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Abstract

The orthography of the Early New High German period has occasionally been misinterpreted in the scholarship, and has consequently been described as being characterized by chaos, arbitrariness, and a proliferation of letters that has no phonological basis. This perceived chaos derives from attempts of the last century to reconcile the writing systems of vastly different dialects with a supposed standard language. Recent scholarship has shown that orthographies of the period can be shown to be systematic if individual dialects are treated separately.

The *Ambraser Heldenbuch* is a parchment codex of the early 16th century. It contains 25 works of courtly, heroic and minor epic literature, of which 15 works are unique to the manuscript. The codex is also unusual in that the identity of the scribe who copied it is known. Hans Ried, sometime Revenue Collector in Bozen and member of a South Tyrolean 'Ministerialenfamilie', copied the manuscript between 1504 and 1516 at the behest of Emperor Maximilian.

The bulk of the dissertation is an analysis of the consonantal orthography of the unica in the *Ambraser Heldenbuch*. Through this analysis and a comparison with the consonantal phonology of the modern Tyrolean dialect, I show that the peculiarities of Ried's orthography can be explained on the basis of the Tyrolean dialect.
For my wife Melissa

*Mir ist wohl bei höchstem Schmerze,*

*Denn ich weiß ein treues Herze.*
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1.0 Introduction

In the last 50 years, that is, since the publication of V. Moser’s *Grammatik des Frühneuhochdeutschen* (1951) and Schirokauer’s *Frühneuhochdeutsch* (1957), interest in the German language between 1300 and 1700 has greatly increased. I.T. Piirainen’s bibliography (to 1980) does not comprise many more entries than can be found in annual bibliographies for the years 1980 to the present. A study of these bibliographies shows that the greater part of the phonological studies of the Early New High German period treat the vowel system, and that treatments of the consonantal system are rare.

The bulk of the scholarship before 1950 deals with Luther and his part in the normalization of the German language, and with the rise of the German language from his dialect, East Middle German. Frings and his students have done more than their part in perpetuating the notion of Luther as *Sprachschöpfer* and East Middle German as the cradle of the New High German language. Schirokauer, however, points out that Luther had very little real influence on the rise of a standard language in Germany:

Luther war kein Zustand, sondern ein Sonderfall, ähnlich dem Isidorübersetzer am Hofe Karls des Großen. Von einer Wirkung Luthers auf das Lautbild kann nicht, auf den Wortschatz kaum gesprochen werden. Von seinem Satzbau sagt sich das 17. Jh. gänzlich los. Man sucht seine Bedeutung für die Sprachgeschichte zu retten.
The notion that the East Middle German dialect area served as a "Musterlandschaft" in the formation of New High German (Eggers 1986:2.19-20) has also, in more recent years, been challenged (Besch 1968, Skála 1970, Diersch 1972, Schulte 1972, Erben 1975, ). Where then is one to seek the germ of New High German? Besch (1973:429) writes:

Es scheint nicht länger möglich zu sein, hauptsächlich nur vom Ostmd. quasi als einer 'Modell-Landschaft' [für das Frnhd.] auszugehen; die Forschung muß auch die übrigen Sprachlandschaften mit einbeziehen und tut es auch zunehmend,

thus implying that Early New High German was not a unified language in the sense that New High German is, that it was a collection of dialects that, through time and normalization, strove toward unification. A unification, I might add that has and has not yet been achieved, as the coexistence of the standard language and regional dialects attests.

Thus, the scholarship shows us that any attempt to represent Early New High German as a unified language is doomed to failure for the simple reason that Early New High German was not unified, just as Middle and Old High German were not. Furthermore, the notion that the German language developed in an uninterrupted flow
from Old to Middle to New High German is equally invalid (cf. Abbé 1950). Indeed, as Schirokauer (1957) points out, the emergence of Early New High German is characterized not so much by a collapse of the quasi-standardized language of the aristocracy that we call Middle High German, as by the rise of dialects in written documents that accompanies the rise of the cities in Central European society:

Mönchs-, Ritter- und Städter-Deutsch bezeichnen das spezifische Gewicht von Sprachzuständen, deren Bezeichnung als ahd., mhd., frnhd. ein bloßes Nacheinander feststellt, das übrigens nicht einmal im engsten historischen Sinn zutreffend ist. (Sp. 859)

If one accepts Schirokauer’s point of view, then one must admit that the study of a unified Early New High German language is meaningless, that we ought instead to study Early New Bavarian, Early New Franconian, etc., for, just as we must consider the Upper German dialects separately from the Middle German ones in Old High German, a study of Early New High German must, as Besch points out (see above) take into account the dialect distinctions that still hold in much of German-speaking Europe.

In his treatment of the consonants, Kehrein (1856), not unexpectedly following in the tradition of Grimm by discussing Buchstaben rather than phonemes, fails, in general, to take the dialect of his texts into account. He constantly compares the Early New High German forms to the corresponding New High German, that is Standard
German, forms, without considering the dialect landscape. The resulting work is a sort of catalogue of 19th century Standard German graphemes and their correspondences in the dialects of the entire High German area. Though such a work can be useful in certain undertakings, it does not give the reader a clear picture of the processes going forward in the language. Indeed, it gives a false impression of complete and utter chaos in the phonological, as well as orthographic systems of Early New High German.

When one considers that this was the only grammar covering the Early New High German period until the publication of V. Moser's *Historisch-grammatische Einführung in die frühneuhochdeutschen Schriftdialekte* in 1909, it is less than surprising that Brooke (1955:xliii-xliv) should write that "Spelling remained arbitrary throughout the period." Given the wide range of dialect areas to be taken into consideration and certain representations of "the" phonological structure of the Early New High German language (Painter 1989:175, Philipp 1980:27ff, Penzl 1984:43-44, 59-60), it is difficult to imagine any other conclusion than that the orthography of this Early New High German language was largely chaotic.

Moser, in his *Einführung* (1909) and unfinished grammar (1929, 1951), does not challenge the notion that Early New High German orthography was largely arbitrary. In the grammar, he introduces the consonants with the statement (I.1.39):

Häufung und Verdoppelung der Konsonantenzeichen ohne innere lautliche
Begründung, die ein Hauptcharakteristikum der frnhd. Orthographie bilden,

In his *Einführung*, however, after a short enumeration of some justified and unjustified "wortungeheuer," as he calls them, Moser writes:

Was die drucke betrifft, so ist die ausdehnung der konsonantenhäufung kaum geringer als in den kanzleien -- selbst ein Brant achtet ihrer nicht; *doch weisen diese nach den dialektgebieten manche eigenheiten auf.* [emphasis mine]

These "eigenheiten" are precisely what one must study if one desires to understand the orthography of Early New High German, for until one understands the writing traditions of the dialect areas that comprise the Early New High German language, it is impossible to make sense of their development into a truly unified Standard German. Precisely this has been the focus of much of Early New High German scholarship in recent years (see Hans Moser 1986)

V. Moser’s treatment is far more valuable to us than is Kehrein’s, for even though he does not treat the dialects independently of one another, he does often indicate whether or not a form is restricted to a particular dialect area. This is most helpful to the student of Modern German dialects who might seek to uncover a pattern in the modern spoken dialect to explain the orthographic quirks of the Early New High German written dialect.
Most recently Herbert Penzl treated Early New High German in his *Frühneuhochdeutsch* (1984). Though he purposely treats a corpus of texts from various dialects and time frames in an attempt to present the reader with the "Hauptzüge des Frühneuhochdeutschen", Penzl seems in his phonological analysis to oversimplify in an effort to systematize the phonology of Early New High German. Though the work is, in all other respects, an excellent study, Penzl’s representation of a single phonological system (pp. 59-60) for his diverse texts is problematic.

In describing certain orthographic characteristics of the period Penzl writes quite rightly (p. 41):

> Die frührhd. so überaus häufige Doppelschreibung ist nicht, wie manche Handbücher behaupten, eine sinnlose "Konsonantenhäufung", auch kaum mehr außerhalb von Zusammensetzungen die Bezeichnung phonetischer Konsonantenlänge.

If one accepts this view -- and I can find no reason not to --, one is left with two alternatives: to continue in the path of the earliest scholarship and seek a system for this proliferation of consonants in a simultaneous study of all of the dialects of Early New High German, or to seek the system of the "Konsonantenhäufung" in the dialects separately. I have chosen the latter alternative and have further restricted myself to the Tirolean dialect area.
Scholarship concerning the *Ambraser Heldenbuch* does not suffer from a superfluity of linguistic studies. As one might expect, literary studies of the works contained in the codex abound. Ried's *Kudrun* copy alone has generated volumes of scholarly discourse. This is hardly surprising, given the number of works transmitted uniquely in this manuscript.

Of the editions I was able to inspect, the vast majority contain nothing that could be classified as a linguistic discussion of the manuscript. Bäuml (1969:32) points out in his excellent introduction to his diplomatic edition of *Kudrun*:

*Bisherige Untersuchungen der sprachlichen Eigenschaften des Kudruntextes hatten -- mit nur einer Ausnahme -- eine Herstellung des normalmhd. Textes zum Ziel, wobei die Sprache der Handschrift nur als von sekundärer Bedeutung in Betracht kommt.*

The exception of which he writes is, of course, Thornton's (1953) dissertation.

Where linguistic topics are discussed, it is the Middle High German (normalized) text that is treated, not the language of the manuscript. Indeed, Otto Warnatsch, in his edition of *Der Mantel* (1883:2) goes so far as to state that: "Eine Darstellung der Sprache und Schreibweise der genugsam bekannten Handschrift wäre überflüssig". Some notable exceptions to this approach are Bäuml's (1969) edition of *Kudrun*, Fischer's (1969) edition of the Herrand stories, and Wolff's (1972) edition of Hartmann's
Klagebüchlein and the so-called zweites Büchlein. The linguistic discussion in the last two works is limited to a few paragraphs. Wolff (1972) limits himself to a discussion of the alternation of initial b - p, s - sch before consonants, and the fate of MHG tw. Fischer devotes one paragraph to the procedure he used in normalizing the text.

Bäuml's (1969) is, by far, the most detailed discussion in any edition. He devotes 10 pages to his linguistic discussion of Ried's work. His emphasis falls on a treatment of the vowels in Ried's Kudrun copy. His discussion of the consonants is brief, but adequate. He treats certain phonological and orthographic developments that are characteristic of New High German: the change of s to sch before certain consonants, mb to mm, tw to zw, as well as the orthographic innovation of writing b, d, g for what was final p, t, k in Middle High German. An incomplete list of editions of the works treated in this dissertation is included as Appendix B.

The bulk of the present study is an analysis of the consonantal orthography of those works that are unique to the Ambraser Heldenbuch, (see the listing of the contents in "The Manuscript") a codex of the early 16th century, copied in Tyrol by the scribe and sometime revenue collector Hans Ried. Through this analysis I hope to show that Ried's orthography was, indeed, systematic, and that the apparent chaos in his orthography can be given order by considering his orthography in the light of the Modern Tyrolean dialect.
2.0 Method

Hans Ried spent the last 12 years of his life copying out the *Ambraser Heldenbuch*. It should come as no surprise that I found it impossible to transcribe and study the entire MS in three years. Even with the aid of the computer, the transcription of the entire manuscript, which would be necessary for the type of study I am undertaking, would be a Herculean task. Not only are there no diplomatic editions of many of the works that comprise the codex, but those editions we do have are meant not for a linguistic analysis, but for a literary one: words that are written together in the MS are separated for the reader's (modern editor's) peace of mind, diacritics are treated as meaningless decorations, in short, the exactness of the transcription often leaves much to be desired. Thus I found it necessary to create my own line-for-line edition of those texts I intend to treat.

With one eye to the future and one on the normalized editions of the unica, I decided that my efforts might best be spent on an edition of those works unique to the MS, for it seemed to me absurd that such works should be studied, in normalized, and often radically emended form, when the language of the MS is so accessible to the modern reader. I hope that by treating the unica, my preliminary work will fill a gap that has existed far too long.

I considered further, that a treatment of works also contained in other MSS would oblige me to take into account differences among those other manuscripts and the present
one, further complicating an already complicated task. Although such a comparison would undoubtedly have been a meaningful undertaking, it would have required a great deal more time than was available to me. Simplicity and time constraints thus pointed toward the treatment of the unica as a reasonable objective.

In the end, however, I believe that the choice of a different subset of texts from this manuscript would not have resulted in a different conclusion, for Ried’s orthography is so regular -- indeed, I could discern no difference in the orthography of Ried’s Biterolf copy and the Herrant von Wildonie stories for which Unterkircher assumes a different Vorlage (1973:8)--, that I think there can be no doubt that he consciously changed the orthography of his copy-text in order to present the reader with a unified system.

It was my intention from the beginning to use the computer in my analysis of the manuscript. Until recently, those working in this area could not avail themselves of this valuable tool and were therefore restricted to a smaller scope or more superficial treatment. Biener’s works (1927/8, 1929), for example, are little more than a catalogue of "interesting" forms that shed more light on what interested Biener than on the language he was studying. Thornton’s dissertation (1953) suffers likewise from the necessarily limited scope of his corpus. With the aid of the computer, I have been able to treat a large corpus in great detail.

The first step was, of course, to create a machine-readable edition of my corpus. I did this with a laptop computer in the Rare Book Room of the University of Illinois
Graduate Library where I was able to transcribe directly to disk from Unterkircher's (1973) photo-facsimile edition of the manuscript, which the Library had purchased for this purpose. As I finished transcribing works, I proofread each twice against the facsimile.

Next I used a pair of "word-cruncher" programs called BYUIndex and BYUView to prepare my text for analysis. The first program indexes each word in the text for use with the other program, BYUView, that creates an on-the-fly concordance of the text. Using this program, one is able to find all instances of a desired phrase, word, or letter in the text. In order to do this, the program generates a number of files. The most useful to my work was the "frequency file," an alphabetical list of all the unique words in the text and the number of times they occur.

I soon found that the BYUView program was not ideal for searching and creating lists of letters in my text. The process of creating a list requires that a key be struck for each word to be added. Unfortunately, the program does not allow for automation of this process. I therefore used a program called GREP.EXE to sort the frequency file. I soon found, however, that this program, too, was not suited to my needs, as it could not manipulate extended ASCII codes in the necessary manner. I was forced to write several short BASIC routines to sort the BYU frequency file, to find various combinations of letters, organize them into lists, and save these lists as files (see "Appendix A"). My conclusions are based on an analysis of these lists. This stage was complicated by a quirk
in the index program that is not mentioned in the program’s documentation. I am indebted to Professor James W. Marchand for his help in solving this problem.

The final stage was the analysis. Using the BYU on-line concordance and the lists generated by BYU and my own programs, I tried to discover a system behind Ried’s orthography in the *Heldenbuch*. It seemed most meet to study all examples of aggregation of consonants (Konsonantenhäufung) that I could find, in order to see whether they could be fitted into any semblance of a system. By comparing Ried’s vocabulary to the Germanic roots from which they derive, I found that there was a system underlying the apparent "Verwahrlosung der frnhd. Orthographie" (V. Moser, 1929, I:4) in Ried’s work, and I then felt I could likewise assume a system for all of the consonants in the codex, and set out, using the same methods, to discover just what it was.

The few facts we know concerning Ried’s life led me first to compare the system derived from my analysis of the manuscript to the system of the Tyrolean dialect. This comparison of Ried’s orthography and the phonological system of the Tyrolean dialect (as represented by Schatz, 1903) led to results that I feel bear out my hypothesis concerning the systematic nature of Ried’s orthography.

I found a model for my comparative method in Hans Moser’s *Die Kanzlei Maximilians I.: Graphematik eines Schreibusus* (1977), in which he subjects four distinct corpora of texts to exhaustive synchronic and diachronic analyses in order to discern a system in the usage of the Habsburg chancery of the early 16th century. As ambitious as this project is, it suffers from a lack of similar preliminary studies of the
smaller chanceries from which Maximilian's scribes were drawn. In dealing with the
Ambraser Heldenbuch, the work of a highly accomplished scribe of the Tyrolean
chancery, I have restricted myself to a synchronic analysis of the text, which, I hope,
may someday prove helpful in understanding the development of the language of the
Habsburger Hofkanzlei.
3.0 The Scribe

Of Hans Ried we know very little, yet this is considerably more than we know about the scribes of most other important manuscripts. He is first mentioned in 1496 in connection with a reward for services rendered, and his name surfaces occasionally in chancery documents until May, 1516, in a supplication to the emperor from his widow. Ried is mentioned in connection with the manuscript no less than 7 times. In April, 1504, he is first mentioned as the scribe of the *Heldenbuch*. In June of that year, the government in Innsbruck is ordered to pay him and supply him with materials. In June, 1505, Ried is given leave to travel to Innsbruck during the hot summer months in order to speed his progress on the book. In December, 1507, an official in Bozen is instructed that he is to allow Ried to travel wherever he desires in order to work on the manuscript, and that the official is to create no difficulties for the scribe and should let the assistant revenue collector carry out Ried’s office until he has finished copying the manuscript. In September, 1509, the government in Bozen is twice ordered to pay Ried 10 Gulden per quarter. In November, 1511, Ried is informed that he will be allowed to remain in Bozen to work on the *Heldenbuch* until January 1, at which time he must report to Innsbruck to take up other duties. Finally, in June, 1515, the government in Innsbruck is ordered to present Ried with an *Ehrenkleid*.

