

ORTNIT

Eleventh ed., Vol. XX, 341

Ortnit's wooing was corrupted by the popular interest in the crusades to an Oriental Brautfahrtsaga, bearing a very close resemblance to the French romance of Huron of Bordeaux. Both heroes receive similar assistance from Alberich (Oberon), who supplanted the Russian Ilya as Ortnit's spic father in the middle high German romance. Neumann maintained that the Russian Ortnit and the Lombard king were originally two different persons, and that the incoherence of the tale is due to the welding of the two legends into one.

See editions of the Heldenbuch and one of Ortnit and Wolfdietrich by Dr. J. E. Elden von Lindhausen (Tubigen, 1906); articles in the Zeitschrift fur deutsches Altertum by K. Mullenhoff(xii. pp.344-354, 1865; xiii. pp. 185-192, 1867), by . . . . and in Germanica by F. Neumann(vol. xxvii. pp 191-219, Vienna, 1882).

1956 ed., XVI, 727

Omits reference to the "welding of the two legends into one" and ref. to Mullenhoff.

NIBE LUNGENLIED

Eleventh ed., Vol. XX, 637-40

Lachmann applied to the N . . . . the method which Wolf had used to resolve the Illiad and Odyssey into their elements. Said the poem was based on some 20 popular ballads. This view was first seriously assailed by Adolph Holtzmann, 1854. who argued that the original could not have been strophic in form --- that it was written by Konrad . . . and that MSS. C is nearest to this original (Lachmann decided in favour of A). A is rough and barbarous. C is the most perfectly finished in lang. and rythm. Article gives the conclusions of Abeling that the poem was first written down by a wandering minstrel c. 971-91, and was remodelled c. 1140 by Konrad who introduced interpolations, etc.

1956 ed., Vol. XVI, 409-10

Repeats what was in 11th ed., but does not give Abeling's conclusions except to refer to his work on the N. . . . which gives a "full bibl. from 1756 to 1905." Mentions other contributions on the poem by Andreas Heusler (1914), Hermann Fischer (1914), Friedrich Wilhelm(1916). Mentions that there have been during latter yrs. advocates of a Latin original of the poem, but "this idea is generally discredited."

\* Says to See M. Thorp, The Study of the Nibelungenlied (1940)

PERCEVAL

Eleventh ed., Vol. XXI, 132-33

The text shows a curious mingling of sources . . . The romance is probably a somewhat late, and not very skillful compilation. The immediate source of this version is the poem of Wolfram von Eschenbach . . . . Parzival has critical texts which have been edited by Lachmann, Martin, and Leitzmann.

1956 ed., Vol. XVII, 501

. . . . Wolfram was right that the two works are independent derivations from a common source.