

Bangor University

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

King Arthur and the privy councillor : Albert Schulz as a cultural mediator between the literary fields of nineteenth century Wales and Germany

Gruber, Edith

Award date:
2014

Awarding institution:
Bangor University

[Link to publication](#)

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal ?

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

**King Arthur and the Privy Councillor:
Albert Schulz as a Cultural Mediator
Between the Literary Fields of Nineteenth Century
Wales and Germany**

Edith Gruber

Bangor University
Doctor of Philosophy (PhD)

**King Arthur and the Privy Councillor: Albert Schulz as a Cultural Mediator
Between the Literary Fields of Nineteenth Century Wales and Germany**

Edith Gruber

Abstract

This thesis presents Albert Schulz, a lawyer and autodidact scholar, who won the first prize at the 1840 Abergavenny Eisteddfod with his *Essay on the Influence of Welsh Traditions on the Literature of France, Germany, and Scandinavia*. It was subsequently published in Britain in 1841 and was widely reviewed in literary journals. Its German edition, entitled *Die Arthursage und die Mährchen des rothen Buchs von Hergest* (1842), comprised the first translations into German of Welsh tales, the *Mabinogion*. At the time, Schulz was well-known among scholars in Wales and Germany, but today, he and his works are mostly forgotten, yet the memory of his essay survives in footnotes.

This thesis has three main aims. First, the circumstances which allowed a German lawyer to enter the Welsh literary field were examined, in particular his cultural and educational background and his literary and philosophical influences, placing him in the Late Romantic period. The analysis of the essay confirmed this, as Schulz adapted Herderian and Schlegelian concepts of a common European literary heritage to the appraisal of the peripheral Welsh literary field. Secondly, the external factors for Schulz' rise within the literary fields were taken into account, using Bourdieu's theory of cultural production and the laws governing it. Research has shown that he was a part of a transnational scholarly network connecting Germany and Wales. He entertained correspondence with prominent figures in the literary fields such as the Karl Lachmann, the Brothers Grimm and Thomas Stephens. Thirdly, his membership in these networks enabled Schulz to become a cultural mediator, transmitting literary and cultural knowledge across linguistic and national borders with his essay and translations. While there was considerable interest in Celticism and the Celtic languages in Germany, Wales and its literature had not yet been the subject of scholarly research prior to Schulz' efforts. Therefore, his work placed Wales on the literary map of Europe alongside the established literary traditions of France, Germany and Scandinavia.

Contents

| | |
|--|-----|
| Abstract | i |
| Contents..... | ii |
| Acknowledgements | iii |
| Declaration and Consent | iv |
| 1. Introduction and rationale | 1 |
| 2. Cultural and historical context | 24 |
| 3. Theoretical framework: Schulz as a player in the German and Welsh literary fields | 57 |
| 4. Schulz' winning essay: a Herderian-Schlegelian entry in the Welsh field..... | 92 |
| 5. Reception of the essay in the British field..... | 139 |
| 6. Schulz' essay in German translation: The German field..... | 171 |
| 7. Conclusion..... | 212 |
| Bibliography..... | 219 |
| Bibliography of Albert Schulz (San-Marte)..... | 219 |
| Primary sources | 220 |
| Secondary Sources | 223 |
| Online sources | 229 |

Acknowledgements

Now that I have completed my thesis I would like to thank all those people who have supported me on this journey.

First and foremost, I have been truly indebted in the preparation of this thesis to my supervisor, Professor Carol Tully, whose patience and kindness, as well as her academic experience, have been invaluable to me.

I would like to show my gratitude to the staff of the School of Modern Languages for their support. It has been a pleasure to work with you and long may it continue.

Rwy'n ddiolchgar iawn i Ganolfan Addysg Uwch Cyfrwng Cymraeg am dderbyn y cyfle i gyflawni'r ymchwil hwn.

My thanks are also due to the supervisor of my M.A. dissertation at the University of Helsinki, Professor Andrew Chesterman, who encouraged me to continue as a post-graduate student.

The informal support and encouragement of many friends have been indispensable, and I would like to thank in particular

- Dr Menna Wyn, diolch o galon am dy gyfeillgarwch a chefnogaeth,
- Elwyn Hughes, the staff of Lifelong Learning and Canolfan Bedwyr and my fellow Welsh learners of Côt dros y Bont for helping me to learn Welsh,
- And the members of the Middle Welsh reading group in Helsinki who were a true inspiration.

Last but not least, I would like to thank my parents, my grandmother and my sister who supported me in any possible way.

Declaration and Consent

Details of the Work

I hereby agree to deposit the following item in the digital repository maintained by Bangor University and/or in any other repository authorized for use by Bangor University.

Author Name:

Title:

Supervisor/Department:

Funding body (if any):

Qualification/Degree obtained:

This item is a product of my own research endeavours and is covered by the agreement below in which the item is referred to as “the Work”. It is identical in content to that deposited in the Library, subject to point 4 below.

Non-exclusive Rights

Rights granted to the digital repository through this agreement are entirely non-exclusive. I am free to publish the Work in its present version or future versions elsewhere.

I agree that Bangor University may electronically store, copy or translate the Work to any approved medium or format for the purpose of future preservation and accessibility. Bangor University is not under any obligation to reproduce or display the Work in the same formats or resolutions in which it was originally deposited.

Bangor University Digital Repository

I understand that work deposited in the digital repository will be accessible to a wide variety of people and institutions, including automated agents and search engines via the World Wide Web.

I understand that once the Work is deposited, the item and its metadata may be incorporated into public access catalogues or services, national databases of electronic theses and dissertations such as the British Library’s EThOS or any service provided by the National Library of Wales.

I understand that the Work may be made available via the National Library of Wales Online Electronic Theses Service under the declared terms and conditions of use (<http://www.llgc.org.uk/index.php?id=4676>). I agree that as part of this service the National Library of Wales may electronically store, copy or convert the Work to any approved medium or format for the purpose of future preservation and accessibility. The National Library of Wales is not under any obligation to reproduce or display the Work in the same formats or resolutions in which it was originally deposited.

Statement 1:

This work has not previously been accepted in substance for any degree and is not being concurrently submitted in candidature for any degree unless as agreed by the University for approved dual awards.

Signed (candidate)

Date

Statement 2:

This thesis is the result of my own investigations, except where otherwise stated. Where correction services have been used, the extent and nature of the correction is clearly marked in a footnote(s).

All other sources are acknowledged by footnotes and/or a bibliography.

Signed (candidate)

Date

Statement 3:

I hereby give consent for my thesis, if accepted, to be available for photocopying, for inter-library loan and for electronic storage (subject to any constraints as defined in statement 4), and for the title and summary to be made available to outside organisations.

Signed (candidate)

Date

NB: Candidates on whose behalf a bar on access has been approved by the Academic Registry should use the following version of **Statement 3:**

Statement 3 (bar):

I hereby give consent for my thesis, if accepted, to be available for photocopying, for inter-library loans and for electronic storage (subject to any constraints as defined in statement 4), after expiry of a bar on access.

Signed (candidate)

Date

Statement 4:

Choose **one** of the following options

| | |
|--|--|
| a) I agree to deposit an electronic copy of my thesis (the Work) in the Bangor University (BU) Institutional Digital Repository, the British Library ETHOS system, and/or in any other repository authorized for use by Bangor University and where necessary have gained the required permissions for the use of third party material. | |
| b) I agree to deposit an electronic copy of my thesis (the Work) in the Bangor University (BU) Institutional Digital Repository, the British Library ETHOS system, and/or in any other repository authorized for use by Bangor University when the approved bar on access has been lifted. | |
| c) I agree to submit my thesis (the Work) electronically via Bangor University's e-submission system, however I opt-out of the electronic deposit to the Bangor University (BU) Institutional Digital Repository, the British Library ETHOS system, and/or in any other repository authorized for use by Bangor University, due to lack of permissions for use of third party material. | |

Options B should only be used if a bar on access has been approved by the University.

In addition to the above I also agree to the following:

1. That I am the author or have the authority of the author(s) to make this agreement and do hereby give Bangor University the right to make available the Work in the way described above.
2. That the electronic copy of the Work deposited in the digital repository and covered by this agreement, is identical in content to the paper copy of the Work deposited in the Bangor University Library, subject to point 4 below.
3. That I have exercised reasonable care to ensure that the Work is original and, to the best of my knowledge, does not breach any laws – including those relating to defamation, libel and copyright.
4. That I have, in instances where the intellectual property of other authors or copyright holders is included in the Work, and where appropriate, gained explicit permission for the inclusion of that material in the Work, and in the electronic form of the Work as accessed through the open access digital repository, *or* that I have identified and removed that material for which adequate and appropriate permission has not been obtained and which will be inaccessible via the digital repository.
5. That Bangor University does not hold any obligation to take legal action on behalf of the Depositor, or other rights holders, in the event of a breach of intellectual property rights, or any other right, in the material deposited.
6. That I will indemnify and keep indemnified Bangor University and the National Library of Wales from and against any loss, liability, claim or damage, including without limitation any related legal fees and court costs (on a full indemnity bases), related to any breach by myself of any term of this agreement.

Signature: Date :

1. Introduction and rationale

This thesis presents the lawyer, administrator, translator, philologist and scholar Albert Schulz (1802–1893), the author of several annotated editions and translations of medieval texts in various languages into modern German. His most notable and most frequently quoted work is *An Essay on the influence of Welsh traditions on the literature of France, Germany and Scandinavia* (1841). It won the main literary competition at the 1840 *eisteddfod* of the Cymreigyddion Society in Abergavenny. The German edition of the essay, *Die Arthursage und die Mährchen des Roten Buchs von Hergest* (1842) was accompanied by German translations of three Welsh medieval tales, *Geraint, Die Dame von der Quelle* and *Peredur*. He translated them from Lady Charlotte Guest's English translations of the Welsh original tales which she titled *Mabinogion*. This publication was widely received in Germany at the time and references to the translations still appear occasionally in modern studies on the subject. Schulz was also the first to publish a modern German rendering of the medieval poetry of Wolfram von Eschenbach, most notably the *Parcival* (1836) and the related *Titurel* (1841). Prior to Schulz' efforts, the oeuvre of this author was only accessible to philologists who were able to read medieval German. Schulz' translations of von Eschenbach and explanatory volumes about the author's life and period were his most successful publications, as the original *Parcival* translation of 1836 was reprinted in two revised editions in 1858 and 1887.

This thesis has three aims which arise from this brief description of Schulz' main impacts on several literary fields. The first question is to address the rather surprising constellation of events. How did a German lawyer succeed in winning a literary competition at a Welsh cultural festival? In order to reveal Schulz' progress from being a student of Law in 1821 to receiving the main prize at an *eisteddfod* in 1840, we must examine his cultural and educational background, his main literary and philosophical influences and his motivations and ideologies.

The sum of these factors alone, however, did not enable Schulz to write this award winning essay. Therefore, the second aim of this thesis is to explore the networks to which Albert Schulz had to gain access in order to become a notable contributor to them. The analysis of the essay on the influence of Welsh traditions reveals his literary, critical, and philosophical affiliations, most notably with Johann Gottfried Herder, August Wilhelm Schlegel, Friedrich Schlegel, and to some extent also Johann Gottlieb Fichte. The present

research shows that Schulz employs Herderian and Schlegelian concepts to support his theories of cultural contacts between the Britons and the Saxon and Anglo-Norman invaders which manifested themselves in the emergence, growth, and development of Arthurian literature from around 600 to the end of the medieval period. By doing this, he acts as a cultural mediator in turn, disseminating several key concepts of German Romanticism via the essay in the British literary field. Schulz also adapts the evolving notion of Romantic Nationalism in Germany for his argument on the functional changes to which the figure Arthur was subjected, depending on the political and social currents in the receiving culture. According to Schulz, Arthur occupied a different position in the literary landscape of each of the examined cultures and periods: from the originally British national hero who defended Britain against the Saxons, he was transformed into the founder of the Round Table and thus the head of feudal society on the secular side, and the defender of Christianity modelled on Charlemagne on the religious side. Schulz also argues that the national character of a given people leaves its imprint on the literary production due to the intellectual predispositions of the authors, who translated and adapted Arthurian traditions into their culture.

By publishing a German edition of the essay accompanied by the first translations of Welsh tales into German in 1842, Schulz' cultural mediation becomes bidirectional. The unpublished original essay, the published English translation, and the German edition with the translations are thus at the intersection of several literary fields. Schulz as their author is the connector between them. The third aim of this thesis is therefore to examine Schulz' literary career as a case study of the interaction of literary networks in nineteenth century Western Europe, primarily those in Germany and Great Britain, including the discrete Welsh field. Although Schulz is rather unknown today, he contributed significantly to the transfer of knowledge between these different literary fields. Providing the theoretical basis for this study are Pierre Bourdieu's concepts of literary fields, the *habitus* and the laws governing cultural production. These concepts will be employed to explain the functioning of the literary fields and the relations of power and influence between the players in these fields.

The name Albert Schulz is more or less unknown among scholars of German Romanticism, medieval studies or comparative literature. None of his books are currently in print in Germany, but recent digitalisation projects have made most of his works

available.¹ Schulz as a scholar does not figure as a major contributor to the literary research culture of his period in any companions to German Romanticism or in any discourse on Arthurian literature, the Welsh *Mabinogion*, Wolfram von Eschenbach's *Parcival* or other medieval German authors and their works. Due to his famous essay on the influence of Welsh traditions, Schulz has instead become a footnote phenomenon, with only very few actually engaging comprehensively with his work. His essay and the subsequent publications in the Welsh field were frequently referenced in footnotes in various fields during the twentieth century, often misrepresenting him and his work. One common mistake is to attribute to him the first German translation from the English translations by Lady Charlotte Guest of the *Four Branches of the Mabinogi*. The form 'mabinogi' is usually used when speaking of the *Four Branches of the Mabinogi*. It can also be used to signify a single tale of the collection of tales translated by Lady Guest, while 'mabinogion' will be used to refer to the entire collection. Lady Charlotte's translations were first published in separate volumes (1838–1849), later in one volume (1877) and they contain the following tales: The Lady of the Fountain, Peredur the son of Evrawc, Geraint the son of Erbin, Kilhwch and Olwen, The Dream of Rhonabwy, Pwyll Prince of Dyved, Branwen the daughter of Llyr, Manawyddan the son of Llyr, Math the son of Mathonwy, The Dream of Maxen Wledig, The Story of Lludd and Llevelys and Taliesin.² Schulz did indeed translate several of Lady Charlotte's *Mabinogion*, but he did not publish a translation of the *Four Branches*.³ Also, his essay is often overlooked and the focus lies entirely on the translations.⁴ Furthermore, the second volume of translations from Lady Guest's

¹ During the research period for this thesis, 2008–2012, Google has digitised all of Schulz' major independent publications.

² Lady Charlotte Guest, *The Mabinogion from the Welsh of the Llyfr Coch o Hergest (The Red Book of Hergest in the Library of Jesus College, Oxford (London: Bernard Quaritch, 1877 [reprint in 1977])*. After the seven books published in 1838–1845 and the three volume edition in 1849, the first single volume edition of her translations was published in 1877 which contained all twelve tales with abridged notes.

³ Schulz' German edition of 1842 contained the German version of the *Tair Rhamant*, the three Welsh romances, *Die Dame von der Quelle*, *Geraint* and *Peredur*. The follow-up publication *Beiträge zur bretonischen und celtisch-germanischen Heldensage* (Quedlinburg, Leipzig: Basse, 1847) introduced another three translations to the German public: *Arthurs Eberjagd* (Kilhwch und Olwen oder der Twrch Trwyth), *Gespräch zwischen Arthur und Eliwlod* (German translation from the Welsh *Ymddidan Arthur a'r Eryr*), and *Lancelot vom See*. After these two volumes, Schulz ceased to publish literary translations from English sources until 1864, when he finished the German translation of Thomas Stephens' *Literature of the Kymry* (1864).

⁴ 'Pocos años después de la traducción de Lady Guest, A. Schultz (San Marte) tradujo al alemán algunos cuentos de los mabinogi; sin embargo, el conocimiento y la difusión de estos relatos se debió, sin duda, a la excelente traducción realizada por J. Loth.' Veronica Cirlot, *Mabinogion* [Spanish translation] Madrid 1982 <<http://www.scribd.com/doc/18031366/Anonimo-Mabinogion>> [accessed 23 September 2012] (p. 30). This quote only refers to Schulz' German edition of his victorious essay, not stating that the translations were the second part of the book and that the essay functioned as a theoretical framework for them. Also, the usage of

Mabinogion, published as *Beiträge zur bretonischen und celtisch-germanischen Heldensage* in 1847, is usually ignored completely.

This was not always the case. In 1893, Alfred Nutt, the editor of the journal *Folk-lore* recognised Schulz' pioneering work on the legend of the Holy Grail, the *Mabinogion* and his editions of several British chronicles.

Geheimrath Albert Schulz, better known by his pseudonym of San Marte, was a book-scholar. He shared with Maclean a keen and lasting interest in all that related to the legendary past of the Celt. It was but the other day (FOLK-LORE, 1890, p. 255, *note*) that I noticed the last work of the veteran, a contribution to that elucidation of Wolfram's great Grail poem which he had begun sixty years previously, and which engaged his best energies throughout his life. In addition to his work on Wolfram, he first made the *Mabinogion* known on the Continent; he edited Gildas, Nennius, and Geoffrey of Monmouth; he collected and edited the texts relating to or connected with Merlin; he was one of the first to systematically investigate the origin and development of the Arthur romantic cycle. His works, outgrown in many respects as they are by the progress of study, will always remain landmarks in the history of Celtic scholarship, and even if they cease to be consulted, will be kept alive by the generous and lofty enthusiasm which inspires them.⁵

Nutt begins his report on the research in the years 1892 and 1893 in the field of Celtic Studies with an obituary of two renowned veterans of the field. The first entry is dedicated to Hector Maclean, a collector of oral literature in the Highlands, while the second section appreciates Schulz' contributions to the field of Celtic Studies. Nutt summarises adequately Schulz' most notable publications and his role as a pioneer of comparative literature and historical criticism of medieval texts. It also proves that Schulz was held in high esteem by his contemporaries and the following generation of scholars, but, as Nutt indicated in his obituary, Schulz' scholarly methods were already outdated by the turn of the century.

In recent years, however, Schulz has appeared in footnotes in various articles in the field of Celtic studies which shows that his name is not entirely forgotten and, in the Welsh field in particular, his essay and his translations are still remembered, albeit peripherally. In several publications, Schulz' name is misspelled as Schultz, and his first name appears to be interchangeable as well. In a volume on the reception of Arthurian literature in Germany from the medieval to the modern period, *The Arthur of the Germans* (2000), Alfred [sic]

the term 'mabinogi' in the Spanish is ambiguous, since it usually refers only to the *Four Branches of the Mabinogi*.

⁵ Alfred Nutt, *Folk-lore*, 4, September 1893, 365–387 (p. 366). <<http://www.jstor.org/stable/1253383>> [accessed 12 September 2012] [spelling, referencing, and capitalisation as in original].

Schulz is mentioned as the author of the *Parcival* and the *Titirel and Willehalm* translations.⁶ Diana Luft mentions Schulz and his essay as an example of a scholar who used Guest's classification of the medieval Welsh tales by categorising *Peredur* as a mabinogi.⁷ Carol Tully interprets the arguments brought forward by Schulz in his essay as a manifestation of 'the Celtic Misconnection', the perception of German Romantics that Wales had lost its former medieval, distinct Celtic identity, unlike Ireland or Scotland which had been able to preserve their cultural characteristics until the Romantic period.⁸

These examples show firstly, that even at the beginning of the twenty-first century, at least within the fields of medieval and Romantic studies, scholars are aware of Schulz' essay and his translations, and secondly, that certain aspects of his work in the Welsh field are used to illustrate the scholarly discourse therein during the first half of the nineteenth century. Heiko Fiedler-Rauer appears to be the only scholar who has conducted more profound research on Schulz' life and oeuvre, in particular from a German perspective. He has published several articles in newspapers in the last decade and contributed to the *Internationales Germanistenlexikon*.⁹ To date, Schulz has not been examined from a comparative viewpoint, taking into account both his activities in the German and in the British literary fields. This thesis aims to close this gap in knowledge while exploring Schulz' life and work as an example of literary networking in the nineteenth century.

Schulz was born during the period of Early Romanticism around the turn of the century, when August Wilhelm Schlegel was already giving his famous lectures on aesthetics, philosophy of art, medieval literature and Romantic poetry in Berlin. Therefore, strictly speaking, Schulz cannot be counted among the key Romantics. However, Schulz was influenced by several representatives of German Romanticism in the 1820s and 1830s, such as the professor of Law in Berlin, Friedrich Carl von Savigny (1779–1861)¹⁰ and

⁶ Müller, Ulrich and Werner Wunderlich, 'The Modern Reception of the Arthurian Legend' in *The Arthur of the Germans. The Arthurian Legend in Medieval German and Dutch Literature* ed. by W.H. Jackson, and S. A. Ranawake (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 2000/2011), p. 305.

⁷ Diana Luft, 'The Meaning of "Mabinogi"', *Cambrian Medieval Celtic Studies* 62 (Winter 2011), 57–80 (p. 62).

