A LEGENDARY BACKDROP FOR GAHMURET

by Lee Stavenhagen

The problems that scholars have typically set for themselves in examining the first two books of Wolfram’s *Parzival* are usually beclouded by the fact that we still have no entirely satisfactory theory as to Wolfram’s source for this part of his epic. This difficulty, which in another context might not seriously hinder the critical approach, in this case is compounded by Wolfram’s own claim, which I am convinced is a wryly contrived and deliberately laid false scent, that he had told the true version of the Parzival story as it had come to him through Kyot, as opposed to the presumably popular version by Chrétien de Troyes.¹ However, since the appearance in 1939 of Friedrich Panzer’s study, “Gahmuret,” this situation has been much improved.² In demonstrating that the first two books of *Parzival* reflect themes and legends from at least several literary sources as well as contemporary political events and figures, Panzer restored literary perspective to the problem. Above all, he documented Wolfram’s ability to draw on current tradition as effectively as on a unified literary source, which should have dispelled any doubt that Wolfram was capable of having constructed the first two books independently of any direct source.

But not all of Panzer’s ideas and suggestions have yet been followed up, while alternative theories continue to appear.³ In referring to the problem of Gahmuret’s bigamy, Panzer cites the “Roman des Gilion de Trazegnies” (p. 71, n. 2). An examination of this elegant little tale reveals adventures that are often very reminiscent of Gahmuret’s splendid career. It also leads one to a complex of epic tradition that seems to have influenced Wolfram. More importantly, it is possible, by examining this material, to learn more about both Wolfram’s method of composition and his intent in writing the first two books.

The Old French *Histoire de Gilion de Trasignyes et de dame Marie sa femme* was composed some time between 1433 and 1458.⁴ Its contents may be briefly sketched as follows. The work opens with a prologue in which
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the author tells how he chanced upon three tombs in the ancient abbey of l'Olive in Hainaut. According to the abbot and epitaphs on the stones, this was the grave of the knight Gilion de Trazegnies, interred between his two wives, one of whom had been a daughter of the Sultan of Babylon. In response to the author's earnest charge to relate the history that led to so poignant an end, the abbot produced a book, "ung petit livre en parchemin escript dune tres ancienne lettre moult obscure en langue ytalienne." The tale it told was of such interest that the author translated it for his lord, Philip, Duke of Burgundy.

Gilion, a knight in the retinue of the Count of Hainaut, vows a pilgrimage to the Holy City if God will bless him with an heir. His wife Marie conceives, and he at once sets out to keep his vow. But he is captured by the Sultan of Egypt. In the course of his subsequent adventures Gilion takes service with the Sultan, becoming his champion and winning many battles. Eventually, deceived by a false report of Marie's death brought by a treacherous rival for her hand, Gilion takes the Sultan's daughter Gracyenne to wife. But Marie is not dead. After Gilion's departure, she had borne twins, who now, after fourteen years, take arms and go in search of their father. But like him they are captured, each by a different Saracen ruler; also, each twin eventually becomes the champion in the army of his captor. One day the two Saracen rulers, Fabur de Moryenne and Margant or Mombrant de Sclovonie, attack each other, and on this occasion the two brothers, Jean and Gérard, are chosen to do single combat. They clash mightily, but after exchanging a few blows recognize each other and break off. Thus reunited, they continue their adventures, until at last they find their father Gilion. He returns with them to Hainaut, bringing Gracyenne along; she has meanwhile been converted and baptized. Marie receives them joyfully, and the bigamy is resolved by the retirement of all three spouses to cloisters. When both women die Gilion has three tombs prepared, the third for the purpose of someday containing his own remains.

