

READING IRONY IN GREGORIUS: THE TEXT AS TEACHER FOR THE RESPONSIBLE READER

Lea Maria Ferguson

Lea Maria Ferguson is alumna of the Literary Studies Research Master and the Book and Digital Media Studies Master at Leiden University. She is currently Teaching Assistant at University College Maastricht.

Painful when missed, elating when recognized, and difficult to be proven or pinpointed conclusively, irony presents itself as a literary trope with a tremendous attraction for provoking, questioning, and challenging ideas. Maybe for these exciting and at the same time potentially dangerous moves, irony has come to be a popular strategy for different types of communication. An important facet of *reading irony* can be found in the poststructuralist and postmodernist notion that the world and its meaning cannot definitely be fixed. And it is this uncertainty that urges readers to actively decide how to read literature, culture, and ultimately, the world they live in.

Irony can be defined as stating something through saying what one does not mean while hinting at a tension within this very statement. As such, irony provides an impetus for readers to make active decisions concerning the interpretation of textual information, exerting ‘reader responsibility’.

In this article, I investigate how the medieval verse epic *Gregorius* by Hartmann von Aue can enable reader responsibility when it comes to the interpretation of irony. I claim that *Gregorius*, as an ironic text, functions as a teacher for responsible (i.e. receptive and critical) readers and thereby enables the realization of reading as a political act. This can also have wider repercussions in readers’ lives outside of the reading experience.

Gregorius (ca. 1190) is a narrative poem recounting the astounding life events of its eponymous protagonist. Gregorius is born from the incestuous love between his parents, who are brother and sister. He is abandoned as a child and placed into a barrel that is set loose in the sea, as his parents want to atone for their sinful love and put him at God's mercy as a sign of good faith. Gregorius is indeed saved by God and grows up with foster parents under the watchful eyes of a pious abbot. When he comes of age, the abbot reveals Gregorius' incestuous identity to him by showing him the tablet that was found beside him in the barrel. This tablet, made by Gregorius's mother, reports his sinful parentage. Determined to find his true parents, Gregorius leaves his foster home and embarks on a journey to find and bring absolution to his parents. He indeed comes to meet his mother as a grown man and the two, initially unaware of their kinship, engage in an incestuous relationship. When Gregorius discovers this, he decides to seek repentance on a desolate island. Seventeen years later he is found by two Romans who were sent out to find the new Pope. Eventually, Gregorius is redeemed by God and even raised to papacy. This story, recounting the protagonist's path from sin to redemption, has been the core of many legends and adaptations.¹ One point of interest in the story's analysis is often the degree of irony at work.

Given the extensive range of research in philosophy and literature dedicated to the study of irony, one might wonder whether there is need for another analysis of the trope, particularly in this medieval legend. Firstly, in light of the proclaimed 'end of irony' in recent years and the developing hesitance to use irony,² I would like to argue that we need to think about irony more openly and that we need to do so now. Instead of abandoning irony as a vague or dangerous trope, we need to work towards understanding it better. Then, we can use these insights to nourish our comprehension of communication and conflict, which may also lead to the ability to assume more active roles in political discourses. Secondly, the choice of *Gregorius* as focus for this article, is grounded in the recurring (even if only ever so slight) undervaluing of Hartmann's achievements as a medieval author: Literary critics often place Hartmann in the shadow of other poets writing in Middle High German (most prominently Wolfram von Eschenbach and Gottfried von Straßburg).³ I wish to demonstrate that Hartmann's *Gregorius*, as a literary achievement, can 'teach' readers to use their own interpretive skills and responsibilities to create meaning, particularly in a religious and political context.

Furthermore, Hartmann's *Gregorius* can be seen as an influential starting point for the development of irony in future adaptations. Due to reasons of scope, I cannot delve into the adaptations of Hartmann's work by the German novelist Thomas Mann and the Theater der Klänge company from Düsseldorf.⁴ At this point, suffice it to say that these adaptations illustrate how irony can develop through the ages and challenge authors as well as readers to produce new interpretations.

Approaching irony

One of the oldest forms of irony is Socratic irony: By feigning ignorance and asking simple and sometimes mocking questions, the Greek philosopher Socrates encouraged critical thinking and the questioning of generally accepted notions with the aim of eventually reaching an underlying truth. In the classical Greek tradition, irony also had undertones of not taking up 'responsibilities as a citizen by pretence of illness', as criticized by the orator Demosthenes.⁵ In a similar line of thought, the Greek polymath Theophrastus criticized irony as being 'non-committal'.⁶ So, what 'is worth noticing here is that as far back as the Ancient Greeks [...] irony was already [perceived as a] a slippery slope', a potentially dangerous literary device creating confusion and irresponsible behaviour.⁷ Is this all irony has to offer, though? Can its destabilising and uncertain attributes not also be the origin of creative readings and the discovery of new meaning?