⁸ Carol Tully, 'The Celtic Misconnection: The German Romantics and Wales' in *Angermion, Yearbook for Anglo-German Literary Criticism, Intellectual History and Cultural Transfers*, 127–141 (pp.128–129).

⁹ These articles comprise 'Magdeburger Gralshüter' in the *Berliner Zeitung*: Heiko Fiedler-Rauer, 'Magdeburger Gralshüter' <http://www2.hu-berlin.de/presse/zeitung/archiv/00_01/num_5/15.html> [accessed 28 Oktober 2008] and idem. 'San-Martes Parcival und seine Beurteiler' in the *Zeitschrift für Germanistik*, 11, (2001) 538–549.

¹⁰ Savigny, apart from being considered the founder of modern jurisprudence in Germany, was also a member of a philosophical network centred in Marburg. Among his interests, Nörr lists literature, philosophy, in particular the philosophical approach to history and mathematics. Cf. Dieter Nörr, *Savignys*

professor August Koberstein (1797–1870),¹¹ a key figure in the literary circle of Naumburg, both of whom had a decisive impact on his education and his research interests. From 1821 to 1824, Schulz studied Law at universities in Berlin and Heidelberg. It is very probable that studying under Savigny left the first imprint of Romantic philosophy on the young Schulz at the beginning of his academic career. Savigny’s philosophical view of history may be the root for Schulz’ approach to literary and historical research. Further, during his traineeship in Naumburg from 1826 to 1830, Schulz became acquainted with and married into the family Lepsius¹² and through them with the literary circle centred in Naumburg and Bad Kösen, led by Koberstein. Besides gaining access to literary high society via his future in-laws, Schulz also made the acquaintance of Baron Karl Josias von Bunsen (1791–1860), the Prussian ambassador in Rome and London and a member of wide-reaching interdisciplinary and international networks. He was of particular importance for Schulz’ later career as a researcher and a publishing scholar, acting as a facilitator between Schulz and the Cymreigyddion.

Although Schulz and his work may have been largely forgotten today, evidence for his wide-ranging, international networks has survived in several archives. Since he did not visit Wales, he developed his networks there mainly via letters. He entertained correspondence with key figures in philology, linguistics, text criticism, folkloric studies and archaeology, such as the Brothers Grimm, Karl Lachmann, and Richard Lepsius in Germany and Thomas Stephens in Wales¹³. There is no evidence that he personally wrote

philosophische Lehrjahre, Studien zur Europäischen Rechtsgeschichte, 66 (Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 1994) pp. 4 and 7.

<<http://books.google.co.uk/books?id=RzmuqDT0rmYC&printsec=frontcover#v=onepage&q&f=false>> [accessed 13 September 2012] [google book preview online].

¹¹ The German teacher Koberstein proved to be of importance as well, as he is the link between the boarding school in Pforta and the literary circle in Naumburg. The uncles of August Wilhelm and Friedrich Schlegel, Johann Heinrich, Johann Adolf and Johann Elias, also went to Pforta, where they met Klopstock and Lessing, so the school in Pforta certainly left its imprint on the period. cf. Edith Höltenschmidt, *Die Mittelalterrezeption der Brüder Schlegel*, (Paderborn, München, Wien, Zürich: Schöningh, 2000), p. 6, fn. 12.

To complete the picture of Schulpforta as an important centre of the developing German Romantic Nationalism, it is also mentioned as the foundation of Leopold von Ranke’s (a German historian in the network with Fichte, Savigny, and Niebuhr) fascination with history and the literature of Antiquity, in G. P. Gooch’s *History and historians in the nineteenth century* (London: Longmans, Greene and Co. 1913), p. 76.

¹² The father, Carl Peter Lepsius (1775–1853) was a judge and a Privy Councillor in Naumburg. He also founded the sächsisch-thüringischen Alterthumsverein (Antiquarian society of Saxony and Thuringia). His son, Karl Richard Lepsius (1810–1884) was educated at Schulpforta before he studied classic philology, archaeology, history and linguistics and became a renowned archaeologist. He is mostly known for deciphering the Oscan language and for continuing Champollion’s work on Egyptian hieroglyphs. Schulz would marry Richard Lepsius’ sister Clara in 1832.

¹³ Thomas Stephens (1821–1875) was a Welsh historian who is mostly known for his critical book *The Literature of the Kymry* (Llandovery: William Rees, 1849) which is based on his prize-winning essay at the 1848 Eisteddfod; and another essay in which he refutes the claim that Madoc, a Welsh prince, was the first to

to Lady Charlotte Guest but she mentions him favourably in her diary and praises his translations. ‘Lepsius to-day brought me a copy of Schulz’s translation into German of the Mabinogion, given in a very different spirit from Villemarqué. Schulz is very scrupulous in his acknowledgements.’¹⁴ This excerpt is also proof of Lepsius’ role as an important connector in Schulz’ network, as he took a copy of Schulz’ translations to Wales to present them to Lady Charlotte.

The influence of these contacts, as well as his absorption of Herderian and Schlegelian ideas link him to core Romantic ideas on the development of tradition and literature through the contact of cultures. While he was mainly a peripheral figure throughout most of his literary career, he briefly appeared in the limelight of the Welsh literary scene with his prize-winning *Essay on the Influence of Welsh traditions on the literature of Germany, France and Scandinavia* at the Abergavenny Eisteddfod in 1840. The essay is the focal point for Schulz’ involvement in several literary fields and may be seen as the cross-section of his cultural and social background, including his education, his environment, his contacts and networks.

The spirit of the Romantic period with its interest in folklore, medieval literature, foreign languages and cultures certainly fuelled Schulz’ zeal to explore literary connections between medieval cultures in Europe and to make forgotten texts available for a wider public. The work of the brothers Grimm in this field was influential as well as the critical editions of Lachmann,¹⁵ in particular his edition of the German medieval poet Wolfram

discover America, a popular legend in the early nineteenth century. At the 1858 Eisteddfod at Llangollen he would have won the literary competition but the prize was withheld due to the unpopular result of his research. Cf. Marion Löffler, *The Literary and Historical Legacy of Iolo Morganwg*, pp. 56–57.

Schulz held Stephens in high esteem due to his critical attitude and decided to translate *The Literature of the Kymry* into German in 1864.

¹⁴ Earl of Bessborough, (ed.) *Lady Charlotte Guest: extracts from her journal, 1833—1852*. (London: Murray, 1950), pp. 135–6. The remark about ‘a very different spirit most likely refers to her criticism of La Villemarqué on pp. 117 and 133–34 where she accuses La Villemarqué of plagiarising her work, giving the impression that he translated directly from the Welsh and not from her English translation. Furthermore, he also used her notes without indicating so. Schulz, in contrary marked all comments he translated from her annotations with L.G. and he praises her translation in the foreword and leaves no doubt at all that he translated from her English text. On her journey to Germany, however, she is unable to meet Schulz as he was still in Bromberg while she travelled to Berlin, Potsdam and Dresden.

¹⁵ Karl Lachmann (1793–1851) is regarded as the founder of modern text criticism with his invention of stemmatics or the Lachmann method. [author’s note: The following excerpt sketches the foundations of modern philology, a rigorous form of manuscript criticism which Lachmann developed. It is included in the footnote in order to show the difference in Lachmann’s purely philological approach as opposed to Schulz’ more comprehensive socio-cultural approach. It also shows the impact that Lachmann’s work has made in the field of philology and that his methods or derivatives thereof are still used today.]

It is widely accepted that stemmatics originated in the work of Karl Lachmann. However, other scholars have also argued that manuscripts can be shown to be related by copy. The idea goes as far back as Erasmus.

von Eschenbach. Schulz entertained correspondence with Lachmann regarding his work on the first translations of Wolfram von Eschenbach's *Parcival* and with Wilhelm Grimm regarding the translation of Lady Charlotte Guest's *Mabinogion* into German. Further, his working methods and his interests are similar to some extent to those of August Wilhelm Schlegel. There is no direct evidence that Schulz was in contact with Schlegel or read his books but the examination of his interests and the research rationale of his essay on the influence of Welsh traditions on European literature have revealed his close affinity to A.W. Schlegel's ideas.

Albert Schulz was born on 18 May 1802 in Schwedt/Oder (Prussia, today in Germany), son of Christian Gottfried Schulz, a royal legal councillor, and his wife Sophie Dorothee. There is little information about his youth and no mention of siblings, but it is known that both his parents died when he was still young, his mother in 1809 and his father in 1817. Before Albert began to study law in Berlin and Heidelberg, he went to school in Schwedt after which, from 1816 to 1821, he received his pre-university education at the *Pädagogium*, a boarding school in Züllichau (today Sulechów in Poland, about 180 km from his hometown).

University records preserve some information about his studies of the Law and the Landeshauptarchiv Sachsen-Anhalt in Magdeburg holds documentation about his early career as a young assessor in Naumburg and Berlin, his career change from law to administration in Magdeburg, his referral to Bromberg and his permanent appointment as 'Königlicher Geheimrath' (Royal Privy Councillor) at the Provinzial-Schulkollegium (Provincial College) in Magdeburg¹⁶ and eventually, his retirement.¹⁷

We then should understand that Lachmann was the first to propose this method as a systematic approach which could help in the editing of texts. It would be incorrect, however, to assume that Lachmann wrote specifically about a particular methodology or theoretical approach. Instead, Lachmann's ideas can be found scattered in the introduction to his editions and in separate articles. [...] It is surprising to discover how many scholars use modern genetic methods —some of them which are closely related to Lachmann's ideas— despite the criticism that traditional genetic methods have endured through the years. It is possible to find a range of scholars using different variants of the Lachmann approach: including some who use what is known as Neo-Lachmannian approaches (Ben Salemans); some who have developed Lachmann's original ideas in order to take into account other aspects of the textual tradition (such as myself, Peter Robinson and our partners in the STEMMA and TEXTNET projects).

<<http://www.textualscholarship.org/stemmatology/index.html>> [accessed 20 April 2012]

¹⁶ Magdeburg, Landeshauptarchiv Sachsen-Anhalt, Rep. C20 I, Ib 352 I & II files on Albert Schulz' work as Royal Privy Councillor at the Provincial College.

¹⁷ Ibid, Rep C20 I, Ib 473, files on Albert Schulz' entire career from his appointment at the Superior Court of Justice in Berlin (1830–33) to his retirement in 1881.

Following in his father's footsteps, Schulz began his studies of the Law in Berlin in the winter term 1821 under, among others, Friedrich Carl von Savigny.¹⁸ While at Göttingen und Marburg, Savigny belonged to a literary-philosophical circle of late Romantics, including the Brentanos, Achim von Arnim and Caroline von Günderode,¹⁹ and was also an avid follower of August Wilhelm Schlegel. In the summer of 1799 and spring of 1800, he travelled frequently to Jena, at the time the intellectual capital of Germany, where he attended the lectures of A.W. Schlegel and Friedrich von Schelling.²⁰ Besides his excursion into philosophy and literary history, Savigny rose very rapidly to be one of the key figures in the field of law.²¹ In particular, his revolutionary approach to dealing with historical sources earned him nationwide recognition.²² It also left a lasting imprint on his students, the Brothers Grimm, in particular Jacob.²³ Schulz, however, only had a short time to absorb Savigny's influence, since he only studied in Berlin for one year. In 1822, Schulz moved to Heidelberg where he completed his studies in the summer term 1824. Being promoted to royal Prussian auscultator, i.e. ('Königlicher Preußischer Auscultator'),²⁴ his first appointment was at the court of justice in Brandenburg (Königliches Stadtgericht Brandenburg) before he received a three year law internship (Referendariat) at the superior court of justice (Oberlandesgericht) Naumburg from December 1826 until January 1830.

During his time in Naumburg Schulz met the Lepsius family, who introduced him to the literary circle in Naumburg. The family members themselves were very active in their academic pursuits. Carl Peter, the father, being a royal privy councillor, had a deep interest in German history. Schulz would later edit Carl Peter Lepsius' literary papers and publish them in 1854. Karl Richard, the son, studied classical philology, linguistics, history and

¹⁸ Besides von Savigny, the other professors, with whom Schulz studied, were J.F.L. Göschen and F.A. Wolf.

¹⁹ Dieter Nörr, 'Savigny, Friedrich Carl von', in *Neue Deutsche Biographie* 22 (2005), pp. 470–473 (p.470) <<http://www.deutsche-biographie.de/pnd118605909.html>> [accessed 12 December 2011].

²⁰ Frederick C. Beiser, 'Savigny and the Historical School of Law' in *The German Historicist Tradition* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), pp. 214–252, p. 219.

²¹ His time in Marburg had such a profound impact on jurisprudence in Germany, that the building, where the faculty of Law is located, is named after him. History of the Savigny-Haus in Marburg <<http://www.uni-marburg.de/fb01/geschichte>> [accessed 16 September 2012].

²² Beiser, 'Savigny and the Historical School of Law', p. 215. 'In 1800, at the age of nineteen [sic, Born in 1779, he was 21 in 1800], he received his doctorate from the University of Marburg; and in 1803, at the age of twenty-four, he became extraordinary professor there. [...] As chair for thirty years of the law faculty in Berlin, Savigny played a pivotal role in the institutionalization of historicist attitudes in the early nineteenth century.'

²³ G. P. Gooch, 'Chapter IV Jacob Grimm' in: *History and Historians in the Nineteenth Century* (London: Longmans, Green, and Co. 1913), pp. 54–63, p. 55.

²⁴ Title formerly given in Germany to a young lawyer who has passed his first public examination, and is thereupon employed by Government, but without salary and with no fixed appointment. (Now called referendar.) OED online version <<http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/13238?redirectedFrom=auscultator#eid>> [accessed 16 September 2012]

archaeology and, under the tutelage of an influential family friend, Karl Josias Bunsen, he became a renowned archaeologist. During his time in Naumburg, Schulz became engaged to Clara Lepsius, Richard's sister. According to Edward Schröder they had one son, Otto, who provided Schröder with material for the article introducing his father Albert in the *Allgemeine Deutsche Bibliographie (ADB)* in one of the supplementary volumes.²⁵ Two further daughters, Klara (died 1914) and Anna Schulz (died 1913), are mentioned in the biography of Schulz' grand-daughter Editha Klipstein.²⁶ Otto Schulz gave Schröder access to personal letters from his father, which painted a vivid picture of Schulz' time in Naumburg. Unfortunately, we have to assume that these letters have not survived the turmoils of the twentieth century. Fiedler-Rauer mentions in his article, that Schulz' family home at Poststraße 8 in Magdeburg did not survive the Second World War. According to the *Magdeburger Häuserbuch*, the buildings in the Poststraße were for the largest part destroyed in the RAF bombing of Magdeburg on 16 January 1944. In the rebuilding efforts the inner city plan underwent significant changes, streets were straightened up. As a part of this process the remains of the Poststraße were merged with the Kreuzgangstraße. This suggests strongly that the family home, which Otto, the son of Albert Schulz most likely inherited, was destroyed in 1944 and that the family was displaced after the bombing raid.²⁷ The scarcity of primary sources of Schulz' correspondence was initially a significant problem during the research for this thesis, until the aforementioned letters written by Wilhelm Grimm as a representative of the German literary field and Thomas Stephens as a representative of the Welsh field were discovered. These letters will be analysed in chapters five and six. Furthermore, Schulz' correspondence with Karl Lachmann was edited by Wolfgang Pfeiffer-Belli in *Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum (ZdfA)*, but it only includes the letter of Lachmann to Schulz, not Schulz' part of the

²⁵ The only evidence of Otto Schulz is the meeting with Schröder, before the latter wrote his entry on Albert Schulz for the *Allgemeine Deutsche Bibliographie (ADB)*; the meeting took place in Wiesbaden before or around 1910, after that we have not found any evidence of Otto or his descendants. The detailed online biography of Schulz' grand-daughter Editha Klipstein does not elucidate the fate of her uncle and his family. She, however, confirms in it the continuous links to the descendants of the Lepsius family and also the fact, that she visited the home of her grandfather in 1936. Cf. Rolf Haaser, 'Lebens-Chronik' *Editha Klipstein Archiv*, <http://www.uni-giessen.de/~g91058/edithaklipsteinarchiv/index_klipst_chronik.htm> [accessed 10 November 2011]

²⁶ Rolf Haaser, *Editha Klipstein Archiv* 'Lebens-Chronik' According to the Editha Klipstein archive, the first daughter married a man named Thun, whose first name is not mentioned. The only evidence for the marriage is the entry in her sister's biography which states that Klara Thun died on 20 January 1914. The latter, Anna, married the Graecist Friedrich Blass in 1873.

²⁷ Fiedler-Rauer, 'San-Martes Parcival und seine Beurteiler', p. 541, and *Magdeburger Häuserbuch*, p. 92, available at <http://www.magdeburg-tourist.de/media/custom/698_4882_1.PDF?1216809345> [accessed 17 September 2012]

conversation.²⁸ Therefore, the article by Schröder in the *ADB* regarding information on Schulz' private life is a valuable source about his early years in Naumburg. In this article, Schröder describes the profound changes in Schulz' life as a new member of the Lepsius family in the following paragraph:

Die Briefe aus dem ersten Jahr des Brautstands haben mir vorgelegen: sie zeugen von einem überaus glücklichen Verhältniß und bekunden u. a., wie früh ihm Wolfram's Parzival zum vertrauten Umgang geworden war.²⁹

The above quote from Schröder's article highlights both Schulz' integration in his new family as well as his awakening interest in medieval German literature and, importantly, how these two aspects were interlinked. Schulz benefited from the connections of the Lepsius family within the German field and also to the British, and in particular Welsh, literary scene. The family friend, Baron Karl Josias von Bunsen, the Prussian ambassador to Rome and London proved to be the crucial connection for Schulz, as the ambassador was a member of an interdisciplinary network of several influential scholars and writers: Friedrich Lücke (1791–1855, theologian), Karl Lachmann, Ernst Schulze (1789–1817, Romantic poet) and Christian August Brandis (1790–1867, philosopher).³⁰ The well-established position of Bunsen in these intellectual circles became an advantage for Schulz on more than one level. Bunsen's long-standing intellectual links with Lachmann undoubtedly played a part in Lachmann's willingness to act as a private reviewer for Schulz's first attempts to enter the field of medieval German literature. Bunsen's networks and their significance for Schulz will be examined in chapter three where the Welsh connection will be illustrated in detail. Further details on the eisteddfodau and the importance of the Cymreigyddion for Schulz' development as a cultural mediator and the effect it had on his publishing career, will be examined in detail prior to the discussion of the essay. The foundation for his success in 1840, however, was basically laid over a decade earlier, during his time in Naumburg, where he made the decisive acquaintances and acquired the solid literary background thanks to the Lepsius family.

²⁸ Wolfgang Pfeiffer-Belli, 'Karl Lachmann an Albert Schulz' in *Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum* 87, 1957, 317–320.

²⁹ Edward Schröder, 'Schulz, Albert', in: *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie* 55 (1910), pp. 194–197. <<http://www.deutsche-biographie.de/pnd109482263.html?anchor=adb>> [accessed 7 November 2011]

³⁰ R. Pauli, 'Bunsen, Christian Karl Josias Freiherr von' in *Allgemeine Deutsche Bibliographie*, 3, (1876), pp. 541–552, (p. 541) <http://daten.digital-sammlungen.de/bsb00008361/image_543> [images 543–554] [accessed 10 November 2011].

After serving there for three years, in 1830, Schulz had to leave Naumburg when he was promoted to legal assessor and transferred to the superior court of justice in Berlin for a term of three years. This year also marks Schulz' debut as a writer, starting his publishing career in the field of Law. His first printed book was an essay evaluating the usefulness of provincial laws in Prussia *Ueber den Werth von Provinzial-Gesetzen, mit besonderer Beziehung auf Preußen*, a highly controversial subject at the time. In this publication Schulz voiced his opinion on a current matter of highest importance in the emerging Prussian kingdom: the abolition of provincial laws in favour of the Allgemeines Landrecht für die preußischen Staaten, (abbreviated A. L. R., 1794).³¹ Considering the explosive nature of the subject matter, Schulz decided to publish it under the pen name San Marte.³² By 1832, the book had been reviewed by several professors of Law, chief among them the popular but controversial Dr Eduard Gans, the main opponent of Schulz' old professor Friedrich von Savigny. Gans welcomed Schulz' approach to strengthening the position of the A. L. R. from being a subsidiary legal code, only in force if the provincial law does not provide a solution to the present case, to becoming the unifying legal code throughout the entire kingdom. In his *Beiträge zur Revision der Preußischen Gesetze*, Gans dedicates an entire chapter to Schulz' essay and begins his review with a eulogy on Schulz' achievement:³³

Zur Beantwortung dieser Frage [ob man die momentane komplexe Gesetzeslage nicht den veränderten politischen Verhältnissen anpassen sollte] ist neulich eine Schrift erschienen, welche mir in Form und Inhalt so überaus gelungen erscheint, welche mit eben so großer Freiheitsliebe, als Mäßigung, mit eben so tiefer Sachkenntnis, als richtiger Würdigung der Gegenwart geschrieben ist, daß ich mich zu ihren Grundsätzen und Meinungen vollkommen bekennen muß, und meinen Lesern nichts Unangenehmes zu erweisen glaube, wenn ich sie mit ihrem Inhalte zuvörderst bekannt mache.³⁴

The choice of words shows clearly that Gans agreed with Schulz on all accounts and views his essay as the result of very thorough research and reflection. As already mentioned, Gans, a keen follower of Hegelian philosophy in law,³⁵ was a major opponent of Savigny. During Schulz' studies in Berlin, Savigny was already a professor whilst Gans, being a Jew

³¹ After the Restoration of 1815, the kingdom of Prussia was a union of the joint Kingdom of Brandenburg-Prussia, the kingdom of Saxony, the provinces of Pomerania, South, West, East and New East Prussia, New Silesia, Warmia, as well as territories in West Germany in the Rhineland, Bremen, etc.