From this and other evidence, Martin Wierschin (1976) and Helmut Weinacht (1979) have been able to arrive at the conclusion that Ried was born ca. 1460/70 to a
South Tirolean noble family whose ancestral home was the Burg Ried on the Talfer River, and who had been vassals to the lords of Wangen since the first half of the 13th century (Tennant 1985, pp. 165-174). They also determined that Ried had, by the time of his first appearance, already risen to the position of Rat in the chancery at Innsbruck, and that he had begun his career in the chancery where Maximilian himself learned to write: that of Duke Siegmund of Tirol, whom Maximilian succeeded in 1489. Indeed, Wierschin (1976:500) has suggested that Hans Ried and the young Maximilian may well have been taught by the same teacher, and that in this way Maximilian became aware of the scribe's talent, a talent that secured for him not only the lucrative task of copying the Ambraser Heldenbuch, but the continued favor of the Emperor as well.

Ried's accomplishment is most remarkable. Working from at least two sources (Unterkircher 1973:8-9) over a span of 12 years (Menhardt 1958), Ried created a document of 476 pages that uses the same orthographic conventions throughout. Not only did he have to concern himself with accurately copying the texts at hand, he did, in effect, "translate/transliterate" them as well. The result is a manuscript of unparalleled consistency.

The magnitude of Ried's accomplishments has, however, escaped the grasp of scholars from time to time. Michaeler, in his 1786 edition of Iwein, writes (Vol. I:63-65 [cited in Unterkircher 1973:7]):
Dieser mein Grundtext bestand in einer dem ersten Anscheine nach schönen Handschrift auf Pergament: daran viele Buchstaben zweifelhaft ausgedrückt, und alle überhaupt nach altfränkischer Form so gestaltet waren, dass sie erst ins Leserliche nach unserem heutigen Alphabethe mussten übertragen werden ... In den immer fortlaufenden breiten Zeilen waren nicht nur keine Reime untergetheilet, oder sonst angezeigt, sondern auch keine Unterscheidungszeichen zum Behufe der Verständlichkeit des Sinnes irgends beygesetzt.

Reading this, I wonder if the good professor has perhaps gotten Ried’s text mixed up with some other. His description does not fit our manuscript at all, for the lines are not broad, as he describes them (the average length of a line is approximately 67 mm), nor is the hand difficult to read, nor does Ried leave any doubt as to where each verse ends: he faithfully indicates the end of each with one or two raised dots.

Yet in 1883 Ried’s efforts still go unrecognized. Oswald Zingerle tacitly assumes, in his article "Das Heldenbuch an der Etsch", that all of the errors and inconsistencies in the manuscript originate with Ried. Having accepted this as one of his givens, he catalogues a few of the instances where the text has been misread (Zingerle blames Ried, though there is no reason why another, earlier scribe might not be responsible, see Unterkircher 1973:10), then concludes (p.141-142) that Ried worked from a single copy-text that can be dated to the first half of the fourteenth century.
This offhand dismissal of Ried's talents seems, like a weed, to have taken root in the scholarship.

In more modern times, in an article in Nachrichten von der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Edward Schröder (1931:213) rails against Ried in a rather lengthy tirade:

Der Grund[,] der den Kaiser Max resp. seine Ratgeber veranlaßt hat, gerade den Zollschreiber von Bozen mit der Herstellung des großen Heldenbuches zu beauftragen, kann einzig und allein in dessen kalligraphischer Kanzleihand gefunden werden, die sich in Erlassen und Diplomen gewiß gut ausnahm und im Buchbild, für das sie von vornherein kaum geeignet war, doch immerhin den Reiz der Moderne hatte. Hans Ried selbst brachte der Aufgabe kein Bildungsinteresse und keine Neigung entgegen, und da die Leistung selbst nicht eben glänzend honoriert wurde, so hielt er sich für berechtigt, die übrigen Vorzüge des Vortrags gehörig auszunutz-
en: Stellung eines Vertreters im Zollamt, regelmäßige Sommerfrische fern von dem

As surprising as these accusations are to someone who is familiar with the manuscript, more surprising still is the fact that such statements have been tacitly accepted ever since Zingerle's attempt to date the *Heldenbuch an der Etsch* on the basis of Ried's copying errors.

Though Schröder, et al., have impugned Ried's abilities and suggested that he took advantage of his position to gain for himself summer "vacations" in more temperate Innsbruck, when one follows the pertinent chancery documents, it becomes clear that it was ill health that prompted Ried's entreaties, not laziness, for by March of 1514 Ried has to be relieved of all chancery duties due to his failing eyesight.

Indeed, Thornton (1953) seems to have been the first to entertain the notion that Ried might possibly have been dealing with a *Vorlage* already fraught with errors. I do not possess the words to defend Ried against centuries of accusation, so I will use Thornton's (1953:12):
4.0 The Manuscript

The *Ambraser Heldenbuch* is a linguistic monument without parallel in German literature. Not only is the 238-leaf codex the work of a single scribe whose identity is known, but of the 25 works contained in the codex, 15 are unique to the manuscript.

The importance of the codex derives from the works that are unique to it. Alongside such works as *Iwein*, *Ortnit*, *Das Nibelungenlied*, and *Erec* (of which this is the only complete manuscript), are 15 unica, including *Kudrun*, *Moritz von Craon*, *Biterolf*, and *Wolfdietrich A*. Considering the great value of the manuscript, I find it quite surprising that in the more than 200 years since Prof. Karl Joseph Michaeler rediscovered it in 1776 (Unterkircher 1973:11), there has been no attempt at a linguistic analysis of the entire manuscript aside from Thomas Thornton’s 1953 Johns Hopkins dissertation, which is based on ‘representative’ excerpts (20 lines from each work) rather than on a more substantial portion of the document.

The *Ambraser Heldenbuch* is first mentioned in an official document from Emperor Maximilian’s Innsbruck chancery, dated 15 April 1502 (Schönherr 1864:382), in which he instructs his *Staberlmeister* Wilhelm von Oy, in Innsbruck, to send to Paul von Liechtenstain, at that time resident on the Etsch River, a certain scribe who is to copy the so-called ‘helldenpuch an der Etsch’ for the Emperor. The document does not name the scribe, who almost certainly is not Hans Ried, for, according to other Chancery documents, the latter was already in Bolzano collecting tariffs for the Emperor, not in the
service of Wilhelm von Oy. Indeed, Ried is not named in conjunction with the Heldenbuch until two years later, 14 April 1504, in another document, in which Hans Ried, Zöllner am Eisack, is said to be working on the book, though no official documents of appointment have been found to date, a fact that has led to the assumption by Unterkircher (1973:5) that Ried was assigned the task orally by the Emperor himself.

Ried's progress on the codex can be traced in a series of documents from the Innsbruck Chancery (Maximilian’s "Österreichische Kanzlei"). Between April, 1504, and June, 1515, Ried is mentioned in connection with the Heldenbuch, Riesenbuch, or Buch in Pergament no less than 7 times (see "The Scribe").

4.1 Physical Description

The Codex consists of 238 leaves of parchment, 460 mm x 360 mm. The parchment is blocked and lined in black ink to give a writing field of 360 mm x 235 mm. This area is further divided into three columns of 66-68 lines, each approximately 67mm long. There are marginalia at the beginning of most works, and elsewhere throughout the MS. The leaves of text are numbered in Ried's hand with Roman numerals from the first page of text (I) to the end (CCXXXVIII). Leaf 238 has been cut out, but two

1 For ease of reading (and in agreement with Unterkircher's facsimile) I have used arabic numerals in my discussion.
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leaves are numbered 153, thus there are 238 leaves in all. The second leaf 153 was modified to read 153* in the 19th century. The five leaves of the table of contents, left unnumbered by Ried, were numbered in pencil 1*-V* in the 19th century. The "Tabula des Heldenpuchs," in Ried's hand, is on the first 4 leaves. It is written in two columns and contains 120 titles (of works and "Abentheuer") with page references.

The manuscript's binding, which dates from the 19th century and bears the signature "Ser. nov. 2663," is the work of the Viennese bookbinder F. Krauss (fl. 1800-1850). It consists of 10mm-thick cardboard covers measuring 485 x 365 mm, covered with brown calfskin onto which remnants of the old leather binding are glued. Written on the back in gold lettering are the words "Das Heldenbuch" at the top, "1517" in the center, and "Nr. 73" at the bottom. The insides of the covers have marbled endpapers. There are two flyleaves (Vorsatzblätter) in front, three in back.

The manuscript is made up of 31 quires, most of which are quaternions (4 sheets folded = 8 leaves). The first quire, a binio (2 sheets folded = 4 leaves), was left unnumbered until the 19th century and contains the "Tabula des Heldenpuchs". To this is glued a single leaf, the recto of which is blank, the verso of which bears an illumination depicting two armored men and the Tyrolean eagle. Quires 2-13, 15-16, 18-27, and 30 are all quaternions. Quires 14 and 17 (leaves 105-111 & 129-135) each have one page cut out and are thus 7 leaves. Quire 28 is a quinternio (5 sheets folded = 10 leaves), and quire 29 a ternio (3 sheets folded = 6 leaves). The last leaf of quire 30 is glued to the first of the three paper flyleaves (Unterkircher 1973:13-14).
4.2 Contents

The codex contains 25 separate works, though not all are complete, of which 15 (those marked with an asterisk) are unique to the manuscript:

1.* 1\textsuperscript{st}-2\textsuperscript{nd} Der Frawn lob. Der Stricker, "Frauenlob"

2.* 2\textsuperscript{nd}-5\textsuperscript{th} Von künig Nero ainem Wilettrich der auch wie ein fraw Swanger wolt sein. Vnd sein Müeter auffschneiden lieffe. von feins fürbitz. "Moritz von Crāôn"

3. 6\textsuperscript{th}-22\textsuperscript{nd} Von künig Artus Hochzeit. auch von feinem Recht. def-gleichen Hofgefind. vnd geschächten als von Calogrian. Chaÿ heř Yban vnd anndern. Hartmann von Aue, "Iwein" (MS d).

4.* 22\textsuperscript{nd}-26\textsuperscript{th} Ein fchöne Difputatz. Von der Liebe. fo einer gegen einer fchönen frawen gehabt vnd getan hat. Hartmann von Aue, "Das Büchlein" ("Die Klage").

5.* 26\textsuperscript{th}-28\textsuperscript{th} Ein klag einer Frawen fo fȳ der lieb halb tuet. "Das [2.] Büchlein" (Attributed to Hartmann on Aue).

vnd feiner hauffrawn ein tail ain schön lefen. (Attrib. Heinrich von dem Türlin, see Kratz 1977), "Der Mantel"

7. 30*-50* No heading. Hartmann von Aue, "Erec" (most complete MS)


10. 95*-127* Ditz Puech Heyßet Chrimhilt. "Das Nibelungenlied" (MS d).

11. 131*-139* Ditz puech hayßet klagen. "Die Klage" (MS d) (complete only to verse 4403).

12. 140*-166* Ditz puech ift von Chaurün. "Kudrun."


15. 205*-214* Das ift Wolffdiettrichs puech wie Er gepoyn ward. Vnd die fraßen nam ze weibe. die Otnides was. "Wolfdietrich A."


17. 217*-217* Ditz pâechel hayßet die getrew Kone. Herrant von Wildonie, "Die getreue Gattin".
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18. 217b-218c **Das püechel hayffet der verkerte Wirt.** Herrant von Wildonie, "Der verkehrte Wirt" ("Der betrogene Gatte").

19. 218c-219c **Das püechel ift von dem ploffen kayfer.** Herrant von Wildonie, "Der nackte Kaiser."

20. 219c-220a **Ditz püechel ift von der katzen.** Herrant von Wildonie, "Die Katze."

21. 220a-225b **Ditz puech hayffet der Ytwitz.** Ulrich von Liechtenstein, "Frauendienst" ("Frauenbuch").

22. 225b-229b **Das puech ift von dem Maß Helmpzechte.** Wernher der Gartenære, "Helmbrecht" (MS A).

23. 229b-233b **Hie hebt fich an Phaff Amis der ctûge vund der weyfe man.** Der Stricker, "Pfaffe Amis" (MS W).

24. 234a-235c No heading. Wolfram von Eschenbach, "Titurlel" (MS H).

25. 235c-237c No heading. "Priester(könig) Johannes".

It is generally accepted (Janota 1978, Unterkircher 1973) that these works are organized into three groups: Courtly, Heroic Epic, and Minor Epic. Unterkircher (1954:4) further divides the last group into two clusters: one consisting of Herrant’s works with those of his father-in-law Ulrich von Lichtenstein, and one consisting of the fragments *Titurlel* and *Priester Johann*. Thornton (1953) suggests yet another division that differs from Unterkircher’s in that it recognizes the first two works, *Frauenlob* and
Moritz von Crâñ, as a group unto themselves, and groups Meier Helmbrecht and Pfaffe Amis with Titurel and Priester Johann.

In discussing the Vorlage for the manuscript, both Unterkircher (1973:8) and Menhardt (1958:320) refer to manuscript O of the Nibelungenlied in Berlin as a possible fragment of the Heldenbuch an der Etsch. Menhardt states that O is, without a doubt, a fragment of the Heldenbuch an der Etsch, while Unterkircher is more conservative in his estimate (1973:8): "Mit großer Wahrscheinlichkeit hat sich sogar ein Rest dieses Buches erhalten." Both men rely heavily on the unpublished dissertation (Vienna 1930) of Rudolf Zimmerl.

Because all or most of the Vorlage for the Ambraser Heldenbuch has been lost, it cannot be known with certainty whether the book was copied from one or many Vorlagen. Menhardt (1958:318-319) argues that the first seven works must have come from a different Vorlage than the rest, because these first seven are not heroic, but courtly in nature, and thus would not have been included in a "Heldenbuch". Unterkircher (1973:9) too assumes that Ried worked from more than one Vorlage and bases his hypothesis, on technical considerations. He takes the fact that Ried began his copy of Dietrichs Flucht in the middle of a quire as an indication that the first seven works of our manuscript were, contrary to Menhardt’ opinion, present in the Vorlage for Dietrichs Flucht as well, reasoning that Ried would have begun writing in a new quire, had he begun copying from a different manuscript. Unterkircher does, however, assume a different Vorlage for the last ten works (16-25) in the manuscript (1973:9):
Für die Verserzählungen der Texte 16-25 hatte Ried wohl Vorlagen die mit dem Heldenbuch an der Etsch nichts zu tun hatten. Es gibt so viele Möglichkeiten, daß er selbst diese Vorlagen fand, oder daß sie ihm von Maximilian oder von einem seiner literarischen Ratgeber zur Verfügung gestellt wurden, daß es ohne urkundlichem Beleg unmöglich ist, eine bestimmte Vermutung zu äußern.

The assumption that Ried used more than one Vorlage is, I think, lent further credibility by the fact that pages 122v, 124b-125c, and 127vn-131v of the Nibelungenlied were left blank, presumably because Ried knew of manuscripts he could use to supplement the main manuscript from which he copied.

Rather than simplifying the matter, the documentary evidence complicates the problem of provenance. Chancery documents make reference to a "helldenpuech an der Etsch," a "Puech in pergamen," and a "Riesenpuech." There has been some debate concerning just what each of these epithets refers to, whether they refer to Ried’s copy, to his Vorlage, or to a number of Vorlagen (Unterkircher 1954:12). In a document dated April 15, 1502, Emperor Maximilian writes to Wilhelm von Oy (Unterkircher 1973: Regest Nr. 6):

Getrewer lieber Wir haben vnnserm lieben getrewen Paulsen von Liechtenstain beuolhen, vns das helldenpuch an der Etsch ausschreiben Zulassen dartzu er dan deines schreibers notdurftig wurdet. Emphelhen wir dir mit ernnst, das du demselben von Liechtenstain deinen schreyber furderlich hinein an die Etsch beruerts
It is clear, I think, that the "helldenpuch an der Etsch" is the work to be copied. In a document dated April 14, 1504, von Liechtenstein writes to the government in Innsbruck (Unterkircher 1973: Regest Nr. 7):

Edlen Ersamen gelerten unnd lieben getreuen Wir haben vnnsrn getreuen Hannsen Ried vnnsrn Zollner am Eysackh Zu Botzen beuolhen vnns ain Puech in pergamen Zu Schreiben, vnnd Im daunon Zu Sold Zu geben Zugesagt benanntlichen hunndert vnnd Sechtzig gulden Reinisch. ... 