At this point, one might feel inclined to turn to the authority of the author: How is a text *meant* to be read? But can the author really prescribe how a text should be understood? One could also argue that readers themselves are able to choose how to interpret textual information. While 'authorial intent' and 'chosen interpretation' might be perceived as fundamentally opposed processes at first, this distinction is by no means straightforward.

Speaking of authorial intent implies not only that it exists, but also that it can be reconstructed, and while the former *might* be the case, the latter is open for interpretation. The notion of authorial intent has received harsh criticism by various poststructuralist and postmodern scholars. Especially Roland Barthes' announcement of the 'death of the author' needs to be considered in this context.⁸ A vital clarification concerning the relationship between the author and the reader consists in the realisation that the author may return to his text, mainly or even only, as a guest: As Barthes explains, '[the author's] life is no longer the origin of his fables, but a fable that runs concurrently with his work'.⁹

This means that the author is not ‘the locus of genuine truth’,¹⁰ but rather a part of the context and framing of the work. While it is untenable to claim that *only* the author can say what the text means, it is equally absurd to claim that the author’s reputation has no influence on how the text is received. It sometimes matters greatly *who* is issuing a particular statement, especially when it comes to irony.

The concept of authorial intent calls for a closer look at the writings of American literary critic Wayne C. Booth. In *A Rhetoric of Irony* (1974), Booth claims that while irony may be seen as an ambiguous entity, one can still succeed in stabilizing it. Booth believes that some forms of irony are so obvious and clearly marked, that one can speak of ‘stable irony’.¹¹ He highlights that stable irony is covert, so that, even though the text clearly indicates how to read the irony, said irony still needs to be *uncovered* by the reader.¹² Herewith, Booth allows for readers to act their part in the reading process. He also implies, however, that the author is authoritative in creating a certain kind of irony that the reader is meant to reconstruct. This can be seen as a limited view of the reader’s responsibility. And it might also be connected to a certain hesitance towards embracing irony, for when taken ‘seriously’, it might actually become quite dangerous.

Irony and authority

In *Irony’s Edge* (1994), Canadian scholar Linda Hutcheon focuses on what she terms irony’s ‘cutting edge’. For her, irony possesses both positive and negative potential because of its evaluative power: It forces the reader to make decisions in a text’s interpretation.¹³ For Hutcheon, this ‘cutting edge’ is one of the most important characteristics of irony, but it also worries her because of the social aspects of missing irony and being excluded from a group as a result. Irony poses the question of who is authorized to decide what the irony of a text consists of, as well as which political repercussions this choice holds.

Hutcheon raises a further question: ‘Why should anyone want to use this strange mode of discourse where you say something you don’t actually mean and expect people to understand not only what you actually do mean but also

your attitude toward it?’¹⁴ She hereby alludes to an interesting tension that might only be expressible through irony: The combination of a statement and an attitude. Further, in explaining that ‘irony can only “complexify”; [...] never “disambiguate”’,¹⁵ Hutcheon stresses, ‘that irony is indebted neither to entirely revolutionary nor eternally conservative motives’.¹⁶ My claim is that through the combination of statement and attitude, different perspectives can be complexified and thereby brought into a productive conflict.

In *On the Political* (2005), the Belgian political theorist Chantal Mouffe promotes exactly this productive conflict between adversaries in ‘the political’.¹⁷ She argues that the aim of politics should not be to achieve consensus, but that one should rather strive for a type of conflict that explores what lies outside or on the borders of consensus as well as how one can cope with the conflict’s creative but also destructive potentials.

In the context of this article, these ‘adversaries’ might also be conceptualized as proponents of different readings or interpretations of irony.

Hutcheon emphasizes the intentional aspect involved in any ironic reading and stresses that ‘[t]o call something ironic is to frame or contextualize it in such a way that, in fact, an intentionalist statement has already been made – either by the ironist *or* by the interpreter (or by both)’.¹⁸ In so doing, she pays tribute both to the ironist, traditionally referred to as the author, and the interpreter or reader. In my interpretation, irony allows for different views to emerge, and therefore presents a platform for potentially adversarial readings of a text as alluded to by Mouffe. Within these different directions of meaning, the reader has to make a decision – and this is a political action, brought about especially by irony.