³² San Marte, *Ueber den Werth von Provinzialgesetzen; mit besonderer Beziehung auf Preußen, ein Wort zur Feier des dritten Augusts* (Quedlinburg, Leipzig: Basse, 1830).

³³ Eduard Gans, *Beiträge zur Revision der Preußischen Gesetze*, (Berlin: Duncker und Humblot, 1830–1832).

³⁴ Ibid. chapter XXII. 'Ueber die Provinzialgesetze', p. 357.

³⁵ Hermann Lübke, 'Gans, Eduard', in *Neue Deutsche Biographie*, 6, (1964), p. 63 <<http://www.deutsche-biographie.de/pnd118689479.html>> [accessed 8 November 2011].

and therefore not eligible for a professorship, held a post as a lecturer at the faculty of Law. Being reviewed favourably by his professor's philosophical disputant could have been a problem for Schulz in his early career.³⁶ It is not hard to imagine that Schulz, as a former student of Savigny, saw himself in a conflict of loyalty between his conviction that his approach was right and the established opinion represented by Savigny.

Possibly as a result of frustration that his ideas were turned down by the conservative majority in the field, Schulz decided to abandon a secure career in Law for a much more uncertain appointment in the administrative sector. There is evidence of a certain degree of tension between Schulz and his superiors. Official correspondence shows that in 1831, the Home Secretary of Prussia even warned Schulz against taking this step by telling him that after his traineeship as a governmental assessor (Regierungsassessor) a permanent appointment could not be guaranteed.³⁷ Schulz nonetheless insisted and was subsequently promoted to royal councillor (Regierungsrath) and legal adviser (Justiziar) in the administrative section of the government in Magdeburg in 1833.

Just before securing the new appointment, Schulz married Clara Lepsius, but he could not settle down in Magdeburg, as the aforementioned publication on the usefulness of provincial laws, first published under his pseudonym San-Marte, was finally attributed to him beyond any doubt and in 1837 he saw himself transferred to Bromberg, which today is Bydgoszcz in Poland, more than 400 km east of Berlin. Schulz resented the transfer and felt he had been sent into the academic desert, far away from well-equipped libraries, archives and the scholarly scene of Berlin and Naumburg/Kösen. Fiedler-Rauer describes this situation as follows:

Seine Karriere im Justizdienst, die ihn über Naumburg nach Magdeburg führte, verlief reibungslos. Empfindlich getroffen hatte ihn jedoch eine Versetzung nach Bromberg,

³⁶ The conflict had started in 1821, when Schulz was studying in Berlin, and it culminated in Gans' attack on one of Savigny's fundamental theories, the *Besitztheorie*. Emil Julius Hugo Steffenhagen 'Gans, Eduard' in *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie*, 8, (1878), pp. 361–362 (p. 362) http://daten.digital-sammlungen.de/bsb00008366/image_364> [images 363–364] [accessed 10 November 2012]. 'Zu besonderer Schärfe gedieh der Conflict, als G. In der seinem 'System des Römischen Civilrechts im Grundrisse' (1827) beigegebenen Abhandlung Savigny's Besitztheorie angriff, [...]. Von Savigny's Schülern mit Hohn zurückgewiesen, traf G. gleichwohl den wunden Punkt, insofern er der historischen Schule das Verlieren in die Einzelheiten der geschichtlichen Forschung und Mangel und philosophischer Bildung und speculativer Begabung zum Vorwurf machte.'

³⁷ Rep C20 I, Ib 473, files on Albert Schulz' entire career from his appointment at the Superior Court of Justice in Berlin (1830–33) to his retirement in 1881.

die San-Marte besonders aus literarhistorischer Sicht als Exil auffasste – fernab von den begehrten Quellen des deutschen Mittelalters.³⁸

[His career in the legal service, which led him via Naumburg to Magdeburg, went swimmingly. He was, however, severely affected by the transfer to Bromberg, which San-Marte considered as an exile, especially in a literary-historical sense, as it was far away from the sought-after sources of the German Middle Ages. My translation.]

His influential friend Lepsius tried his best to reverse the referral and in 1843 he was successful: Schulz' literary endeavours, previously frowned upon by the authorities, turned into an asset when he was promoted Royal Prussian Councillor (Königlicher Preußischer Regierungsrath) at the Provincial College in Magdeburg where he worked as an administrator in higher education until his retirement in 1881 at the age of 79. After almost twenty years of moving from appointment to appointment, Schulz could finally settle down and concentrate on his professional career as well as on his literary research. Fiedler-Rauer confirms that he was a 'betriebsamer and hochdekoriertes Verwaltungsbeamter'³⁹ throughout his 38 years as Royal Privy Councillor in Magdeburg. Besides his career as an administrator, Schulz' career as a researcher also gained momentum: the late 1840s and the 1850s mark the pinnacle of Schulz' productivity. He received the *doctor honoris causae* for his literary and philological achievements at the University of Königsberg in 1862⁴⁰, in particular for his *Parcival* translation of 1836 and the related *Parcivalstudien*. He died on 3 June 1893 in Magdeburg.⁴¹

As much of Schulz' work is relatively unknown today, it is useful to provide some detail on his publications. The following section illustrates his progression as a scholar from the first attempts to gain a foothold in the field of German medieval literature to a more comparative approach in later years which saw him covering several different branches of

³⁸ Fiedler-Rauer, 'Magdeburger Gralshüter' <http://www2.hu-berlin.de/presse/zeitung/archiv/00_01/num_5/15.html>

³⁹ Ibid.

⁴⁰ Johann Gottfried Herder is one of the most famous alumni of the University of Königsberg.

⁴¹ Schröder, 'Schulz, Albert', p. 197. Schulz' son Otto, provided Edward Schröder with material for the article introducing his father Albert in the *Allgemeine Deutsche Bibliographie*, chiefly among these the personal letters alluded to earlier. Schröder lists the following sources for his article: Zwei Nachrufe in der Magdeburger Zeitung 1893, Nr. 279 (5. Juni, Abendausgabe). Briefe und Jugendliteratur, sowie reiche Auszüge aus den Personalacten hat mir der einzige Sohn von Schulz, Herr Otto Schulz in Wiesbaden mitgeteilt, einige persönliche Erinnerungen Herr Geh. Rath Professor Dr. Urban, Propst von U. L. Frauen in Magdeburg.

U. L. Frauen is a former monastery with an incorporated religious school opposite the Poststraße where Schulz lived. It is one of the most important Romanesque buildings in Germany. After its secularisation in the 1830s, it became a public *pädagogium*. Since Schulz occupied a high position in another state-owned educational institution, the Provincial College in Magdeburg, it is not surprising that he had contacts to the senior staff of the *pädagogium* in the former monastery.

European medieval literature, most notably the Arthurian material. After the controversial essay of 1830, Schulz moved into calmer waters with his first attempt at translating the medieval German poem *Parcival* by Wolfram von Eschenbach into modern German in 1833.⁴² This pilot project contains excerpts of the poem rendered in rhymed verses with four stressed syllables in each line in modern German. In the same year, Lachmann published the first critical edition of the *Parcival* text. Schulz sent Lachmann excerpts of his translation before publishing it in order to obtain a critical opinion on his first contribution to medieval studies. In the foreword Schulz promised his readers that he would publish a comprehensive translation of the entire work of von Eschenbach. In 1836, the first volume of *Leben und Dichten Wolframs von Eschenbach* was published, including *Parcival*, and an extensive introduction to the poet and to the historical and literary background of his era, the twelfth and thirteenth centuries in Germany.⁴³ Five years later, in 1841, Schulz finished his first major work with the second volume of *Leben und Dichten Wolframs von Eschenbach*, including translations of songs, and other epic poems such as *Wilhelm von Orange* and *Titurel* and a dissertation on the life and work of the author with particular focus on the development of the saga of the Holy Grail.⁴⁴

Between these two major books Schulz also worked on other medieval German tales comprised in his 1839 publication *Gudrun. Nordseesage*, along with a dissertation on the poem Gudrun and the cycle of poems from the North Sea region (Nordseesagenkreis).⁴⁵ This book is the first to be published from his ‘literary exile’ in Bromberg and the first one with the addition (A. Schulz) to the pseudonym San-Marte.

Schulz’ interest in Wales originates in this period. During his research on *Parcival* it is very likely that Schulz first encountered the Arthurian tales and their Welsh background, in particular the parallel narrative of *Peredur* in Middle Welsh. In the letters from Lachmann to Schulz in 1835, we find Lachmann’s answers to Schulz’ queries on the French versions

⁴² San-Marte, *Parcival; Rittergedicht von Wolfram von Eschenbach; Im Auszuge mitgetheilt von San Marte* (Magdeburg: Creutz, 1833).

⁴³ San-Marte, *Leben und Dichten Wolframs von Eschenbach; Erster Band, Parcival; Aus dem Mittelhochdeutschen zum ersten Male übersetzt*, 2 vols (Magdeburg: Creutz, 1836/1841), I (1836).

⁴⁴ Idem, *Leben und Dichten Wolframs von Eschenbach. Zweiter Band. Lieder, Wilhelm von Orange und Titurel von Wolfram von Eschenbach, und der jüngere Titurel von Albrecht in Uebersetzung und Auszug, nebst Abhandlungen über das Leben und Wirken Wolframs von Eschenbach, und die Sage vom heiligen Gral*, 2 vols, II, (Magdeburg: Creutz, 1841).

⁴⁵ Idem, (A. Schulz), *Gudrun; Nordseesage; Nebst Abhandlung über das mittelhochdeutsche Gedicht Gudrun und den Nordseesagenkrei*. (Berlin, Posen, Bromberg: Mittler, 1839).

of *Perceval* and other Arthurian traditions.⁴⁶ Schulz' new in-laws, the Lepsius family, helped him establish the link to Wales, the Cymreigyddion Society and their annual eisteddfodau through the family friend Baron von Bunsen. This connection provided him with a platform to develop this interest in the Welsh elements in European literature and made him aware of the existence of the Welsh field and its traditions.

Responding to a call from the Cymreigyddion for essay on the subject, Schulz entered the competition at the 1840 Abergavenny Eisteddfod with his *An Essay on the influence of Welsh tradition on the literature of Germany, France, and Scandinavia*, submitted in the original German.⁴⁷ This proved to be the successful entry and was subsequently published the following year in its English translation. In 1842, Schulz edited his original German manuscript and added his first translations of three volumes of Lady Charlotte's *Mabinogion*, namely the tales of *Iarlles y Ffynnon*, *Peredur ab Eyrwrc* and *Geraint ab Erbin* into German to the book titled *Die Arthursage und die Märchen des rothen Buchs von Hergest*.⁴⁸ Both the English translation and the German republication sparked reactions in Britain and Germany. The reviews in Britain were mainly favourable regarding his research but rather critical, bordering on condescending, about the research question set by the Cymreigyddion. The *Monthly Review* and the *Monthly Magazine* were full of praise while the *Athenaeum* and the *Gentleman's Magazine* did acknowledge Schulz' academic work but did not deem the topic to be of any significance. In Germany, the situation was very different, as Schulz' research met fierce criticism from Ernst Susemihl, a reviewer of the *Neue Jenaische Allgemeine Literatur-Zeitung*. The harsh, even polemic tone of the criticism may have deterred Schulz from continuing his efforts to translate all the *Mabinogion* tales from Lady Guest's English versions.⁴⁹

Despite the criticism he met, Schulz did not withdraw from the British literary field. In 1844, he published his first edition of Latin texts by British authors, namely Nennius and Gildas.⁵⁰ Schulz based his critical edition on the English edition of Joseph Stevenson,

⁴⁶ Pfeiffer-Belli, 'Karl Lachmann an Albert Schulz' in *ZdA* 87, 1957, 317–320.

⁴⁷ Albert Schulz, *An Essay on the influence of Welsh tradition upon the literature of Germany, France, and Scandinavia, which obtained the prize of the Abergavenny Cymreigyddion Society, at the eisteddfod of 1840; Translated by Mrs. Berrington from the German of A. Schulz* (Llandoverly: William Rees, 1841), (London: Longman, Williams, Hughes), (Chester: Parry), (Abergavenny: Morgan).

⁴⁸ Idem, *Die Arthursage und die Märchen des rothen Buchs von Hergest* (Quedlinburg, Leipzig: Basse, 1842) Bibliothek der gesammten deutschen Nationalliteratur, Abth. II, B. 2. [section II, vol. 2].

⁴⁹ He made another attempt in 1847 at translating from Lady Charlotte's versions but was met with similar criticism (see the discussion of his 1847 publication).

⁵⁰ San-Marte (A. Schulz) *Nennius und Gildas* (Berlin: Röse, 1844).

Nennius et Gildas, ex recensione Stevenson, published in 1838. He added his own foreword in which he introduces the German reader to the legendary British history including the stories of King Arthur, before he faithfully translates, or has someone translate for him, the English preface into German. The Latin text is a copy of Stevenson's edition; the English annotations are translated into German.

In 1847, Schulz turned his attention again to the *Mabinogion* with his publication *Beiträge zur bretonischen und celtisch-germanischen Heldensage*,⁵¹ which can be seen as the follow-up to his award-winning essay. This time, Schulz examined the transmission of British traditions with a particular focus on the development and dissemination of Arthurian material in and through Brittany, slightly shifting the attention away from Wales. The second part of the book contains another series of German translations of Lady Guest's renderings of *Culhwch ac Olwen*, and *Arthur and Eliwlod*. These would be his last translations from the *Mabinogion*, leaving the *Four Branches* inaccessible to the German public until the publication of the German translation by Martin Buber in 1914.⁵² Instead of including more translations to his publication, Schulz adds a detailed discussion of the saga of Finn, Hengest and Horsa in the Anglo-Saxon, Irish, German, Welsh, Dutch and Scandinavian traditions. In so doing, he followed the example of his first publication on Welsh traditions, the *Arthursage* in 1842, which was divided in three main parts, the first part being the essay, the second part containing three translations and the third part offering a comparative analysis of the translated tales. In the 1847 publication, however, the third part of the book contained a comparative study of different tales in a pan-European context, not related to the translations. Both the *Arthursage* and the *Beiträge* show Schulz's interest in comparative literary studies. This research focus was very popular at the time in the Welsh literary field, in particular among the members of the Cymreigyddion Society, who had a history of setting comparative research questions in their main competitions in the late 1830s.⁵³ Thus Schulz's own interests fell on fertile ground in Wales. The motivations and the rationale of the literary competitions in the Abergavenny Eisteddfodau will be discussed in more detail in chapter three.

⁵¹ Idem, *Beiträge zur bretonischen und celtisch-germanischen Heldensage*, Bibliothek der gesammten deutschen National-Literatur, Abth. II B. 3. [section II, vol. 3] (Quedlinburg, Leipzig: Basse, 1847).

⁵² Martin Buber, *Die vier Zweige des Mabinogi* (Leipzig: Insel, 1914). Buber translated from the widely lauded French translation *Les Mabinogion du Livre rouge de Hergest avec les variantes du Livre blanc de Rhydderch* by Joseph Loth (Paris: Fontemoing et cie, 1913).

⁵³ Mair Elvet Thomas, *Afiath yng Ngwent* (Caerdydd [Cardiff]: Gwasg Prifysgol Cymru [University of Wales Press], 1978), p. 85.

After 1848, Schulz did not publish for several years. It is unknown whether the turbulent situation of 1848 forced him to decrease his scholarly productivity for a while but it is very likely that the aftermath of the revolution caused ruptures in his networks while the number of publications in these years also dropped on a larger scale. The sheer volume of the four following publications in 1853 and 1854 could also be seen as an indicator to several years of quiet research. First, Schulz published his translation of the epic poem *Walther von Aquitanien* from the tenth century Latin into German with added commentary.⁵⁴ This was followed by his long term project *Die Sagen von Merlin*, a compilation of sources on the fascinating and in medieval texts almost omnipresent figure of Merlin.⁵⁵ In this book, Schulz included all the materials which he could not include in his previous publications on Arthurian material, for example the prophecies of Merlin. For his exhaustive overview of the representation of Myrddin/Merlin, Schulz drew from Welsh, Breton, Scottish, Italian and Latin sources. In 1854, he first published the edited volume *Kleine Schriften. Beiträge zur thüringisch-sächsischen Geschichte und deutschen Kunst- und Alterthumskunde von Karl Peter Lepsius* which comprised the literary remains of his father-in-law Karl Peter Lepsius (1775–1853) who had died the year before.⁵⁶ In the foreword Schulz underscores the importance of Lepsius’ influence on his life, career and philosophy. The foreword will be examined more closely in chapter three.

In 1854, he also published his edition of Geoffrey’s *Historia Regum Britanniae*,⁵⁷ a critical review of the various prints of Geoffrey’s much debated history of the kings of Britain.⁵⁸ Schulz based his work mainly on earlier editions by Giles and the almost identical version

⁵⁴ San-Marte (A. Schulz) *Walter von Aquitanien; Heldengedicht aus dem Lateinischen des zehnten Jahrhunderts, übersetzt und erläutert von San-Marte (A. Schulz)*. (Magdeburg: Creutz, 1853).

⁵⁵ San-Marte (A. Schulz), *Die Sagen von Merlin; Mit altwälschen, bretagnischen, schottischen, italienischen und lateinischen Gedichten und Prophezeihungen Merlins, der Prophetia Merlini des Gottfrieds von Monmouth und der Vita Merlini, lateinischem Gedichte aus dem 13. Jahrhundert; Herausgegeben und erläutert von San-Marte (A. Schulz)* (Halle: Waisenhausbuchhandlung, 1853).

⁵⁶ Idem, *Kleine Schriften; Beiträge zur thüringisch-sächsischen Geschichte und deutschen Kunst- und Alterthumskunde von Karl Peter Lepsius, Königlich Preußischem Geheimen Regierungs-Rath, Landrath a. D. und Ritter des rothen Adler-Ordens IV. Klasse; Gesammelt und theilweise zum ersten Male aus dem handschriftlichen Nachlaß des Verfassers herausgegeben von A. Schulz (San-Marte)* (Magdeburg: Creutzsche Buchhandlung, 1854).

⁵⁷ Idem, *Gottfried’s von Monmouth Historia Regum Britanniae, mit literar-historischer Einleitung und ausführlichen Anmerkungen; und: Brut Tysilio, altwälsche Chronik, in deutscher Uebersetzung, herausgegeben von San-Marte (A. Schulz)* (Halle: Anton, 1854).

⁵⁸ The *Historia* traces back the origin of the British people to Troy so understanding *Historia* as history would be misleading. It should rather be seen as a mythological account of past events, mingling historical facts and mythological figures. Schulz decides to treat the book as such, following Herder and Schlegel in this. Further, the debate on the sources was quite lively, since Geoffrey alluded to ancient British books where he drew his stories from. Schulz voices his opinion on the natures of said book in his essay.

available in the *Heidelberger Scriptoriensammlung* with other variant readings.⁵⁹ He also included Roberts' English translation of *Brut Tysyllo*, an old Welsh chronicle which at the time was seen as a parallel text to the *Historia*, or even a retranslation of the Latin chronicle into Welsh.⁶⁰ Schulz paralleled his Latin text with the English translation although he remarked that the term translation must be understood very loosely, since it was not a literal translation but rather a rephrasing.⁶¹ This remark reveals his attitude towards translation and his critical view of the term 'translation' as it was used in previous centuries. In the foreword to his edition of the *Historia*, Schulz made it clear that his previous book on Merlin and the present edition should be read as complimentary works as each contained relevant information for the understanding of the other. This shows that Schulz understood the entirety of his scholarly work as an on-going process, with current projects building on existing publications.

Schulz' final publication in the field of Celtic studies is his 1864 German translation of Thomas Stephens' *The Literature of the Kymry*, originally published in 1849, and entitled *Die Geschichte der wälschen Literatur*.⁶² Schulz was very impressed with Stephens' critical and methodical approach to literary history which distinguished him from many of his contemporaries:

Ich setze das Verdienst des Verfassers aber nicht allein darin, dieses Geistesleben [von Wales] vor uns überhaupt in einem großen Bilde aufgerollt und klar gelegt zu haben, sondern insbesondere auch darin, [...], die fernere Forschung vor Irrwegen bewahren wird, auf denen sie zum Theil schon gute Strecken zurückgelegt hat, und von denen sie unbedingt umkehren muss. – Es gilt dies vornehmlich von den celtisch-mythologischen Phantastereien, die von Davies (*Mythology and Rites of the British Druids*. London, 1809) mit immenser aber abstruser Gelehrsamkeit ausgegangen sind, und in England z.B. durch den Verfasser der *Britannia after the Romans* (Herbert) und dessen *Neodruidic – Heresy* u. A. m.⁶³

Besides praising Stephens for his scholarly integrity, Schulz also highlights the importance of making this highly instructive treatise available to the German public. He adds a critical overview of books about Wales previously published in Germany, beginning with his own, prize-winning essay in both its English translation and the German edition with the

⁵⁹ Schulz, *Historia Regum Britanniae*, pp. xlvi–xlvii.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, p. lxxi.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*

⁶² *Idem*, *Geschichte der wälschen Literatur vom XII. bis zum XIV. Jahrhundert; Gekrönte Preisschrift von Thomas Stephens; Aus dem Englischen übersetzt und durch Beigabe altwälscher Dichtungen in deutscher Uebersetzung ergänzt* (Halle: Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses, 1864).

