

Das Mittelalter: Perspektiven mediävistischer Forschung. JOERG O. FICHTE, ed., 'Providentia—Fatum—Fortuna.' Vol. 1,1 (1996). HEDWIG RÖCKELEIN and HANS-WERNER GOETZ, eds., 'Frauen-Beziehungsgeflechte im Mittelalter.' Vol. 1,2 (1996).

In his introductory remarks to the first issue of *Das Mittelalter: Perspektiven mediävistischer Forschung*, Wilhelm G. Busse addresses the pertinent question: Why yet another journal on a market which is already flooded with scholarly publications? *Das Mittelalter*, edited by Wilhelm G. Busse, the president of the German *Mediävistenverband*, presents itself as 'a forum for interdisciplinary Medieval Studies. Each separate issue will treat a current topic of medieval scholarship, assuming a perspective transcending departmental limits. An additional newsletter section will report on basic research, discussions, and recent publications within the individual fields with respect to their relevance for Medieval Studies as a whole' (inside cover). Its discriminating feature, according to Busse, is meant to be 'an interdisciplinary dialogue, which does not stagnate in a mere addition of the individual fields' knowledge' (cf. 3); instead, it should be 'aiming towards a common result ("Erkenntnisziel")', obligatory, determined, and shared by all' (cf. 4).

This ambitious program renders particular responsibility to the editors of each respective volume, who have to assume the additional task of selecting and guiding the authors with this 'common result' in mind. The editors of the two issues which have already appeared in print have taken different routes to achieve this goal. Joerg O. Fichte, in charge of Vol. 1,1 (1996): 'Providentia—Fatum—Fortuna,' provides the reader with a survey of the subject matter, placing the individual articles within its chronology. His contribution, complete with a select bibliography, is a welcome introduction to the field; by sketching the wideness of its scope, however, Fichte demonstrates the impossibility of presenting a unified discourse. The individual articles, all meritorious in their own right, are too different in their approaches to enter more than implicit dialogue with each other. (The contributions to Vol. 1,1 are: Franz Tinnefeld, 'Schicksal und Vorherbestimmung im Denken der Byzantiner'; Udo Kindermann, 'Zur Ästhetik der Schicksalsbewältigung in einer hochmittelalterlichen Logotherapie'; David Anderson: 'Fra Paolino's *De providentia et fortuna*'; Hans-Werner Goetz, 'Fortuna in der hochmittelalterlichen Geschichtsschreibung'; Walter Blank, 'Providentia oder Prognose? Zur Zukunftserwartung im Spätmittelalter'; Friedrich Wolfzettel, 'Spätmittelalterliches Selbstverständnis des Dichters im Zeichen von Fortuna: Guillaume de Machaut und Christine de Pizan'; Sibylle Appuhn-Radtke, 'Fortuna Bifrons. Zu einem mittelalterlichen Bildtyp und dessen Nachleben in der Ikonographie Albrecht Dürers'; Hans Holländer, 'Die Kugel der Fortuna.')

Hedwig Röckelein and Hans-Werner Goetz, the editors of Vol. 1,2 (1996): 'Frauen-Beziehungsgeflechte im Mittelalter' have tried to streamline their issue's discussion by providing the individual authors with a list of textual and methodological questions for consideration. They, in turn, summarized the articles' theses according to the criteria provided. The discussion strived for, however, remains one between authors and editors. The articles themselves reflect little of the questionnaire's items, other

than in conclusive, final paragraphs. (Vol. 1,2 contains: Ingrid Bennewitz, “Frauen”-Gespräche. Zur Inszenierung des Frauendialogs in der mittelhochdeutschen Literatur; Ann Marie Rasmussen, ‘Zur wissenschaftlichen Analyse von Müttern und Töchtern im Mittelalter: Margarethe von Courtenay und Yolande von Vianden’; Wendelin Knoch, ‘Jungfrau und Mutter. Beobachtungen zur Neubestimmung fraulicher Würde bei Hildegard von Bingen’; Doris Ruhe, ‘Von Frau zu Frau. Christine de Pizans Ratschläge für die weibliche Lebenspraxis’; Hedwig Röckelein, ‘Hamburger Beginen im Spätmittelalter—“autonome” oder “fremdbestimmte” Frauengemeinschaften?’; Hans-Werner Goetz, ‘Heiligenkult und Geschlecht. Geschlechtsspezifisches Wunderwirken in frühmittelalterlichen Mirakelberichten?’; Gabriela Signori, ‘Defensivgemeinschaften: Kreißende, Hebammen und “Mitweiber” im Spiegel spätmittelalterlicher Geburtswunder.’)

Both issues live up to the challenge of interdisciplinarity by including contributions from scholars working in a wide variety of medieval fields. (Internationality does not seem to be as much a goal; there is one non-German author per issue.) The quality of the individual articles is beyond dispute; the quality of the desired dialogue will yet have to be determined in the issues to come. If it is to go beyond the editors’ efforts to summarize, schematize, and unify in their introductions, much more directing will be necessary during the actual process of composition. Whether this would be beneficial or desirable at all remains yet to be seen.

SUSANNE HAFNER
Universität Hamburg