Didactic irony

As mentioned before, the authority of the author is debatable. Therefore, it might make more sense to view the text itself as challenging the reader. This is the case especially for a text that is ironic; by pushing the reader towards choosing from contradicting and conflicting meanings, the ironic text assumes a didactic role. ‘Didacticism’ is derived from the Greek *didaktikós* and means ‘apt at teaching’;¹⁹ the adjective ‘didactic’ refers

“Irony poses the question of who is authorized to decide what the irony of a text consists of, as well as which political repercussions this choice holds.”

to '[h]aving the character or manner of a teacher or instructor'²⁰ – thus, in the present context, the ironic text may be seen as a teacher for the reader.

The history of didactic literature spans from Ancient Greece and the Middle Ages, across the 18th and 19th centuries, to today's literature.²¹ Throughout time, many different and contradicting points of advice have been brought forward by authors, which makes for various and ambiguous lessons to be 'learnt' from literature. Additionally, authors are not the (sole) authority concerning the meaning of their work. As creators, authors mark the beginning so to speak, and as guests they can be the frame and context – but ultimately, the interpretive process of the reader is the moment that the text comes alive.²² This has important repercussions for the didactic nature of a text and how it can affect readers. In *Doing what comes naturally* (1989), American scholar Stanley Fish assesses this process of interpretation:

How can you know without doubt whether or not a work is ironic? My answer is that you always know, but that what you know, because it rests in a structure of assumptions and beliefs [...], is subject to challenge or revision, as a result of which you will still always know, even though what you know will be different. For someone like Booth such a state of affairs is distressing because it seems to doom us to an infinite regress of unstable interpretations; but one can just as easily say that it graces us with an endless succession of interpretive certainties, a reassuring sequence in which one set of obvious and indisputable facts gives way to another.²³

By including counter-narratives, contradictions, and uncertainties, didactic irony stimulates the reader to responsibly engage in the meaning-making process of reading. For Fish, this process can most fruitfully take place within 'interpretive communities' – groups of students, scholars, and other interested people who create discourses concerning topics and conceptions of their interests. Through reading and writing, one can connect with and receive instructions from those authors from whom one is distanced through space and time. Textual communication (even when it appears to be one-way) can be seen as a form of a joint process of interpretation similar to Fish's interpretive communities. It is this process that will be adapted next concerning the reading of irony in the medieval *Gregorius*.

Medieval irony

In his article on 'Medieval Irony' (1981), literary critic Edmond Reiss agrees with Booth that 'everything is ironic in one definition or another' and also with literary scholar D.C. Muecke's declaration that 'in principle, irony is whatever we agree to call irony'.²⁴ Reiss then continues to qualify medieval irony more closely by observing that the 'world view' in 'the Middle Ages, though lacking the modernist consciousness of irony, was nevertheless essentially ironic', and this also extended to medieval forms of 'literary expression'.²⁵ With this added emphasis, Reiss clarifies that he is referring to stable and traditional forms of irony that pervade medieval didactic literature; to him, medieval irony is not only very present, but also very clearly and easily interpreted. According to Reiss, medieval writers such as Hartmann must have known that in imitating God they could only ever be ironic. To them, the reality of God was an underlying and unquestionable truth: '[T]he medieval poet, not a doubter, could write ironically knowing that his ironies would not at all hinder truth'.²⁶ Reiss would therefore interpret the role of the narrator in *Gregorius* – who effectively assumes the position of God by absolving Gregorius of his sins and declaring him Pope – as an ironic move that does not question but rather supports the Christian faith.

In line with traditional and stable conceptions of irony, one might thus interpret the underlying religiosity of *Gregorius* as the 'truth' that the reader is meant to discover through the reading experience. By feigning ignorance, the narrator of *Gregorius* can also be seen as appealing to the reader and his or her life experience in a Socratic manner:

*N*ū bin ich gescheiden
wā dzwischen von in beiden,
wan mir iewederz nie geschach:
ichn gewan nie liep noch ungemach,
ich enlebe übele noch wol.²⁷

In claiming that he himself has never known love and can therefore not properly understand the joys and pains of this emotion, the narrator appeals to the audience to draw on their experience; the audience is given the advice to be careful when it comes to matters of love as they can exert great pain and misfortune.