The phrase "in pergamen" is ambiguous here. Does it refer to a book written on parchment that Ried is to copy? Does it refer to a particular "Book on Parchment" (a rather unlikely interpretation considering the use of "ain")? Or does it refer to the fact that Ried was to use parchment for his copy, a detail that must not have gone unnoticed, considering the scope of the undertaking and the ready abundance of other, cheaper writing materials? Excluding the possibility that the phrase refers to a book known as the "Buch in Pergament," we are left with two interpretations that are equally useless in determining whether one or more Vorlagen were copied.
I have not been able to gain access to transcripts of those documents that refer to a "Riesenpuech," dated September 20 and 22, 1509, and thus am not able to address them authoritatively. From the synopses of these documents in Unterkircher's commentary (1973:25), however, it seems that "Riesenpuech" refers not to the Vorlage, but to Ried's copy, The *Ambraser Heldenbuch*.

4.3 Paleography and Graphic Inventory

The manuscript is written in a rather distinct mixture of chancery cursive and fraktur, which Unterkircher suggests should be called "Heldenbuchschrift" (1973:20). He points out that seven scripts in Leonhard Wagner's early 16th-century *Proba centum scripturarum* (1963) are similar to Ried's "Heldenbuchschrift," but that none of them exactly corresponds to it. Of these seven scripts, five are gothic cursive: *Compostorialis* [sic] maior (p. 16 [6v]), *Compostericalis* [sic] minor (p. 66 [31v]), *Literalis simplex* (p. 24 [12r]), *Literalis cursalica* (p. 52 [24v]), and *Cursiusa literalis* (p. 101 [49r]); one is fraktur: *Rotalis minor* (p. 14 [5v]); and one is chancery script: *Auersalicana media* (p. 30 [13v]).

Ried is not consistent in his use of majuscules. In general he sets the majuscule in proper nouns, at the beginning of a sentence, in numbers, and for the 3rd. sing. masc. and fem. pronouns. He often, though not always, highlights majuscules with a vertical
stroke of red ink. Unterkircher (1973) and Bäuml (1969:23-30) discuss the forms of Ried’s letters at length with the following results:

**Minusculles:**

- **a** chancery script.
- **b** chancery script.
- **c** Fraktur, but always easily distinguishable from *t*.
- **d** two varieties: 1. chancery script, 2. cursive in which the upright loops downward and is closed where the bow and the upright meet. Ried uses these forms in free variation, though the cursive form is by far the less common.
- **e** Fraktur, occasionally similar to *o* in that the pocket is closed by a diagonal stroke down and to the left that meets the downstroke below the middle point.
- **f** Fraktur.
- **g** chancery script in which the bottom loop curves far to the left and back, terminating at the front bow of the downstroke.
- **h** two varieties: 1. chancery script, 2. Kurrentschrift. The two types vary freely, though Ried often uses the chancery script form when there is a lack of space available.
- **i** chancery script. The downstroke is bent at the top and bottom. The dot is often to the right of the letter, sometimes left off altogether. Ried varies *i*, *j* and *y* freely, though he clearly prefers *i* in word-medial position.
\(j\) always a cursive majuscule.

\(k\) Fraktur in which the upper loop often curves so far to the right and down that it touches the next letter, sometimes even the second letter.

\(l\) chancery script.

\(m\) chancery script. The last stroke is always bent upward.

\(n\) chancery script, often very similar to \(u\).

\(o\) Fraktur.

\(p\) Fraktur.

\(q\) Fraktur.

\(r\) two varieties: 1. Basic form of textura with a split vertical which Bäuml calls the precursor of the German cursive \(r\), 2. cursive \(r\)-rotunda, often connected to the preceding or following letter. The cursive form is used most often, though by no means exclusively, after \(b, o, p\) and at the ends of lines. Ried uses the two forms in free variation.

\(s\) three varieties: 1. Textura-form long \(f\) with the spindle shape typical for Fraktur; 2. round \(s\); 3. German cursive final \(σ\), sometimes with a horn-like off-stroke. Ried sets long \(f\) in word-initial and word-medial position, regardless of the letter’s position with regard to open juncture. He varies \(s\) and \(σ\) freely in word-final position.

\(t\) Fraktur. The crossbar is usually left out when combined with \(z\).
u chancery script. This letter is rarely used in word-initial position and varies freely with v.

v chancery script. This letter is rarely used in word-medial position and varies freely with u.

w chancery script.

x chancery script.

y chancery script.

z Fraktur. The loop curves quite far below the line.

Majuscules:


E sometimes is a Fraktur form, sometimes an uncial.

F has the form of a Fraktur minuscule. It is distinguished from the minuscule in that the downstroke curves to the left below the line.

I is a bastarda form, being a bow concave on the left side.

J is a cursive form with a loop under the line.

M is a bastarda form and looks much like a left-leaning H, but has a diagonal on-stroke running up and to the right.

V, W and Z have the form of the fraktur minuscule and are distinguished merely by size. Z is also distinguished by the upward diagonal of the top stroke, rather than the downward curve of the minuscule.
The only punctuation marks used in the text indicate the ends of verses, though Ried does occasionally make errors. On leaves 1-22\textsuperscript{r} the scribe uses a raised dot; on leaves 22\textsuperscript{v}-92\textsuperscript{r} a colon, rarely a raised dot; and on leaves 95\textsuperscript{v}-238\textsuperscript{r} a raised dot. Unterkircher assumes that Ried maintained the punctuation of his Vorlagen and views the scribe's usage of the raised dot versus the colon as evidence that he was copying from more than one Vorlage (1973:15).

To indicate that a word has been divided between lines, Ried uses a slanted double dash. He occasionally omits this mark, most notably after the prefix ge-.

Ried uses abbreviations sparingly, and almost always near the ends of lines. He sets a tilde (\textasciitilde) over vowels, \textit{n}, or \textit{m} to indicate that a nasal has been omitted; a vertical tilde (\textasciitilde') to indicate that an -(e)r- has been left off; and a swallow-shaped stroke (\textdagger) to indicate -ra- in \textit{fprach}.

Ried uses 4 different diacritic marks in the manuscript: *, ″, ′, and °. The use of these marks is facultative. The case of \textit{w} and \textit{y} most dramatically illustrates this status in the manuscript. These letters can appear with any diacritic in any position to represent any of the values associated with them: \textit{w} and \textit{y} with diacritic can represent /u, w/ or /i, j/ respectively.

The diacritics ″ and ° can occur over all vowels (including \textit{v} which is simply a graphic variant of \textit{u}) in free variation. When written over \textit{a}, \textit{e}, \textit{o}, or \textit{u} these diacritics indicate the umlauted form of Middle High German short /a, o, u/ or long /ā, ū/ (the
umlaut of Middle High German long /ü/ is, of course, represented by a diphthong: aw, ew, āw, ēw, etc.).

The other two diacritic marks (", °) pose some problems. The superscript "o" occurs most frequently over u to indicate the vowel that derives from MHG uo (as in fûren, gûte, zû), but occasionally occurs over other vowels as well (frômbden, tât, schône, gefschâhe, tôdtten)

The superscript half circle is generally used to indicate umlaut, as are ", and ". Indeed, this symbol is far more prevalent than either of the other two as an umlaut marker, contrary to Thornton’s claim (1962:63 n. 3, 66 n. 15) that the a-shaped mark is Ried’s preferred notation. It would be an over-simplification, however, to say that this mark is used exclusively to indicate umlaut, for it often occurs over a u where one would expect an ā. It is possible that Ried used diacritical markings that were visually similar to those in his Vorlage, but that Ried’s understanding of the values of the diacritics in question, and thus the diacritics’ distribution in the text, differed from that of his Vorlage, creating some confusion.

4.3.1 Summary

Analysis of the preceding discussion yields the following distinct consonantal graphs:

\[ \{b, c, f, g, k, l, m, n, p, q, t, w, x, z\} \text{ all without allophones.} \]
\langle d \rangle \text{ with two allographs (cursive and chancery forms) in free variation.}

\langle h \rangle \text{ with two allographs (fraktur and chancery forms) in free variation.}

\langle i \rangle \text{ with three allographs (i, j, y) in free variation}

\langle r \rangle \text{ with two allographs (textura r and round z) in free variation.}

\langle s \rangle \text{ with three allographs: round s and Kurrent σ in free variation with one another, but in complementary distribution with long Ъ which occurs in word-initial and word-medial position.}

\langle v \rangle \text{ with two allographs (u, ν) in free variation.}
5.0 Introduction to the manuscript evidence

In the following discussion all Proto-Germanic forms are identified as such by the abbreviation PG, pre-High German forms by pre-HG. For the sake of simplicity, however, these forms are not preceded by an asterisk, as to do so would seem redundant. I have used asterisks in the lists of examples to indicate that an example below illustrates the use of a different letter than does the example above.

The lists of examples given are not exhaustive, though I did use exhaustive lists in my analysis. The number of examples is so large as to make it completely impractical to include them all. I have included in the lists here those words that appeared with the greatest frequency in the manuscript.

5.1 Germanic Fricatives

5.1.1 Germanic /f/

Ried sets /f/ (22%) and v (76%) (as well as u [5%]) for PG /f/ in initial position. /f/ is by far the more common variant, keeping in mind that the prefix ver- accounts for more than half of the instances of consonantal v in the text:

- 16x beualch ‘commanded’
- 222x dauon ‘from there’
- 12x geuallen ‘please’
- 1x geuatter ‘godfather’
In initial position before liquids / is again Ried's usual spelling (95%) for PG /fl/.

He also sets v before l (41%) and only twice before r (less than 1%):
2x frēuel 'wantonness'
1x frone 'lord'
3x gefliffen 'striven'
8x gefraget 'asked'
9x junckfrawen 'maiden'
15x vnfro 'unhappy'
102x fro 'happy'
7x fliehen 'flee'
70x fragen 'ask'
295x frawen 'lady'
42x frey 'free'

1x vzdēfel 'wantonness'
1x vzandebare 'holy'
13x vleisfe 'effort'
5x vlieffen 'flow'

Ried's usual spelling for PG /f/ after /n/ is ff (83%), in word-medial as well as in word-final position, though he does occasionally use a simple f-spelling (17%). I could find no examples of v spellings in this position.

2x fânff 'five'
3x kunffit 'arrival'
22x fânffte 'soft'
1x fânfte 'fifth'
1x kunftig 'future'
6x fanfte 'soft'

After liquids the single f (21%) is less common than the ff spelling (79%), in all positions. Again, I could find no examples of v spellings in this position.
10x bedarf 'needs'  
7x Pitrolffes 'Biterolf's'  
47x wolff 'wolf'  
7x wolffe 'wolf'  
6x zwelffe 'twelve'  
24x zwelff 'twelve'

Single PG /f/ appears in the manuscript as f (62%) or u (38%) in medial position, and as ff (25%) before open juncture.

8x aindlif 'eleven'  
2x bzüeffte 'tested'  
2x pruefet 'tests'  
1x graf 'count'  
106x hofe 'court'  
1x nefe 'nephew'  
2x zwelf 'twelve'

Ried prefers to write ff (88%) to f (12%) before PG /t/.

6x affter 'after'  
85x crafft 'power'  
10x craft 'power'
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1x heftel ‘haft’
3x kunfft ‘arrival’
9x lufft ‘air’
66x oft ‘often’
59x ritterfchaft ‘chivalry’
22x fanffe ‘soft’
28x fchafft ‘shaft’

1x kunftig ‘future’
1x lufte ‘air’
2x oft ‘often’
2x ritterfchaft ‘chivalry’
6x fanfte ‘soft’
4x fchaft ‘shaft’

Summary

Ried represents PG /f/ in initial and medial position with f or v, while after nasals and before /t/ he sets ff, sometimes f. The fact that he distinguishes PG /f/ from PG /p/ in medial position (cf. "Germanic /p/") supports the assumption that the two sounds were, indeed, distinct and had not, as in Modern German, fallen together. Though in clusters, Ried often doubles letters yielding a unit that would normally be reserved for a sound with a different historical derivation (ff for PG /f/ rather than PG /p/), the evidence for an f-ff distinction in Ried’s orthography is so strong, that I would rather posit a neutralization in the case of clusters than accept the alternative: that Ried does not distinguish f and ff, and that the distribution in intervocalic position is purely coincidental.
5.1.2 Germanic /p/

The dental fricative appears in the manuscript as \(d\) in initial position before vowels. Ried consistently sets \(t\) in taufent, teutfch, and tach but otherwise does not set \(t\) in this position. Kranzmayer (1956:§27c) attributes these \(t\)-forms to the operation of E. Schröder's Law of Assimilation under which initial lenes become fortes if a medial fortis follows as in teutfch and tach (less than 1%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>word</th>
<th>meaning</th>
<th>count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>alda</td>
<td>'there'</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>da</td>
<td>'there'</td>
<td>3703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bedarff</td>
<td>'needs'</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bedeite</td>
<td>'means'</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dancken</td>
<td>'thank'</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dann</td>
<td>'then'</td>
<td>309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>degen</td>
<td>'warrior'</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dein</td>
<td>'thine'</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dienen</td>
<td>'serve'</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>durch</td>
<td>'through'</td>
<td>579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gedacht</td>
<td>'thought'</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>piderbe</td>
<td>'excellent'</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tache</td>
<td>'roof'</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tach</td>
<td>'roof'</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tauent</td>
<td>'thousand'</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teutfch</td>
<td>'German'</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In initial position before liquids, Ried sets \(d\) for PG /p/ without exception.

15x dezij ‘three’
16x *dringen* ‘press’
16x *verdzieffen* ‘annoy’

After nasals PG /p/ appears as d prevocally, and as d (40%), dt (29%), and t (31%) before open juncture.

85x *anndern* ‘other’
50x *ander* ‘other’
1x *frombd* ‘foreign’
22x *frømbden* ‘foreign’
74x *gefinde* ‘servants’
25x *hinder* ‘behind’
110x *kind* ‘child’
69x *kinde* ‘child’
24x *kund* ‘news’
13x *kündt* ‘news’
32x *kunt* ‘news’
160x *kunde* ‘news’
19x *münd* ‘mouth’
2x *mündt* ‘mouth’
1x *münt* ‘mouth’
9x *munde* ‘mouth’
1x *tugend* ‘virtue’
39x *tugende* ‘virtues’
1x *zand* ‘tooth’

The few examples of geminate /p/ in the manuscript are spelled *tt*. 
For PG /p/ after liquids, Ried sets d in all positions, as well as dt (1%) and t (57%) before open juncture.

Ried normally (95%) represents single postvocalic PG /p/ with d (with t 5% of the time), but also sets dt (12%), and t (44%) before open juncture.
Summary

The reflex of PG /b/ is written d in all positions, as well as dt and t before open juncture, as an indication of Auslautverhärtung. Only in the words Dach, Tausent, and Deutsch does Ried write t in initial position.

5.1.3 Germanic /h/

Not surprisingly, Ried always represents PG /h/ after open juncture with an h.
30x allenthalben ‘everywhere’
43x behalten ‘retain’
18x dahin ‘thither’
13x hail ‘salvation’
7x haim ‘home’
10x halben ‘half’
23x halt ‘just’
717x han ‘have’
10x hayden ‘heathen’
17x haïffen ‘be called’
251x heer ‘army’
59x helm ‘helmet’
127x hertze ‘heart’
495x hie ‘hier’
230x hin ‘thither’
3x vnhaul ‘calamity’

PG /h/ in initial position before consonants is always lost.

7x erlachte ‘laughed’
2x los ‘lot’
3x lauffen ‘run’
9x naiget ‘gnaw’
3x raben ‘raven’
37x raine ‘pure’
17x ring ‘ring’
1688x was ‘what’
Ried spells the reflex of PG /h/ after liquids *ch* (96%) or, far less often, *h* (4%).

16x *beualch* 'commanded'
1x *beualh* 'commanded'
6x *beulhen* 'commanded'

579x *durch* 'through'

4x *ferch* 'life'

1x *folcher* 'such'

21x *folher* 'such'

16x *votchte* 'fear'

23x *welche* 'which'

2x *welhe* 'which'

1x *verhe* 'life'

1x *zwerhen* 'mix'

Single postvocalic PG /h/ appears in the manuscript as *h* intervocally or, in clusters or before open juncture, as *ch* (99% of the time), and is never absent.

579x *durch* 'through'

3x *emphach* 'received'

1x *dehfe* 'axe'

27x *emphaken* 'receive'

1x *emphahn* 'receive'

1x *erwachfen* 'grow up'

1x *fleucht* 'flies'

1x *fleuh* 'flees'

90x *gefchach* 'happened'

14x *geschahe* 'would happen'

163x *gefehchen* 'happened'

38x *hoch* 'high'

39x *hohen* 'high'

1x *leych* 'lend'

6x *leyhen* 'lend'
For PG /h/ before /t/ Ried usually writes ch (99%) or h (1%), though he does occasionally use an h-less spelling for nit.