⁶³ *Ibid.*, p. iii.

translations of the Mabinogion, followed by all his other publications in the Welsh literary field, before he mentions other notable books such as Ferdinand Walter's *Das alte Wales* (1859) and Guest's translations of the *Mabinogion* which had been reviewed in German journals.

Schulz was not only interested in Celtic and Arthurian works. In the same year as the *Arthursage* was published, 1842, he broke new ground with his collection of Polish national sagas, fairy tales and legends, entitled *Groß-Polens Nationalsagen, Märchen und Legenden, und Lokalsagen des Großherzogtums Posen*.⁶⁴ According to Schröder, Schulz had already taken an interest in the folk traditions of Poland as a young man, as early as 1830, when he planned to write a play inspired by his interest in Polish history. Its working title was *Roszinski* but there is no mention whether it was ever finished.⁶⁵ The time in Bromberg, despite being considered as a period of academic exile, inspired him to do further research on the folktales of Poland. In 1848, five years after Schulz' move to Magdeburg, he produced a second publication in this field, entitled *Die polnische Königssage*,⁶⁶ which was the mythical account of the origin of the Polish nation, to some extent comparable to Geoffrey of Monmouth's *Historia Regum Britanniae*, including a critical review of the sources.

During the same period Schulz widened his field of activity further, not only adding new literary traditions to his interests but also a completely different genre. After moving back to Madgeburg in 1843, Schulz finally made his debut as playwright with the religious tragedy *Des Kreuzes Prüfung* (1845).⁶⁷ According to Fiedler-Rauer, Schulz completed three plays, of which one, *Boleslav II* remained unpublished but made the stage in 1850. The other two, the debut *Des Kreuzes Prüfung* as well as another drama entitled *Der Liebe Streit und Widerstreit* (1872) were never performed but only published.⁶⁸

Following on from the first successful publications in the 1830s and 1840s, the 1850s marked the peak of Schulz' academic career, as his most substantial volumes, the *Historia Regum Britanniae* and *Die Sagen von Merlin*, were published then. By then, he had

⁶⁴ Idem, *Gross-Polens Nationalsagen, Märchen und Legenden, und Lokalsagen des Grossherzogtums Posen* (Bromberg: Levit, 1842).

⁶⁵ Schröder, 'Schulz , Albert', p. 195.

⁶⁶ San-Marte, *Die polnische Königssage; Nach den Quellen dargestellt und kritisch erörtert von San-Marte*, (Berlin: H. Schultze, 1848).

⁶⁷ Idem, (A. Schulz), *Des Kreuzes Prüfung; Glaubenstragödie* (Magdeburg: Heinrichshofen, 1845).

⁶⁸ Fiedler-Rauer, 'San-Martes Parcival und seine Beurteiler', p. 543.

established himself in several literary fields: the British, the German and the Polish. This decade saw several second prints of previous publications, such as *Leben und Dichten Wolframs von Eschenbach* in 1858 and *Grosspolens Nationalsagen, Maerchen und Legenden*, entitled *Polens Vorzeit in Sage und Dichtung* in 1859.⁶⁹ The *Parcival* translation even saw a third edition in 1887. Schulz also continued his critical work on von Eschenbach with his *Parcivalstudien* which were published in three volumes from 1860–1862 and also several *Parcival*-related articles in Pfeiffer’s *Germania*.⁷⁰ By 1864, his reputation as a scholar in medieval German literature was such that the University of Königsberg awarded him the title *doctor honoris causae*, in particular for his *Parcivalstudien*. In the years following the award, Schulz continued his efforts to present von Eschenbach from different viewpoints through his book *Zur Waffenkunde des älteren deutschen Mittelalters. Mit 13 Abbildungen aus Handschriften zur Parcivaldichtung* and with his *Reimregister* (rhyme register) for the works of von Eschenbach in 1867. He also published an article on heraldic figures in *Germania* and contributed to other collections in his field of expertise.⁷¹ In 1872, he compiled and edited an edition of eight of his previously published essays, entitled *Rückblicke auf Dichtungen und Sagen des deutschen Mittelalters* (1872).⁷² From the late 1860s onwards, Schulz’ publication activity began to dwindle, although he still conducted research on von Eschenbach and *Wilhelm von Orange*.⁷³ A homonymous translation of the latter, published in 1873, was Schulz’ last major independent publication, yet he still contributed essays and articles to various journals and encyclopaedias.⁷⁴ Schröder regards Schulz’ long-lasting research on Wolfram von Eschenbach as an indicator of his evolution as a scholar. He contrasts Schulz’ first

⁶⁹ Albert Schulz, *Polens Vorzeit in Dichtung und Wahrheit* (Bromberg: Louis Levit, 1859)

⁷⁰ Idem, ‘Über die Eigennamen im Parzival des Wolfram von Eschenbach’ in *Germania* 2, Vierteljahrsschrift für Deutsche Alterthumskunde (1857), 386–409.

And also: Idem. ‘Wolfram von Eschenbach und Guiot von Provins’ in *Germania* 3, Vierteljahrsschrift für Deutsche Alterthumskunde (1858), 445–464.

And also: Idem. ‘Wolfram’s Parcival und seine Beurteiler’ in *Germania* 7 Vierteljahrsschrift für Deutsche Alterthumskunde, (1862), 55–73.

⁷¹ Idem, ‘Schildmaler und Malerwappen’ in: *Germania* 9, Vierteljahrsschrift für Deutsche Alterthumskunde, (1864) 463–470, and also idem, ‘Über die Volkssagen von Ahasverus und Faust im Lichte ihrer Zeit’ in *Deutsches Museum* 7, (Leipzig: Brockhaus, 1866), pp. 193–210.

⁷² Idem, *Rückblicke auf Dichtungen und Sagen des deutschen Mittelalters: literarische Vorträge von San-Marte* (Quedlinburg, Leipzig: Basse, 1872). This volume contains a selection of his works on Merlin, the Nibelungen, Wolfram von Eschenbach, and the previously mentioned essay on Ahasverus.

⁷³ Idem, *Wilhelm von Orange. Heldengedicht von Wolfram von Eschenbach* (Halle: Verlag der Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses, 1873).

⁷⁴ For example the article ‘Gaal’ in *Allgemeine Encyclopädie der Wissenschaften und Künste* 1.27 edited by Johann Samuel Ersch and Johann Gottfried Gruber in 1877. Schulz also contributed to *Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie* in 1884 with ‘Zur Gral- und Arthursage; Das Schwert des Grals und das Gesetz der Tafelrunde’ in *ZfdPh* 16, 129–165.

publications in the 1830s and 1840s, clearly influenced by Romantic ideas, with those of the later Schulz, beginning with the second, revised *Parcival* translation in 1858:

Wir unterscheiden in Schulz' Wolfram-Studien zwei Perioden: in der ersten überwiegt die romantische Neigung, die der Jüngling der phantastischen Sagenwelt Wolfram's entgegengebracht hat; so gelangt der gereifte Mann zu Sagenforschungen, die ihn theilweise weit von dem deutschen Dichter abführen. In dieser Periode könnte ich mir die Begeisterung, mit der sich Sch. für Guiot de Provins im 1. Heft der *Parcival*-Studien einsetzt, gar nicht vorstellen, ja kaum ein Interesse für diesen von der Sagenwelt des Grals weit abstehenden Didaktiker – Mit der neuen Auflage der *Parzival*-Übersetzung beginnt die zweite Periode: das Interesse am Stofflichen scheidet fast aus: Wolfram, „der evangelische Ritter“, seine aus dem Mittelalter erwachsene und über das Mittelalter hinausweisende Weltanschauung und der starke, ewiggültige sittliche Gehalt seiner Dichtung treten in den Vordergrund.⁷⁵

While the young Schulz was enthusiastic about the Romantic poetry itself and the themes that were transmitted in European traditions, the older Schulz from the late 1850s onwards concentrated more on the Christian elements and the questions of morality in Wolfram's work. This evolution of Schulz as a scholar reflects a similar philosophical current in late Romanticism, which acquired a more pious flavour.⁷⁶ The titles of Schulz' dramas are also an indicator of a gradual shift towards a more religious focus. Moreover, the trinity of Romanticism, Pietism and emerging Nationalism strengthened during the nineteenth century, as it became engraved in the consciousness of generation after generation of *Bildungsbürger*.⁷⁷

While Schulz, the mature scholar, would certainly provide a very compelling research field in its own right, this thesis is mainly concerned with the first decade of Schulz' career as a researcher, examining the years leading to the turning point in his scholarly life: winning the main prize at the Abergavenny Eisteddfod. In so doing, Schulz became a mediator between two literary fields, whose contributions resulted in a transfer of cultural and literary knowledge. The Essay, the preconditions for its composition, the result of the editing process in 1842, and the reception in the British and German literary fields are the central focus of this research and the thesis is structured accordingly. Chapter two examines the external factors, the literary and philosophical currents in Schulz' time which emerge in his work, with particular emphasis on the Romantic Movement and the

⁷⁵ Schröder, 'Schulz, Albert', pp. 196–97.

⁷⁶ Ricarda Schmidt, 'From Early to Late Romanticism' in *The Cambridge Companion to German Romanticism*, ed. by Nicolas Saul (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), pp. 21–39 (p. 22).

⁷⁷ Liah Greenfield, 'The Final Solution of Infinite Longing: Germany' in *Nationalism, Five Roads to Modernity* (Cambridge, MA; London, England: Harvard University Press, 1992), pp. 275–395 (p. 363).

beginning of Celticism in Germany. This sets the stage for the trans-national networks which enabled scholars to exchange ideas across national and cultural boundaries. Chapter three provides a theoretical framework to the investigation, as the maturing process of Schulz as a scholar and ‘player’ in various fields will be examined by the means of Pierre Bourdieu’s theory of cultural production, involving the literary and artistic fields, the laws of cultural production within these fields and the field of power governing there. Chapter four contains a thorough examination of the essay on the influence of Welsh traditions, highlighting the literary, philosophical and methodological influences on the young scholar Schulz, as laid out in chapter two. Chapter five focuses on the reception of the English essay in the British literary field, taking into account first and foremost the power relations in the literary field which manifest themselves in the reviews. Chapter six presents the edited German version published in 1842, elaborating on the changes which Schulz made in the text to adapt it to a new readership. It also contains an analysis of the translations as a transmission of cultural knowledge from one field to another and closes with the reception of the German book in the German literary field. The concepts established in chapter three aid to understand the highly variable reception in the respective literary fields, which are examined in chapters five and six.

2. Cultural and historical context

While the previous chapter focused on Schulz' biography and publications, the present chapter seeks to place him in his cultural, intellectual and historical environment. It outlines the intellectual currents in the literary fields in the early nineteenth century, and then proceeds to show how these influenced the young researcher. The factors which played a role in Schulz' choice of fields of research, the adopted methodology and the underlying philosophy can be found by examining his known literary interests, his apparent approach to historical documents, and his endorsement of typically Romantic philosophical principles. In the final part of this chapter, his contacts and networks in Germany will be examined as the consolidation of the factors listed above.

Strictly speaking Schulz did not fully belong to the Romantic period but he and his work were certainly influenced by the key figures of Romanticism. He was born in 1802, in the transitional period from Early to High Romanticism. The first decade of the nineteenth century saw the publication of several significant works, which can be seen as manifestations of key research interests of the Romantic nationalist movement and which would later have a profound impact on Schulz' scholarly career. In these years, 1802–04, August Wilhelm Schlegel was lecturing in Berlin on aesthetics, Romantic poetry and the history of German literature.⁷⁸ In Wales at the same time, Edward Williams, better known under his bardic name Iolo Morganwg, with the help of Owen Jones and William Owen Pughe, published the *Myvyrian archaiology*, one of the earliest printed collections of transcriptions of Welsh manuscripts, containing medieval poetry, bardic prose and Welsh triads.⁷⁹ Thus Schulz grew up in a period which saw the emergence of research into the literary history of Europe. Schlegel's lectures and the *Myvyrian archaiology* are of particular importance as, on the one hand, the lectures are widely seen as one of the founding works of Romantic German nationalism, while, on the other hand, the *Myvyrian* served as the foundation for the first generations of scholars and translators of the Welsh literary heritage until the publication of John Gwenogvryn Evans' diplomatic editions of the early Welsh manuscripts, which he published between 1887 (edition of the *Red Book of*

⁷⁸ August Wilhelm Schlegel, *Kritische Ausgabe der Vorlesungen über Ästhetik* I [1798–1803] & II/1 [1803–1827] ed. by Ernst Behler (Paderborn, München, Wien, Zürich: Schöningh 1989 [2007]).

⁷⁹ *The Myvyrian archaiology of Wales: collected out of ancient manuscripts* ed. by Owen Jones (Myvyr), Edward Williams (Iolo Morganwg), William Owen Pughe (Idrison) (Denbigh: T. Gee, 1870).

Hergest) and 1910 (edition of the *Book of Taliesin*).⁸⁰ Both the *Myvyrian archaiology* and Schlegel's lectures had an impact on Schulz as a scholar. He praises the *Myvyrian* as a milestone in the quest to unearth the treasures of the Cambro-British past. Although there is no direct reference in his work to A.W. Schlegel's lectures, it becomes obvious in Schulz' work that he was deeply influenced by Schlegelian views on the European literary heritage and Schlegel's critical and historical approach to medieval and Romantic poetry.

A.W. Schlegel begins his lecture series with his *Vorlesungen über philosophische Kunstlehre* in Jena in 1798 which reflect strongly the philosophical currents of Early Romanticism.⁸¹ These lectures had less impact than his later series of lectures *Vorlesungen über schöne Kunst und Literatur* in Berlin and Vienna (1801–04), and the further development of his distinction of classical versus Romantic literature in *Vorlesungen über Dramatische Kunst und Literatur* (1808). These were more popular and were widely translated into other languages, most notably the English translation in 1815 which was brought to the attention of the British intellectuals in 1816.⁸² Ewton explains this different reception with the argument that the latter two series showcased Schlegel's strengths more effectively.⁸³ He claims that Schlegel was never an accomplished philosopher; he should rather be remembered as a scholar, critic, historian and belletrist.⁸⁴ Thus, his Jena lectures did not show Schlegel at this best, which, in Ewton's view, is embodied by Schlegel's innovative combination of a historical and theoretical approach when critically reviewing literature. Moreover, his lectures in Berlin focus more on German national ideas, the common origin of Western European cultures and languages and the importance of the preservation and critical study of the early poetry in the so-called Modern Languages. The ideology behind these lectures is already more historical than philosophical, so they could be seen as the cornerstone for Late Romanticism with its emphasis on the medieval and historical. This new approach to the history of literature and mythology would become visible several decades later in Schulz' *Essay on the influence of Welsh traditions on the literature of France, Germany and Scandinavia*. Fitting the mould of a Late Romantic

⁸⁰ The editions of the major ancient books of Wales were John Gwenogvryn Evans (ed.) *The Text of the Mabinogion and other Welsh tales from the Red Book of Hergest* (Oxford: J. G. Evans, 1887), *The Black Book of Carmarthen* (Pwllheli, 1906), *The White Book Mabinogion* (Pwllheli, 1907), *The Text of the Book of Aneirin* (Pwllheli, 1908) and *The Text of the Book of Taliesin* (Llanbedrog, 1910).

⁸¹ Ricarda Schmidt, 'From early to late Romanticism', p. 22.

⁸² Maike Oergel, *The Return of King Arthur and the Nibelungen, National Myth in Nineteenth-Century English and German literature* (Berlin, New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1998), p. 102f.

⁸³ Ralph W. Ewton, *The Literary Theories of August Wilhelm Schlegel* (The Hague, Paris: Mouton, 1972), p. 11.

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 15.

with a growing interest in the mythological past of Europe, Schulz also displayed an interest in other fields such as heraldry and archaeology, besides his research in the older literatures of Germany, Britain, France, Spain, Scandinavia and Poland.

The origin of Schulz' eclectic research interests is illustrated in Eduard Schröder's entry in the *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie*. It reveals the literary preferences of the young scholar Schulz during his assignments in Naumburg and Magdeburg.

Am 30. Mai 1830 holt er "den seit Februar im Staube ruhenden altdeutschen Parcival heraus": "und der Dichtergenius des Alten trug mich in seine lichten Zauberregionen. Das ist auch ein Buch für alle Launen, wie der Ariost und Tristram Shandy, und für alle Zeiten, wie die Bibel". Und nachdem er auf Grund einer weiteren Prüfung in den Verwaltungsdienst übernommen und an die Regierung in Magdeburg versetzt war, pflegte er dort in den Abendstunden 1—2 Stunden Parzival zu lesen, "oder einen Andern": Goethe, Scott, Shakespeare, die griechischen Tragiker.⁸⁵

The above quote from Schulz' papers show the growing interest in Old German poetry, in particular Wolfram von Eschenbach's *Parcival*. Schröder's second direct quote from Schulz' letters shows that Schulz shared the Romantic admiration for the early period of poetic composition. The letters also provide information on his other reading habits. Schulz had very eclectic taste, reading the classics of world literature, ranging from the Ancient Greek tragedies, Ariosto's fifteenth century Italian poetry, to the plays of Shakespeare, Laurence Sterne's *Tristram Shandy*, Goethe, and Sir Walter Scott. If we assign the mentioned works to their respective literary fields, we find that, besides his interest in Greek Antiquity and Italian Renaissance, Schulz was reading several classics from the German and British literary fields. From his early career onwards, he engaged with these two fields, first as a reader, a passive 'consumer' of the literary products, before he became an active contributor to first the German and later the British literary field.

Both this range of material and Schulz' working methods suggest Schlegel's influence. In his research, Schulz frequently encounters uncertain sources, unclear readings and doubtful references. Nonetheless, he endeavours to give the reader the best picture possible of the topic or the text, its background and the circumstances of its composition, but he often remarks that he is unable to give the final answer and that he doubts that there will be an absolute solution to the present problem. He seems to accept that and he asks the reader for his understanding. Several times, Schulz comes to the conclusion that the more results his

⁸⁵ Edward Schröder, 'Schulz, Albert', *ADB* 55 (1910), pp. 194–195.

research yields, the more questions and problems appear. Schulz also encourages his readers to come to their own conclusions and, if they are really interested in the subject, to take up the books and manuscripts and embark on a journey into medieval literature themselves, even to improve and to replace his version. He pointedly ends the foreword to his *Parcival* with the words:

[...] so möge ein Jeder nach seinem Sinn und Bedürfniß aus der Dichtung entnehmen, was ihm gemäß ist und weiß er bedarf, denn sie ist reich und mannigfaltig, wie die Schöpfungen der Natur; und freut er sich ihrer in wahrem Genuß auch nur durch die Vermittelung einer mangelhaften Uebertragung, so ist für den Uebersetzer der volle Lohn seiner Arbeit gefunden, und Niemand soll mit lebhafterer Freude als er denjenigen begrüßen, dem es gelingt, den gegenwärtigen Versuch durch eine tüchtigere Arbeit zu verdrängen und überflüssig zu machen. Wie der Baumeister des Münsters zu Bern in der Steinschrift am hohen Chor desselben, doch in bescheiderem Sinne, ruf' ich Jeglichem zu, der Beruf in Sich fühlt: **Mach's nach.**⁸⁶ [emphasis as in original]

Schulz therefore exemplifies the Romantic author, as envisaged by John McCarthy when stating that 'common to all discussions of the Romantics' art of criticism is the insistence on its open-ended, fragmentary nature that requires a proactive reader.'⁸⁷ Schulz frequently engages the reader in his arguments and even challenges him to do his own research if he thinks that his version is faulty – which, according to Schulz' modest attitude towards his own work, it certainly is. This constant dialogue with the reader will be examined in detail in chapters four and six in which the prize-winning essay and its German republication will be discussed thoroughly.

The Romantics had a similar view of criticism and research. For them, facts obtained through research 'reconstitute themselves as experiments and approximations'⁸⁸ and that lies in the very nature of the research. A. W. Schlegel labels research 'an historical experiment that deals with and results in facts so that each fact is marked simultaneously by a unique individuality and a quality both mysterious and experimental.'⁸⁹ Schulz' perception of his own research corresponds to this description, as he sees the process of making the medieval texts accessible to a wider public as a constant experiment where each author attempts to contribute more to the understanding of the matter, yet he doubts that it will ever be resolved to the full satisfaction of strict philologists or historians.

⁸⁶ Albert Schulz, *Parcival*, pp. x–xi.