But his retirement is not to end in peace; a message arrives from the Sultan, who is hard pressed by enemy attack. Gilion takes up his arms and hastens to the aid of his former lord; he carries the victory, but in battle receives a mortal wound. Seeing that he cannot recover, he realizes that his limbs will lie far from the place so carefully provided for them. Therefore he charges the Sultan at least to return his heart to Trazegnies for burial. The Sultan of course honors the request, giving Gilion's body burial but returning his heart: "Laquelle chose il feist et fu son cuer apporte et mis en la tumbe que pour lui avoit fait faire." Let the following points be considered in comparing Gilion's adventures with Gahmuret's. Gahmuret, according to Wolfram, also had two wives, one a Saracen acquired during adventures in the service of the Sultan of Bagdad. Gahmuret also fathered two sons, each born after his father's de-
parture. These sons, like Gillon’s, meet as the result of a search for their father and recognize each other only after having come to blows. Gahmuret, like Gillon, having left the Sultan’s service, is recalled, and receives a mortal wound in defending his old master. Gahmuret’s last act is to send back the bloodstained shift he wore in his last encounter and the fatal barb, which are interred in his stead in the minster (Parzival, 111, 30-112, 2). Gillon’s heart is removed from his body and borne back to be interred in the tomb between his two wives.

The most obvious reply to such a list of correspondences would be to postulate that the author of the Histoire de Gillon knew and borrowed from Parzival. But other considerations speak against such a possibility. First, it seems most unlikely that an author who knew Wolfram’s work would confine his borrowing to these peripheral themes, ignoring entirely the story of Parzival and the Grail. Nor is there any hint in the fluent, lucid prose of the Histoire de Gillon of any sympathy on the part of its author for the stylistic complexity that so endeared Wolfram to his imitators. But perhaps most convincing of all is the fact that the points at which the stories of Gillon and Gahmuret are similar form a theme more characterized by the sentiment of well-loved clichés than the sharp edges of originality. For argument’s sake, I will suppose that the Histoire de Gillon is based on a legend, probably a very popular legend, that Wolfram also knew and used.

An examination of what little is known about the sources of the Histoire de Gillon shows that this hypothesis is at least admissible. Although little credence need be attached to the author’s claim that his tale is a translation of an ancient Italian manuscript, an anterior version of some kind must have existed. The text refers or seems to refer twice to such a version, quoting “l’escripture ou le livre qui de ce fait mention” and again “l’histoire.” The date of the earlier version would most probably be about the middle of the fourteenth century, at which time other references to the legend of Gillon begin to appear. Even prior to this earlier reaction, some elements of the story of Gillon can be traced. These elements tend to divide into a legendary and a historical component. Marie de France’s lais of Eliduc (ca. 1165), the story of Amlethus (Hamlet) told by Saxo Grammaticus (ca. 1185), Walter of Arras’ Ille et Galeron (ca. 1166) and the popular fables of Goldtree and Silvertree all have to do with a bigamous hero. Eliduc in particular seems to have influenced the formation of the Gillon legend. Opinions differ as to how these tales and legends relate to each other, but there seems to be general agreement that they are all manifestations of one legend about a man with two wives and that this legend existed in Europe at least as early as the eleventh century.

But the Histoire de Gillon gives particular attention to a feature not mentioned in any of the older legends, Gillon’s marvelous tomb. The narrative devotes considerable space to describing how Gillon orders three tombs
to be constructed, for himself and his two wives. The plot has its denouement in the interment of Gilion's heart in the tomb prepared for it. The author closes with assurances that it was the tomb which had originally attracted his attention to the tale, and that it is still to be seen at the abbey of l'Olive. The prominence of the hero's tomb, then, is a feature not derived from the older legend of the bigamous knight but belonging to the history of Gilion. Alphonse Bayot concludes therefore that the Gilion legend resulted from the association of an actual tomb of one of the lords of Trazegnies with the bigamy legend. This tomb he identifies as that of Gilles I, who died between 1161 and 1163 from a blow received in battle and was buried in the priory of Herlaimont, near l'Olive. Gilles' wife, for unknown reasons, went by two names, first Damise, later Gerberge; Bayot surmises that both names would have appeared on her gravestone but only one date, and connects this with the fact that the *Histoire de Gilion* states that both Gilion's wives died in the same year. The name Damise became Dame Marie, and perhaps Gracyenne, or Gratiane, as it also appears, derived from Gerberge.