29x brachten ‘brought’
6x erfechten ‘achieve’
2x flucht ‘flight’
1x färbbracht ‘brought forward’
26x knecht ‘servant’
28x leicht ‘light’
1748x nicht ‘not’
2x flecht ‘simple’
106x tochter ‘daughter’
16x vochte ‘feared’
33x zucht ‘decorum’

131x nahen ‘near’
75x fahren ‘saw’
108x fehen ‘see’
1x fpehe ‘spy’
3x fpehen ‘spy’
1x fahelgewät ‘armor’
2x fahle ‘steel’
24x zehen ‘ten’

1 x niht ‘not’
134 x nit ‘not’
Summary

Ried vacillates in his representation of PG /h/ between ch, before and after consonants and before open juncture, and h in all positions.

5.1.4 Germanic /s/

Ried always writes s for pre-vocalic Germanic /s/ in initial position.

51x gefach ‘saw’
80x gefait ‘said’
392x fach ‘saw’
213x fagen ‘say’
112x fam ‘as’
83x fafs ‘sat’
1605x fein ‘his’
106x felber ‘oneself’
85x felten ‘seldom’
273x fint ‘are’
632x fol ‘should’
97x fozgen ‘care’
10x fände ‘sin’
471x fy ‘she, they’
For PG /s/ in initial position before sonants and /w/, Ried vacillates between s and sch, but does not clearly prefer one form to the other. Before l he prefers s 66%-34%, before m he prefers sch 76%-24%, before n he sets sch 72% of the time, and before w he prefers s 63%-37%.

32x erflagen ‘slay’ 12x erschlagen ‘slay’
2x gesniți ‘cut’ 5x geschnitten ‘cut’
17x flaffen ‘sleep’ 1x schlaffen ‘sleep’
6x flecht ‘simple’ 4x schlecht ‘simple’
59x flüg ‘struck’ 51x schlüg ‘struck’
1x fmiele ‘smile’ 2x schmielen ‘smile’
7x fnee ‘snow’ 8x schnee ‘snow’
7x fnelle ‘quick’ 9x schnelle ‘quick’
4x fwaches ‘weak’ 3x schwaches ‘weak’
25x fdre ‘difficult’ 28x schwäre ‘difficult’
46x fwert ‘sword’ 55x schwert ‘sword’
1x verfmahen ‘disdain’ 24x verfchmahen ‘disdain’
4x verfwigen ‘be silent’ 3x verfchwigen ‘be silent’

In initial and medial position before PG /t/ and /p/, Ried always writes s for PG /s/. For PG /sk/ he always writes sch.

4x gespil ‘played’ 62x beftan ‘endure’ 163x geschehen ‘happen’
12x gesprach ‘spoke’ 48x bift ‘are’ 148x schaden ‘injury’
11x fpat ‘late’ 96x fürften ‘prince’ 95x fchar ‘host’
Ried's normal designation for post-vocalic PG /s/ is single s, only very rarely does he set ss (2%) and then he does so exclusively before open juncture.

2x eijfen 'iron'
1x erkos 'chose'
61x genefen 'recovered'
19x gifel 'hostage'
17x hawfe 'house'
12x kiefen 'choose'
6x lufen 'solve'
1x puefen 'breast'
1x puefem 'breast'
1x puefm 'breast'
18x rayfe 'journey'
102x taufent 'thousand'
24x verliefen 'lose'
129x wafen 'being'
Ried represents intervocalic geminate pre-HG /ss/ with ss. When the geminate is part of a consonant cluster, however, Ried often sets simple s (23%) instead of ss (77%).

9x gewissen ‘conscience’
6x küffen ‘kiss’
2x miffet ‘misses’
25x roffe ‘horse’

5x wifte ‘knew’
4x kufte ‘kissed’

For PG /s/ after /r/ Ried consistently sets s, with the exception of a single occurrence of gierfchait, which would seem to indicate that the sound may have been realized /ʃ/.

3x durft ‘thirst’
1x gewirft ‘made worse’
1x girfheit ‘greed’
1x gierfchait ‘greed’
1x wierfte ‘worst’
5x wirfer ‘worse’
Summary

Germanic /s/ is written s in all positions. Before resonants and /w/ it can be written sch. Before /p/ and /t/ Ried never sets sch, which he always sets for PG /sk/. From this evidence we can assume that initial PG /s/ before consonants was realized as /§/, which is supported by evidence of the modern dialect. From this evidence it is impossible, however, to determine the value of the reflex of PG /s/ in medial position before consonants, though the phonology of the modern dialect would indicate an alveopalatal fricative.

Before open juncture Ried occasionally sets ss for PG /s/, undoubtedly an indication of Auslautverhärtung. The geminate pre-HG /ss/ is represented by ss, as well as by s before open juncture and consonants, again, probably an indication of fortition, and thus a neutralization of the fortis-lenis opposition, before open juncture. Pre-HG /tt/ and /ss/ have fallen together.

5.2 Germanic Voiceless Stops

5.2.1 Germanic /p/

Not surprisingly, PG /p/ in initial position is represented by ph (84%) or pf (16%), the former being by far the more common variant.
3x phaffen ‘priest’ 4x pfaffe ‘priest’
2x phande ‘collateral’
6x phant ‘collateral’
4x phard ‘horse’
13x phelle ‘pelt’
1x phullm ‘pillow’
2x phunt ‘pound’ 1x pfundt ‘pound’

For PG /p/ in initial position before resonants, Ried writes ph (99%) and pf (1%). The more common variant is clearly ph. In fact, the one occurrence of pflag ‘attended to’ is the only case in which Ried writes pf in this position.

86x phlegen ‘attend to’ 1x pflag ‘attended to’
4x phlicht ‘duty’
2x phlag ‘plow’
2x phläme ‘plum’
1x phnacht ‘snorted’
1x phnurret ‘puffs up’

Ried sets ph (97%) and pf (3%) in medial position for PG /p/ after nasals.

1x gelimphet ‘made appropriate’
1x gerumphen ‘wrinkle’
Ried represents the geminate of PG /p/ by ph (64%) and pf (36%).

After liquids, however, Ried’s normal spelling for the reflex of Germanic /p/ is ff (71%), though he does occasionally set single f (29%). Only in the case of the proper nouns Helpferick and Gelfrat does Ried consistently set pf after l, but even then he does set f elsewhere in the manuscript. This is presumably the result of Ried’s sometimes following his Vorlage closely and sometimes with less attention.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2x <em>Gelfrat</em> ‘Gelfrat’</td>
<td>1x <em>Gelfrat</em> ‘Gelfrat’</td>
<td>5x <em>Gelphrat</em> ‘Gelfrat’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16x <em>halff</em> ‘helped’</td>
<td>10x <em>half</em> ‘helped’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31x <em>helffen</em> ‘help’</td>
<td>1x <em>helfen</em> ‘help’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1x <em>Helfferigk</em> ‘Helferich’</td>
<td>5x <em>Helpherigk</em> ‘Helferich’</td>
<td>2x <em>Helpferig</em> ‘Helferich’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3x <em>scharff</em> ‘sharp’</td>
<td>4x <em>scharffen</em> ‘sharp’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13x <em>warff</em> ‘threw’</td>
<td>4x <em>werffen</em> ‘throw’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1x <em>warf</em> ‘threw’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Postvocalic single PG /p/ is represented by *ff* (87%) and before open juncture occasionally by *f* (13%). Only in the word *wafen* does Ried set single *f* for medial PG /p/.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5x <em>begritten</em> ‘seized’</td>
<td>1x <em>auf</em> ‘up’</td>
<td>750x <em>auf</em> ‘up’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2x <em>begriff</em> ‘seized’</td>
<td>2x <em>begriiff</em> ‘seized’</td>
<td>1x <em>grif</em> ‘seized’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2x <em>getauffet</em> ‘baptized’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10x <em>kauffen</em> ‘buy’</td>
<td>1x <em>kauff</em> ‘buy’</td>
<td>1x <em>kaufleute</em> ‘merchants’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13x <em>lieffen</em> ‘ran’</td>
<td>26x <em>lieff</em> ‘ran’</td>
<td>8x <em>lieff</em> ‘ran’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4x <em>offen</em> ‘open’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4x <em>pfaffe</em> ‘priest’</td>
<td>1x <em>pfaff</em> ‘priest’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9x <em>räeffen</em> ‘called’</td>
<td>2x <em>räeff</em> ‘called’</td>
<td>2x <em>ruff</em> ‘cry’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14x <em>schiffen</em> ‘ships’</td>
<td>7x <em>schiff</em> ‘ship’</td>
<td>19x <em>schif</em> ‘ship’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9x <em>schauffen</em> ‘achieve’</td>
<td>5x <em>geschuff</em> ‘made’</td>
<td>3x <em>schuff</em> ‘made’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17x <em>flaffen</em> ‘sleep’</td>
<td>2x <em>flaff</em> ‘sleep’</td>
<td>5x <em>flaf</em> ‘sleep’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2x *straffen* 'taut'
20x *tieffen* 'deep' 5x *tieff* 'deep'
54x *waffen* 'weapons' 1x *wafen* 'weapon'

After /s/ PG /p/ is always spelled *p*.

12x *gefprach* 'spoke'
8x *spannen* 'span'
4x *sparn* 'spare'
31x *per* 'spear'
22x *speyfe* 'food'
31x *spil* 'game'
1000x *sprach* 'spoke'
6x *springen* 'jump'

Summary

Germanic /p/ clearly shows the effects of the High German Sound Shift in the manuscript. In initial position, as well as after nasals and in gemination, PG /p/ has shifted to the affricate /pf/ and is written *ph* or *pf*. After resonants or in medial position when single, PG /p/ has been shifted to the fricative /ff/, which Rieds spells *ff*, though before open juncture he alternates between *ff* and *f*.

Again, this seems to indicate a neutralization of the fortis-lenis opposition before open juncture (cf. "Germanic /fi/"). In two proper nouns Ried writes *ph* - *pf* after /l/,
but also writes these same names with *ff* - *f*, indicating that in some instances (probably accidentally) his own spelling took precedence. After /s/, PG /p/ remains unshifted and is spelled /p/. Only in the treatment of PG /p/ after liquids does Ried’s orthography conflict with the supposed results of the Consonant Shift given in the handbooks (V. Moser 1909:§96; Philipp 1980:8-10; Braune & Eggers 1975:§87; Paul/Wiehl/Grosse 1989:§86-91), which maintain that PG /p/ was shifted to /pf/ in this position. Braune & Eggers (1975:§87) maintains that it was characteristic of the Upper German dialects of Old High German to display the affricate in this position, while Paul/Wiehl/Grosse (1989:117-18) maintains that the Upper German dialects showed simple *f* in the 9th century.

5.2.2 Germanic /t/

Ried distinguishes two variants for PG /t/ in initial position. In word-initial position he sets almost exclusively *z* (though never *tz*), whereas after open juncture in the second element of a compound or complex stem he vacillates in his representation of initial /t/ between *tz* (54%) and *z* (46%). In foreign words and in *cefwen* Ried also uses *c* (less than 1%) to indicate the affricate /ts/ before front vowels, i.e., in those positions where affrication has occurred in Latin.
12x allenzeiten 'always' 9x allentzeiten 'always'
1x allze 'all too'
3x bezwingen 'subdue'
15x darzâ 'in addition' 123x dartzâ 'in addition'
8x gezelt 'tent'
1x herzoge 'duke'
14x hertzoge 'duke'
3x vertzagen 'despair'
1x vnuerizaget 'undaunted'

1x cefwen 'right'
1x cefar 'Caesar'
1x ciperpañmen 'cyprus trees'

Initial PG /t/ before /t/ is spelled t.

1x auftrüg 'bring forward'
21x betragen 'behave'
5x entraün 'not to trust'
41x getragen 'carry'
19x getréwe 'faithful'
3x getrósten 'comfort'
1x trachtein 'lord'
118x tragen 'carry'
14x traib 'drove'
3x tranck 'drank'
5x trauren 'to grieve'
7x traût 'familiar'
40x *trewen* ‘fidelity’
32x *trost* ‘solace’
122x *tråg* ‘carried’
6x *trunkenhait* ‘intoxication’
12x *vngetrewe* ‘unfaithful’
6x *vertreiben* ‘drive away’

PG /t/ after /n/ appears everywhere as tz with one exception.

3x *gantz* ‘completely’
1x *krantz* ‘wreath’
1x *muntze* ‘coin’
1x *rantzte* ‘jumped around’
78x *vnntz* ‘until’
2x *vnz* ‘until’

Ried spells the geminate, PG /tt/, most commonly tz, though he does set z in forms of *ittwitzen* (4x = less than 1%).

1x *antlitz* ‘countenance’
1x *haitzen* ‘to heat’
1x *katz* ‘cat’
24x *lützel* ‘little’
3x *fetzen* ‘to set’
36x *fitzen* ‘to sit’
12x *witzen* ‘wits’ 1x *itwizen* ‘reproach’
1x *itwitzen* ‘reproach’
1x *itweýzzen* ‘reproach’
1x *itewiffen* ‘reproach’

PG /t/ after liquids appears in the manuscript as *tz*, only once, probably erroneously, as *z*.

3x *artzet* ‘physician’
127x *hertze* ‘heart’
1x *herzen* ‘heart’
6x *holtz* ‘wood’
1x *faltze* ‘salt’
37x *ftoltzen* ‘proud’
2x *fwartz* ‘black’
2x *fchwartz* ‘black’

Ried sets *ss, sz, z, and zz* for PG postvocalic, single /t/. The *z*-spellings are so rare (less than 2%) that one can safely assume that in these cases the Vorlage has influenced Ried’s orthography. In the case of *daz*, Ried uses this form almost exclusively for the conjunction, while using the form *das* for the pronoun.

2x *afọ* ‘ate’ 1x *erlofzt* ‘redeemed’ 2x *beflozzen* ‘decided’
23x *beffer* ‘better’ 1x *gofz* ‘poured’
13x *befeffen* ‘possessed’ 2x *grāefzte* ‘greeted’
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>effen</td>
<td>'eat'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>genieff</td>
<td>'to enjoy'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>groffen</td>
<td>'great'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>haßflet</td>
<td>'is called'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hieff</td>
<td>'was called'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lieffen</td>
<td>'let'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>liefs</td>
<td>'let'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>müeffen</td>
<td>'must'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mâfs</td>
<td>'must'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fas</td>
<td>'sat'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>straffe</td>
<td>'street'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fâeffe</td>
<td>'sweet'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trugksäftten</td>
<td>'seneschal'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wayfs</td>
<td>'know'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wiffen</td>
<td>'to know'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kreyfs</td>
<td>'circle'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gemazzen</td>
<td>'is appropriate'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gefezzen</td>
<td>'seated'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hazzent</td>
<td>'hate'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lafz</td>
<td>'let'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>myefz</td>
<td>'must'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beflozfen</td>
<td>'decided'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>laz</td>
<td>'let'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For PG /t/ after fricatives Ried sets t.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>acht</td>
<td>'eight'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>achtzigk</td>
<td>'eighty'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>crafft</td>
<td>'power'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ellenthaffte</td>
<td>'powerful'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>erfechten</td>
<td>'get by fighting'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fozych</td>
<td>'fear'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fârchten</td>
<td>'fear'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gefellschaft</td>
<td>'society'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hefftel</td>
<td>'haft'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Summary

As with PG /p/, PG /t/ clearly shows the effects of the High German Consonant Shift, though after liquids it shows no further or anomalous development.

In initial position it is written z, in word-medial position tz, and c before front vowels in foreign words and cefwen. After resonants and in gemination it is written tz or, very rarely z. In the case of PG /tt/ in itwitz - iewartssen it seems clear that Ried was unfamiliar with the word and did not know how to interpret the symbol used in his Vorlage: whether to analyze it as Witzen or Wissen. Germanic /t/ after fricatives remained unshifted and is represented by t.
5.2.3 *Germanic /k/

Ried sets *k* (95%), *ch* (4%), and *kh* (1%) for PG /k/ in initial position. He also sets *q* exclusively in the root of *qual* (8x).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kammerere 'chamberlain'</td>
<td>5x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kebos 'concubine'</td>
<td>1x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kiefen 'choose'</td>
<td>12x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>komen 'come'</td>
<td>364x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>küssfen 'kiss'</td>
<td>6x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>käne 'bold'</td>
<td>71x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chammerer 'chamberlain'</td>
<td>1x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chebos 'concubine'</td>
<td>1x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chiefen 'choose'</td>
<td>3x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chomen 'kome'</td>
<td>3x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chuffen 'kiss'</td>
<td>6x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khai 'Kay'</td>
<td>10x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>khüene 'bold'</td>
<td>1x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>khiele 'keel'</td>
<td>1x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chunstenobele 'Constantinople'</td>
<td>2x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In initial position before /l/ Ried writes PG /k/ as *k* (60%), *c* (40%). Before /r/ he writes *k* (37%), *c* (42%), and *ch* (21%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>klagen 'lament'</td>
<td>17x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>klaider 'clothes'</td>
<td>13x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>knaben 'boy'</td>
<td>38x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>knechte 'servants'</td>
<td>31x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>knie 'knee'</td>
<td>4x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>knopf 'button'</td>
<td>1x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For PG /k/ after nasals, the scribe sets ck (88%), ch (less than 1%), ckh (6%),
gk (4%), gkh (less than 1%), and k (less than 1%). Because the last occurs only once
in the corpus, it would seem to be an error.