⁸⁷ John A. McCarthy, 'Forms and objectives of Romantic criticism', in *The Cambridge Companion to German Romanticism*, ed. by Nicholas Saul (Cambridge: University of Cambridge Press, 2009), pp. 101–118 (p. 114).

⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 112.

⁸⁹ *Ibid.*

Schulz' encouraging attitude towards his readers and especially his aim to include a wider public in his intended readership is actually not a very common trait among Romantic writers, but according to Dorotea Masiakowski, A. W. Schlegel's works do display a comparable attitude.

Aber auch eine andere, bisher zu wenig beachtete Tendenz macht sich hier [die Texte, mit denen sich Schlegel an die Öffentlichkeit wendet] bemerkbar: der an August Wilhelm Schlegels Werk deutlich erkennbare Drang, mit dem Publikum zu kommunizieren, Meinungen und Urteile an gebildete Kreise direkt zu vermitteln, um sie (und auch sich selbst) populär zu machen.⁹⁰

She notices an intention in A. W. Schlegel's oeuvre to communicate with his audience, transmit opinions and judgements directly to the educated class in order to make them (and himself) popular. Further, she sees this tendency in opposition to the majority of the Romantic writers who, according to the traditional opinion, are rather elitist.

Dies widerspricht der traditionellen Vorstellung vom Elitencharacter der romantischen Bewegung und ihrer programmatisch hermetischen Abkapselung und sollte als soziales Phänomen der romantischen Gesellschaft eingehender untersucht werden.⁹¹

Masiakowski illustrates this by including a reference to Bernhard Giesen's image of the Romantics, who, in his publications, are depicted as secluded groups of intellectuals. A good example for his communicative approach and the inclusiveness of his writing style would be A. W. Schlegel's Berlin lectures which he begins with an introduction especially to the readers and listeners who did not attend his previous lectures. He explains that he is unable to reiterate everything that was said in the first series and kindly asks his audience to make themselves familiar with the topics already covered by consulting what has already been published in print. He nevertheless summarises the content of the lectures with the following.

Ich werde mich daher nicht dabey aufhalten, die Wichtigkeit und den Werth aller schönen Kunst und der Poesie insbesondere aus philosophischen Gründen darzuthun oder durch rhetorische Wendungen zu empfehlen.⁹²

⁹⁰ Dorotea Masiakowski, *Einheit und Vielfalt im Europabild August Wilhelm Schlegels* (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2002), p. 10.

⁹¹ Ibid.

⁹² A. W. Schlegel, *Kritische Ausgabe der Vorlesungen* II/1, 1803–1827, Dritter Teil, Vorlesungen über die romantische Poesie [1803–1804], p. 1.

Here he clearly states that he foregoes the philosophical justification for his work on art and poetry but assumes that his readers agree with him on the importance on writing a comprehensive history of art and poetry, as can be seen in the following:

Ich nehme an, dass *wir* uns einig sind, die Kunst sey nicht für einen allenfalls entbehrlichen Luxus des Geistes zu halten, dessen Genuß in einer flüchtigen Unterhaltung, dessen Ertrag in einer bloß äußerlichen Politur bestehe, welche letztere man sich ja weit wohlfeiler <ja ich darf sagen auch sicherer>, in den Kreisen *der sogenannten feinen aber gehaltleeren Geselligkeit* erwerben könnte.⁹³

In the first line, Schlegel addresses the reader directly and includes him in his reasoning by using the pronoun *we*, thus he suggests that the writer and the reader are on the same level. The second emphasised phrase of the quote clearly shows Schlegel's intent to wrestle the fine art from the grasp of the higher social classes and make it accessible to a wider audience.

Schulz can definitely be seen as a follower of Schlegel in his endeavour to write as inclusively as possible. For instance, he added the following instructions on the back cover of his edition of *Historia Regum Britanniae*:

Es wird gebeten, vorliegendes Werk, ausser den Verehrern der celtischen Sprache und Literatur und ausser allen Historikern, ganz besonders auch öffentlichen Bibliotheken vorlegen zu wollen, namentlich Universitäts-, Gymnasial-, Fürstlichen/ und Stadt-Bibliotheken, sowie allen historischen und Alterthums-Vereinen. Selbst Freunden altgermanischer Sprache und Poesie dürfte dieses Buch nicht unwillkommen sein.⁹⁴

This is a clear statement of Schulz' intention to make his studies accessible to great variety of people from as many backgrounds as possible. The list of intended readers shows the hierarchy within the target audience, i.e. who would be most likely interested in his book; first the specialists in Celtic studies and history, but then also public libraries such as university, grammar school, royal and municipal libraries as well as all sorts of historically minded societies. Schulz also recommends the book to scholars in early German language and literature, as it will open a new perspective on their studies.

Apart from thinking that his book would be useful for different audiences of different understanding and prior knowledge of the subject discussed in his treatise, Schulz was aware of the fact that these groups of readers would engage with the book in a different way. For the specialists in the field he hoped to provide the first step towards a more

⁹³ Ibid. [my emphasis]

⁹⁴ Schulz, *Historia Regum Britanniae*, 1854, foreword.

comprehensive study of the subject, being fully aware of his lack of formal education in the field, as Edward Schröder remarks in his article on Schulz in the *ADB*.

[D]er laienhafte Charakter dieser Bücher, den ihr Verfasser nur vertheidigt, nirgends ableugnet, drängt sich allzusehr auf, um den Leser nicht zu ermüden. Der Verfasser bleibt immer eine sympathische Erscheinung: die ausharrende Treue dieses Autodidakten, der zuweilen vergißt, daß ihm das Rüstzeug des Philologen fehlt, aber sich das doch immer wieder ins Gedächtniß ruft, die Ehrlichkeit, mit der er überall die Quellen und die Grenzen seines Wissens aufdeckt, und das nicht von Selbstgefühl, wohl aber von Eitelkeit freie Streben, einen herrlichen Schatz des Mittelalters allen Gebildeten der Nation zu erschließen und einen großen und liebenswerthen Menschen der Stauferzeit den unruhig hastenden Menschen unserer Tage nahe zu bringen, das alles fordert unsere Anerkennung heraus und verlangt unsern Dank.⁹⁵

Schröder remarks that Schulz defends his approachable writing style because the latter wishes to make the reading experience as effortless as possible for his readers. Schulz is rightfully labelled a sympathetic, honest and humble writer, who works neatly and diligently, always disclosing the sources of his knowledge and the limitations thereof. Unlike contemporary critics of Schulz, Schröder is able to recognise this as a commendable effort which merits the gratitude of the reader.

When reading Schulz' early books closely, the characteristics mentioned above, those which are central to High Romanticism, emerge clearly: the emphasis on German history and culture and the interest in medieval German literature as a consequence. This approach is inherited from thinkers such as Johann Gottlieb Fichte, Johann Gottfried Herder and Schlegel. Herder reproached the late eighteenth century humanists with being seduced by the literary monuments of Classic Antiquity instead of taking the opportunity to include more of their own people's creativity in their works.⁹⁶ Schlegel is also very critical of the 'Grecomania' of his time, talking about the blind faith in its authority 'der blinde Glaube an die Autorität [der Regeln des Aristoteles]'⁹⁷ when he explains how contemporary man should view the art of the past. He mentions Winckelmann as an example of a humanist who, according to Schlegel, began to unearth the treasures of Antiquity and made himself a

⁹⁵ Schröder, 'Schulz, Albert', p. 197.

⁹⁶ Bernd Fischer, *Das Eigene und das Eigentliche: Klopstock, Herder, Fichte, Kleist. Episoden aus der Konstruktionsgeschichte nationaler Intentionalitäten*. (Berlin: Erich Schmidt Verlag, 1995), p. 214f.

⁹⁷ A. W. Schlegel, *Kritische Ausgabe der Vorlesungen*, I, Vorlesungen über philosophische Kunstlehre, Jena 1798, Zweiter Teil, Geschichte der Kunstlehre, § 265, p. 132.

priest of the old gods.⁹⁸ Schlegel nevertheless acknowledges Winckelmann's recognition and appropriate treatment of ancient poetry which are manifestations of the classical spirit.

[Winckelmann hatte] die Poesie der Alten sehr gut erkannt, und seine Betrachtungsart der Denkmähler des Alterthums in jenen bleibt ein vollendetes Vorbild für jede Darstellung des classischen Geistes von anderen Seiten.⁹⁹

After admitting the value of his work, however, he criticises Winckelmann for his audacity in completely ignoring the modern arts, with the exception of a few truly great figures. Further, Winckelmann did them even greater injustice by labelling them mere imitations of the great artworks of Antiquity. Schlegel puts this down to ignorance of modern philosophy, especially French and English philosophers, and being prejudiced by Winckelmann's occupation in classical philology.¹⁰⁰ While Schlegel certainly appreciates the great authors of Ancient Greece, he nonetheless emphasises that a nation's own literature should be just as important as the literary monuments of classical Antiquity.

Ferner ritterlich oder bürgerlich soll unsre Poesie seyn, wie die der Minnesinger und des Hans Sachs; allgemeiner ausgedrückt: auf eine idealistische oder realistische Weise national, wobei jedoch nicht vergessen werden darf, was ich über die Nationalität des neueren Europa gesagt habe. Endlich soll unsre Poesie die tiefe Wahrheit, das große Gemüth dernjenigen Dichtungen athmen, die wir als die ursprünglichsten[,] als das älteste Denkmal Deutscher Art, betrachten müssen; [...].¹⁰¹

Using the medieval *Minnesinger* and the sixteenth century *Meistersänger* Sachs as his examples, Schlegel clearly expresses his opinion on what should be the central focus for his contemporaries with interest in German literature. They should not attempt to imitate the works of ancient authors but rather find inspiration in the older literature in the German language as they can tell us more about the *Gemüt* of the German nation. Therefore, he advocates firstly more self-confidence regarding the own people's past as well as viewing it as a manifestation of the basic characteristics of soul of the German people.

Schulz' contact, Koberstein, as mentioned above, was also keen on including more of the earlier German material in the curriculum for German literature at the boarding school in Pforta and he had the support of other Romantic scholars like the Brothers Grimm. This German-centred attitude reflects that of Fichte's *Reden an die deutsche Nation*, but from a

⁹⁸ A. W. Schlegel, *Kritische Ausgabe der Vorlesungen* II/1, Drucklegungen aus den Vorlesungen über schöne Literatur und Kunst, Ueber Litteratur, Kunst und Geist des Zeitalters, p. 250.

⁹⁹ *Ibid.*

¹⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 250.

¹⁰¹ A. W. Schlegel, *Kritische Ausgabe der Vorlesungen* II/1, Dritter Teil, Vorlesungen über die romantische Poesie [1803–1804], p. 65.

more practical viewpoint. Here, we see again the development from the more philosophical ideas to more concrete actions which occurred at, or just after the turn of the century. Fichte, a philosopher, would naturally look at it from a more philosophical angle but his ideas were taken up by others and influenced them in their action. Fichte's educational programme for his nation, the Germans, can be considered as the philosophy underlying and supporting A.W. Schlegel's, Koberstein's, and also Schulz' motivations for contributing to the continuous discovery and dissemination of medieval German literature. These three scholars felt that it was their mission to remind the German people of their heritage and convince them of the importance of keeping its memory alive. Fichte's *Reden an die deutsche Nation* contain the philosophical rationale behind the endeavours of Schlegel, Koberstein, and Schulz.

In his addresses, Fichte voices his concerns that a general popular education (*Volkserziehung*) is not enough. While it is important for the entire population to gain a basic education in fundamental skills, the particularities of their culture, their nation must be taken into account. Therefore he demands a German national education (*Nationalerziehung*) as he deems both education in general and in particular in the mother tongue as essential to the well-being of a nation.¹⁰² Fichte, however, does not stop at the education in the mother tongue but views the national education in a more philosophical light, an idea pertaining to the early Romantic period. He summarises the goals of his new education as creating 'an entirely new system of German national education, the like of which has never before existed in any other nation'.¹⁰³ He also sees education as an art, that must be developed to ensure that it fulfils its goals 'The education I propose shall be a sure and deliberate art to form a firm and infallible good will in man, and this is its first attribute.'¹⁰⁴ In explaining the foundations of the new education, Fichte also introduces one of his key notions of cultivation of humanity (*Bildung zum Menschen*). This cultivation of

¹⁰² Johann Gottlieb Fichte, *Addresses to the German nation*, ed. by Gregory Moore (Cambridge: University Press Cambridge, 2008) First address, p. 19 'There is thus nothing we can do save bring the new education to all who are German, without exception, so that it becomes not the education of a particular class but simply of the nation as such, and without exempting a single individual member; [...] and that in this way there arises among us not a popular education [*Volks-Erziehung*] but rather a specifically German national education [*National-Erziehung*].'

¹⁰³ Fichte, Second address, p. 22.

¹⁰⁴ *Ibid.*

humanity and the education to be a good German citizen proud of his heritage thus go hand in hand in Fichte's programme.¹⁰⁵

This model of new education also comes into play when Fichte speaks of the resurgence of the German nation. He explains the love of the fatherland that must be behind the promotion of Germanness in the world.

Through such an education we shall undoubtedly attain the first goal which we set ourselves and which formed the point of departure for our addresses. That spirit which is to be produced contains within it, as an integral component, the higher love of fatherland, the understanding of earthly life as eternal and of the fatherland as the vehicle of this eternity – and, should this spirit be raised up among the Germans, specific love of the German fatherland. From this love the intrepid defender of the fatherland and the peaceful and law-abiding citizen follow of themselves.¹⁰⁶

In order to exemplify his concept of fatherland and to show previous examples of it in history, Fichte alludes to the Romans and their belief in an eternal existence of their Rome, signifying not merely the city of Rome but also the culture, the nation and the spirit that the word Rome evokes in them. In his eighth address he endeavours to inspire his fellow countrymen to see beyond their own mortal lives but to consider the people, the folk, and the fatherland to be eternal and to strive to contribute to its preservation. 'In this sense, as the vehicle and pledge of earthly eternity, and as that which can be eternal here below, people and fatherland far exceed the state, in the ordinary signification of the word [...].'¹⁰⁷

When talking about the fractured nature of the German principalities in contrast to the unifying spirit of the common cultural and linguistic heritage, Fichte draws another comparison to one of the great people of Antiquity, the Greeks:

As was the case only among the ancient Greeks before them, among the Germans the state and the nation were actually separate from each other, each was represented by itself, the former in the particular German territories and principalities, the latter visibly in the imperial union and [...] in a multitude of customs and institutions. As far as the German language extended, everyone who had first seen the light of the day within its

¹⁰⁵ Herder is actually the first to promote the cultural renewal of the German nation; his *Briefe zur Beförderung der Humanität*, No. 40 (1794) in particular, highlight the importance of the historical literary products of German speaking writers in this process. Herder sees therein the tradition of the baroque *Sprach- und Kultur* nation. Cf. Fischer, *Das Eigene und das Eigentliche: Klopstock, Herder, Fichte, Kleist. Episoden aus der Konstruktionsgeschichte nationaler Intentionalitäten*, p. 200, and Johann Gottfried Herder, *Briefe zur Beförderung der Humanität*, 1793–1797, Vierte Sammlung, online version available at <http://www.zeno.org/Literatur/M/Herder,+Johann+Gottfried/Theoretische+Schriften/Briefe+zur+Beförderung+der+Humanität> [accessed 21 March 2013].

¹⁰⁶ Fichte, Ninth address, p. 118.

¹⁰⁷ Fichte, Eighth address, p. 105.

domain could regard himself as a citizen in a twofold sense: partly of the state of his birth, to whose care he was first commended, and partly of the common fatherland of the German nation as a whole.¹⁰⁸

Fichte uses these comparisons both to the Romans and the Greeks to illustrate how all German speaking citizens could feel united in their common heritage and how they could feel encouraged to live their nationality. These ideas voiced here by Fichte are fundamental for the development of a sense of belonging together, being one folk, in short, of German nationhood. Further, by putting the German speaking nations on the same level with the two great cultures of Antiquity he tries to elevate the status of the German culture and strengthen the self-esteem of his contemporaries. His programme, however, is not a simple copy of the classical education, thus agreeing with Herder and Schlegel, but it is unique and appropriate for the Germans.

Schulz' contributions to the study of medieval German literature can be seen in the light of this awakening of the national pride of the Germans in their heritage. Furthermore, it can be assumed that the spirit of his time not only affected his views on German national heritage but also drew his attention to similar efforts in other nations, in particular the Celtic revival and the discovery of the Polish mythological heritage. As we have seen in chapter one, his publication list reflects this expanding endeavour to unearth forgotten national treasures of various nations. One possible point of departure for Schulz could have been Sir Walter Scott, whose works he read in his early years in Naumburg. Therefore he was familiar with the recreation of Scottish national pride through the means of literature. Whereas there is no proof that Schulz had read *Ossian*, some of Scott's novels are inspired by Ossianic themes and Scott's theoretical works share the Schlegelian view of early poetry as an important source for the early history of a given people as well as the early history of mankind.¹⁰⁹ While Scott asserts that the 'foundation of fables lies deep in human nature' and therefore sees poetry as a universal trait to all early civilisations, he also adheres to the climate theory postulated by Herder. Scott compares poetry to a seed which can be planted in almost all soils but that it will grow in a different manner according to the conditions in which it lives.¹¹⁰ This organic view of poetry is taken up by Schulz in the foreword to his 1841 essay, where he describes his approach to the 'organic life of

¹⁰⁸ Fichte, Eighth address, p. 111.

¹⁰⁹ Maïke Oergel, *The Return of King Arthur and the Nibelungen*, p. 136.

¹¹⁰ *Ibid.*

tradition' and later he also employs the image of tradition as a seed which is transmitted from country to country.¹¹¹

Taking into account that Schulz had read Scott, it is very likely that Schulz, as a promoter of the German literary heritage, had learned to appreciate the same spirit of building new self-esteem as a nation by the means of poetry in Scotland. As the Welsh movement promoting eisteddfodau and Cymreigyddion societies gathered sway throughout the country, it may have struck a chord with Schulz; especially so, since the efforts of other Celtic scholars mainly concentrated on ancient Irish and Scottish folk traditions as a sign of the revival of the Celtic nations. It appears that, to Schulz, the Welsh traditions seemed a mainly overlooked and undiscovered niche where he could take the first steps towards bringing them to the attention of the German people. He hints at that in the foreword to his second volume on Arthurian traditions, *Beiträge zur bretonischen und celtisch-germanischen Heldensage*, in which he declares that he had found the existing work on the origins of the Arthurian legends insufficient, as it provided no information on the early stages of tradition prior to its arrival in France. Herder, however, had already mentioned Wales as the potential cradle of Arthurian literature in *Ideen zu einer Philosophie der Geschichte der Menschheit*.¹¹² Schulz may have read this and, considering the lack of books published in German on the subject, decided to dedicate himself to it. Bernhard Maier confirms Schulz' pioneering work in the field of medieval literature in his history of German and Welsh cultural contacts:

Zu den ersten, die sich ihm deutschen Sprachraum mit der kymrischen Literatur des Mittelalters befaßten, zählt der Jurist und Verwaltungsbeamte Albert Schulz, der unter dem Pseudonym San Marte bereits 1842 *Die Arthursage und die Mä[h]rchen des rothen Buches von Hergest* und 1847 *Beiträge zur bretonischen und celtisch-germanischen Heldensage* veröffentlichte.¹¹³

Maier also mentions Julius Rodenberg's *Ein Herbst in Wales* (1858) as a prime example of a Romantic travel report and Ferdinand Walter's comprehensive history of the social and political reality of medieval Wales, entitled *Das alte Wales* (1859), as the next Wales-themed publications on the German literary field. Therefore it is fair to say that Schulz was

¹¹¹ See Schulz, 1841, pp. 5–6 and p. 22.

¹¹² Johann Gottfried Herder, *Ideen zu einer Philosophie der Geschichte der Menschheit*, vol. 4 book 16 [online version available at: <<http://www.textlog.de/5666-2.html>>, accessed 21 November 2013].

¹¹³ Bernhard Maier, 'Einleitung zur zweiten Sektion: Deutsch-walisische Kulturbeziehungen. Wales und Deutschland: Neun Jahrhunderte kulturellen Austauschs' in *150 Jahre 'Mabinogion' – Deutsch-Walisische Kulturbeziehungen*, (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 2001), pp. 131–140, (p. 135).

the first to engage with Welsh literature, but in other, related fields such as philology, Wales and the Welsh language had already been brought to the attention of the German scholarly community. In his article on the status of the Welsh language in German philology, Erich Poppe cites a list of books on the Welsh language which were available to German scholars around 1850, comprising publications from as early as 1547 up to 1840. None of these are in German and, comprising mainly grammars and dictionaries, they are meant for a specialist audience, who used them for their comparative linguistic studies in Indo-European etymology.¹¹⁴ Celtic Studies as a modern academic discipline was born in Germany in 1853 with Johann Kaspar Zeuss' *Grammatica Celtica*.¹¹⁵

While there was an awareness of the Welsh language among German philologists, none of its literature was available in German, even though a large amount of literature in foreign languages was translated in that period. Most famously, the translations of Herder and A.W. Schlegel had made the literature, and in particular the poetry, of many different peoples and languages accessible to the educated classes, but neither of them published translations of Welsh literature. Herder was a prolific translator, who made several texts available to the German public that were hitherto unavailable or only in a bad translation. His most famous translations include Solomon's *Song of Songs* (from Hebrew with a commentary), *Minnelieder*, German medieval love songs, *The Cid* from Spanish and various Greek, Roman and Hebrew Poems, which he published in several volumes such as the Greek Anthology appearing in *Blumen aus der griechischen Anthologie gesammelt*, *Nachlese aus der griechischen Anthologie*, or the *Jüdische Parabeln* from Hebrew. Besides translating himself he also published detailed critiques of other scholars' translations such as Michael Denis' *Ossian* translation.