Now note that Wolfram gives particular prominence to Gahmuret's tomb, devoting two entire 30-line stanzas to its description (107-108). And in *Willehalm*, when Wolfram mentions the Sultan whom Gahmuret served, the splendid burial of the Sultan's champion occupies the poet's full attention:

```
só mac von Marroch Akarín
mit éren fürsten hêrre sîn,
des bâruckes geseliehte,
der mit kristenfîshchem rehte
Gahmureten ze Baldac
bestatt, dâ von man sprechen mac,
welch pîvilde er im erkôs
da er den lip durch in verlôs:
wie sprach sîn epitafîûm!
daz was ze jâmers sîten frum:
wie was gehârt sîns sarkes stat,
alsô der bârue selbe bat,
von smârât und von rubîn!
```

*Willehalm*, 73, 19-74, 1)

This passage is oddly out of context, inserted in a list of Saracen nobles conquered by Willehalm. Why should Wolfram stop at the mere mention of the "bârue" to tell about Gahmuret’s burial and epitaph? And devote not a line to the Sultan himself, who in *Parzival* (13, 16-19) was said to rule two-thirds of the earth? Why, indeed, unless Gahmuret's service with the Sultan was closely associated in Wolfram's mind with the tale of Gahmuret's burial and tomb?

Since the historical germ of the Gilion legend dates from the twelfth
century, Wolfram could have been familiar with it. Trazegnies was particularly famous for its tournaments, held since 1170. Wolfram's professed interest in *Turnierwesen* will have been the channel through which Trazegnies and its legends caught his attention. Even to the present day Chateau de Trazegnies is famous for its mausoleums, some of considerable historical interest dating from the beginning of the sixteenth century. Perhaps this fame rests on a tradition going back to the days when the lords of Trazegnies were still entombed at Herlaimont. As to the fact that Gilles I was actually buried at Herlaimont, whereas in the Gilion legend and the Gahmuret story the hero died in the Orient and only a memento occupied the tomb, it may be pointed out that Gilles' two successors both died in the East. Othon II died in Palestine before 1195 and Gilles II was killed at Constantinople in 1204. It was in fact during his second pilgrimage to the Holy Land that Othon II died, which fits with the legend that both Gilion and Gahmuret were killed on their second Oriental expeditions. Gilles II was often identified later with the Gilion of legend, since it was known that he was killed in the East. Either the history of Othon's two trips was later applied to his son Gilles, or the latter was identified with a "wol geborne Franzois" named Gillis who is mentioned in the German chronicle of the Crusade of 1189 for his extraordinary deeds of valor. In either case, Gilles II would then have been supposed to have made two expeditions to the Orient, losing his life in the second.

One more item in connection with Gilles II may be pertinent in this connection. This is the fact that his seal is one of the earliest known from all the Low Countries to show a heraldic charge, so appearing from 1199. Perhaps the early development of heraldry at Trazegnies is reflected in the prominence given armorial bearings in the first two books of *Parzival*. These books, it has been pointed out, contain more references to and descriptions of bearings than all the rest. The escutcheon of Trazegnies was later charged with a lion rampant in umbra to designate the eldest son. Might there be any connection with the black panther Gahmuret bore upon becoming the senior of his line? Although the lion of Trazegnies does not appear until 1374, its origin in Hainaut may be considerably earlier. The matter would hardly be worth citing if it were not for the fact that any such heraldic connection between Gahmuret and the house of Trazegnies would bear further on the long-standing "Löwen-Panther-Leopardenfrage," as Panzer named it, the argument as to whether Gahmuret's blazon reflects the panther of Steiermark, the leopards of Anjou, or the lions of England.

However that may be, the material presented so far points, I suggest, to the existence of a legend centering about the mausoleum of a hero who furnished the prototype for both Gilion and Gahmuret.