7x angker ‘anchor’ 1x angkher ‘anchor’
1x blanch ‘white’
1x hengkhet ‘hangs’

2x krancken ‘sick’
1x kranchen ‘sick’

7x fschencken ‘give’
1x trinckhen ‘drink’

7x trincken ‘drink’
1x wancken ‘vacillate’
1x wanketen ‘vacillated’
1x wanggan ‘vacillation’

The geminate pre-HG /kk/ appears as ck (89%), gk (4%), gkh (5%), ckh (1%),
and gg (less than 1%).
Ried spells the reflex of PG /k/ after liquids ck (24%), ch (74%), ckh (1%), kh (1%) and, in foreign words, c (less than 1%).
Postvocalic, single PG /k/ appears as *ch, never as *h.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>German Word</th>
<th>English Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>aichen</td>
<td>oaks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>entweichen</td>
<td>yield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>erraicht</td>
<td>achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>erwachet</td>
<td>awoke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>frechen</td>
<td>insolent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>machen</td>
<td>make</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>michel</td>
<td>great</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prechen</td>
<td>break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>raichen</td>
<td>reach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>riechen</td>
<td>smell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ficher</td>
<td>certain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ftechen</td>
<td>stab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fuchet</td>
<td>sought</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wachen</td>
<td>watch, wake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>waichen</td>
<td>soft, weak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>auch</td>
<td>also</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>billich</td>
<td>fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dach</td>
<td>roof</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dich</td>
<td>thee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>doch</td>
<td>nevertheless</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>endelich</td>
<td>finally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ich</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lauch</td>
<td>leek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mich</td>
<td>me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pach</td>
<td>brook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>muelich</td>
<td>troublesome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>puech</td>
<td>book</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sprach</td>
<td>spoke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plaich</td>
<td>pale</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
After /s/ PG /k/ always appears as ch.

1x afche 'ash'
1x erwünschen 'desire'
2x fleisch 'flesh'
90x gefchach 'caught sight of'
163x geschehen 'happened'
4x keufche 'chaste, chastity'
12x maifterchaft 'superiority, great power'
12x menfchen 'people'
59x ritterchaft 'chivalry'
148x schaden 'damage'
95x fchar 'host'
63x fchein 'appearance'
75x fchiere 'simply'
47x schild 'shield'
97x fchone 'beautiful'
44x schulden 'debt, to owe'
15x tische 'table'
8x vifche 'fish'
5x vnkenfche 'unchaste'
5x wunfch 'wish'
14x zwifchen 'between'
Summary

Germanic /k/ displays the same level of shifting as PG /t/. In initial position, Ried clearly indicates the affricate /kx/ with the spellings kh and ch, though his normal spelling is k. In initial position before consonants he sets k, c, and, only before /r/, ch. This last is unusual in that, contrary to the belief that this spelling derives from the Latin practice of designating Greek χ with ch, Ried never uses ch in Christ or related forms.

After sonants and in gemination, Ried uses "simple" and complex graphs (i.e., graphic combinations concluding or not concluding with h) to spell the reflex of PG /k/: ck, gk, and gg; and ch, kh, ckh, and gkh. His use of augmented graphs, ie. graphs with h appended, suggests that the sound in question is an affricate, rather than a simple stop. This is precisely what one should expect in this position for PG /k/.

Ried's use of the grapheme ch in this position, however, causes some problems. This grapheme is Ried's usual representation of intervocalic PG /k/ and post-consonantal PG /h/ and as such must represent /x/. If one considers the fact that Ried always spells stark with ch and that in the modern dialect of Imst, PG /k/ after liquids is represented by /x/, the value of PG /k/ after liquids in the manuscript becomes uncertain.

Ried writes ch for the reflex of post-vocalic single PG /k/. For the cluster PG /sk/ he writes sch.
5.3 Germanic Voiced Obstruents

5.3.1 Germanic /b/

For the reflex of PG /b/ in initial position, Ried writes p (36%) and b (64%), and very rarely (less than 1%) w. Ried shows a slight preference for p as the reflex of PG /b/ in this position, though he consistently spells the prefix be- with b, except in the case of piderb where he evidently does not recognize the first element as a prefix (cf. MGer. bieder).

13x erparmen ‘have mercy’ 84x burge ‘castles’
66x gepot ‘commanded’ 9x biderbe ‘distinguished
8x pach ‘brook’ 1x bitte ‘image’
5x paine ‘bones’ 1x enbieten ‘summon’
2x payzlant ‘Bavaria’ 2x bayzlant ‘Bavaria’
15x perge ‘mountains’ 159x baide ‘both’
78x pefte ‘best’ 45x balde ‘soon’
19x piderbe ‘distinguished’ 139x bas ‘better’
6x pilde ‘image’ 7x beheim ‘Bohemia’
31x piten ‘request’ 336x bey ‘by’
133x poten ‘messenger’ 16x billich ‘fair’
7x puech ‘book’ 4x redebare ‘honest’
6x pueffe ‘contrition’ 3x ymbis ‘snack’
24x purge ‘castles’
7x verpozgen ‘hidden’
In initial position before consonants, Ried represents PG /b/ by \( p \) or \( b \). Ried prefers \( p \) before /l/ (85%) and \( b \) before /r/ (52%).

2x _armpzuften_ ‘crossbows’
3x _erplichen_ ‘paled’
10x _gepzaft_ ‘burst’
3x _plint_ ‘blind’
12x _plos_ ‘simply’
10x _plûmen_ ‘flowers’
23x _plût_ ‘blood’
7x _prach_ ‘broke’
24x _prait_ ‘broad’
7x _prechen_ ‘break’
2x _prennen_ ‘burn’
2x _pringen_ ‘bring’
8x _pziot_ ‘bread’
1x _zerpplaûen_ ‘bruise’
6x _zerprochen_ ‘broken’

PG /b/ after nasals has apparently been lost, though Ried does occasionally indicate it by setting a \( b \) (4%).
The geminate PG /bb/ is spelled *pp* everywhere except in the words *sippe* and *üppig* and related forms where it is occasionally indicated by a single *p* (16%).

Ried consistently sets *b* for PG /b/ after liquids. On rare occasions (less than 1%) he does, however, set *w* in this position.

1x *alb* ‘fairy’  
1x *garwe* ‘sheaf’  
30x *allenthalben* ‘everywhere’  
9x *baidenthalben* ‘on both sides’  
9x *biderbe* ‘distinguished’
Single, postvocalic /b/ appears in the manuscript as b. Before open juncture and before voiceless stops it also appears as p (1%).
In initial position, Ried vacillates between b and p as a designation for the reflex of PG /b/. Clearly, the opposition of /b/ and /p/ has been neutralized in this position, as is to be expected of a text of Austro-Bavarian origin.

Though Ried sometimes writes b for PG /b/ after /m/, it is clear from the mm spellings, as well as from hypercorrect spellings (cf. "Germanic /m/"), that PG /b/ has been assimilated to /m/ in this position. Thus mb can be seen as an allograph for mm.

The geminate pre-HG /bb/ appears as pp, rarely as p, and in these cases, always intervocalically. It should be noted that in intervocalic position, b does not contrast with p, thus Ried's p-spellings in this position are unambiguous.

For PG /b/ after liquids, Ried writes b or, very rarely, w (cf. "Germanic /w/")
Ried writes $b$ for post-vocalic single PG /b/. Before open juncture (and once before $t$), he also sets $p$ (Auslautverhärtung).

5.3.2 Germanic /d/

Ried writes initial PG /d/ $t$, or occasionally $th$ (10%).

$2x$ betaubet ‘deafened’
$308x$ getan ‘done’
$19x$ getar ‘dare’
$167x$ tag ‘day’
$76x$ tail ‘part’
$26x$ taten ‘did’
$175x$ tet ‘would do’
$11x$ teifel ‘devil’
$11x$ tewze ‘dear’
$20x$ tieffen ‘deep’
$15x$ tischel ‘table’
$106x$ tochter ‘daughter’
$89x$ todt ‘dead, death’
$18x$ tu ‘do’
$10x$ tumben ‘dumb’
$39x$ tugende ‘virtue’

$4x$ thet ‘would do’
$40x$ thu ‘do’
$4x$ thumen ‘dumb’
In initial position before /r/ PG /d/ always appears as t.

21x betragen ‘behave’
2x ertrincken ‘drown’
1x getrauret ‘lamented’
1x getrawmet ‘dreamed’
118x tragen ‘carry’
14x traib ‘drove’
5x trawzen ‘lament’
1x treāget ‘betrays’
7x trincken ‘drink’
2x tropfe ‘drop’
2x truebe ‘dreary’
1x vertraib ‘drove away’

After nasals PG /d/ appears as d everywhere. Before open juncture, Ried sets d (61%), dt (8%) and t (31%).

12x befonnder ‘special’
39x ennde ‘end’
4x freānd ‘friend’
6x freānt ‘friend’
18x freundt ‘friend’
32x freunde ‘friend’
48x funden ‘found’
8x hand ‘hand’
150x hant ‘have’
107x hant ‘hand’
47x hannde ‘hand’
25x hinder ‘behind’
Ried writes the pre-HG geminate /dd/ with tt (97%) and t (3%).
Ried's treatment of PG /d/ after liquids is somewhat unusual. After /r/ he consistently sets t or, finally, dt, whereas after /l/ he vacillates between d, dt, and t in medial (d: 33%; dt: 1%; t: 65%) as well as final position (d: 3%; dt: 1%; t: 96%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2x dulten</td>
<td>'endure'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6x garte</td>
<td>'garden'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1x garten</td>
<td>'garden'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3x gärtn</td>
<td>'belt'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126x hart</td>
<td>'hard'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4x hardt</td>
<td>'hard'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29x herten</td>
<td>'hard'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18x milte</td>
<td>'generous'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38x schilt</td>
<td>'shield'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2x schildt</td>
<td>'shield'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171x folte</td>
<td>'should have'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9x vierden</td>
<td>'fourth'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10x wartet</td>
<td>'waits'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2x wartman</td>
<td>'guard'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>235x wirt</td>
<td>'host'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14x wirte</td>
<td>'host'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31x wort</td>
<td>'word'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22x wusten</td>
<td>'words'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6x dulden</td>
<td>'endure'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1x milden</td>
<td>'generous'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47x schild</td>
<td>'shield'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1x folde</td>
<td>'should have'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For postvocalic, single PG /d/ Ried generally sets t (94%), though tt (6%) spellings are not uncommon.
For the reflex of initial PG /d/, Ried sets t or th, the latter chiefly in forms of the verb tun. For PG /d/ after nasals he writes d, or dt or t before open juncture. He writes t and dt after liquids in all positions, but occasionally sets d after /l/.
In general, Ried sets \( tt \) for pre-HG geminate /dd/, though rarely he sets \( t \) before open juncture or after short syllables.

The reflex of single PG /d/ is much more troublesome. Ried seems to prefer \( t \) for this sound, but often sets \( tt \) intervocally so that the inconsistency cannot be attributed to fortition before open juncture.

5.3.3 Germanic /g/

Ried sets \( g \) for PG /g/ in initial position. I have found no \( k \) spellings in the manuscript.

2x angee 'approach'
170x began 'do'
120x gab 'gave'
2x galgen 'gallows'
355x gar 'quite'
113x geben 'give'
71x gedacht 'thought'
41x geet 'go'
28x gefangen 'captured'
94x gegen 'against'
11x gelten 'be valid'
28x gemaine 'common'
115x genüg ‘enough’
274x gerne ‘gladly’
127x gefte ‘guests’
471x güt ‘good’
23x vergeffen ‘forget’
19x vngerne ‘reluctantly’

In initial position before resonants PG /g/ appears as g.

8x begraben ‘buried’
2x begriff ‘concept’
2x glantz ‘sparkle’
5x glät ‘heat’
10x graben ‘dig’
5x gral ‘grail’
26x gras ‘grass’
16x graue ‘count’
2x greiffen ‘sieze’
12x grejffen ‘sieze’
6x grießen ‘greet’
7x grüßen ‘greet’
101x groffen ‘great’
3x gråene ‘green’
8x grunde ‘ground’
18x grümme ‘grim’
54x marggraue ‘margrave’
Ried represents PG /g/ after nasals most commonly by \textit{g}, though before open juncture he also uses the variants \textit{gk} (2\%), \textit{ck} (2\%), and \textit{ckh} (1\%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>\textit{anfang} 'beginning'</td>
<td>1x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\textit{anfangk} 'beginning'</td>
<td>1x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\textit{begangen} 'committed'</td>
<td>4x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\textit{ding} 'thing'</td>
<td>55x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\textit{dingen} 'things'</td>
<td>58x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\textit{erklingen} 'resound'</td>
<td>12x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\textit{gang} 'path'</td>
<td>4x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\textit{gangen} 'went'</td>
<td>1x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\textit{hangen} 'hang'</td>
<td>3x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\textit{hunger} 'hunger'</td>
<td>4x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\textit{jung} 'young'</td>
<td>9x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\textit{junge} 'young'</td>
<td>75x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\textit{klang} 'noise'</td>
<td>5x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\textit{lang} 'long'</td>
<td>41x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\textit{lanng} 'long'</td>
<td>35x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\textit{ring} 'ring'</td>
<td>17x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\textit{ringen} 'rings'</td>
<td>42x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\textit{sprang} 'sprang'</td>
<td>31x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\textit{twang} 'impelled'</td>
<td>1x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\textit{twingen} 'impel'</td>
<td>2x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\textit{klangk} 'noise'</td>
<td>3x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\textit{langk} 'long'</td>
<td>3x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\textit{ringk} 'ring'</td>
<td>1x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\textit{gesprangk} 'sprang'</td>
<td>1x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\textit{zwancksal} 'coercion'</td>
<td>1x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\textit{iünckhfrawen} 'maiden'</td>
<td>1x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*
The geminate /gg/ appears in the manuscript as ck (14%), gk (62%), or gkh (24%).

1x ecke ‘corner’ 6x egke ‘corner’
1x psucken ‘bridges’ 2x prugke ‘bridge’
1x rucken ‘back’ 8x rugke ‘back’
1x zuckie ‘twitched’ 1x zugket ‘twitches’ 1x rugkhen ‘back’
1x hengket ‘hangs’ 6x zugkhet ‘twitches’

PG /g/ after liquids is written g (65%), ch (30%), and gk (5%), the latter two being found only before open juncture.

41x burg ‘castle’ 1x burch ‘castle’
84x burge ‘castles’ 1x burgkfrawen ‘lady’
11x march ‘marrow’
4x karg ‘niggardly’
2x kargen ‘stingy’
109x mozgen ‘morning, morrow’
15x perg ‘mountain’
15x perge ‘mountains’
12x foeg ‘sorrow’
97x foegen ‘sorrow’
7x verpoegen ‘hidden’
24x volgen ‘follow’
6x volg ‘follow’
Postvocalic, single /g/ appears in all positions as g (70%), before open juncture as gk (2%) and k (28%).

4x achtzig ‘eighty’
320x degen ‘warrior’
32x erflagen ‘slay’
1x ewig ‘eternal’
2x ewige ‘eternal’
19x klage ‘lament’
10x klag ‘lament’
308x kunig ‘king’
85x lag ‘lay’
36x lagen ‘lay’
329x mag ‘may’
194x manigen ‘many a’
26x mågen ‘may’
58x phlag ‘cared for’
86x phlegen ‘care for’
7x triegen ‘betray’
122x tråg ‘carried’
9x vogl ‘bird’
60x weygant ‘warrior’

13x viertzigk ‘forty’
2x ewigklichen ‘eternal’
1x rainklich ‘purely’
3x gewaltigklichn ‘violent’
4x gewaltiklich ‘violently’
1x kângkleiche ‘royal’

* 1x achtzick ‘eighty’
Summary

Ried uses $g$ to represent PG /g/ in initial position. For PG /g/ after nasals he sets $g$, or $gk$, $k$, $ck$, or $ckh$ before open juncture. This last variant is troubling as a representation for PG /g/, since it normally indicates an affricate.

For the pre-HG geminate /gg/, Ried writes $ch$, $gk$, and $gkh$. Again, the affricate grapheme $gkh$ is problematic as a representation of PG /gg/, since it seems to betray a confusion of PG /kk/, which one expects to develop into /kx/, and PG /gg/, which one expects to become /kk/.

The reflex of PG /g/ after liquids is written $g$, or $gk$ or $ch$ before open juncture.

Ried writes $g$ for post-vocalic single PG /g/. Before open juncture he also writes $gk$ and $k$.

5.4 Germanic Resonants

5.4.1 Germanic /m/

Germanic /m/ shows very little variation in the manuscript. In initial position it is always represented by $m$:
In post-vocalic position the only remarkable phenomenon with regard to PG /m/ is Ried's occasional doubled spellings. With the exception of the doublings after /t/ and the verb 'ziemen', Ried's doubled spellings coincide with modern German orthography.