The narrator presents the audience with another easily reconstructable irony: When the two Romans, sent to find the Pope, encounter Gregorius on his rock, they expect him to be beautiful, strong, rich, clean, and well-dressed. Instead, they find a naked, embarrassed, and

fettered man who covers himself with a leaf.²⁸ While this leaf comes out of nowhere on the plantless rock, the crucial point here is that on the one hand, reader expectations are laid bare and thereby mocked, and on the other hand, there is an allusion to the idea that underlying values are more important than external looks. This notion needs to be viewed in all its complexity, for while medieval thought on the relationship between external and internal values started to become more critical in the 12th century, long-held prejudices about outer beauty presenting inner purity still remained. And eventually, Gregorius does turn back into a beautiful and visibly noble man because his faith protects him.²⁹ Nevertheless, there is also a playful allusion to the audience's and the Romans' initial disappointment: Their failure to recognize the Pope immediately holds some ironic reference that can be seen as chastising from a Christian perspective. Additionally, even after Gregorius marries his mother, he keeps reading the plate that tells him about his birth sin and he tries to seek repentance for this.³⁰ Though he is unaware of the new and greater sin of double incest he committed by marrying his mother, the reader is acutely aware of this and might perceive this as an ironic twist of fate, with some elements of humour to it.

In 'Taking laughter seriously' (1995), American scholar Lisa Perfetti, in reference to the work of Russian philosopher Mikhail Bakhtin, critically assesses the notion of medieval humour and laughter. Her conclusion is that while this type of laughter may be seen as liberating, it may also lead to a (veiled) reinforcement of traditional and conventional social rules by offering a mere pretence-solution for tensions by playfully addressing but not really solving them.³¹ This means that the circumstances only change while the 'carnival' – the ironic situation in the text – lasts; however, no real change is achieved because the system and society outside of the text remains unchallenged and everything will go 'back to normal'. Once the carnival ends, so does freedom from the norms. In returning to *Gregorius*, one might hypothesize that the work's irony only exists within itself and is kept in check by the confines of literature. As such, irony as a relief might have existed temporarily only and might have been available exclusively to those wealthy enough to socialize within literate circles in the Middle Ages.

'Complexifying' irony

Despite the aforementioned restrictive view of medieval irony, there might be more to discover in *Gregorius*. One such instance is the narrator's references to Gregorius as the 'holy sinner'.³²

This foreshadowing of redemption, when it is still incomprehensible to the audience, presents the reader with the possibility of reflecting critically on the presented events. By eventually referring to Gregorius as *sündenlösen man* (man free of sin),³³ one might even go as far as claiming that the persistence and existence of the original sin for every human being during their life on earth is questioned. Does Hartmann play with the idea that Gregorius becomes freed from his sins because of the act of narration, which is a human creation? Or is this a deeply pious affirmation of the hope for God's mercy and his unknowable ways of forgiveness? Consequently, the meaning of the irony between the role of the narrator and God might not be as stable as Reiss supposes. The 'holy sinner' is not only a paradox, but also ironically demonstrates the notion that God's ways are unknowable and that what may seem completely outrageous to most humans can still be approved by God. However, the fact that the narrator himself 'becomes' God can also be interpreted as a form of human agency and emancipation.

An interesting form of verbal irony in *Gregorius* is connected to the core sin that drives this narrative, namely the incestuous nature of the relationships recurring throughout Gregorius' life. The sexual intercourse between Gregorius' parents is referred to as *der triuwen alze viel* (too much [brotherly] loyalty)³⁴ and extensive relational terminology is used to intensify the tragically ironic situation of Gregorius as being unknowingly married to his mother, who is also the sister of his father: *sin muoter, sin base, sin wip* (his mother, his aunt, his wife).³⁵ It has often been assumed that this ironic perspective on the main character's incestuous affiliations expresses the benevolent attitude of the narrator.³⁶ However, what is more important might be the implied possibility that incest can be openly discussed, and perhaps even 'solved' through human narration and interpretation as performative, active, and responsible processes. To a certain extent, critical irony may also be seen as coming into existence when Gregorius comments on his wish to finally find his mother being granted by God. He did not expect to 'find' that he had been married to her for quite some time and the irony with which he expresses his gratitude might imply both that he still believes in God, but that he also criticizes him.³⁷

Here, German medievalist Friedrich Ohly's idea in *Der Verfluchte und der Erwählte* (*The Cursed and the Chosen*, 1976) becomes relevant: He explains that '[n]ot how you enter into the situation of guilt is the central question, but how to get out of it'.³⁸ Ohly highlights the need to act despite or rather because of guilt, even if one has not

Verbal irony consists in the saying of 'what one does not mean'; situational irony comes into being when the perception of a situation is retrospectively altered through new or diverging information which ironizes the evaluations held beforehand. These forms of irony can coincide with Socratic irony and a plethora of additional possibilities which arise through the reader's interpretation of the text.

necessarily chosen or brought about this guilt oneself. So, the origin of this guilt needs to be discussed in more detail.