Contrary to the contemporary belief, that 'German society and culture was [sic] considered backward and inferior compared to the French and the English' and therefore the only way to improve German literature would be 'through the imitation of classical Latin and French models', Herder, after a detailed analysis of classical literatures, thought that Germans could only gain very little directly from it, since they were also very different from, say, the Greeks of the Hellenic period or the Romans of the Classical Age or the French of the

¹¹⁴ Erich Poppe, 'The Welsh language in German philology around 1850' in *150 Jahre 'Mabinogion' – Deutsch-Walisische Kulturbeziehungen* (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 2001), pp. 203–221, (p.203–205).

¹¹⁵ Johann Kaspar Zeuss, *Grammatica celtica; E monumentis vetustis tam hibernicae linguae quam britannicae dialecti, cambricae, cornicae, armoricae nec non e gallicae priscae reliquiis construxit* (Lipsiae, apud Weidmannos [Leipzig: Weidmann], 1853)

seventeenth century.¹¹⁶ He apparently hoped to enrich German culture by the means of translation since, according to his theory of the development, the ageing of languages, ‘the German language had meanwhile reached the age of adulthood, where lyric poetry was no longer possible, but only beautiful prose.’¹¹⁷ Therefore, translation of poetry was necessary to enable the matured language to return to a younger stage; therefore translations of Greek or Hebrew poetry, which, at the time of its composition, was written in a youthful poetic language, could in turn rejuvenate and renew an existing language, whose poetic productivity had been diminished. Thus, Herder saw translation as the means to revive long lost linguistic sensuality and find forgotten qualities.

A.W. Schlegel disagrees with Herder on the stage of the German language. He argues that German is more philosophical and poetic than Latin and on the whole closer to Greek in terms of construction and therefore has the potential to approach the incomparable language.¹¹⁸ Further, he considers German to be a language that is very much alive, possessing the richest sources for morphological and poetic recreation and invention. The poets have always struggled with the quick ageing of the language due to its constant flow, despite attempts to rein the changes in with rules and norms but it has always succeeded to break loose and kept its progressiveness alive.¹¹⁹

A. W. Schlegel followed Herder’s example in translating extensively from other languages into German, although he had a different idea of the purpose of translation. During his time at the University of Göttingen, the poet Gottfried August Bürger acted as a mentor for Schlegel, especially in the field of translating foreign literary works into German, such as the collaboration on the translation of *A Midsummer Night’s Dream* in 1789, Schlegel’s first attempt at translating Shakespeare. After completing his studies in Göttingen, Schlegel continued his efforts in translating Shakespeare’s plays; during the very productive decade 1791–1801 he managed to publish seventeen plays in German.¹²⁰ Moreover, besides publishing the translations, Schlegel also published essays on the writers he was

¹¹⁶ Wulf Koepke, ‘Herder’s views on the Germans and their Future Literature’ in *A companion to the works of Johann Gottfried Herder* ed. by Hans Adler and Wulf Koepke (Rochester, NY: Camden House, 2009), pp. 215–232 (p. 218).

¹¹⁷ Gerhard Sauder, ‘Herder’s Poetic Works, Translations, and Views on Poetry in *A companion to the works of Johann Gottfried Herder* ed. by Hans Adler and Wulf Koepke (Rochester, NY: Camden House, 2009), pp. 305–330 (p.318).

¹¹⁸ A. W. Schlegel, *Kritische Ausgabe der Vorlesungen*, II/1, Dritter Teil, Vorlesungen über die romantische Poesie, p. 22.

¹¹⁹ Ibid.

¹²⁰ Ewton, *The Literary Theories of August Wilhelm Schlegel*, p. 10.

translating, such as ‘Etwas über William Shakespeare bei Gelegenheit Wilhelm Meisters’ in 1796. This essay, on the one hand, shows the influence of Goethe’s work on Schlegel, but also ‘lays down the principles of adequate translation of foreign works of literary art [...]’.¹²¹ Following Herder’s example of *Blumen aus der griechische Anthologie*, he also published a collection of translated Mediterranean poems which he called *Blumensträuße italiänischer, spanischer und portugiesischer Poesie* (1804). The purpose of making them available for the German public was to give them a taste of the most important poets of the South, reflecting Herder’s position of experiencing a culture and a people as thoroughly as possible through their poetry.¹²²

From the list above we can deduct that Herder’s and Schlegel’s focus laid mainly on poetry from the Antiquity and folk poetry from Scandinavia, Central Europe and the Mediterranean. The key publications among these, which may have inspired Schulz in his endeavour to make forgotten treasures available to the German public, were Herder’s *Volkslieder*, later published under the title *Stimmen der Völker in Liedern*, and his letters on poetry inspired by Ossian, and A. W. Schlegel’s translations of Italian, Spanish and Portuguese poetry: *Blumensträuße italiänischer, spanischer und portugiesischer Poesie*.

In choosing the Welsh literary heritage as his research focus in 1840, Schulz found his niche on the literary map of Europe as it was known to the German public. Since his predecessors Herder and Schlegel had not covered this area of European literature, he was obviously motivated to bring this forgotten literature to the attention of the German readership. Welsh traditions proved to be an obvious choice for practical reasons as well: Schulz profited from his acquaintances via the Lepsius-Bunsen network to Abergavenny.

Besides discovering the literary heritage of an overlooked culture, the unearthing of treasures of his own nation’s written monuments has always been one of the key interests of Schulz and he continuously expanded his activities in the field of discovering and documenting the national heritage. His personal interest in earlier German history and literature was not only reflected in his publications from 1833 onwards but also his membership of various societies which he listed in his books the 1850s and 1860s in small print behind his name in the following form:

¹²¹ Ibid.

¹²² A. W. Schlegel, *Kritische Ausgabe der Vorlesungen*, II/1, Dritter Teil, p. 7.

‘A. Schulz, königl. Preuss. Regierungsrath im Provinzial-schulkollegio zu Magdeburg, des Thüringisch-Sächsischen Vereins für Erforschung des vaterländischen Alterthums und seiner Denkmäler, und der Königlichen Deutschen Gesellschaft zu Königsberg i. Pr. ordentlichem, so wie der Berliner Gesellschaft für deutsche Sprache auswärtigem Mitgliede’.¹²³

Schulz limited this list to the three societies he deemed most important. Besides them, he was also a member of the Society for Thuringian History and Archaeology in Jena, the Scholars’ Committee of the German National Museum in Nuremberg and the Society for the Study of Modern Languages in Berlin. In later publications, he would list them all, as can be seen on the title page of his 1864 translation of Thomas Stephens’ *Literature of the Kymry*. His membership of these six societies reflect strongly Schulz’ passion for key aspects of High Romanticism; the emphasis lies on the research into the own nation’s past from various angles, including philological, historical, archaeological, architectural and linguistic interests. Membership in these societies would provide him with important contacts to scholars in the same field as well as with opportunities to publish the results of his researches.

One key feature which stands out in Schulz’ work is the open-ended nature of his research, the state of continuous discovery and analysis in the field, which does not allow him to come to a final and complete conclusion. In his essay and also in later critical editions, he faithfully informs the reader of the sources for his reasoning; those which appear to be reliable, as well as those deemed to be suspicious. He also points out the gaps in his research and instances in which there are no sources where one can only deduce and infer. The outcome is not the absolute truth on the sources but a critical review thereof which leaves a few questions open. The philosophical trait of Romantic criticism described below would thus apply to Schulz’ approach to ancient texts:

[...] [I]ncomprehensibility emerges as a feature of the Romantic programme. Lack of understanding is not seen as something to be resolved, but as a state to be affirmed as in an existence that is on the one hand concretely fixed and iterative and the other elusively imprecise in its unexpected twists and turns.¹²⁴

This reflects Schlegel’s view of incomprehensibility as the key factor in creating poetry. He criticises the obligation to explain everything in the education of his period which, in

¹²³ Schulz, *Historia Regum Britanniae und Brut Tysyllo*, 1854, Title page.

¹²⁴ McCarthy, ‘Forms and objectives of Romantic criticism’, p. 107.

his opinion is too much focused on morality [Sittlichkeit] and economic usefulness.¹²⁵ Thus, Schlegel takes Fichte's educational programme one step further and emphasises the importance of including poetry in education. According to Schlegel, children are now raised to function and even play has been transformed into a reflection of useful work, devoid of imagining the unimaginable and thus of poetry:

‘[...] [A]lles hat man ihnen frühzeitig verständlich machen wollen, da doch der Reiz des Lebens auf der Unbegreiflichkeit, auf dem Geheimniß beruht; und so wird bey der aufwachsenden Generation alle Poesie [...] in Keim ertötet’.¹²⁶

Rediscovering the poetry within is one of the main points on the Romantic programme, as a reaction to the programme of the Enlightenment and the ‘Age of Reason’, and it has to start as early as possible, or rather, its development should not be hindered. Herder also stresses the importance of poetry, as for him, the study of a people's poetry is the key to understanding their individual view of humanity, even if it seems incompatible with the reader's own culture:

Die jeweilige Ausbildung der Humanität anzuerkennen, auch wenn sie mit der eigenen Individuation kaum kompatibel erscheint, ist das Problem- und Aufgabenfeld der Herderschen Hermeneutik. Sie erfordert Einfühlung in andere Zeiten, Kulturen, Völker und Menschen. Diese wiederum ist seines Erachtens nirgendwo erfolgreicher als im Studium der Dichtung.¹²⁷

These arguments for the study of the poetry of his own people as well the literary remains of hitherto overlooked cultures are the driving force behind Schulz' endeavours that spanned over several decades. In so doing, he would contribute to the development of his own *Kulturation* through enriching the contemporary culture with the treasures of the past, thus renewing what was considered the original Germanness as well as giving a place to the humanity of other cultures.

Both A.W. Schlegel and Schulz were criticised for the popular nature of the presentation of their research to the public. Schlegel intended several of his texts on the European idea for a wider public, i.e. his public lectures in Berlin (1801–4) and Vienna (1808), as well as his reviews, his pamphlets written during his time in Sweden and the popular articles published in the *Berliner Kalender* (1829 and 1831). He thought that the topic would not

¹²⁵ A. W. Schlegel, *Kritische Ausgabe der Vorlesungen* II/1, Vorlesungen über schöne Literatur und Kunst, Berlin 1801–1804, Zweiter Teil, Vorlesungen über schöne Literatur [1802–1803], p. 521.

¹²⁶ Ibid.

¹²⁷ Fischer, *Das Eigene und das Eigentliche*, p. 190.

only be of interest to the educated classes, but actually essential for their humanistic education. For this reason, he wrote his texts following a communicative approach. Schulz in turn did the same with his own field of interest. Just as Schlegel felt passionate about the common European heritage which he wanted to share with many, Schulz also wanted to reach out to a larger audience and share his discoveries in medieval literature with as many as possible. In a way, he even supported Schlegel's agenda from a literary point of view, since he discovered the links between medieval literature in Britain, France, Germany and Scandinavia and propagated them to a wider readership. Schlegel was aware of Arthurian literature and its possible origin in Britain but he seemingly did not deem it important enough to pursue further studies in the field. He compares thematically the fables surrounding King Arthur with those having Charlemagne as their focal point and concludes that the Arthurian material must be older than the Frankish tales.¹²⁸ Further, Schlegel cites Warton, who had already postulated the theory that the figure of King Arthur was actually of British origin and only received its conveyed literary form in Northern France in the style of a chivalrous romance. Schlegel agrees with his reasoning but concludes the paragraph with the words:

Übrigens wird der Ernst der Geschichten vom Artus allerdings, auch durch Scherz aufgeheitert, und die Tafelrunde hat an dem Seneschell Kay oder Queux ihren gratioſo, ihren unwillkürlichen Lustigmacher.¹²⁹

Despite acknowledging the British origin, Schlegel did not dedicate much of his time and his research to Celtic traditions, as he did not examine the nations at the periphery of Europe in detail. He mainly focused on the main nations of Europe, die *Hauptnationen*. He chooses them neither on diplomatic nor on geographical grounds but insists that it is the inner cultural unity, which defines them as such. Schlegel considers only two major branches of principal European peoples, being of either Latin or German origin.¹³⁰

Schulz, in contrast to Schlegel, dedicated more than two decades of his scholarly work to the Celtic nations, in particular to literature of Welsh origin. For Schulz, it was already established, that the Celtic languages and cultures were a branch of its own on the tree of the Indo-European languages. He therefore treats them as a literature with its own particular traits and does not try to link them somehow to ancient Germanic tribes. Further,

¹²⁸ A. W. Schlegel, *Vorlesungen über Ästhetik II/1*, p. 105.

¹²⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 106.

¹³⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 11.

Schulz takes the Arthurian material more seriously than Schlegel did. In his books he never gives the impression that he thinks of them as comedies. Schulz uses the image of a giant tree to illustrate the origin and growth of chivalrous literature. The Welsh origins are the roots of said tree and in the course of the centuries, various branches grew from the common stem, each branch depicting one language, one tradition that adapted the original material for its own people, be it German, French or Scandinavian.¹³¹ Therefore, Welsh traditions are very important as they are at the base of all Arthurian literature.

Schulz thus disagrees with A. W. Schlegel on the importance of the Welsh traditions but he does not voice his criticism directly, instead he continues his essay on the Arthurian origins in Wales, treating them as a serious subject of study just as he did with *Parcival*. Here, it could be added that Schulz also spends a significant amount of time with the critical study of Polish traditions, chiefly among them the Saga of Kings. If we contrast this dedication to an overlooked culture with the attitude of A. W. Schlegel towards Polish literature, the difference of the tone of discourse could not be greater. Before defining the *Hauptnationen*, Schlegel clearly casts out several other peoples who would be considered European for geographical reasons, such as the Slavic nations or the Turkish. He denies them their place among the great European *Kulturnationen* as he deems their literature insignificant by saying that the reader would not be interested in an introduction to Turkish, Polish or Russian poetry:

[...] dennoch werden Sie mir gern erlassen, Sie mit der Poesie dieser Erzfeinde der Christenheit bekannt zu machen. Ebenowenig sind Sie wahrscheinlich auf die schöne Literatur der Russen und Pohlen begierig, von der wohl niemand viel zu rühmen weiß.¹³²

Schulz, in contrast, views the Polish literature a part of the European literary heritage and well worth extensive study. He justifies his view of the Slavic people as a part of the European family with a reference to a Polish historian named Dlugosz who apparently copied the British chronicler Nennius in his account of the mythological origin of the Polish people. According to this myth, a son of Noah, Japhet, with his three sons populated Europe after the deluge. Each of the three sons, Isicon, Armenon and Regno had several sons which each became the head of eponymous people; according to this, through his four son, Isicon is the prime father of the Franks, Latin, British and Aleman people; Armenon's

¹³¹ Albert Schulz, *Die Arthursage und die Märchen des rothen Buchs von Hergest*, p. 3.

¹³² A. W. Schlegel, *Vorlesungen über Ästhetik* II/1. 1803–1827, p. 10. [spelling as in original].

sons are at the origin of the Goths, Burgunds and Langobards while Regno's offspring is seen as the prime fathers of the Vandals, Bohemians, Saxons, Russians, Bulgarian and many more Slavic people.¹³³ Of course, Schulz does not take this account as the truth, but, in a Schlegelian sense, recognises it as an early attempt to divide the inhabitants of Europe into three strands by the means of mythology: the Romanic, the Germanic and the Slavic people. Therefore, the literary heritage of the latter deserves to be studied just as well as the early literature of the former two ethnic groups. Schulz' justification of studying Slavic literatures thus employs and expands Schlegelian ideas beyond the limitations which Schlegel initially had set in his lectures on the *Hauptnationen* of Europe.

The status of the Celtic peoples was also quite debatable in Schlegel's time. Some scholars sought to find a link between the Celts and the Germanic tribes, as did for example Klopstock and initially also Herder in *Von deutscher Art und Kunst*,¹³⁴ before he renounced his previous views and rejected the idea that Germans and Celts were of the same tribe. A.W. Schlegel, however, made a clear statement in his lectures *Vorlesungen über die romantische Literatur*. In the foreword, where he defines the 'Hauptnationen des neueren Europas', the principal nations of modern Europe, he briefly mentions the 'albrittisch gebliebene Wallis', as the possible source for the chivalrous literature of the Middle Ages.¹³⁵ Thus he distinguishes between England of the Anglo-Saxons and Wales as the refuge of the British population. In the lecture itself, Schlegel first criticises Klopstock who attempted to claim a Germanic origin for the bards whilst, according to him, the Roman chroniclers exclusively mentioned the bards when recording events where Celtic tribes were involved: 'Man hat nämlich die Barden, die von Römischen Schriftstellern durchaus nur Gallischen Völkerstämmen zugeschrieben werden, auf die Germanier übertragen.'¹³⁶

Schlegel further rejects the pan-Celtic hypothesis that Gauls, Britons and all indigenous peoples of Western Europe could be united with the Germanic tribes under the label *Celts*.

Dieses hängt mit einem umfassenderen, und in eignen gelehrten Werken ausgeführten Misverständnisse zusammen, daß man Gallier und die ihnen verwandten Stämme als Britten, u.s.w., überhaupt die Urbewohner des westlichen Europa, mit den Germanischen unter dem Namen der Celten zusammenwirft, [...]

¹³³ Albert Schulz, *Polens Vorzeit in Dichtung und Wahrheit*, p. 4.

¹³⁴ Johann Gottfried Herder, *Von deutscher Art und Kunst*, ed. by Edna Purdie (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1924).

¹³⁵ Schlegel, *Vorlesungen über Ästhetik* II/1, p. 12.

¹³⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 28.

This statement is a critical response to the opinion postulated by Klopstock and the Genevois Paul Henri Mallet, who were both at the court of King Frederik V. of Denmark. In his *Histoire de Danmarc* (1755), Mallet does not yet distinguish between Celts and Scandinavians, and by extension of Scandinavians to Germans, which would later be important for the reception of Celtic traditions, in particular Ossian, in Germany.¹³⁷ This example of falsely created national identity based on an alleged translation would reverberate with German poets and scholars for several decades.

Schlegel thinks the Welsh and the Scots are closely related to the Gauls on the continent and he also takes the reports about bards performing at the court of the rulers as factual history. His approach is already significantly more critical than that of the generation of German scholars before him who welcomed all new information hailing from the British Isles without critical thought. The pseudo translation of *Ossian* marked the beginning of the dissemination of Celtic literature in continental Europe, in particular in Germany. The fascination with Celtic literature had begun already in the late eighteenth century with the poems of the fictitious bard Ossian, which James Macpherson claimed to have translated from Gaelic fragments of ancient highland poetry into English in 1760. By the end of the century they were translated into several European languages, French, German, Russian, Polish, Hungarian and Italian, followed by Spanish in the early nineteenth century.

The poems associated with the invented figure of Ossian and their study has engaged German writers for over a century. The first generation to be influenced by the phenomenon of Ossianism were the poets of the *Sturm und Drang* period as well as the early Romantics. The figure of Ossian proved to have great influence on the poets of the time, chiefly among them Klopstock, Gerstenberg, and Denis. Early research in the reception of Celtic literature focused mainly on them, such as Rudolf Tombo's dissertation on Ossian in Germany in 1901.¹³⁸ The previously mentioned opinion, that the bards were of Germanic origin is reflected in the title of one chapter in *Ossian in Germany*, 'Klopstock and the bards' which suggests that the followers of Klopstock saw themselves as descendants of the bards, again showing the pan-Celtic ideology which was *en vogue* at the end of the eighteenth century in Germany.

¹³⁷ Fischer, *Das Eigene und das Eigentliche*, p. 95.

¹³⁸ Rudolf Tombo, Jr., *Ossian in Germany* (New York: The Columbia University Press, 1901).

