being and are subsequently measured by the tenets of this realm and not by external forces of success or failure)

Haug's assessments of these various forms imply that Heinrich's protagonist remains a successful, lucky hero, one beset with the twists of fortune in a demonic, fantastic world. Der Stricker's knight is, in turn,

homeland is that of Lewis Jillings, "Heinrich von dem Türlin: Zum Problem der biographischen Forschung" in *Die mittelalterliche Literatur in Kärnten. Vorträge des Symposiums in St. Georgen/Längsee vom 8. bis 13. 9. 1980*, ed. Peter Krämer, Wiener Arbeiten zur germanischen Altertumskunde und Philologie (Vienna 1981) 86–102.

⁴³Walter Haug, "Paradigmatische Poesie. Der spätere deutsche Artusroman auf dem Weg zu einer 'nachklassischen' Ästhetik," *Deutsche Vierteljahresschrift* 2 (1980) 204–231, esp. 211

⁴⁴Haug (n. 43 above) 220.

paired with figures from the realm of the grotesque. Fortune has little to do with his stunning success, as he comes equipped with wiles and skills which sweep away his opponents.

We may well concur with Haug’s assessment of Heinrich’s work as being “. . . auf dem Weg zum fantastischen Panoptikum” (underway towards a fantastic waxworks), but Stricker’s *Daniel* remains a work without a true crisis, a “groteske Fantasie” (grotesque fantasy).⁴⁵ Furthermore, we should recall Haug’s comments on the other world phenomenology associated with Der Stricker’s production:

Die Welt, die sie [die Fantasie] schafft, ist zwar zauberisch gefährlich, dabei aber mehr untermenschlichbizzarr-böse als wirklich dämonisch. Magische Technik herrscht vor, und dies verhindert die Entfaltung jenes undurchsichtig und abgründig Fantastische, dem man im *Wigalois* oder in der *Crône* begegnet.⁴⁶

(The world which fantasy creates is, owing to magic, dangerous, but is actually more inhuman, bizarre, and evil than truly demonic. Magical technology reigns, and this aspect hinders the development of the opaque, catastrophic fantastic which one encounters in *Wigalois* or *Die Crône*.)

These fascinating technical marvels exhibited by the protagonist, together with the remarkable dexterity of the poet in their subsequent application, hint at radical alterations in previously existing norms of courtly behavior.⁴⁷ They also represent a vigorous attempt to redefine the concept of a knight.

Returning to the question of *list* in Stricker’s *Daniel*, we can readily observe that the protagonist checks the actions of fantastic, yet helpless, figures—Juran the dwarf, the monster without a body, giants, and so forth. Daniel, lacking even the barest of semblances to a crisis-hero (compare Hartmann’s *Iwein*), invokes “‘list’ [als] reines Mittel zum Zweck . . .” (guile as a pure means to a purpose).⁴⁸ *List* itself appears to

⁴⁵Haug (n. 43 above) 214 and 220. See as well Walter Haug, *Literaturtheorie im deutschen Mittelalter* (Darmstadt 1992) 260.

⁴⁶Haug (n. 43 above) 220.

⁴⁷For details, see Ragotzky (n. 38 above) 184ff. Ragotzky mentions two opposing views regarding the evaluation of the bourgeoisie and Stricker’s poetic license.

⁴⁸Ragotzky (n. 38 above) 201. Ragotzky maintains: “Das Handlungsmodell der ‘list’ im Sinne direkter Entsprechungen zu neuen sozialen Handlungsweisen, die als Folge neuer Wirtschaftspraktiken angenommen werden, zu deuten, muß fehlschlagen.” (The

assume new, self-defining functions, the consequences of which manifest themselves directly in the course of the romance. Müller recalls that, “Analog zum ‘Daniel’ ist die zentrale Bedeutung der List für die Selbstverwirklichung, wenn auch deren Konzeption große Differenzen aufweist” (Analogous to ‘Daniel’ is the central meaning of cunning for self-development, even if its conception indicates marked differences).⁴⁹ The various opponents of Daniel simply do not possess this uncanny sense of intellectual acumen, and they suffer accordingly:

Auf der einen Seite [steht] Daniel, der mit Hilfe einer Listanwendung als Sieger aus einer scheinbar hoffnungslosen Situation hervorgeht, auf der anderen Seite [ist] Juran, der trotz seiner übernatürlichen Kräfte unterliegt, weil ihm *wisheit* und *sinne* abhanden gekommen sind.⁵⁰

(Daniel stands on one side as one who, with the aid of clever guile, emerges out of an apparently hopeless situation. On the other side is Juran, who, in spite of his supernatural strength, fails miserably, because he has lost wisdom and intellectual expertise.)