As medievalist Peter Wapnewski (1979) points out, the parents' incest is not and cannot be Gregorius's fault.³⁹ Nevertheless, Gregorius is still punished, and needs to seek redemption. The reader is tempted to read this as Hartmann yielding to medieval cultural conventions: 'At this point, early criticism of the work began. In light of the brutal torment that Gregorius has to undergo, it was noted that the poet [Hartmann] must have failed this theological problem and ecclesiastical canon by being caught up in popular opinion'.⁴⁰ Wapnewski assumes that even though Gregorius is innocent at birth, the prevalent moral code of Hartmann's world simply demanded a certain extent of guilt on the part of Gregorius himself.⁴¹ However, instead of almost caricaturing Hartmann as a mere mouthpiece of popular opinion, could one not also read the harsh punishment of Gregorius, in light of his initial innocence, as an ironic exaggeration of the injustice prevalent in some parts of medieval society? One can be punished even if innocent. Nevertheless, one might also come out a winner, achieve absolute redemption, and even assume papacy. The didactic irony that exists in this text makes itself known through its exaggerated openness to what is being taught and the manner in which it allows its readers to critically question long-held beliefs and conventions.

Thus, Wapnewski's final verdict may also be read in the light of critical openness. Wapnewski claims that 'here Hartmann truly accomplishes

a dismantling of the world of courtly values [...]. He does not dismantle them in their entirety but teaches that all these values are not entitled to absolute validity and that they each contain the seed to their own self-dissolution and self-removal [...]. Only he can possess them who engages in creating them anew and anew'.⁴² In this, Wapnewski not only approximates Fish's previously mentioned observations concerning the dynamic origin of the certainty of meaning, but also creates a clear connection between Hartmann's *Gregorius* and the concept of didactic irony as described above.

Conclusion

By presenting the reader with ironic potential, a playful questioning of values, beliefs, and social conventions, a text can provoke a reader's own responsibility and activity in the reading process. The uncertainty of meaning – prevalent in postmodernist discourses and invoked by ironic texts – presents space and opportunity for the reader to assert this responsibility. By acting upon writer and reader alike, didactic irony enables critical distance and evaluation. In this process of interpretation, the author may return as a guest into his or her own work and thereby function as a frame and context for the reader.

The function, role, and even existence of the 'teacher' in didactic irony remain ambiguous. While neither author nor reader can assume this position completely or without limitations, the most likely candidate to take up this instance of teaching is the ironic text itself. By being confronted with didactic irony as an instructing and simultaneously veiling and bewildering method, readers are initiated and (re-)thrown into the world in which they live as political beings. As such, what a text teaches concerning the interpretive processes that occur while reading may also go beyond the text and come to inform more fundamental and comprehensive life choices, such as political ones. Appreciating the plurality of meaning and conflicting views, as well as the necessity to choose and create one's own reading and understanding of texts and communication in general, is central to becoming a responsible reader. For such readers, and in awareness of the stability *and* dynamics of 'interpretive communities', reading *Gregorius*, then, becomes an encounter with the text as teacher.

Notes.