In fact, the identification of the Old Germanic tribes with the bards of old is nothing but a misunderstanding of a fragment of Tacitus' *Germania* 'quem bardit vocatur' in the third paragraph, which was taken out of context.¹³⁹ The followers of Ossian in Germany assumed that Tacitus was talking about German bards but a look at the whole passage reveals that Tacitus did not speak of the people reciting the songs but of the recital itself which, according to him, is called bardit.¹⁴⁰ Later generations of scholars looked beyond the poets named above. In a study on the beginnings of Celtic studies in Germany triggered by Ossian, Howard Gaskill shows a different research focus. The names that he lists as prominent poets of the late eighteenth century are Hölderlin, Goethe and most importantly, Herder. Although the first studies on the subject of Ossianism in Germany mostly focussed on Klopstock and 'the Bards', Gaskill still thinks that the impact of Ossian on Hölderlin's, Goethe's and even more so on Herder's work was much more intense and longer lasting, as he states that

[y]et his [Ossian's] significance for the discourse of German sensibility is massive, certainly more significant in its literary influence than his inspiration of the short-lived bardic nonsense which flourished around Klopstock and which has received more attention than it deserves.¹⁴¹

According to Gaskill, Goethe's inspiration by Ossian manifests itself in the early stages in his career, when he published an edition of the text in English and even tried to read the Gaelic original of the seventh book of *Temora* and translated the *Songs of Selma* for *Werther's Leiden* (*The Sorrows of Young Werther*), one of the key oeuvres of the Storm and Stress period, and finally he wrote a poem called 'Wonne der Wehmut',¹⁴² reflecting the concept of the joy of grief. The tenor of the poems thus found very favourable reception in Germany where the sentimentalist movement had gained strength.¹⁴³

Besides the rise of Sentimentalism which paved the way for the literary reception of Ossian, there is also another reason why the Highland poems were received so enthusiastically in Germany in particular, leading to a mass production of poetry and lyric

¹³⁹ Fischer, *Das Eigene und das Eigentliche*, p. 96.

¹⁴⁰ sunt illis haec quoque carmina quorum relatu, quem barditum vocant, accendunt animos futuraeque pugnae fortunam ipso cantu augurantur – the barditum refers back to carmina, songs, not the singers. <<http://www.thelatinlibrary.com/tacitus/tac.ger.shtml>> [accessed 11 December 2011]

¹⁴¹ Howard Gaskill, 'Herder, Ossian and the Celtic' in *Celticism* ed. by Terence Brown (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1996), p. 258.

¹⁴² *Ibid.* p. 259.

¹⁴³ Howard Gaskill, 'Ossian, Herder, and the Idea of Folk Song' in *Literature of the Sturm and Drang*, ed. by David Hill (Rochester, NY: Camden House, 2003), p. 104.

prose mainly from the 1770s well into the first half of the nineteenth century. To understand the impact that Ossian had on the Germans, the political situation in Scotland in the mid eighteenth century must be taken into account and to what extent parallels could be drawn with Germany. The emergence of the supposedly ancient Highland poetry happened in the aftermath of the failure of the Jacobite rising in 1745. Pretending that the defeated nation had a literature that was significantly older (Macpherson claimed he had translated from third century manuscripts) than that of the victors allowed the resurrection of national pride and the feeling of deserving a place among the cultivated nations. Dealing with the aftermath of 1745, the Scottish intellectuals tried to restore their national pride by showing that their culture was not inferior to the English and dated further back than any English literature.¹⁴⁴ A. W. Schlegel detects a similar feeling among the Germans who feel that their literature is inferior to those of France or Britain. One example for this feeling of inferiority is Goethe.

In the mid eighteenth century, parts of Germany were occupied by French army. As Goethe relates in his autobiography, his family hosted a French general in their house for several years. Moreover, Goethe became very interested in French theatre and watched the performances regularly. In his writing, a certain sense of inferiority in comparison of the German language to the French can be felt, also in regard to the Italian language, which his mother spoke fluently.¹⁴⁵ Goethe mainly recalls reading Italian, Latin and Greek classics and then added French to his repertoire. Later in his life, the meteoric rise of Ossian and the connected revival of Scottish national pride would have influenced him to believe in the greatness of his own country's literary past. A few decades later, A. W. Schlegel looks back at this period and confirms that several men with good intentions perceived a flaw within the Germans; instead of valuing their own literature the Germans are more interested in foreign works. As a result, they tried to instil national pride in their people. Schlegel mainly blames Klopstock for this overemphasis of German virtues and

¹⁴⁴ Mícheál Mac Craith 'The "Forging" of Ossian' in *Celticism*, ed. by Terence Brown, (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1996), p. 138.

¹⁴⁵ Goethe's perceived inferiority in comparison to the French becomes apparent in several instances in his autobiography, most notably in the following paragraph where he describes his meetings with a French dance master in Strasbourg: 'One circumstance, however, greatly facilitated the instruction of this teacher: he had two daughters, both pretty, and both not yet twenty. Having been instructed in this art from their youth upwards, they showed themselves very skilful, and might have been able, as partners, soon to help even the *most clumsy* scholars into some cultivation. They were both very polite, *spoke nothing but French*; and I, on my part, did my best, *that I might not appear awkward or ridiculous before them.*' [my emphasis] Johann Wolfgang von Goethe, *Truth and Poetry Relating to my Life*, transl. by John Oxenford (s.l.: The Floating Press, 2008), p. 634.

character.¹⁴⁶ Besides the quest to find a German national identity, two other distinct movements opened the door to Ossian: the imitation of the great works of Antiquity and the return to nature as advocated by Rousseau and his followers.¹⁴⁷ This deep interest in nature and Antiquity then merged to give rise to the search of the own distant past, the German medieval poems and songs, on which especially Herder centred his interest. Herder's efforts in researching ancient popular tales and in creating the image of the 'folk' in turn inspired others to gather folk-tales such as Brentano and von Arnim and their *Des Knaben Wunderhorn* (1808) and the Brothers Grimm and their various collections, most notably the *Grimm's Haus- und Kindermärchen* (1812–15), but in regard to the Celtic interest also their publication of Celtic fairy tales. The Grimms' efforts, however, concentrated mainly on Irish fairy tales; Ossian and the literature inspired by the poems covered the Scottish field, thus leaving the Welsh field still untouched. These tendencies and the opportunity to discover uncharted territory, at least from a German perspective, set the stage for Schulz to contribute to the community of medievalists and add his share to the corpus of medieval literature revisited by publishing his *Parcival* translation and other texts by Wolfram von Eschenbach.

Tombo holds that Ossian was only one among many literary products from England that were popular in Germany in the eighteenth century, but the scope of its influence on virtually every writer of the period made it special.¹⁴⁸ First and foremost, Klopstock used the Ossianic images for his own ideas of German patriotism, while Gerstenberg was inspired to write a long drama based on Ossianic themes and Denis first translated it into hexameters to imitate the bard. These three examples show the impact on several levels, illustrating the uptake or imitation of nationalistic, literary and poetic concepts from these poems. Listing about a dozen of writers like Schiller, Lenz, Merck, Stolberg, Cramer, Many German scholars continued to work on Ossianic themes, even after the first doubts regarding the authenticity of the poems were voiced. The Germans became one of the main defenders of Macpherson's work, chiefly among them Herder. Tombo underscores the

¹⁴⁶ A. W. Schlegel, *Vorlesungen über Ästhetik II/1. 1803–1827*, p. 15.

¹⁴⁷ Herder reveals himself as a follower of Rousseau by comparing him and his critics to Voltaire criticising Rousseau for his enthusiasm for the 'wild people' in his essay 'Auszug aus einem Briefwechsel über Oßian und die Lieder alter Völker' (Johann Gottfried Herder, *Von deutscher Art und Kunst*, ed. by Edna Purdie (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1924), p. 56.)

¹⁴⁸ Here Tombo classifies all literature written in English as literature from England, when he talks about English translations of Gaelic poetry alongside *Paradise Lost* without discriminating between the different genres, cultural origins and original languages. This shows the underlying hegemony of the English language as the dominant mean of expression in literature. Tombo, despite writing a volume on the influence of Ossian, is very obviously influenced by this hegemony.

magnitude of impact of Ossian on the works of Herder, as later scholars seen above also did, when claiming that ‘Herder hailed the advent of the songs with delight and based his theories largely upon them.’¹⁴⁹ Fischer agrees with Tombo on Herder’s initial enthusiasm, stating that Herder thought that they were the last remnants of a Northern national culture and the study of these songs would yield a whole new picture of the individuality of said culture. According to Herder’s hermeneutics the character of a people is revealed to posterity in pristine condition.¹⁵⁰ The idea of a general Northern Europe culture, postulated initially by Herder, stems from the idea that in Northern Europe the original German character was preserved in the Northern Islands, the lands of the Edda.¹⁵¹ This is again an example of confusing cultural connections at various stages of establishing the *Kulturation* on historical grounds, resulting in Gallo-Germanic, Scandinavian-Germanic and eventually German-Germanic (deutsch-germanisch) notions of culture.¹⁵²

Gaskill agrees with Tombo’s judgement that Herder was the major Ossianist in Germany. Herder was the most vocal among the German scholars to promote the purportedly ancient Highland poetry poems and to defend its authenticity in his essay ‘Auszug aus einem Briefwechsel über Oßian und die Lieder alter Völker’. This uncritical enthusiasm left later generations of scholars and critics embarrassed to explain ‘how someone with such a fine awareness of the qualities of “primitive” poetry have been taken in by Macpherson’s impudent fraud?’¹⁵³ In the critical reception of his works on Ossian, Herder is often misrepresented as an enthusiast clinging to an illusion he helped to create, yet he was capable of recognising the editing process of fragments of original poetry by Macpherson. Thus, he considered the Ossianic poems neither as fully authentic nor as a complete forgery and was thus not the uncritical dreamer as he is portrayed by modern scholars.¹⁵⁴ A.W. Schlegel, however, was seemingly convinced of the non-genuineness of Ossian, as he states in his lectures on *Romanzen und andere Volkslieder*, romances and other folk songs.¹⁵⁵ He criticises Herder for putting Ossian alongside Homer, Hesiod, Orpheus in his foreword to his *Volkslieder*, folk songs. Schlegel does not count them among folk songs proper as they should reflect the poetry and songs within the common people, not the

¹⁴⁹ Tombo, *Ossian in Germany*, p. 67.

¹⁵⁰ Fischer, *Das Eigene und das Eigentliche*, p. 206.

¹⁵¹ *Ibid.* p. 197.

¹⁵² *Ibid.* p. 207.

¹⁵³ Gaskill, ‘Ossian, Herder, and the Idea of Folk Song’, p. 96.

¹⁵⁴ *Ibid.*

¹⁵⁵ Schlegel, A. W. *Vorlesungen über Ästhetik II/1*, p. 123f.

highest art of the age, which Homer and Hesiod were. The grouping of these four names is interesting, as he first mentions Homer and Hesiod before citing two mythical, not real, poets, Orpheus and Ossian. Further along in his argument, he also separates the Edda and the ‘angebliche Ossian’ as old natural poetry, ‘*alte Naturpoesie*’, from folk songs proper. Calling it ‘angebliche Ossian’, the pretended Ossian, Schlegel clarifies that he does not believe in its genuineness.¹⁵⁶

The interest in folksongs and traditional tales remained strong despite the first doubts about the authenticity of Ossian. Despite the first doubts, scholars were still holding onto the hope that Macpherson’s work was deeply rooted in Old Scottish tradition but when more and more evidence against his translation’s authenticity was uncovered, the general attitude gradually changed, but it took almost half a century to be widely accepted. The first decades after Macpherson’s death in 1796 were still marked by a relentless production of Ossianic literature until at least Ahlwards’ new translation of 1816, whose excellence was hailed widely. Several years later, the interest gradually abated and soon the first critical voices dared to speak up. One of the dissident voices was A. W. Schlegel, who was one of the first to judge the uncritical folksong collection fever. In addition to that, other Celtic texts were brought to the attention to a wider public, for example the translations of medieval Welsh poetry into English by Evan Evans (Ieuan Prydydd Hir) in 1764 and the first attempt of translating the *Four Branches of the Mabinogi* into English by William Owen Pughe in 1795.¹⁵⁷ On the continent, however, these texts were mostly ignored. Over forty years later, in 1839, however, Lorenz Diefenbach refers to Owen und [Evan?] Evans without giving further bibliographical details and later, in 1848, Christian Keferstein shows awareness of Pughe’s *Dictionary of the wellsh [sic] Language* (1832).¹⁵⁸ This coincides with Schulz’ contributions to the Welsh literary field, while earlier, at the turn of the century, Wales and its literary heritage were mainly overlooked. Nonetheless, the interest in folk and fairy tales was very strong in Central Europe early in the nineteenth century; besides Herder, the Brothers Grimm are the primary example for the systematic collection of popular traditions. At first, they concentrated mainly on those of German and French origin, drawing from the work of Charles Perrault a century earlier for their collection of

¹⁵⁶ Ibid.

¹⁵⁷ William Owen Pughe, ‘The Mabinogion, or Juvenile Amusements, being Ancient Welsh Romances’ in *Cambrian Register* 1795, pp. 177–187.

¹⁵⁸ Poppe, ‘The Welsh language in German philology around 1850’, p. 207.

Kinder und Hausmärchen in 1812 and 1815.¹⁵⁹ A decade later, they published a collection of Irish fairy tales entitled *Irische Elfenmärchen* (1826).¹⁶⁰ So, despite the fraudulent nature of Macpherson's Ossian, it assisted in bringing a whole new mythology to the fore of scholarly interest. The fascination with Ossian and the engagement with Irish fairy tales also show that the interest in Celtic folk traditions and poetry only touched Scotland and Ireland and left Wales aside.

By the time Schulz took his first steps in the scholarly community, the veracity of Ossian's poems and the existence of the medieval poet were already doubted openly. This new, more critical attitude coincides with Schulz' early days as the dispute about the veracity of the Ossianic poems around 1840 could have influenced Schulz' perception of the Welsh material he was working with at the time.¹⁶¹ It may have shaped his view on the authenticity of ancient Celtic manuscripts and on the agenda that some Celtic scholars might have had while editing texts or translating them. In his edition of Geoffrey of Monmouth's *Historia Regum Britanniae* Schulz clearly criticises uncritical Celtic scholars, by providing the example of Algernon Herbert, the author of *Britannia after the Romans*. Schulz points out that Herbert made several mistakes concerning the presumed age of the old bardic poems and also later Arthurian literature. Herbert dates the *Lyvyr y Greal*, the book of the Grail, to 717 and claims that Tysilio, a sixth century Welsh saint, wrote it.¹⁶² Schulz explains that Arthurian literature containing the Grail theme is unlikely to have been composed before the onset of chivalric literature and he would date Welsh Grail literature to the fourteenth century, as Dafydd ap Gwilym, the famous fourteenth century poet, mentioned the Grail in his poems.¹⁶³ Modern day scholarship has confirmed that Schulz's judgement was correct, as the mentioned *Lyvyr y Greal* is a part of Peniarth 11, a manuscript of the Hengwrt collection which has been dated to the late fourteenth, early

¹⁵⁹ Jacob and Wilhelm Grimm, *Kinder- und Hausmärchen*, (Berlin, 1812–1815).

¹⁶⁰ Jacob Grimm, *Irische Elfenmärchen, aus dem Englischen* (Leipzig, 1826).

¹⁶¹ Tombo describes the advent of scholarly criticism of the Ossianic poems: The critical essay on the non-genuineness of the poems by Mrs. Robinson (Therese Adolfine Louise von Jacob, Talvj, a scholar, author and translator who published in America after marrying Professor Edward Robinson) in 1840 marks the turn of the tide. Cf. Published Doctoral Thesis of Irma Elizabeth Voigt *The Life and Works of Mrs. Therese Robinson Talvj* (University of Illinois, 1913) p. 38. [electronic version on archive.org: <<http://archive.org/details/lifeworksofmrsth00voigrich>> [accessed 12 October 2012].

¹⁶² Herbert, *Britannia after the Romans*, being an attempt to illustrate the religious and political revolutions of that province in the fifth and succeeding centuries, (London: John G. Bohn, 1836), p. viii. <<http://www.archive.org/stream/britanniaafterro00herbuoft#page/n23/mode/2up>> [accessed 11 November 2011].

¹⁶³ Schulz, *Gottfried's von Monmouth Historia Regum Britanniae*, p. LXVIII

fifteenth century.¹⁶⁴ Schulz could not have known that, as the Hengwrt collection's catalogue was not published until 1869–1871 in *Archaeologia Cambrensis*.¹⁶⁵

Further, Schulz condemns the uncritical attitude that he, as a German, could not comprehend:

Diese für uns Deutsche unbegreifliche Unkritik, an der namentlich auch Davies vorzugsweise leidet, hat die celtischen Studien fast in Verruf gebracht, und es wird nicht eher als der Weg zur wissenschaftlichen Wahrheit gefunden werden, als bis der ganze bisherige phantastische Bau niedergerissen ist, und die alten echten Werkstücke gehörig gesäubert und geordnet sind: die dann freilich keinen vollendeten Göttertempel des Hu und der Ceridwen bilden, aber doch einen ehrwürdigen Torso celtischer Mythologie darstellen werden, an den zu glauben der wissenschaftliche Geist ohne Erröthen sich fähig halten darf.¹⁶⁶

Here Schulz rails against the overly zealous attempts to reconstruct the Celtic mythology regardless of the doubtfulness of some sources or their alleged age. Further, he clearly states what should be the aim of Celtic studies: to trace the ancient fragments, cleanse them of later additions and put them in chronological order to arrive at a realistic picture of the origins of Celtic literature and mythology. At the time of writing the above, in 1854, Schulz had already conducted research in the field of Celtic studies for roughly fifteen years. Unlike in his first publications, where he toned down his criticism, he now acts as an established scholar in the field, voicing his opinion clearly and backing it up with logic, arguments and facts. Despite the heavy criticism that Schulz faced in the beginning, he did not leave the field to return to his initial niche, Wolfram von Eschenbach. He weathered the storm and continued to deepen his specialist knowledge in Celtic and medieval studies.

As already alluded to briefly in the introduction, Schulz' key contact in his early career was the Lepsius family and their contacts to influential people both in the Prussian administration as well as the scholarly networks in Germany and in Britain. According to Edward Schröder, Schulz was encouraged to pursue literary studies in his free-time by the young professor Koberstein¹⁶⁷ in Naumburg and by his father-in-law Lepsius.¹⁶⁸ As

¹⁶⁴ Description of Peniarth 11 <<http://www.rhyddiaithganoloesol.caerdydd.ac.uk/en/tei-header.php?ms=Pen11>> [accessed 11 November 2011].

¹⁶⁵ Ibid. 'The Hengwrt catalogue was revised first by Aneurin Owen (d. 1851), and then by William Watkin Wynne. This catalogue was published in *Archaeologia Cambrensis* 1869–1871 (Jones 1943: xv)'

¹⁶⁶ Schulz, *Gottfried's von Monmouth Historia Regum Britanniae*, p. lxix.

¹⁶⁷ Schröder, 'Albert Schulz' in *ADB* 55, p. 195 mentions Koberstein as a possible influence for Schulz. 'Woher der erste Anstoß zu diesem Studium Wolfram's von Eschenbach kam, dem der vielbeschäftigte Regierungsassessor und Regierungsrath während eines langen Lebens treu blieb, dem er den größten Theil seiner litterarischen Production, ein volles Dutzend Bände gewidmet hat, hab' ich nicht ermitteln können: ich

mentioned in the first chapter on Schulz' publications, the posthumous edition of Karl Peter Lepsius' literary remains in 1854 speaks volumes of Schulz' admiration and gratefulness to his mentor. Through this connection Schulz was also initiated to medieval German literature. Further, Koberstein, a former student of Hegel, was in contact with both Lachmann and the Brothers Grimm. Lachmann was the critical but commendatory reviewer of Koberstein's first dissertation on a Middle German poem in 1823.¹⁶⁹ Jacob Grimm in turn encouraged him to include the fourteenth century Austrian poet Peter Suchenwirt in his German curriculum in order to foster interest in medieval German literature among his students.¹⁷⁰ The Koberstein-Lepsius axis provided the base for Schulz to engage in philological discourse with key figures first in Germany and then later also abroad.

In the early nineteenth century, Naumburg / Kösen were the location of a circle of scholars who studied early German literature.¹⁷¹ As a part of this circle in the late 1820s, Schulz was introduced there to his later fields of research. He chose Wolfram von Eschenbach as his central interest, especially as von Eschenbach's texts were not yet available in modern German for the wider public but had to be read in their original in Middle High German. Apart from encouragement from his mentors in Naumburg, Schulz was also keen on receiving feedback from specialists in the field, such as Karl Lachmann, who published the first critical edition of *Parcival* in 1833, the same year in which Schulz' translation of excerpts of the text was published. Between 1833 and 1835 Schulz wrote several letters to Lachmann with queries regarding difficulties in the original text, background to the *Parcival* material. His letters have not been preserved but Lachmann's responses were edited in the 1950s and published in *Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum (ZfdA)*.¹⁷² They bear

vermuthe, daß es die Anregungen waren, welche der junge Professor Koberstein von Schulpforta nach Kösen und Naumburg herübertrug. Das einzige Buch Schulz', das (soviel ich sehe) ein Widmungsblatt trägt, Heft 2 der „*Parcival-Studien*“, ist Koberstein „in aufrichtiger Verehrung und Dankbarkeit“ zugeeignet (1861).¹⁶⁹ Jürgen Settgast, in his NDB article on Lepsius, also considers Lepsius' time in Schulpforta crucial for his interest in philology, which was then transmitted to Schulz. Jürgen Settgast, 'Lepsius, Karl Richard', in *Neue Deutsche Biographie*, 14, (1985), 308-309. <<http://www.deutsche-biographie.de/pnd118727699.html>> [accessed 11 November 2011].