Now it is clear enough that Heinrich von Veldeke in his *Eneide* provided Wolfram with the direct model for Gahmuret's elaborate sarcophagus and
epitaphium. And here Wolfram demonstrated those qualities of perception and originality that set him apart from his contemporaries, from poets like Veldeke who strove to conform to the models of courtly literature. Wolfram did more than edit what he borrowed. He salted it from the cellars of his own disordered stock of eclectic lore, rearranged it, disguised it, published it under the pretext of a fictitious authority, and thus produced one of the most penetrating documents of medieval life and aspirations. He did this, characteristically, by taking that which was relevant to his purpose from whatever source was at hand. His recombination of source elements, such as the tragedy of Pallas, with sentimental tales of knightly exploits in the far Orient, always is kept in service to a general pattern, always contributes to development of the story toward completeness. The tales from which Wolfram derived Gahmuret’s successive involvement with an Eastern princess and then one from his own culture, his violent death in the East after returning to defend his first liege, the token of his devotion returned by the Sultan for burial, and other features are smoothly combined with a well-known passage from classical court literature. Thus is the still unborn Parzival marked with the sign of triuwe and unverzaget mannes muts. Wolfram’s compositional aptness answers when the diffuse-ness of his sources seems inconsonant with the cosmopolitan scope of Parzival.

But before we dismiss the prototype of Gilion as another of the minor tales and legends that contributed to Parzival it will be well to examine another branch of the Gilion legend: its German counterpart, the widely-known saga of the Graf von Gleichen. Since the sixteenth century this romance of the Crusades has furnished a theme to German dramatists and novelists. A very brief outline will suffice here.

The Count of Gleichen, called either Ernst or Ludwig, is captured during an expedition to the East and put to slave labor by the Saracens. The sultan’s daughter however is greatly attracted to the sturdy Thuringian, and offers to set him free if he will marry her. Although he has a wife and children at home, he prefers two wives to further slavery. On the way back to Germany the Count and his second bride receive special papal absolution in Rome. The Oriental princess is most cordially received by the first countess, and the three spend the rest of their lives together in perfect harmony. The trio is buried under a single stone, bearing a relief of the Count between his two wives, which is still to be seen at Erfurt.

This tale as such need not concern us further here, since it is not known to have existed complete in Germany before the early sixteenth century. But delving into the history and legends of the Counts of Gleichen leads us again to a traditional fund of lore that furnished elements to early French and Germanic romances and that provides a link with another branch of the hero’s-tomb legend, if I may call it that.
At least several historical Counts of Gleichen have been identified with the legendary adventurer; he is usually called Ernst, and supposed to be Ernst III, who is mentioned in documents from 1195 to 1223. Now the house of Gleichen was of sufficiently ancient lineage to sustain a colorful genealogical myth, which prefaces many of the older retellings of Count Ernst's cross-cultural bigamy; according to their chroniclers, the Counts of Gleichen reckoned their descent from a hero whom many a German noble was proud to name as an ancestor: Widukind. And among the hosts of legends surrounding that Saxon renegade there reappears the tale of the hero's tomb.

Widukind is a hero of first magnitude in German legend, a protagonist of the ages through which the Germanic peoples came to terms first with Christianity and then with its foes. As the epic scene shifted from the northern lowlands to the walls of Constantinople, the hordes of Islam succeeded to the old threat of Saxon heathendom and Widukind was knighted. Once the prototype of the heathen ruler forced to see the wisdom, if not the blessing, of conversion, he now was recast as a leader of the Saracens, so appearing first in French chansons de geste.

In the Chanson de Saisnes, composed about 1200 by Jean Bodel of Arras on the basis of older French songs and tales, Guiteclin (Widukind) rules over Saxons who are presented as Saracens and followers of "Mahon." Guiteclin is besieged by and eventually killed in single combat with Charlemagne, whereupon his beautiful Saracen widow Sebile beseeches proper burial for her fallen lord. Charlemagne accordingly has a magnificent tomb prepared, "de marbre bel et gent," and causes to be erected above it "... piers molt trés granz, ... de XXX. piez de lonc et plus." Here we have another indication that a hero's-tomb legend flourished in the Low Countries and northern France late in the twelfth century, attached now not to Gilion but to the supposed ancestor of Gilion's German counterpart. To be sure, there is no mention of Guiteclin's having two wives at once. But after his death Sebile is baptized and marries Charlemagne's seneschal Baudouin; the problems arising from the collision of two cultures are still discussed within the framework of knighthood and marriage, the two institutions on which these legends characteristically focus.