- 1 Among others, Sophocles' *The Theban Plays* (ca. 442-401 BC) and *La vie du pape Saint Grégoire ou La légende du bon pêcheur* (late 12th century, by an anonymous author). In more recent years, new adaptations were created, such as Thomas Mann's novel *Der Erwählte* (1951), and *Gregorius auf dem Stein*, a music theatre production by J. U. Lensing and the Theater der Klänge Düsseldorf (2004, theatrical performance; 2012, film production).
- 2 See e.g. Hirschhorn, Michael. 'Irony, The End of: Why Graydon Carter wasn't entirely wrong'. *New York Magazine*. 27 August 2011. Web. 2 May 2016.
- 3 This sentiment can be seen in the work of Keck, Anna. *Die Liebeskonzeption der mittelalterlichen Tristanromane. Zur Erzähllogik der Werke Bérouls, Eilharts, Thomas' und Gottfrieds*. München: Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 1998. Print. 21; and Brooke Snyder, Susan. *The Paradox of Despair: Studies of the Despair Theme in Medieval and Renaissance Literature*. Michigan: Ann Arbor, 1963. Print. 233. For a highlighting of this 'misrepresentation' see Bertau, Karl. *Deutsche Literatur im Europäischen Mittelalter: Band I: 800 – 1197*. München: C. H. Beck Verlag, 1972. Print. 630.
- 4 A more in-depth analysis can be found in Ferguson, L.M. *Didactic irony and the realm of uncertainty - The legend of Gregorius and its adaptation: A lesson in reading*. MA dissertation. Leiden University, 2014.
- 5 Cuddon, John A. 'Didactic'. *The Penguin Dictionary of Literary Terms and Literary Theory*. Ed. C. E. Preston. London: Penguin Books, 1998. Print. 428.
- 6 Ibid.
- 7 Furst, Lilian R. *Fictions of Romantic Irony*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1984. Print. 7.
- 8 Barthes, Roland. 'From Work to Text'. *Modern Literary Theory: A reader*. Eds. Philip Rice and Patricia Waugh. London/New York: Edward Arnold, 1989. 166-171. Print.
- 9 Ibid. 170.
- 10 Ibid.
- 11 Booth, Wayne C. *A Rhetoric of Irony*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1974. Print.
- 12 Ibid. 6.
- 13 Hutcheon, Linda. *Irony's Edge: The Theory and Politics of Irony*. London: Routledge, 1994. Print. 2.
- 14 Ibid.
- 15 Ibid. 13.
- 16 Ibid. 10.
- 17 Mouffe, Chantal. *On the Political*. Abingdon/New York: Routledge, 2005. Print. 5.
- 18 Hutcheon. *Irony's Edge*. 118.
- 19 'didactic'. *Encyclopaedia Britannica Online Academic Edition*. 2013. Web. 15 December 2015.
- 20 'didactic'. *Oxford English Dictionary*. Web. 30 June 2016.
- 21 Cuddon. *The Penguin Dictionary of Literary Terms and Literary Theory*. 428.
- 22 This underlying (and seemingly clear) distinction between author and reader needs to be evaluated carefully: The author can also become the reader of his or her own work. My emphasis here is not so much on the actual person, but the respective attitude they hold in relation to the text. For a more in-depth analysis of this, refer to e.g.: Burke, Séan. *The Death and Return of the Author: Criticism and Subjectivity in Barthes, Foucault and Derrida*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2008. Print.
- 23 Fish, Stanley. 'Short People Got No Reason to Live: Reading Irony'. *Doing what comes naturally: Change, Rhetoric, and the Practice of Theory in Literary and Legal Studies*. Durham/London: Duke University Press, 1989. 180-196. Print. 196.
- 24 Reiss, Edmond. 'Medieval Irony'. *Journal of the History of Ideas* 42.2 (1981): 209-226, 211. Print.
- 25 Ibid.
- 26 Ibid. 218.
- 27 Hartmann von Aue. *Gregorius*. Eds. Friedrich Neumann and Waltraud Fritsch-Rößler. Stuttgart: Philipp Reclam, 2011. Print. v. 795: 'Now, I am free of these two, because neither ever happened to me, neither happiness nor pain; after a fashion, I am not even really alive'. All translations are made by the author.
- 28 Ibid. v. 3408.
- 29 Ibid. v. 3466.
- 30 Ibid. v. 2277.
- 31 Perfetti, Lisa. 'Taking Laughter Seriously'. *Bakhtin and Medieval Voices*. Ed. Thomas J. Farrell. Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 1995. Print. 38-60.
- 32 Hartmann von Aue. *Gregorius*. 176, v. 2552, v. 4003.
- 33 Ibid. 3658.
- 34 Ibid. 396.
- 35 Ibid. 3831.
- 36 Fritsch-Rößler, Waltraud. *Hartmann von Aue: Gregorius*. 4th ed. Wiesbaden: Brockhaus, 1972. Print. 257.

- 37 Hartmann von Aue. *Gregorius*. v. 2608.
- 38 Ohly, Friedrich. *Der Verfluchte und der Erwählte: Vom Leben mit der Schuld*. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1976. Print. 12.
- 39 Wapnewski, Peter. *Hartmann von Aue*. Stuttgart: Metzler, 1979. Print. 96.
- 40 Ibid. 97.
- 41 Ibid.
- 42 Ibid. 99.