In its Strickerian form, *list* thus achieves prominence as a variation of *Klugheit* (intelligence) and *Ethik* (ethos), thereby altering plot development and progression of the knight through time and space.⁵¹

Even as they may appear so dramatically different from their original forms in Gottfried’s *Tristan*, these new concepts of altered cleverness and subtlety appeal to us as readers of Heinrich’s romance. Both poets seem most interested in moments of restoration and self-definition, rather than variations which permit successful creations of an essentially anti-Arthurian character. For Der Stricker, *list* remains wedded to the very de rigueur application of self-help, a process begun in *Diu Crône* and *Wigalois*. The poet provides his readers and audiences with ethical, morally defensible applications of cunning. Evil is repre-

use of any model of function of “list” in the sense of direct equivalents to new social forms of behavior which figure as a result of new economic practices is simply wrong.) Henderson argues again this position; see Ingeborg Henderson, *Strickers Daniel von dem Blühenden Tal. Werkstruktur und Interpretation unter Berücksichtigung der handschriftlichen Überlieferung*, German Language and Literature Monographs 1 (Amsterdam 1976) 12.

⁴⁹Müller (n. 38 above) 11.

⁵⁰See Moelleken and Henderson (n. 1 above) 190. Moelleken and Henderson (n. 1 above) provide countless examples of Daniel’s remarkable abilities (190ff.).

⁵¹Müller (n. 38 above) 18ff. and 25ff.

hensible and must be stopped, and Daniel may employ any means necessary to promote the sanctity and harmony of the Arthurian world. The legal basis of *list*, coupled with moral underpinnings of an ethos of cleverness, achieves notable success. The strong affinity with order, a keen interest in reestablishment of previously-existing forms of governance (Arthurian), and the latent desirability of attaining stability for the protagonist reinforce the perception that Der Stricker sought to create a courtly romance at once at odds with but yet in tune with current social mores and values. As Ingeborg Henderson notes, “Kernpunkt allen Geschehens ist darum die Wahrung und Sicherung der umgreifendend Ordnung . . . “ (The basis of all activity is the maintenance and protection of an all-encompassing order.)⁵² Moreover, even a “Superheld” (superhero), one utilizing *list* in unusual contexts, remains partially anchored to the traditions of his predecessors. The concluding act of King Arthur underscores this very point:

des was der künec Artûs frô.
 zesamen gap er sie dô
 beidiu mit sîn selbes hant
 und hiez in über diz lant
 ze Clûse herzoge sîn. (vv. 8305–8309)

(King Arthur was very pleased about this. Thus, he commended both Daniel and Sandinôse to one another with his own hand, and he declared that Daniel would henceforth be the Duke of Cluse.)

Der Stricker thus closes his poem with the basis of the Arthurian, that is to say, the essence of order, justice, and tranquility, and the ends appear to justify the admittedly questionable means.

CONCLUSION

In the final analysis, we may conclude that Heinrich, his forerunners, and his contemporary, Der Stricker, all chose multifaceted presentations of *list* within the context of plot development in their various courtly romances. Perhaps in keeping with their pronounced spirituality, Wolfram and Wirnt tend to sublimate or ignore cunning. Gottfried, on the other hand, accents an education based on artifice and wiles. Tristan himself also stresses the primacy of clever behavior and the position of

⁵²Henderson (n. 48 above) 192.

self: Tristan the artist, Tristan the warrior, and Tristan the lover are vastly different concepts.

In a temporal sense, the final two works offer competing, yet oftentimes similar visions of rehabilitation. *Diu Crône* favors French and German antecedents, and deploys *list* in a manner calculated to stymie anti-Arthurians—both monsters and evil knights—and inculcate the pre-existing Arthurian world with a *modus vivendi*: old-fashioned chivalry. The vigorous style (Jillings) suggests reaffirmation and cogent use of determinants, and the crises of individuality and failure preclude immediate application of *kunst*, *wisheit*, or *list*.

