

Leeds Studies in English

Article:

F. P. Pickering, 'A Note on J. Boyd, Ulrich Füetrer's Parzival: Material and Sources (Medium Ævum Monographs I), Oxford, 1936', *Leeds Studies in English*, 5 (1936), 93-95

Permanent URL:

https://ludos.leeds.ac.uk:443/R/-?func=dbin-jump-full&object_id=134426&silos_library=GEN01



Leeds Studies in English
School of English
University of Leeds
<http://www.leeds.ac.uk/lse>

A Note on J. Boyd, *Ulrich F  ttrer's Parzival: Material and Sources* (Medium   vum Monographs I), Oxford, 1936.

The publication of this book must fill English Germanists with misgivings. A deservedly neglected German author of the fifteenth century writes up from earlier sources the principal stories of the Arthurian cycle at a time when even as purely literary themes they are completely outlived. A living Germanist retells one of these fifteenth-century versions partly in his own words, and partly by quoting from the German version, and demonstrates repeatedly and convincingly that it is not as long or as full as the combined three sources on which it draws. The resultant copy is printed and offered for sale at ten shillings. This is our first cause for misgiving.

It is claimed on the dust-cover of the book, which we may reasonably suppose the author read before the book was released, that "so far Ulrich F  ttrer's method of applying his material was unknown." Had the author spent one-tenth of the time he has devoted to reading the authorities on Wolfram von Eschenbach's "Kyot" and classifying them as believers and non-believers in looking through the relevant sections of the *Jahresberichte   ber die Erscheinungen auf dem Gebiet der Germanischen Philologie*, he would have discovered that in 1927 Dr. Alice Carlson published a work entitled *Ulrich F  ttrer und sein Iban* (Diss. Munich, 1927) in which the infinitely more important comparison between Ulrich's "Iban" and his sources (believed to have been non-German) was fully worked out. Dr. Carlson's results are worth noting. In the introduction to her work Dr. Carlson thanks Professor Panzer of Heidelberg for having informed her that "perhaps one of his pupils would edit *Parzival* (p. 5)." The author of the present monograph is a pupil of Professor Panzer. He intends also

to edit "Parzival." Whether he is the pupil Professor Panzer then had in mind or not, one would have thought that the news that Dr. Alice Carlson was working on Füetrer would have been passed on to him, or that at least he would have been advised to make certain before publishing whether Ulrich's treatment of any of his subjects had or had not been investigated. There is further in the University Library of Heidelberg a dissertation (in typescript only) by Karl Friedrich Probst and with the title *Die Quellen des Poitislir und Flordimar in Ulrich Füetrers Buch der Abenteuer* (1922) where Ulrich's use of non-Arthurian material is discussed. This is our second cause for misgiving.

All through the book there is a lack of preciseness in the methods of quoting other work, which makes it difficult to identify some of the items. Thus on p. 3 there is a reference to Riezler, *Geschichte*, iii, p. 871, which Dr. Carlson quotes more fully as Siegmund Riezler *Geschichte der europäischen Staaten*, B. III. (pp. 14 and 157). Further, to a '2 Heft' of a volume of *Germania*, a novel and irritating method of reference. Did Dr. Boyd use an unbound copy of the 1883 volume? No place or date of publication is supplied for Arthur Peter's edition of Ulrich's "Lanzilot" (the full reference, if anyone should require it, is *Ulrich Füetrers Prosaroman von Lanzilot, nach der Donaueschinger Hs.*, (Bibl. d. lit. Vereins in Stuttgart, 175, Tübingen, 1885). For the edition of the *Bayerische Chronick*, the date (actually 1909) is omitted. How can the reader form any opinion on the development of work on Ulrich when such information is not given? The phrase 'den thimonen richten' ('to arrange the rudder') according to Dr. Boyd 'is not an invention of Ulrich, for it is to be found in Hugo von Wolkenstein.' Dr. Boyd does not give chapter and verse, which is really called for, since Hugo von Wolkenstein is not a well-known author. Names reminiscent of Hugo von Wolkenstein are Hugo von Montfort, Oswald von Wolkenstein and Hugo von Langenstein. Perhaps the phrase is to be found in the work of one of them. All these shortcomings have

been noted on one page of the book, and this is our third cause for misgiving.

It is hard to believe that no more worthy contribution to medieval scholarship could have been found in Oxford to inaugurate this series.

Manchester.

F. P. PICKERING.