Tales of Widukind also furnished source materials for the Middle Dutch poem Ogier, of which 184 verses are known to have survived. This thirteenth-century work, which was also based on earlier French songs and tales, can be reconstructed nearly entire by means of another version, apparently a clumsy attempt at a High German translation. In Ogier an episode was devoted to Charlemagne's siege of Widukind, who in the High German translation goes by the name of Blancardin. Now two manuscripts of Chrétien's Perceval contain an introduction relating the tragic fate of Perceval's father, who is called Bliocadran. Similarities between the Blio-
cadran Prologue, as some call it, and Wolfram's story of Gahmuret indicate a relationship of some kind, but the weight of scholarly opinion is against the hypothesis that Wolfram used the Bliocadran directly as a source. Only one other explanation of the similarities is at all feasible: a common source of some kind stands behind both.

To many the suggestion that the name Bliocadran could be derived from the same protoform that became Blancardin in the Widukind legends will seem a tenuous speculation. But the etymologies that connect Bliocadran with a Breton or Welsh minstrel called Blihis or Bleheris by no means exclude such a speculation, especially when one considers that the only satisfactory explanation for the parallels between Gahmuret and the Bliocadran is to assume the existence of a fund of source material that contributed to both. That fund I identify with popular versions of the hero's-tomb legend.

Note that Wolfram in writing the Gahmuret story must have had at least one purpose in common with the author of the Bliocadran; namely to furnish an introduction for the story of Perceval. If Wolfram worked with a version of Perceval that did not contain the Bliocadran, he must have found Chrétien's beginning too abrupt and supplied his own introduction. But then how could Wolfram have accidentally produced a story similar in so many basic respects to another introduction entirely unknown to him? Or if Wolfram did know the Bliocadran, perhaps he dismissed it as of a slightness incongruent with the ambition of his conception of Parzival, a work that in comparison to Chrétien's courtly romance deserves to be called the first German tragedy. Certainly Wolfram's aspirations and ability were far beyond the talents the Bliocadran author had brought to the task.

Or Wolfram may have known and used at least one version of the Perceval legend besides Chrétien's to which another account or prologue telling of the hero's parents was appended. The Gahmuret story would then be an expansion of this prologue, the Bliocadran a reduction. Such a hypothesis by no means excludes the possibility that Wolfram knew the Bliocadran also. The author of the latter made it plain scarcely a quarter of the way through that he wanted to have done with the tale of Perceval's father and get on with the main story:

De lui ne voel ci plus conter,
De lui ne del tornolement,
Ainçois vos voel dire coment
La dame...

Wolfram would have been just the man to seize such a chance to show what could really be done with the available material; his propensity for displaying his own genius in finding and handling sources resounds in his famous crow of self-satisfaction at the end of Parzival. Chrétien's account of Perceval's ancestry is conspicuously meager; perhaps an oral tradition
delighted in citing Widukind, who so often appears in an ancestral role, as Perceval’s progenitor, alias Blancardin or Bliocadran. Wolfram, following this tradition, then found that the Widukind legends afforded him full latitude for his purpose of expanding on Perceval’s background, and in the hero’s-tomb branch of these legends he saw the pattern that became the Gahmuret story.

The materials I have gathered here do much to show what the real nature of this pattern is. Gahmuret faces “ein sittliches Problem,” as Panzer put it (p. 11), “das den Dichter dauernd, in Epik und Lyrik, beschäftigt hat: den Widerstreit von Konvention und Natur, dem nachzusinnen die so feinen als starren Formen, wie die ritterliche Gesellschaft der Stauferzeit sie herausgebildet hatte, mannigfachen Anlaß gaben.”