Daniel, on the other hand, creates a protagonist without a demonstrable self-identity crisis. The knight is well-equipped to counter dwarves, giants, and beasts of all sorts, and he has a powerful and persuasive weapon: *list* as ethos and *list* as wisdom. While Tristan and Gawein require practice or accouterments, Daniel possesses given talents: he need not undergo lengthy training (Tristan) or subject himself to failure (Gawein). Perhaps this very lack of introspection, the centerpiece of a *descensus*-filled work such as *Parzival*, led to limited interest in Stricker's poetic effort. The relatively poor reception of Stricker's piece may also have been a product of bad timing: works by Wolfram, Gottfried, and Hartmann overwhelmed the competition, and the courtly audiences for whom these poems were intended appear to have simply identified more with the classical poets.⁵³

The implications are clear. Heinrich chose, whether by happenstance or intent, to create and evaluate his protagonist in a manner at once similar and antithetical to Stricker's Daniel. Christine Zach's treatment of Old French and German sources for *Diu Crône* suggests that the poet either ignored or had limited contact with *Daniel*. Given the exigencies of circulation and the paucity of manuscripts, it is possible to assume that neither poet possessed substantive knowledge of the other's efforts. Each thus took a decidedly different approach to *list* as a component of

⁵³See, for example, Werner Schröder, "Und zuckte in uf als einen schoup: Parodierte Artus-Herrlichkeit in Strickers 'Daniel,'" *Sprache und Recht. Beiträge zur Kulturgeschichte des Mittelalters*. 2 vols. (Berlin 1986) 2.814–830, repr. in *Kleinere Schriften: (1956–1987)*, 2 vols. (Stuttgart 1989) 2.593–604. On source materials pertaining to *Diu Crône*, see Christine Zach, *Die Erzählmotive der Crône Heinrichs von dem Türlin und ihre altfranzösischen Quellen. Ein kommentiertes Register*, Passauer Schriften zur Sprache und Literatur 5 (Passau 1990).

chivalry, although some of the end results—rejuvenation and reaffirmation—are essentially the same. Sadly enough, neither poem provided firm standing for these minstrels, as both languished in relative obscurity for hundreds of years.

Stricker’s *Daniel*, like Wirnt’s *Wigalois*, creates parallel kingdoms, although Wirnt employs his protagonist as a redeemer. In addition, Daniel remains the “listiger Superheld” (cunning superhero) (Haug). Heinrich rejects both models and reassembles Arthurian hegemony via a multidimensional knight—Gawein. In the manner of Der Stricker, Heinrich places greater emphasis on territoriality, and in both instances, *list* assumes a proportionality and value at odds with the ideals espoused by certain older contemporaries.⁵⁴ However, Heinrich prefers the *ordo* of the Arthurian world; his man remains at the cusp of knight-hood and soundly renounces any second kingdom. Stricker’s *Daniel*, while expressing sympathy for Karidol, exhibits decidedly novel tendencies vis-à-vis Arthur. Another poet, Der Pleier, reacts to these preferences in his *Garel von dem blühenden Tal*: he strongly repudiates *list* as a constituent element of courtly romance and anchors a renewed Arthurian dominion at the center of his poem.⁵⁵

Department of Germanic Languages and Literatures
Washington University
St. Louis, MO 63130-4899

⁵⁴Compare Brall (n. 42 above) 256ff. on territoriality in *Daniel*. See as well Gert Kaiser, “Der ‘Wigalois’ des Wirnt von Gravenberc. Zur Bedeutung des Territorialisierungsprozesses für die ‘höfisch-ritterlichen’ Literatur des 13. Jahrhunderts,” *Euphorion* 69 (1975) 410–443. Schröder rejects both positions. See Werner Schröder (n. 53 above) 593ff. and Werner Schröder, “Zur Literaturverarbeitung durch Heinrich von dem Türlin in seinem Gawein-Roman ‘Diu Crône,’” *Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum* 2.121 (1992) 132–174.

⁵⁵Müller (n. 38 above) 38ff.