In the case of frummen, one can clearly see that false analogy with words such as tumb - tummen is at work:

- 9x cammerere 'chamberlain' 1x camer 'chamber'
- 1x kamerere 'chamberlain'
- 2x erparmmen 'mercy'
- 15x frumen 'pious' 8x frumb 'pious'
2x gezýmmet 'is seemly'  
43x iammer 'misery'  
26x kemmenaten 'chamber'  
2x kummen 'come'  
147x nýmmer 'never'  
1x parmnunge 'mercy'  
1x sturmmen 'storm'  
1x zefammen 'together'  
1x zýmet 'is seemly'  
3x iamer 'misery'  

In intervocalic position, PG /m/ occurs most frequently as m (93%), and infrequently as mm (7%).

28x bekomen 'receive'  
16x dahaýme 'home'  
6x frumet 'is fitting'  
108x genomen 'taken'  
1x getzimet 'is seemly'  
20x haýme 'home'  
19x himele 'heaven'  
3x iamer 'suffering'  
364x komen 'come'  
84x namen 'name'  
10x plûmen 'flower'  
10x schame 'shame'  
1x haýmme 'home'  

1x himmel 'heaven'  
43x iammer 'suffering'  
14x sturmen 'storm'  
10x zefamen 'together'  
1x parmunge 'mercy'  
4x summer 'summer'  
2x zýmmet 'is seemly'
Summary

Ried writes \( m \) for PG /m/ everywhere. After /r/ he often sets double \( mm \), as well as after short syllables and almost always in agreement with Modern German orthography.

5.4.2 Germanic /n/

As with PG /m/ there is little remarkable about Ried's treatment of PG /n/. In initial position \( n \) is set exclusively:

33x benomen 'taken'
5x erneren 'nourish'
96x genant 'called'
542x nach 'after'
57x nemen 'take'
91x nider 'down'
295x nie 'never'
503x noch 'still'
195x not 'need'
147x njimmer 'never'
138x vernomen 'perceived'
1x vnnutze 'useless'
Before open juncture Ried will occasionally double an n (less than 1%), though this is by no means a usual occurrence:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>redenn</em> 'speak'</td>
<td>1x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>reyten</em> 'ride'</td>
<td>1x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>roffen</em> 'horses'</td>
<td>1x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>fagenn</em> 'say'</td>
<td>1x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>fehenn</em> 'see'</td>
<td>1x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>ftechenn</em> 'stab'</td>
<td>1x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>vonn</em> 'from'</td>
<td>3x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>reden</em> 'speak'</td>
<td>12x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>reyten</em> 'ride'</td>
<td>13x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>roffen</em> 'horses'</td>
<td>18x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>fagen</em> 'say'</td>
<td>213x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>fehen</em> 'see'</td>
<td>108x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>ftechen</em> 'stab'</td>
<td>3x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>von</em> 'from'</td>
<td>2454x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The pre-HG geminate /nn/ occurs in the manuscript as *nn*, sometimes as *n*. Ried represents the geminate with a single *n* chiefly before open juncture or when it is the first element of a cluster. In the case of *gewine* it seems likely, due to the relative scarcity of abbreviations in the manuscript, that Ried set the tilde to correct what he must have perceived as an incorrect *n*-spelling.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>bekannt</em> 'known'</td>
<td>23x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>gewinnen</em> 'gain'</td>
<td>25x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>gunnen</em> 'grant'</td>
<td>9x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>mann</em> 'man'</td>
<td>22x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>sunnen</em> 'sun'</td>
<td>14x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>wunne</em> 'bliss'</td>
<td>24x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>bekant</em> 'known'</td>
<td>72x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>gewine</em> 'gain'</td>
<td>1x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>man</em> 'man'</td>
<td>2304x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>wünen</em> 'bliss'</td>
<td>1x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In intervocalic position, PG /n/ occurs most frequently as n (95%), and infrequently as nn (5%).

104x ainem ‘a’ 1x kâenne ‘bold’
46x ane ‘without’
31x gedianet ‘served’
28x gemaine ‘common’
71x kâene ‘bold’.
308x kunig ‘king’
33x lone ‘reward’
144x maniger ‘many a’
1x monat ‘month’
37x raine ‘pure’
99x schone ‘beautiful’

When PG /n/ appears as the first element of a consonant cluster, Ried’s usage fluctuates between nn and n, the former being slightly more common. It is clear that in this position he recognizes no distinction between nn and n:

85x anndern ‘other’ 14x andern ‘other’
12x befonnder ‘special’ 1x befonder ‘special’
11x danncken ‘thank’ 18x dancken ‘thank’
14x ellennde ‘miserable’ 20x ellende ‘miserable’
6x emphanngen ‘receive’ 21x emphangen ‘receive’
39x ennde ‘end’ 35x ende ‘end’
As with PG /m/, Ried show the same penchant for doubling PG /n/ (37%) after /r/:

1x dozznen 'thorns'
1x ernneft 'earnest'
1x hochgeboznnen 'high-born'
7x lernnen 'learn'
1x stirnnen 'brow'
1x warnnen 'warn'
2x zoznn 'anger'
4x zoznnen 'anger'
1x zûrnnet 'is angry'

1x dozn 'thorn'
3x ernnft 'earnest'
1x hochgeboznn 'high-born'
3x lernen 'learn'
1x stirne 'brow'
1x warnen 'warn'
65x zozn 'anger'
38x zozne 'anger'
3x zûrnet 'is angry'
The prefix *ent-* shows assimilation to *em(p)*- before labials:

1x *enntwenken* ‘be unfaithful’
1x *entplenndet* ‘blinded’
2x *entrunnen* ‘flowed away’

14x *empern* ‘do wothout’
27x *empahen* ‘receive’
28x *empot* ‘summoned’

The assimilation of final /m/ to /n/ when it is an inflectional element (Dat. Plur. - *en*, 1. Sg. Pres. Ind. *han, bin*) is fully realized (cf. Braune 1975 §124). In addition, final /m/ in unstressed syllables does not regularly show development to /n/:

1x *chzadem* ‘din’
3x *gadem* ‘room’
1x *fadem* ‘thread’
1x *puefem* ‘breast’
1x *pâfem* ‘breast’
1x *pâfm* ‘breast’

*Summary*

Ried sets *n* for single PG /n/, *nn* for pre-HG /nn/, which he also spells *n* before open juncture. He often writes double *nn* for single PG /n/ before consonants and after liquids.
5.4.3 Germanic /l/

After open juncture, PG /l/ remains unchanged and is represented by l:

80x beleiben ‘remain’
11x erlaubet ‘allows’
12x gelait ‘accompanied’
24x gelegen ‘lay’
150x laid ‘suffering’
229x lannde ‘land’
201x leben ‘life’
366x leib ‘body’
138x liebe ‘love’
73x lob ‘praise’
8x miffelingen ‘fail’
24x verliefen ‘lose’

Ried writes l for post-vocalic single PG /l/. He infrequently sets ll (12%) and then chiefly in consonant clusters or after short vowels:

1x gallt ‘held’
1x helffen ‘help’
2x hellme ‘helmet’
4x helt ‘hero’
2x Hildebrzande ‘Hildebrand’

9x gallt ‘held’
11x helffe ‘help’
33x helme ‘helmet’
270x helt ‘hero’
4x Hildebrzande ‘Hildebrand’
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34x *füllen* ‘shall’
1x *unzählig* ‘uncountable’
1x *wilden* ‘wild’
1x *wollen* ‘will’
1x *wollen* ‘will’
1x *zwolf* ‘twelve’

Ried regularly writes *ll* for pre-HG /ll/ , except before open juncture, where he sets *l* (12%) as well. He never sets *l* for /ll/ in medial position, and minimal pairs of *l* and *ll* can be found in this position:

438x *alle* ‘all’
4x *ellenthaffte* ‘powerful’
12x *geuallen* ‘please’
19x *helle* ‘bright’
13x *fchalle* ‘resonance’
9x *fchnelle* ‘quick’
13x *vollen* ‘full’
56x *welle* ‘will’
132x *willen* ‘will’

For intervocalic PG /ll/, Ried writes *l* (98%), and, very rarely, *ll* (2%).

2x *dieweile* ‘because’
32x *edele* ‘noble’
3x *erholen* ‘recover’
8x *eylen* ‘hurry’

3x *beuollen* ‘commanded’
34x *sullen* ‘shall’
1x *wollan* ‘tally-ho’
1x *wollauf* ‘well!’
Summary

Ried writes l for the reflex of PG single /l/, but also ll in clusters, and rarely after short vowels. For pre-HG geminate /ll/ he generally writes ll, though he often sets l before open juncture.

5.4.4 Germanic /r/, /z/

In initial position Ried always sets r for PG /r/

56x berait ‘ready’
15x geraten ‘counseled’
119x rait ‘rode’
18x raŷfe ‘journey’
222x recken ‘warriors’
29x rieten ‘guessed’
75x rofs ‘horse’

For the pre-HG geminate /rr/ and for PG /rz/ Ried sets rr. Before open juncture he also sets r (less than 1%).

1x befperzet ‘locked’
1x durre ‘dry’
7x gewirret ‘was confused’
1x harre ‘lie in wait’
120x herz ‘lord’
147x her ‘lord’
255x herre ‘lord’
2x irret ‘erred’
6x irre ‘crazy’
1x phnurrret ‘puffs up’

In intervocalic position, Ried writes single r for PG /r/, very rarely he writes rr (less than 1%) in this position.

11x bewaren ‘preserve’
238x ere ‘honor’
25x ewren ‘your’
31x fileren ‘lead’
110x here ‘noble’

2x gewerre ‘defend’
1x sparen ‘beams’
1x werre ‘defend’
1x werren ‘defend’
40x hōren 'hear'
8x iare 'years'
241x måre 'story'
9x oren 'ears'
78x schiere 'sheer'
245x sere 'very'
318x waren 'were'
5x ziere 'attractive'

Summary

Germanic single /r/ appears in the manuscript as r, as does PG /z/ where it has been retained. The pre-HG geminate /rr/ and PG /rz/ have fallen together and are written rr, and also r before open juncture.

5.5 Germanic Glides

5.5.1 Germanic /w/

Initial PG /w/ is represented in Ried’s orthography by w, rarely by b (1%). The latter variant, with one exception (beybosc), occurs exclusively when open juncture follows a liquid:
With one exception where he sets w (and rhymes with Gilbe), Ried consistently writes b for PG /w/ after liquids:

1x Gilbe 'yellow'
1x Marbes 'tender'
1x Sparbere 'sparrow'
1x [m]Jilwe 'mite'
2x Valbe 'fallow'
17x Varbe 'color'
Summary

Ried sets \( w \) for initial and intervocalic PG /w/, for which he sometimes writes \( b \). He very rarely sets \( b \) in initial position, and then chiefly when it is the second element of a compound and follows a liquid. After liquids (without intervening open juncture), Ried always sets \( b \), except in \( \text{wilwe} \) (in \( \text{die böse Frau} \)), where his understanding of the text is questionable. The correct reading is \( \text{milbe} \).

5.5.2 Germanic /j/

Ried recognizes 3 spellings for PG /j/ in initial position: \( i \) (18%), \( j \) (64%), \( jh \) (less than 1%), and \( y \) (18%). By far the least common is \( jh \), while \( i \) and \( y \) are nearly equally distributed overall, though Ried clearly has preferences as to which variant is appropriate to a given root. It is interesting to note that, although the spellings with \( h \) are quite rare, they are not restricted to any one text (or to either of the two Vorlagen that Unterkircher posits [see "The Scribe"]), but are scattered throughout the manuscript (1 in \( \text{die Klage} \), 8 in \( \text{Biterolf} \), 3 in \( \text{Kudrun} \), 1 in \( \text{Wolfdietrich A} \), 1 in \( \text{der nackte Kaiser} \), 1 in \( \text{die böse Frau} \), and one in \( \text{Titurel} \)).
Germanic /j/ after consonants sometimes caused gemination and has been reduced to /ə/ (cf. Braune 1975:§§96-99).

Summary

Ried sets /, y, and jh for initial PG /j/, the last variant being quite rare.
5.6 Konsonantenhäufungen

\(<b>\)

bp occurs only twice: liebplichen, weybplih. This construction could be construed as an indication of the voiceless nature of the /b/, just as the t in many dt spellings has been. The rarity of this spelling, however, considered together with the abundance of pl spellings for the bound root /-lix-/ after nasals, indicates that it is either epenthetic or that -plich- is considered an allomorph of the bound root /-lix-/.

The latter seems more probable since Ried does not otherwise indicate devoicing of /b/ with bp but with p.

bb, a spelling for which one would expect pp in Bavarian (Moser 1951:119), occurs twice in abbt. The etymology of the word, however, neatly explains this spelling: from Church L. abbās, acc. abbātem.
\( \langle d \rangle \)

\( dh \) Ried uses this spelling frequently in \( dhain-(dhein-) \) 'none' which he spells thus 311 times, as opposed to 90 \( kain-(kein-) \) spellings. Thornton (1953) assumes that this is purely a spelling convention for this word. The fact that this grapheme does not occur elsewhere supports this assumption.

\( dw \) occurs once for NHG /zw/ in \( dwerhes \), otherwise it is the result of normal development (syncope, etc.): \( dweders < MHG deweders, Ludwig- \).

\( dt \) occurs frequently for final /d/: \( brandt, enhanndt, erdtreich, fandt \). In this position it seems to be an indication of devoicing since it occurs in this position only for the phoneme /d/ never for /t/.

Additionally, Ried uses this spelling for verbal forms ending in /-dət/ that have undergone syncope: \( 1x gepadt, 7x redte \). In fact, Ried's use of \( dt \) in \( riedt \) indicates that he may have construed the spelling as a verbal ending, regardless of whether the root syllable ends in /d/ or not.

Finally, Ried sets \( dt \) once for Gmc /d/ medially after /n/ and liquids (\( vnndter \)). One could attribute this to the influence of the Vorlage, for in this position MHG /d/ has become /t/ in the Tirolean dialect. If we assume a \( d \) spelling in Ried's copy-text, then
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it is hardly surprising that he set \( dt \), an alternate spelling for \( /t/ \). One could also attribute this spelling to a neutralization of the fortis-lenis distinction in this position, such as Schatz (1897:19-20) describes as operating in the dialect of Imst.

\( \langle f \rangle \)

\( ff \) occurs intervocally (and after liquids) only for Gmc. \(^{-}p^{-}/\), never for Gmc. \(^{-}f^{-}/\). It also occurs frequently before \( /t/ \) e.g., in the bound root \( /-\text{aft}-/\), and in word-final position where fortis and lenis would naturally be confused due to Auslautverhärtung. Ried uses this spelling in \( \text{durffen} \), though this form could be explained as levelling from those forms that have no ending. See "Germanic \( /p/\)" and "Germanic \( /t/\)"

\( \langle g \rangle \)

\( gk \) occurs frequently for \( /g/ \) before open juncture, presumably as an indication of devoicing. It stands for Gmc. \(^{-}kk/\) in free variation with \( ck \), apparently as a result of the High German Consonant Shift causing the merger of Gmc. \(^{-}gg/\) with Gmc. \(^{-}kk/\). This assessment, however, is problematic, since Gmc. \( /kk/ \) should develop into \( /kx/ \) in Ried's dialect, and Gmc. \( /gg/ \) into \( /kk/ \). The expected opposition of \( /kk/ \) and \( /kx/ \) is not
displayed in the manuscript and in some cases Ried even uses affricate spellings for the reflex of simple Gmc. /g/. See "Germanic /g/"

\[ k \]

Single \( k \) is used primarily in initial position for the reflex of Gmc. */k/*. In addition, Ried uses this spelling before the bound root */-lix/ - */-leix/, and in words of foreign origin: baldekin - paltekin, ekunares, mautekein, milkem, ykaria, zirkare; Exceptions to this rule seem to be: Neitkeres, wanketen, werken.

The Use of single \( k \) for */g/ in the combination */ig + l(e)ix/* is by far the most prevalent in the MS. Ried uses this spelling 297 times while using \( gk \) only 15 times, and \( ck \) never. Given the great frequency with which these two morphemes (*/-ig/* and */-lix/*) occur together, it is probable that the combination has been falsely analyzed, that the allophone [k] of */g/ has been analyzed as belonging to the morpheme */-lix/*, thus giving an allomorph [−klix] of */-lix/*. If this is the case, then the [k] would be construed as the first element of the bound root */-lix/* and would thus need to be spelled with a simple \( k \) rather than the \( ck \) that Ried usually uses. It is also possible that Ried uses simple \( k \), because the phonetic value devoiced */g/* is not identical to */k/* which, I believe, is best interpreted as */kh/*. 
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Ried regularly uses $ck$ to indicate the reflex of Gmc. */k/ in post-consonantal position as well as for Gmc. */gg/, for which he uses the spelling $gk$ as well. Thus $ck$ occurs precisely where the affricate */kh/ is to be expected in a dialect that is *streng oberdeutsch*.