The most significant kinship between Gahmuret and Widukind is on this level. Both are archetypal personifications of the chivalric dilemma. The collision of Christendom with heathendom was handled on a social scale by the institution of warfare. But knighthood, the instrument of warfare, also functioned as an individual mechanism in the soul’s salvation. At first, the fact that knighthood gave one membership in two antagonistic societies, Moslem and Christian, seemed only to reduce the problem to one of levels. Thus Saladin could be at once the respected, polished knight on one level and arch-enemy of Christianity on another. But the knight-hero’s evolution was moving toward a state far removed from that in which social, religious, and individual goals admitted relatively simple integration. The ninth- and tenth-century sources relate the history of Widukind’s long, determined resistance, his ultimate capitulation and baptism in a tone of pious Carolingian exemplification. Widukind becomes a founder of churches and dedicated Christian regent of the converted Saxons. But with time the implicit theme of individual conflict came to the fore and Widukind became a tragic figure. In the twelfth-century tales he reverts to his heathen reign and must be slain by Charlemagne or one of his Christian champions. The embroidery of adventure has switched the focus from Charlemagne to Widukind and fabricated a folk hero. The problem of Saxon heathendom was long forgotten; the opponent of Christendom now was Islam, and the Saxons became Saracens. The simplicity of Widukind’s conversion and salvation became the multiplicity of the knight’s adventures and his tragic death.

One final complication to the plot remained: romantic involvement. With this the knight’s bondage to two incompatible worlds becomes complete in soul, mind, and heart. He cannot lift a finger without destroying either his cultural ties or himself. This stage appears first as an appendix to the Widukind tragedy in the form of his queen’s renunciation of heathendom and marriage with her lord’s conqueror, and then in full development in the theme reenacted by Gahmuret, Gilion de Trazegnies, and the Graf
von Gleichen. Although a Christian, the knight passes easily into Saracen service in accordance with the universal code of chivalry which made no distinction between Christian and heathen. But the institution of marriage did require this distinction, and when in the course of his adventures the hero acquires a wife on each side no solution is possible. He eventually loses his life in his insatiable quest of valor, and his tomb becomes a dumb monument to his interpenetration of two cultures, two religions, and two romances through the one common bond of knighthood.

It will be seen that most of the testimonies to Gahmuret's legendary backdrop I have collected tend to localize. Trazegnies and Gilon, Jean Bodel, the Dutch Ogier and Blancardin all belong to the northeastern low-lands. But opposed to this comforting consistency is the diffusion of the Widukind legends throughout a great many popular works, in the Nibelungenlied, the Karlmeinet, and in Frisian and German popular legend down to the present day. Widukind's wide popularity as a legendary hero, with the attendant variation and ramification of stories about him, can be made to account for a residue of puzzling details. The main point of the earlier Widukind legends is the moral of his conversion and baptism. Gahmuret reflects a later stage of the Widukind legends, characteristic for the High Medieval period, in which the hero's knightly deeds and romantic involvements among the Saracens overshadow the conversion theme; but note that Wolfram goes on to tell an episode much in the style of the smothering charm that permeates the Grail castle after Amfortas' redemption: the conversion and baptism of Gahmuret's son Feirefiz. The Grail is not visible to Feirefiz, who grew up under heathen tutelage, although he can very well see the lovely young princess who bears the potent stone. After he submits to baptism, at the bidding of his heart, he can see the Grail and may take the girl to wife (810, 7-818, 23). In the stories of the Graf von Gleichen, Gilon de Trazegnies, and Jean Bodel's Guiteclin, marriage immediately crowns the conversion of the Saracen princess.

Feirefiz may reflect in yet another way the figure of Widukind. Feirefiz' father-quest has often been compared to a similar quest retold in the Middle Dutch romance Moriaen. Moriaen, the issue of a Christian knight and an Oriental mother, is black. His skin, his horse, his armor, all are coal black; only his teeth gleam white. Feirefiz is black and white too, but all over: "als ein geschriben permint / swarz und blanc her und da" (747, 26-27). In the stage of the legend in which he is presented as a Saracen, Widukind's regular epithet eques niger in the chronicles will refer both to the color of his skin and the state of his soul. As a sign of his conversion he laid aside his swart arms and thenceforth bore white. Wolfram's elaborate magpie metaphor seems clearly to have been constructed along the same symbolic lines.

To me the most striking fact to emerge from this study is the concern
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Wolfram shows for real problems in the Gahmuret story. Beneath all the fun of Gahmuret’s exaggerated swashbuckling, Wolfram’s portrayal has a dramatic human conviction that holds good even to the point of tragedy. Gahmuret demands the engagement of the reader on a totally different level from that evolved by Parzival’s errant striving toward Grail stewardship, and affords us something like a practical exercise, an opportunity to polish skills that will be needed later, when the real work begins.