The spelling $ck$ is not to be considered a senseless proliferation of consonants as it is often called in the handbooks (Brook 1955:xliii-xliv; Moser 1929:1.1.39). It is rather to be seen as a levelling of the geminate form in preference over that of the initial or post-consonantal form.

nn occurs frequently after $r$, after short vowels (*tennemarch, Annen 'Ahnen' < MHG an(e)*), and in consonant clusters /nt, nd, nk(x)/. It is normal in the form annder-.

Ried regularly uses $ss$ to indicate the reflexes of OHG /zz/ and Gmc. */ss/ which correspond to the fortis /s/ in the dialect. Ried often uses this spelling before open
juncture, regardless of the origin of the phoneme in question, to indicate final "devoicing" of the lenis /z/. Schatz 1897 discusses the character of final consonants at some length and maintains that in the dialect of Imst all final consonants are realized as semi-fortes and are in fact somewhat longer in duration than their lenis counterparts. Such a semi-fortis realization would account for the spellings found in the MS.

⟨z⟩

Ried almost always distinguishes the pronoun das and conjunction daβ in the manuscript as das and daz. As Thornton 1953 points out, this is perhaps the earliest attestation of such a consistent distinction between conjunction and pronoun.

Ried occasionally writes z for /s/ (see "Germanic /s/", "Germanic /t/"") but such cases are rare and should probably be attributed to the Vorlage.
6.0 Conclusion

6.1 Graphic Analysis

From the preceding discussion, one can create the systematic overview of Ried's graphic usage found in figure 1. This system of graphs is further simplified, if one takes those graphs that occur in free variation to be allographs of a common grapheme. Thus, since \( dt \) always occurs in free variation with \( t \), these graphic units can be said to be allographs of the grapheme \( \langle t \rangle \). Similarly \( f \) and \( v \), \( ph \) and \( pf \), \( ch \) and \( h \) in medial position, and \( b \) and \( p \) in initial position can be said to be allographs of \( \langle f \rangle, \langle ph \rangle, \langle ch \rangle, \) and \( \langle b \rangle \), respectively.

In the case of \( ch \) it is difficult to determine whether the graph represents the fricative \( /x/ \) or the affricate \( /kx/ \) in medial position after liquids, and thus whether it is indeed in free variation with \( ck, gk, gg, kh, ckh, \) and \( gkh \). In his *Tirolische Mundart* (1903:11-12) Schatz maintains, as does Kranzmayer (1956:109), that after \( /r/ \) and \( /l/ \), PG \( /k/ \) is shifted to \( /x/ \) in the Tyrolean Dialects, while after nasals it is shifted to \( /kx/ \). Ried's usage does not seem to be consistent with this state of development. He often uses \( ch \)-spellings for PG \( /k/ \) after \( /r/ \), which could be interpreted as indicative of development of the Proto-Germanic phoneme to \( /x/ \) in this position. If we are indeed dealing with the phoneme \( /x/ \), then Ried's use of \( ck \) is troubling, as it is used elsewhere to signify the affricate \( /kx/ \).
Figure 1.

Graphs in Relation to Proto-Germanic

Parentheses indicate that the graph is rare as a reflex of the Proto-Germanic phoneme in that position. I am holding to Hans Moser's (1977:58-59) convention of using dashes to indicate oppositions, tildes for neutralizations, and arrows to indicate oppositions that may be neutralized in one direction: \(<ai> \rightarrow \langle ei\rangle\) means that \(<ai>\) can also be written \(<ei>\). Superscript numbers indicate further restrictions on the position in which the graph corresponds to the Proto-Germanic phoneme (note that these restrictions apply to all graphs in a set of neutralized graphs):

1 In clusters.
2 Before open juncture.
3 After nasals.
4 After liquids.
5 Before fricatives.
6 Before resonants.
7 After short vowels.
8 When an inflectional element, and in the prefix ent- before labials.
9 After fricatives.
Further evidence against positing /x/ after liquids is the total absence of ch-spellings after /l/. One could argue that the lack of examples of PG /lk/ in the text (only in the roots of *falcken, volck, and wolcken*) gives a skewed impression of the phonetic situation, and that Ried uses *ck* as a graphic variant of *ch* in this position. Such an argument, however, does not address the fact that the normal spelling in this position, *ck*, is by far the most common representation of the affricate in the manuscript. If we consider also, that there existed a tradition of using *ch* to designate the affricate (Braune 1975:§173; Paul/Wiehl/Grosse 1989:§157-70; Schatz 1907:§62, Moulton 1989:73), but no such tradition of indicating the fricative with *ck*, then it becomes increasingly less likely that we are dealing with a fricative in this position.

Ried also sets *ch* after /n/, where it must designate the affricate (Schatz 1903:11), as well as for PG /g/ after /r/ before open juncture, where, as the result of Auslautverhärtung, it must designate the affricate (Kranzmayer 1956:§27d; Braune 1975:§149, Anm. 5). Considering that there are no hypercorrect ck-spellings for PG /h/ after /r/, which we should expect if *ck* is simply a graphic variant of *ch* in this position, it is clear that PG /h/ and PG /k/ have not fallen together after liquids, and that Ried’s use of *ch* in this position should be viewed as a conservative retention of the spelling *ch* for the affricate /kh/. Thus we can say that *ch* is an allograph of *k* in this position.

Ried’s h-augmented spellings both for the affricate reflexes of PG /k/ and for the reflex of geminate pre-HG /gg/ are also problematic. The Modern Tyrolean counterparts of these phonemes, /kx/ and /k/ (Wiesinger 1990:458), show that these phonemes have
not merged. Ried, however, seems not to distinguish between them, using the same
graphs for both phonemes. Closer inspection reveals that what appears to be arbitrariness
on Ried’s part is probably honest confusion.

Though *h*-spellings are infrequent for PG /k/, they are quite rare for pre-HG /gg/,
which Ried spells *gkh* only ten times: once in *rugkhen*, and nine times in forms of
zugkhen. In the former case, *rugkhen* is a unique form, since Ried usually writes the
word with *gk*, and thus can easily be attributed to error or scribal confusion. *Zugkhen,*
however, is Ried’s usual form and cannot be explained away so easily.

The phoneme /k/ is somewhat unusual in the dialect, since it is restricted to words
of foreign origin and to reflexes of the geminate pre-HG /gg/ (Kranzmayer 1956:§37).
Furthermore, in the late Old High German period in South Tyrolean dialects, pre-HG
/gg/ before open juncture is realized as /kx/, while in medial position it reverts to /k/
yielding the alternation /k/ - /kx/, and in the South Bavarian ‘Stadt- und Verkehrs-
mundart’ the phoneme /k/ has been replaced with /kx/ in medial position (Kranzmayer
1956:§37 b, c). Therefore, a strong case can be made that Ried’s system did not possess
a distinct grapheme for this phoneme, and that, since /k/ alternates with /kx/, any <k>-graph
could be used to designate the sound. In addition, the use of *ck* and *gk* (i.e.
without *h*) for the affricate indicates that the *h*-graphs (*ckh, gkh*) no longer contrast with
*h*-less ones, but rather are graphic variants that give the reader no more information about
a particular form than do *ck* and *gk*. Thus it can be assumed that, in choosing the graph
*gkh* for the normal spelling of *zugkhen*, Ried simply chose one of the many variants of
ck available to him, and that his particular choice is in no way a reflection of the manner in which he might have pronounced the word in question.

The result of this analysis of the graphic inventory is the set of graphemes found in figure 2. The following graphemes have allographs:

\(<f>: f, v, u, \text{where } u \text{ usually occurs word-medially, } v \text{ word-initially.}\)

\(<i>: i, j, y, jh, \text{where } j \text{ and } jh \text{ are restricted to word-initial position.}\)

\(<k>: k, kh, ch, c, q, ck, gk, gg, ch, kh, ckh, gkh, \text{where only the first five may be used in initial position.}\)

\(<p>: p, pp, \text{where } pp \text{ occurs only intervocally.}\)

\(<r>: r, z, \text{where } z \text{ occurs mainly after } b, o, \text{ and } p, \text{ and at the ends of lines.}\)

\(<rr>: rr, rz, zz, t\)

\(<s>: f, s, \sigma, \text{where } f \text{ occurs in word-initial and word-medial position, } s \text{ and } \sigma \text{ in word-final position in free variation.}\)

\(<ss>: ff, fs, f\sigma, fz, \beta, (\sigma\sigma)\)

\(<t>: t, dt\)

\(<z>: z, tz, c (\text{before front vowels only})\)
6.2 Ried's Graphemic System

The system in figure 2 clearly shows that the effects of Auslautverhärehtung are more far reaching than the handbook accounts indicate (Paul/Wiehl/Grosse 1989:§86-91). Not only are b, d, and g effected, but reflexes of all the Proto-Germanic obstruents and sonants show alternations before open juncture as well. Not unexpectedly, Early New Tyrolean (ENT) medial /b, d, g/ (voiceless lenes) can be spelled ⟨p⟩, ⟨q⟩, and ⟨k⟩ in the manuscript. The lenes ENT /v, z, m, n, l, r/ from PG /f, s, m, n, l, r/ likewise show alternations before open juncture and may be spelled with graphs normally reserved for fortes ⟨ff⟩, ⟨ss⟩, ⟨mm⟩, ⟨nn⟩, ⟨ll⟩, and ⟨rr⟩. Similarly Ried sometimes spells the fortes ENT /s, f, s/ from PG /ss, p, tt/ with ⟨s⟩, ⟨f⟩, and ⟨s⟩ before open juncture; all of these graphemes represent lenes in other positions. Thus, it is clear that the distinction between fortis grapheme and lenis grapheme is neutralized before open juncture.

This is precisely what one should expect in the Tyrolean dialect area according to Kranzmayer (1956:§27d & Map 22). He maintains that modern dialect forms have preserved the effects of Auslautverhärehtung of liquids, nasals, and fricatives in Old High German, a fact that seems to have escaped V. Moser (1909:§§24, 130). In light of the evidence of this manuscript, it would be very difficult, and perhaps foolish, to disagree with Kranzmayer, for I can think of no better way to explain these alternations than to attribute them to Auslautverhärehtung.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>/f/</th>
<th>/p/</th>
<th>/b/</th>
<th>/m/</th>
<th>/w/</th>
<th>/j/</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Init.</td>
<td>/f/</td>
<td>/p/</td>
<td>/b/</td>
<td>/m/</td>
<td>/w/</td>
<td>/j/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Init.</td>
<td>(f)→(ff) &lt;sup&gt;1,2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;i&gt;χ&lt;/i&gt;</td>
<td>(b)→(p) &lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>(m)→(mm) &lt;sup&gt;2,4,7&lt;/sup&gt;, (n)→(nn) &lt;sup&gt;1,4&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>(w), (b)&lt;sup&gt;4&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>(i)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gem.</td>
<td>(f)→(ff) &lt;sup&gt;1,2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>(p)→(p)&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>(b)→(p)&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>(m)→(mm)&lt;sup&gt;2,4,7&lt;/sup&gt;, (n)→(nn)&lt;sup&gt;1,4&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>(w), (b)&lt;sup&gt;4&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>(i)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>/h/</th>
<th>/t/</th>
<th>/g/</th>
<th>/n/</th>
<th>/l/</th>
<th>/r/, /z/</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Init.</td>
<td>/h/</td>
<td>/t/</td>
<td>/g/</td>
<td>/n/</td>
<td>/l/</td>
<td>/r/, /z/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Init.</td>
<td>(h)→(h)&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>(g)&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;→(g)&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>(g)→(k)&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>(l)→(l)&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>(r)&lt;sup&gt;7&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>(r)&lt;sup&gt;7&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gem.</td>
<td>(h)&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;→(h)&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>(t)→(t)&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>(g)&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;→(g)&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>(n)→(nn)&lt;sup&gt;1,4&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>(l)→(l)&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>(r)&lt;sup&gt;7&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2.
Distinct Graphemes in Relation to Proto-Germanic

For notes, see Figure 1.
Auslautverhärtung, however, cannot be called upon for an explanation of all of Ried’s graphic doublings. Aside from unexpected doublings before open juncture, Ried doubles graphs with impunity in clusters as well (e.g. *erparmmen* ‘mercy’). As with all other unusual occurrences, certain aspects of this phenomenon, too, can be traced to the Tyrolean dialect area. Schatz (1897:20) writes that voiceless stops and fricatives, i.e., all stops and fricatives in South Bavarian, are pronounced as fortes when they are in clusters, whether lenis in combination with fortis or lenis with lenis. Kranzmayer (1956) and Wiesinger (1990) make no mention of this phenomenon, which leads me to assume that it is perhaps restricted to the dialect of Imst. V. Moser (1951:§140.3), Paul/Wiehl/Grosse (1989:§131-132), Schatz (1907:§77), Braune (1975:§139), and Kranzmayer (1956:§31b), however, all describe a neutralization of the distinction between the reflexes of PG /p/ and /f/ before /t/ and /s/. Kranzmayer maintains that pre-HG /f/ never underwent voicing (i.e. lenition) before /t,s/, and thus merged with the (fortis) voiceless fricative from PG /p/ in this position. It is clear, therefore, though none of the works cited state it explicitly, that PG /p,f/ have merged before /t/ in a voiceless *fortis* fricative. Thus, there is no fortis-lenis opposition in this position and the question of whether to set a single or double graph is moot, as in the case of Auslautverhärtung or initial PG /b/.

In trying to understand Ried’s other doublings in clusters, the evidence of the modern dialect offers little help. An inspection of the available studies of chancery languages also yields little. Hans Moser (1977:129, 132) describes regular doublings of
l and n in clusters, but forgoes any speculation as to the reason for these, while Tennant
(1985:139-40) is content simply to cite Moser. Thornton (1953:72-74) doubts that the
doubling of nasals in this manuscript has any phonetic significance, and points out that
already in the late 15th and early 16th centuries the doubling of consonants was decried
as an abuse. V. Moser (1929:\$30.4) points out that doublings of p, n, l, and r (of which
only n and l need concern us) in clusters are widespread by the end of the 15th century
and that in High German imprints in particular, such doublings are common until the end
of the 16th century. He fails, however, to offer any explanation for this phenomenon.

The distribution of intervocalic <n> and <nn>, <d> and <dd>, and <f> and <ff> shows
so clearly that Ried distinguished between single and double graphs in this position, that
the prevailing notion that the use of doubled graphs in clusters might be arbitrary, is
difficult to accept. Hans Moser (1978:44) interprets this apparent arbitrariness in the
Habsburg chancery by maintaining that for some graphemes there was no opposition
between single and double variants, and that therefore either could be used, the only
restriction being that when two such graphemes occur side by side, the doubled variant
may only be used for one. In Ried’s case it is clear that there is an opposition between
single and double variants of <f>, <n>, and <d> intervocally. The Proto-Germanic
geminates /mm, nn, ll/, however, as the result of assimilation processes (Prokosch
1938:85-86), do not occur in clusters with other consonants, nor do the results of the
West Germanic consonant gemination. Thus, single (lenis) /m, n, l/ and double (fortis)
/mm, nn, ll/ do not contrast in this position and may be written with either a single or
a double graph, just as initial ENT /p/ may be written 〈b〉 or 〈p〉, even though these graphemes stand in opposition intervocally.

If one compares Ried’s graphemic system (figure 3) with that of the Habsburg chancery as presented by Hans Moser (figure 4), one will notice some striking similarities. Not surprisingly, the oppositions 〈d〉 - 〈t〉, 〈f〉 - 〈ff〉, and 〈s〉 - 〈ss〉 are neutralized under certain conditions in both systems. Those conditions, however, are not always the same in each of the two systems. While the oppositions 〈f〉 - 〈ff〉, and 〈s〉 - 〈ss〉 hold, according to Moser (1977:258), only intervocally, in Ried’s orthography, the opposition is neutralized only before open juncture and, in the case of 〈f〉 - 〈ff〉, before voiceless stops, where the fortis can be written 〈ff〉.

The opposition 〈d〉 - 〈t〉 is neutralized in identical environments in the Habsburg chancery and in Ried’s orthography. Ried, however, does not distinguish a ‘neutralization variant’ (Hans Moser 1977:109), as Moser calls it, for this opposition. Moser claims that the graph 〈dt〉 is used only where the opposition 〈d〉 - 〈t〉 has been neutralized, e.g., before open juncture. Ried’s system, on the other hand, recognizes this graph as a variant of 〈t〉 that can be used without restriction.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stops</th>
<th>Lenis</th>
<th>Fortis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>⟨b⟩</td>
<td>⟨p⟩</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ℓ²</td>
<td>ℓ²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fricatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lenis</td>
<td>⟨f⟩</td>
<td>⟨s⟩</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ℓ²</td>
<td>ℓ²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fortis</td>
<td>⟨ff⟩</td>
<td>⟨ss⟩</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>⟨ch⟩</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affricates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>⟨ph⟩</td>
<td>⟨z⟩</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>⟨k⟩</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquids</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lenis</td>
<td>⟨l⟩</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ℓ¹</td>
<td>ℓ²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fortis</td>
<td>⟨ll⟩</td>
<td>⟨r⟩</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lenis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>⟨rr⟩</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nasals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lenis</td>
<td>⟨m⟩</td>
<td>⟨n⟩</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ℓ², 7</td>
<td>ℓ², 4, 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fortis</td>
<td>⟨mm⟩</td>
<td>⟨nn⟩</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3
Ried's Graphemic System
Indeed, Ried’s system shows no special neutralization variants at all; $gk$ is equally valid in Ried’s system as a spelling for intervocalic /k/ or /kx/ (i.e., where the phoneme is not the result of neutralizations) as it is for a /g/ before open juncture, though in the Habsburg chancery it is restricted to those positions where the opposition $\langle g \rangle - \langle k \rangle$ has been neutralized (Hans Moser 1977:267-268). It is clear that with respect to neutralization variants, Ried’s orthography represents a great simplification of the Habsburg chancery system. Although his system recognizes these variants, it does not restrict their use to those positions where neutralizations occur, as chancery usage does.