NOTES

1. A critical review of the scholarly literature on this most famous of Wolfram-problems is given by Ralph Lowet, Wolfram von Eschenbach’s Parzival im Wandel der Zeiten (München, 1955), pp. 111-130. But proof of the incredible vitality with which Wolfram managed to infuse his mythical informant, if proof were needed, is afforded by the appearance every few years of yet another Kyot-theory. See for example Herbert Kolb, Munsalvaesche (München, 1963), especially pp. 179-208. Developments since the appearance of Lowet’s work are outlined by Bumke, Wolfram von Eschenbach (Stuttgart, 1964), pp. 39-42 and 73-74, and K. O. Brogsitter, Artuseik (Stuttgart, 1965), pp. 79-84.


3. Helaine Newstead, for example, has collected a great deal of material to show legends of the Welsh sea god Bran: “Perceval’s Father and Welsh Tradition,” that both Perceval’s father and the Fisher King are characterizations reflecting Romantic Review, XXXVI (1945), 1-31. It may be noted that Panzer’s discussion of Gahmuret is almost unique in not pointing in a Celtic direction. Compare citations by Otto Springer in Arthurian Literature in the Middle Ages, ed. R. S. Loomis (Oxford, 1959), pp. 226-227 and 245.


5. Ibid., pp. 1-2.

6. Ibid., p. 214.

7. Although Wolfram correctly located the califate in Bagdad, he confused that city with the Egyptian Babylon (Ernst Martin, Kommentar [1902], to Parzival 14, 3). The Babylon of the Histoire de Gilion, however, is on the Nile: “Si se bouterent en la riviere du nil en euxx tellement exploictant que en v jours ilz arriverevent au port de babilonne” (Wolff, p. 67).

8. The outline given here follows Alphonse Bayot’s very competent monograph, Le Roman de Gillion de Trazegnies (Louvain, 1903).


12. Bayot (pp. 103-107) summarizes the literature on this subject and postulates an Indic source for the European legend, citing Kamliśa’s drama Vikramorvast, which recites “l’une des plus anciennes légendes de l’Inde.”

13. The hero’s tomb seems to have been a prominent characteristic also of the version from which the Histoire de Gillion immediately derives: “et dist l’histoire que, apres leur mort, Gillon fist lever tres tumbes” (Wolff, p. 213).

14. Two manuscripts of the Histoire de Gillion state that Gilion’s tomb was “en la chapelle de Herlemon.” The priory of Herlaimont, about two miles from the
Chateau de Trazegnies, was founded about 1135 by Gilles’ father Othon, first recorded master of Trazegnies, who was also buried there (Bayot, pp. 109, 116, 121).


19. His death is recorded by Villehardouin in chapter 231 of his chronicle of the Fourth Crusade.

20. Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Deutsche Chroniken, IV, 2, 4146-4277.

21. Azure, bendy of seven parts or, bordure engrailed. See Fourez, pp. 111-112.


24. Fourez, p. 112.

25. “Gahmuret,” p. 64, n. 1 (bibliography). See also Martin, Kommentar, pp. XL-XLI and notes to 101, 7; Schreiber, Neue Bausteine zu einer Lebensgeschichte Wolframs von Eschenbach (Frankfurt, 1922), pp. 91-94.


27. The first recorded literary treatment of the Gleichen tale is a lost drama by Frischlin. See E. Sauer, Die Sage vom Grafen von Gleichen in der deutschen Literatur (Diss. Strassburg, 1911). An interesting entry in Hayn and Gotendorf’s Bibliotheca Germanorum Erotica & Curiosa (see “Gleichen, Erst III, Graf von”) lists what appears to be one of the many popular romances on the Gleichen theme under the title: Elika, Gräfin von Gleichen. Ein wahre Geschichte aus den Zeiten der Kreuzzüge (2 vols., Wien, 1790). This item attracted my attention because of the similarity of the name Elika to Belakane. Copies of this novel have become exceedingly rare, however, and I have not been able to locate one.
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