The resonants show neutralization patterns that differ greatly from those of the Habsburg chancery. Hans Moser (1977:127-129) maintains that $\langle r \rangle$ and $\langle rr \rangle$ contrast intervocalically and finally after vowels, and that in other positions the opposition is
neutralized. Furthermore, he states that the variant used after vowels is dependent upon the length of that vowel: <rr> after short vowels, <r> after long vowels and diphthongs. Inspection of Ried's system shows that, although Ried recognizes an opposition of <r> and <rr> in the same positions as the chancery does, the distribution of the two graphs cannot be described in terms of preceding vowel length. Rather, in Ried's system, the distribution of these graphs, when not final, depends on whether the phoneme in question derives from PG /r/ or PG /rr, rz/.

Similarly, in the Habsburg chancery, single and double / are distinguished only in post-vocalic position (Hans Moser 1977:128-130): 〈l〉 after long vowels and diphthongs, 〈ll〉 after short vowels. As in the previous example, however, the use of the single or double variant cannot be related to vowel quality, but is determined solely by the derivation of the word, as long as they are not before open juncture. In clusters with other consonants, Ried's usage agrees precisely with that of the Habsburg chancery.

Moser (1977:130) does not recognize an opposition between m and mm, and thus maintains that the chancery possesses only one grapheme 〈m〉 with allographs m, mm. This is not the case in Ried's orthography. The two graphs clearly represent the reflexes of pre-HG /m/ and /mm/, respectively, even though either can be used in positions where there is no opposition between the two (in clusters with other consonants or before open juncture). Ried's relatively rare use of 〈mm〉 for the reflex of PG /m/ after short vowels is probably attributable to his Vorlage.
In the case of $\langle n \rangle$ and $\langle nn \rangle$, Moser (1977:130-133) writes that the distribution of the single and double graphs is nearly the same as with $\langle d \rangle$ - $\langle dl \rangle$ and $\langle r \rangle$ - $\langle rr \rangle$, i.e. single after long vowel or diphthong, double after short vowel. He does, however, note a tendency to double before dentals, gutturals, and fricatives. Ried's orthography shows this same tendency, which, as I explained above, reflects the fact that ENT /n/ and /nn/ do not contrast in this position. Elsewhere, the distribution of $\langle n \rangle$ and $\langle nn \rangle$ depends on the nature of the pre-High German phonemes, double or single, from which they derive.

Moser (1977:134) further distinguishes a grapheme $\langle ng \rangle$, examples of which, he says, cannot be found in his material. He maintains, however, that the existence of a phoneme /ŋ/ during this period is highly probable, and points to the equivocal testimony of the early grammarians (see also Painter 1989:168-170) to support this claim. Ried's orthography likewise shows no sign of a separate /ŋ/ phoneme, as, indeed, Modern German orthography does not. I find it difficult to determine the status of [ŋ] in this period. Therefore, I will not posit a separate grapheme $\langle ng \rangle$ for which there is no explicit evidence in the manuscript.

6.3 Ried's Phonology

From the preceding orthographic analysis one can derive the phonological system in figure 5 for Hans Ried's dialect. The only points in which the inventory of this system
diverges from the descriptions of Kranzmayer (1956) and Wiesinger (1990) is in the absence of a phoneme /ŋ/, which may have existed in Ried's dialect, but is not distinguished in the orthography. The lack of a lenis counterpart for /š/ is characteristic of the Tyrolean dialect area (Kranzmayer 1956:§42).

The distribution of the phonemes also agrees with descriptions of the Tyrolean dialect. The distinction between /b/ and /p/ is neutralized in initial position, while that between /d/ and /t/, and /g/ and /k/ is retained. The reason for this 'skewed' system is, of course, that while for ENT /t/ and /g/ the natural development of the language introduced new phonemes that contrasted with them (PG /p/- > /d/-, late OHG /gg-/ > /k/- cf. Kranzmayer 1956:§37), no such phoneme developed to contrast with ENT /b/ < PG /b/.

The neutralization of the fortis-lenis distinction before open juncture (Auslautverhärtung) also corresponds to the state of development of the modern Tyrolean dialect in Kranzmayer's (1956:§27) descriptions, as does the presence of the fortis /f/ for PG /f/ before voiceless stops.

The reflexes of shifted PG /p, t/ correspond exactly to their Modern Tyrolean counterparts (Kranzmayer 1956:§38-40, 43-45), though shifted PG /k/ diverges from the modern dialect after liquids, where the affricate, rather than the fricative, is in evidence. This could be seen as evidence that the simplification of /kx/ to /x/ after liquids is a recent development of the modern dialect (cf. Kranzmayer 1956:§38c).
| Stops: | Fortis | /p/ | /t/ | /k/ |
|        | Lenis  | /b/ | /d/ | /g/ |
|        |        | ⟨p⟩ | ⟨t⟩ | ⟨k⟩ |
|        |        | ⟨b⟩ | ⟨d⟩ | ⟨g⟩ |
| Fricatives: | Fortis | /f/ | /s/ | /ʃ/ | /x/ |
|        |        | ⟨ff⟩ | ⟨ss⟩ | ⟨ʃʃ⟩ | ⟨ch⟩ |
|        | Lenis  | /v/ | /z/ | /h/ |
|        |        | ⟨f⟩ | ⟨s⟩ | ⟨h⟩ |
| Affricates: |        | /pf/ | /ts/ | /kh/ |
|        |        | ⟨ph⟩ | ⟨z⟩ | ⟨k⟩ |
| Sonants¹: | Fortis | /m/ | /n/ |
|        |        | ⟨mm⟩ | ⟨nn⟩ |
|        | Lenis  | /m/ | /n/ |
|        |        | ⟨m⟩ | ⟨n⟩ |
| Fortis | /.setAutoFocus(true); | /r/ | /ɾ/ |
|        | ⟨rr⟩ | ⟨r⟩ |
| Lenis  | /l/ | /ɾ/ |
|        | ⟨r⟩ | ⟨ɾ⟩ |
| Glides: | /w/ | /ɹ/ |
|        | ⟨w⟩ | ⟨ɾ⟩ |

1 For lack of a better symbol, I have used a macron to denote the fortis sonants, as does Kranzmayer (1956:§27d).
From the manuscript evidence and the descriptions of the modern Tyrolean dialect it seems quite clear that Ried's orthographic conventions are firmly grounded in the phonology of the Tyrolean dialect.

6.4 Summary

This analysis of Hans Ried's orthographic usage in the *Ambraser Heldenbuch* has yielded an orthographic system that is quite regular and can in no way be interpreted as chaotic or random. Though it is not a standard orthography in the modern, prescriptive sense, it is, nonetheless, a regimented system of orthography governed by proscriptive, rather than prescriptive rules. Ried's system is not intolerant of variation, as standard orthographies are, but rather is content to restrict the allowable variants in certain positions or words. Thus the orthography of the manuscript may appear, at first, to be unregulated, when, in fact, there is system to which Ried rigidly adheres.

I have also shown that this system of orthography is based solidly in the Tyrolean dialect. By showing that certain features that are unique to South Bavarian and some that are unique to the Tyrolean dialect in particular, I hope to have proven that, at the very least, in the case of the *Ambraser Heldenbuch*, an Early New High German orthography can be shown to be regular when considered in the light of dialect evidence.
Appendix A

These BASIC routines search the input file "hugefile$" for the character string "letter$" and write all hits (all non-hits in the case of program names beginning "Not-") to an output file. In some cases the "letter$" variable is generated by the program from information that the user supplies.

"Anyletr" - This program finds a specified letter in any position.

100 CLS
110 INPUT "File to use"; hugefile$
120 INPUT "letter to find"; letter$
125 biglist$ = "_" + letter$ + "_
130 OPEN hugefile$ FOR INPUT AS #1
140 OPEN "o", #2, biglist$
150 WHILE EOF(1) = 0
160 LINE INPUT #1, layn$
170 IF INSTR(layn$, letter$) <> 0 THEN WRITE #2, layn$
180 WEND
190 CLOSE 1, #2
2000 BEEP
2010 INPUT "Continue to another letter (y/n)"; further$
2020 IF further$ = "y" THEN GOTO 100
Initletr - This program finds a specified letter in word-initial position.

100 CLS
110 INPUT "File to use"; hugefile$
111 CLS
120 INPUT "letter to find in initial position"; lettr$
121 letter$ = " " + lettr$
125 biglist$ = "_#" + lettr$ + "_"
130 OPEN hugefile$ FOR INPUT AS #1
140 OPEN "o", #2, biglist$
150 WHILE EOF(1) = 0
160 LINE INPUT #1, layn$
170 IF INSTR(layn$, letter$) <> 0 THEN WRITE #2, layn$
180 WEND
190 CLOSE 1, #2
2000 BEEP
2010 INPUT "Find another letter in this list (y/n)"; further$
2020 IF further$ = "y" THEN GOTO 111
2025 INPUT "Find a letter in another list (y/n)"; weiter$
2030 IF weiter$ = "y" THEN GOTO 100
2050 PRINT "Factum est"
2060 BEEP
2070 SYSTEM
Finaletr - This program finds a specified letter in word-final position.

100 CLS
110 INPUT "File to use"; hugefile$
111 CLS
120 INPUT "letter to find in final position"; lettr$
121 letter$ = lettr$ + CHR$(34)
125 biglist$ = "_" + lettr$ + "#_"
130 OPEN hugefile$ FOR INPUT AS #1
140 OPEN "o", #2, biglist$
150 WHILE EOF(1) = 0
160   LINE INPUT #1, layn$
170   IF INSTR(layn$, letter$) <> 0 THEN WRITE #2, layn$
180 WEND
190 CLOSE 1, #2
2000 BEEP
2010 INPUT "Find another letter in this list (y/n)"; further$
2020 IF further$ = "y" THEN GOTO 111
2025 INPUT "Find a letter in another list (y/n)"; weiter$
2030 IF weiter$ = "y" THEN GOTO 100
2050 PRINT "Factum est"
2060 BEEP
2070 SYSTEM
Midletr - This program finds a specified letter in word-medial position.

100 CLS
110 INPUT "File to use"; hugefile$
120 INPUT "letter to find"; letter$
125 biglist$ = "_%" + letter$ + "_%"
130 OPEN hugefile$ FOR INPUT AS #1
140 OPEN "o", #2, biglist$
150 WHILE EOF(1) = 0
160   LINE INPUT #1, layn$
162   laenge = LEN(layn$) - 1
164   letterlen = LEN(letter$)
166   zaehle = 11
168      WHILE zaehle < > laenge
170      IF MID$(layn$, zaehle, letterlen) = letter$ THEN WRITE #2, layn$
172      zaehle = zaehle + 1
174     WEND
180 WEND
190 CLOSE 1, #2
195 finallist$ = "_%" + letter$ + "_%"
200 OPEN biglist$ FOR INPUT AS #1
210 OPEN "o", #2, finallist$
220 WHILE EOF(1) = 0
230   LINE INPUT #1, zeilenew$
240   IF zeilenew$ <> zeileold$ THEN WRITE #2, zeilenew$
250   zeileold$ = zeilenew$
260 WEND
2000 BEEP
Notinit - This program finds a specified letter in all positions other than word-initial

100 CLS
110 INPUT "File to use"; hugefile$
111 CLS
120 INPUT "letter to exclude in initial position"; lettr$
121 letter$ = " " + lettr$
125 biglist$ = "_0#" + lettr$ + "_"
130 OPEN hugefile$ FOR INPUT AS #1
140 OPEN "o", #2, biglist$
150 WHILE EOF(1) = 0
160  LINE INPUT #1, layn$
170  IF INSTR(layn$, letter$) = 0 THEN WRITE #2, layn$
180 WEND
190 CLOSE 1, #2
2000 BEEP
2010 INPUT "Exclude another letter in this list (y/n)"; further$
2020 IF further$ = "y" THEN GOTO 111
2025 INPUT "Exclude a letter in another list (y/n)"; weiter$
2030 IF weiter$ = "y" THEN GOTO 100
2050 PRINT "Factum est"
Notfinal - This program finds a specified letter when not final.

100 CLS
110 INPUT "File to use"; hugefile$
111 CLS
120 INPUT "letter to exclude in final position"; lettr$
121 letter$ = lettr$ + CHR$(34)
125 biglist$ = "_0" + lettr$ + "#_
130 OPEN hugefile$ FOR INPUT AS #1
140 OPEN "o", #2, biglist$
150 WHILE EOF(1) = 0
160 LINE INPUT #1, layn$
170 IF INSTR(layn$, letter$) = 0 THEN WRITE #2, layn$
180 WEND
190 CLOSE 1, #2
2000 BEEP
2010 INPUT "Exclude another letter in this list (y/n)"; further$
2020 IF further$ = "y" THEN GOTO 111
2025 INPUT "Exclude a letter in another list (y/n)"; weiter$
2030 IF weiter$ = "y" THEN GOTO 100
2050 PRINT "Factum est"
2060 BEEP
2070 SYSTEM
Notletr - This program finds those words in which a specified letter does not occur.

100 CLS
110 INPUT "File to use"; hugefile$
120 INPUT "letter to exclude"; letter$
125 biglist$ = "_0" + letter$ + "_"
130 OPEN hugefile$ FOR INPUT AS #1
140 OPEN "o", #2, biglist$
150 WHILE EOF(1) = 0
160 LINE INPUT #1, layn$
170 IF INSTR(layn$, letter$) = 0 THEN WRITE #2, layn$
180 WEND
190 CLOSE 1, #2
2000 BEEP
2010 INPUT "Shall I exclude another letter (y/n)"; further$
2020 IF further$ = "y" THEN GOTO 100
2050 PRINT "Finished!"
2060 BEEP
2070 SYSTEM
Appendix B

An Incomplete List of the Unica Contained in the Ambraser Heldenbuch

1. Der Stricker "Frauenlob"

2. "Moritz von Craôn"

6. "Der Mantel" (attrib. Heinrich von dem Türlin)


12. "Kudrun"


13. "Biterolf"


15. "Wolfdietrich A"


16. "Die böse Frau"


17-20. Herrant von Wildonie "Die getreue Gattin", "Der verkehrte Wirt" ("Der betrogene Gatte"), "Der nackte Kaiser", "Die Katze"
(Altdeutsche Textbibliothek, 51.) Tübingen: Max Niemeyer.

21. Ulrich von Liechtenstein, "Frauendienst" ("Frauenbuch")
(Göppinger Arbeiten zur Germanistik, 520.) Göppingen: Kümmerle Verlag.
Bibliography

Abbé, D. van. 1950. "The Middle High German Written Language: Fact or Fancy?" 

Althaus, Hans Peter, Helmut Henne, and Herbert Ernst Wiegand, eds. 1973. *Lexikon

& Co.

Besch, Werner. 1968. "Zur Entstehung der neuhochdeutschen Schriftsprache."
*Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie*, 87:3-88.


*Teuthonista*, 4:32-43.


Tübingen: Max Niemeyer.


Vita

Geoffrey Muckenhirn was born on Nov. 23, 1962 in Columbus, GA. He attended the Illinois Public Schools and graduated from Glenbrook South High School in 1980. He began his studies at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign in August, 1980 and spent 1982-83 in Baden bei Wien with the Illinois-Austria Exchange Program where he first encountered German of the Southern variety. He received his baccalaureate in German Language and Literature in May, 1984.

He remained at The University of Illinois for his Master’s studies where he taught beginning German while concentrating on the study of the older Germanic dialects with Professor Elmer H. Antonsen and of German Romanticism, writing his Master’s exams with Professor James M. McGlathery in 1986. After receiving his A.M., he continued study at the University of Illinois. In 1987-88, he acted as Assistant to the Director of the Austria-Illinois Exchange Program in Baden and studied at the University of Vienna, taking courses in Germanic Philology. Upon returning to The University of Illinois, he pursued a course of study in Germanic Linguistics.

He is a member of the German honorary fraternity Delta Phi Alpha, and of numerous professional societies, including the Linguistic Society of America, The Renaissance Society of America, and the MLA.