¹⁶⁸ Franz Xaver von Wegele 'Karl Peter Lepsius' in *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie*, 18, (1883), pp. 418–419. <online transcript: <http://www.deutsche-biographie.de/pnd116945885.html?anchor=adb>> [accessed 1 October 2013].

¹⁶⁹ Erich Schmidt, 'Koberstein, August' in *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie*, 16, (1882), pp. 360–363. <http://daten.digital-sammlungen.de/bsb00008374/image_362> [images 362–365] [accessed 11 November 2011].

¹⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 360.

¹⁷¹ *Ibid.*, p. 361.

¹⁷² Pfeiffer-Belli, 'Karl Lachmann an Albert Schulz (San Marte)', pp. 317–320.

witness of a mentor-disciple relationship which will be analysed more closely by the means of the field theory of Bourdieu in chapter three.

The Welsh connection also manifested itself through the Lepsius family. Apart from meeting his future wife Clara Lepsius, Schulz also benefited from the connections of the Lepsius family to the British, and in particular Welsh, literary scene. A family friend, Baron Karl Josias von Bunsen, the Prussian ambassador to Rome and London, had relied on the services of the archaeologist Richard Lepsius to advance research in the field. Bunsen had met Lepsius in Paris, where the latter had become renowned for his groundbreaking works in Egyptian archaeology. Bunsen invited Lepsius to Rome and encouraged him to work on Etruscan and Umbrian texts and also set him on deciphering Egyptian hieroglyphs. Apart from his interest in archaeology, Baron von Bunsen had a particular interest in British and especially Welsh literature, a link which will be examined in detail in the next chapter.

Both the Naumburg / Kösen network with its interest in medieval literature and the Welsh link to the Eisteddfod movement were key in raising Schulz' awareness of the 1840 essay competition. The main prize at the Eisteddfod was not only advertised in newspapers in Britain, but also in journals of literary interest such as the *Athenaeum*, as Schulz' later critic Ernst Susemihl remarked in his review of the *Arthursage*.¹⁷³ During his research for his *Parcivalstudien*, he would have come across French versions of the Parcival material, which in turn linked to the Welsh Peredur. Schulz confirms the connection in the foreword to the German edition where he states that in his previous publications he has not yet explored the origins of the Arthurian material which lay outside France:

Eine Kritik der Gralsage nach ihrer ersten Entstehung und späteren Verschmelzung mit der Arthursage hatte ich bereits im fünften Buche des zweiten Bandes meines *Lebens und Dichtens Wolframs von Eschenbach* zu geben versucht: der Drang aber, den ersten Bildungsgang der Arthursage bis dahin, daß diese in Nordfrankreich ihren neuen Aufschwung nahm, zu erforschen, ward von Neuem durch dieses Preisausschreiben angeregt.¹⁷⁴

Thus it is quite safe to assume that Schulz had come across the theories on the origin of the Arthurian tales during his research for the book on Wolfram von Eschenbach but as he

¹⁷³ Ernst Susemihl, 'Geschichte der Poesie. Die Arthursage und die Märchen des rothen Buchs von Hergest. Herausgegeben von San-Marte (A. Schulz). Bibliothek der gesammten deutschen National-Literatur. Abth. II B. 2.) Quedlinburg, Leipzig: Basse. 1842.' in *Neue Jenaische Allgemeine Literaturzeitung*, vol 2. no. 231, (27 September 1843), p. 934.

¹⁷⁴ Schulz, *Die Arthursage und die Märchen des rothen Buchs von Hergest*, p. v.

says in the introduction above he apparently did not have the time to deepen his knowledge about it. At the same time, Comte Henri Hersart de la Villemarqué was also working on medieval French and Breton literature as he had been aware of the Welsh-Breton connection longer than Schulz. He visited the Abergavenny Eisteddfod in 1838 and made a lasting impression there. After he had given a speech in French on the first evening of the Eisteddfod, 9 October 1838, he surprised the Welsh audience with the Breton song *Kan-Aouen Eisteddvod* which he composed for the occasion. It was reported that the Welsh speakers could partially understand the song.¹⁷⁵ Furthermore, the next day, he received a ceremonial horn, as a lasting token of the connection between the Welsh and the Breton peoples. One of the silver rings around the horn was engraved with the words:

‘Oddiwrth Gymreigyddion y Fenni i Genadwr Llydawaidd Brenin y Ffrangcod, ar ei ymweliad a’r Gylchwyl, 10fed o Hydref 1838’¹⁷⁶

[From the Abergavenny Cymreigyddion to the deputy of the King of the French on the occasion of his visit to the Anniversary on the 10th of October 1838; my translation]

At the end of the ceremony, he was received into the Gorsedd and took the bardic name Nizon. La Villemarqué was not the first Breton visitor; his compatriot François Rio had visited the Eisteddfod in its third year in 1835 and had been received enthusiastically by the Welsh audience.¹⁷⁷ The Welsh-Breton connection had begun roughly three decades earlier, when the Welsh reverend Thomas Price, Carnhuanawc, met Breton prisoners of war between 1805 and 1810.¹⁷⁸ Following his experiences, Price published articles on the different branches of the Celtic languages and began to entertain correspondence with Breton scholars such as La Villemarqué.¹⁷⁹ Both Rio and La Villemarqué were instrumental in the foundation first pan-Celtic movement in France, the latter establishing the Breton version of the Gorsedd after his visit to Wales.

Schulz displayed a certain French bias as well. In the footnotes to his 1841 essay we find that he used predominantly French and Latin sources for his argumentation and in the text we find that he held La Villemarqué in great esteem. The first letter of Schulz to Thomas Stephens (in English) dates to 14 April 1854, in which Schulz thanks Thomas for the copy

¹⁷⁵ Thomas, *Afiath yng Ngwent*, p. 133.

¹⁷⁶ *Ibid.* p. 134.

¹⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 7.

¹⁷⁸ Marion Löffler ‘Der Pankeltismus vor dem Ersten Weltkrieg im europäischen Kontext’ in *150 Jahre ‘Mabinogion’ – Deutsch-Walisische Kulturbeziehungen*, (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 2001), pp. 271–289, (p. 276).

¹⁷⁹ *Ibid.*

of the *Literature of the Kymry* and offers him two of his latest publications, *Die Sagen von Merlin* and *Geoffrey's Historia Regum Britanniae* as presents.¹⁸⁰ The second letter dates to 27 March 1864.¹⁸¹ This time, Schulz sends Stephens a copy of his German translation of Stephens' *The Literature of the Kymry*, which Schulz translated as *Geschichte der wälschen Literatur vom XII. bis zum XIV. Jahrhundert*. This is evidence of repeated correspondence with notable figures on the Welsh literary field and the book exchange also bears witness of Schulz' continuous interest in the field. Both letters will be analysed in chapter five to illustrate how Schulz' connections expanded within the Welsh field after making impact therein with his essay in 1841.

One aim of this thesis is to trace Schulz' movements in various fields and gauge the impact which he and his work had on these fields. The present has chapter outlined the philosophical and cultural background of his period, which moulded Schulz as a scholar. Based on the evidence found in letters, it appears that at his time, he was an active player in both literary fields, seemingly on the same level as other notable players such as the Grimms, Lachmann and Thomas Stephens. In hindsight, however, it is obvious that after his death, Schulz was more or less forgotten, while the works of the others continued to be read and their names are well-known to modern day scholars in the field. The central questions therefore are the following: firstly, are there any indicators or a theoretical framework which could explain why Schulz faded away from memory, and secondly, why his reception and his memory differ greatly in the literary fields of Wales and Germany. In Wales, he is mainly remembered for this prize-winning essay of 1840, which is indicated by his presence in footnotes of academic papers in the field of Welsh traditions, as mentioned in chapter one. In Germany, however, most of the modern critical reception of Schulz is centred on his work on Wolfram von Eschenbach¹⁸² and he is categorised as a 'Germanist', a scholar in German studies, by various encyclopaedias.¹⁸³ In the next

¹⁸⁰ National Library of Wales, *Letters 1840–1860*, MS 942C, fols 280a–c 'Schulz to Thomas Stephens' in a collection of letters mainly to Stephens from the 'Cymreigyddion y Fenni' written by a circle of writers and poets and also others, including Théodore Hersart de la Villemarqué, Albert Schulz ('San Marte'), John Ceiriog Hughes ('Ceiriog'), Robert John Pryse ('Gweirydd ap Rhys') and E. A. Freeman and a few circular letters.

¹⁸¹ NLW, *Letters 1845–1875*, MS 965E, fols 101–107, 'Schulz to Stephens'.

¹⁸² Heiko Fiedler-Rauer, 'San-Martes "Parcival" und seine Beurteiler' and also idem, 'Magdeburger Gralshüter'.

¹⁸³ Edward Schröder, 'Schulz, Albert', in *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie* 55 (1910), pp. 194–195 and *Internationales Germanistenlexikon*, ed. by Christoph König (Berlin, New York: De Gruyter, 2003), pp. 1681–1682.

Martin Wiehle, *Magdeburger Persönlichkeiten*, Magdeburger Schriftenreihe (Magdeburg: imPULS Verlag, 1993), p. 99. This book places Schulz among great figures of European history. Besides a short article on

chapter, Schulz' path from the German to the Welsh literary field and his critical reception by his contemporaries will be analysed with the aid of Bourdieu's and Even-Zohar's theories on literary production, the socio-cultural factors which influence the players in the literary fields and the role of cultural transfer.

Schulz, it also contains concise biographies of German rulers, and it shows the connection of many bishops, cardinals, politicians, philosophers, composers, writers, entrepreneurs and other famous personalities of over a thousand year period to the city of Magdeburg. The entry about Schulz is found among the short biographies of other scholars in the category entitled: 'Aber nicht nur in den technischen Wissenschaften, sondern auch in anderen Wissenschaftsbereichen leisteten Magdeburger Gelehrte Hervorragendes: [...] Schulz, Albert, Pseudonym San Marte, Germanist und Politiker, geb. 18.5.1802 Schwedt an der Oder, gest. 3.6. 1893 Magdeburg. Neben seiner Tätigkeit als Verwaltungsjurist war er ein namhafter [sic] Germanist, der Bücher über Wolfram von Eschenbach, Parsival und die Artussage schrieb. 1850 nahm er als liberaler Abgeordneter am Unionsparlament in Erfurt teil. Von 1833 bis 1837 arbeitete er als Regierungsrat der Regierung in Magdeburg. Wegen eines Buches wurde er 1837 strafversetzt und kam erst 1843 wieder zurück. Bis 1881 war er dann beim Provinzialschulkollegium tätig.'

3. Theoretical framework: Schulz as a player in the German and Welsh literary fields

The previous two chapters have presented Schulz and his literary works in the cultural context of his time and in his own field, the German literary field. His first publications on *Parcival* and Wolfram von Eschenbach introduced him as a new arrival among the established figures in that field. With his essay submission to the main literary competition at the Abergavenny Eisteddfod in 1840, however, Schulz moved into another field, the Welsh literary field, as an active contributor. His research enriched the body of knowledge in that field. Two years later, the publication of the first German translations of three of the *Mabinogion* from the English of Lady Charlotte Guest with a German version of the 1840 essay can be seen as the return product from the Welsh field, disseminating new cultural knowledge from a foreign, hitherto unknown cultural field to Schulz' home field. Since the Welsh field had not yet been explored by German scholars prior to Schulz' efforts, he acted as a pioneer. Furthermore, German scholars had not shown much interest in the literary competitions at eisteddfodau, so Schulz was a pioneer in both directions. However, despite the novelty of his activities as a cultural mediator, he and his works did not receive the attention of the major players in both fields. They also did not become part of the canon in either field and, after his death, were mostly forgotten. An analysis of the reception of his inter-cultural works, the essay in its English translation and the German edition with the *Mabinogion*, could aid in explaining this phenomenon. The reviews which are examined for this thesis show that British reviewers were rather impressed with Schulz' work but were not convinced of the importance of the topic itself. In Germany, the opposite reaction can be observed: the reviewer considered the research focus of the essay as a very important addition to the cultural and literary knowledge in the German field, yet Schulz' effort did not do justice to its significance.

In order to understand these greatly varying reactions to Albert Schulz' contributions to German and Welsh philology we need to look at the background of both Schulz and his critics. The tone and the main points of criticism depend on three main factors: first, the status of the reviewer within the field, secondly, his attitude towards the subject, the study of the suggested Welsh origins of the Arthurian legends and their transmission across Europe, and thirdly, each reviewer's attitude towards Schulz, regarding Schulz' credentials, his manner of presenting the arguments and his overall stance on the importance of Welsh literature for European literature. The following chapter outlines a suitable theoretical

framework to analyse the significant differences in the German and the British literary fields.

Two methodologies have been identified. Firstly, Pierre Bourdieu has developed a theoretical framework to analyse the impact artists and writers make in the societies in which they live and how these societies react to them and in what ways the reception of their works shapes their self-conception and their future works. The central notions in this theoretical framework are the *champ* or *field*, two main interpretations of the *field*, different kinds of fields, such as the *literary* or *artistic field* on the one hand and the *field of power* on the other hand, the nature of *cultural production* along with the *market of symbolic goods*, and the *habitus* which each player in the fields possesses.

The other component of the theoretical framework is based on Itamar Even-Zohar's research into socio-cultural systems. He is mostly known for his development of the *polysystem theory* which may be compared to some extent to Bourdieu's theory of cultural fields. The most relevant concepts conceived by Even-Zohar are closely related to Bourdieu's cultural production, namely the opposing notions of *culture-as-goods* versus *culture-as-tools*. In this thesis, the terminology of Bourdieu will be used predominantly. Even-Zohar's concepts of *repertoire* and *cultural transfer*; however, complete the theoretical framework where necessary; in particular for the canonisation of literary works and for Schulz' function as a cultural mediator. In this chapter, the major notions will be explained and their application to Schulz and his critics will also be outlined. These theoretical concepts are mainly employed as tools to explain the phenomena that are encountered in the different literary fields.

According to William Earle, Bourdieu uses the term *champ* or *field* to convey two different concepts. *Field* in the first, larger sense denotes a 'global social space' which provides a number of 'addresses' for each person inhabiting this social space, thus marking their position within it.¹⁸⁴ The neighbours of each address are part of the same social class sharing a similar background and having relatively easy access to each other in terms of social rather than spatial proximity. Taken to the extreme, they may even live in different countries or continents. In other words they have in common a significant part of their economic and cultural capital which puts them close to each other on the map of the global social space. Mobility within the social space is mostly conceived as upward or downward

¹⁸⁴ William Earle, 'Bourdieu Nouveau' in *Bourdieu, A Critical Reader*, ed. by Richard Shusterman (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1999), pp. 175–191 (p. 177).

motion of the inhabitants, occupying better or worse addresses in the social field. Profession, education, political orientation, occupations outside their profession (colloquially termed hobbies), membership in clubs, societies, etc. can all result in a move. If we apply these definitions to Albert Schulz we arrive at the following picture: being the son of a lawyer, Schulz had a relatively high prestige address as his point of departure, defined by the profession of his father. His education in a boarding school and subsequent studies of Law all contributed to maintaining his position within the field. During his appointment in Naumburg he met the Lepsius family which provided him with access to another address, the father being a royal privy councillor. Further, the connections to scholars such as Lachmann and the Grimms that were established by association with the Lepsius family paved Schulz' way into yet another 'street', the field of philologists, literary critics and activists in the field of recording and editing national traditions. Through them, Schulz rose further within the larger field, because these acquaintances carried prestige since Lachmann and the Grimms were already well established players in their field when Schulz came into contact with them. The correspondence with them also introduced Schulz to a whole new group of people of whom he had not yet been a member. This development of Schulz' connections leads on to another meaning of 'field' in the Bourdieuan sense.

The second and narrower definition of field describes smaller social universes in the global social space. In highly developed societies with a great degree of social differentiation we find a large number of those smaller cultural fields. In Schulz' case, we find a multitude of smaller sub-fields, the field of Law, German medieval literature, Welsh medieval literature, archaeology, heraldry, Polish traditions, among others. Bourdieu explains the nature of these fields as follows: 'What do I mean by field? As I use the term, a field is a separate social universe having its own laws of functioning independent of those of politics and the economy'.¹⁸⁵

Bourdieu bases his theory of fields of cultural production on relational thinking. In constructing what he calls a literary field he looks at the 'structural relations [...] between social positions that are both occupied and manipulated by social agents which may be isolated individuals, groups or institutions'.¹⁸⁶ Cultural production comprises all sorts of

¹⁸⁵ Pierre Bourdieu, 'Field of Power, Literary field and Habitus' in *The Field of Cultural Production*, ed. by Randal Johnson (New York: Columbia University Press, 1993), pp. 161–175 (p. 162).

¹⁸⁶ Idem, 'The Field of Cultural Production, or: the Economic World Reversed' in *ibid.*, pp. 29–73 (p. 29).

artistic or literary works; hence Bourdieu calls the fields of cultural production literary or artistic fields.

What does this imply for Schulz' membership in various cultural fields? Originally coming from the field of lawyers, he had a higher middle class up-bringing in a boarding school, where a high standard of education in literature, both classical and German, was taught to the pupils. Being part of the higher middle-class, a certain knowledge of several literary fields was a given, but it did not necessarily lead to an active role in one or several of them. Schulz, however, began to contribute to several literary fields due to his connections with active members of those fields. Bourdieu's theory of literary fields and the field of power will help to identify the criteria for Schulz' inclusion in these different fields and to establish his position within depending on his credentials. From the reactions of other 'players' in the fields we can deduce whether Schulz managed to gain a central position or occupied a rather peripheral 'address'. The difficulty in determining the extent of a field and the positions of the players within it can be resolved by defining first what exactly the literary field is versus the field of power and how the two notions are connected.

Within his theory of cultural fields Bourdieu establishes sub-fields in the narrower sense of the term field. The relevant field for this study is the literary field which Bourdieu defines as follows:

The literary field (one may also speak of the artistic field, the philosophical field, etc.) is an independent social universe with its own laws of functioning, its specific relations of force, its dominants and its dominated, and so forth. Put another way, to speak of 'field' is to recall that literary works are produced in a particular social universe endowed with particular institutions and obeying specific laws.¹⁸⁷

Bourdieu holds that each art or literary work is essentially explained by setting the positions of the agents in the space of the field through exploiting the objective relations between them.¹⁸⁸ Thus, he avoids overemphasising the significance of the individual players in the field but rather looks at the network which exists between the agents present in the field. He even goes further by claiming that neither the field of the relations nor the agents within it can exist on their own:

¹⁸⁷ Bourdieu, 'Field of Power, Literary field and Habitus', p. 163.

¹⁸⁸ Idem, 'The Field of Cultural Production', p. 30.

The existence of the writer, as fact and as value, is inseparable from the existence of the literary field as an autonomous universe endowed with specific principles of evaluation of practices and works.¹⁸⁹

One problematic aspect of drawing the outlines of the field and the rules for contributing to it is the temporal aspect. In this study we have to reconstruct the setting of the time in which the author or artist was living, more precisely, what exactly were the structures in the fields at the moment when he entered them. Further, we have to trace how the relations between the players within the field changed throughout the period of the author's or artist's membership.¹⁹⁰

To understand [Flaubert or Baudelaire, or] any writer, major or minor, is first of all to understand what the status of writer consists of at the moment considered; that is, more precisely, the social conditions of the possibility of this social function, of this social personage. In fact, the invention of the writer, in the modern sense of the term, is inseparable from the progressive invention of a particular social game, which I term the *literary field* and which is constituted as it establishes its autonomy, that is to say, its specific laws of functioning, within the field of power.¹⁹¹

In Schulz' case this process of entering several fields and establishing his position within them spans several decades and ranges from the field of Law to various literary fields. Schulz initial address was in the field of Law, in which he gradually moved from the periphery as a student of Law among many towards a more central place by the means of his first publication of 1830. His essay on the usefulness of Provincial Laws brought Schulz, under his pen-name San Marte, into centre field as the essay became a debatable issue among key players at the faculty of Law in Berlin. In these early years, Schulz also gained access to the fringes of the literary field of the Bad Kösen – Naumburg circle through the acquaintance with the Lepsius family. After having met resistance to his new ideas for reorganising the Provincial legislation in Prussia, Schulz, as a published writer, moved to the field of German medieval literature from 1833 onwards and only a few years later he gained a 'profile' in the field of Welsh medieval literature. The prize-winning 1840 essay proved to be the most significant contribution to the Welsh literary field by Schulz, as the following publications later in the 1840s were not met with the same interest. After the book was published in Britain in 1841, he gained the greatest recognition of his career and sparked reactions in the Welsh and British fields. This impact was then reflected back towards the German literary field, where the reception of his essay differed significantly

¹⁸⁹ Idem, 'Field of Power, Literary Field and Habitus', p. 162f.

¹⁹⁰ Idem, 'The Field of Cultural Production', p. 31f.

¹⁹¹ Idem, 'Field of Power, Literary Field and Habitus', p. 164, [italics as in original].

from the initial reactions in the British and Welsh fields. Evidence of the different degree of impact will be discussed in chapters five and six with the help of the notions established in the present chapter. In order to explain the varying reception it can be assumed that the set-up in each of these fields must have been fundamentally different and also Schulz' address in both must have been seen in a very different light. The *field of power*, another notion established by Bourdieu may help to explain these diverging opinions on Schulz and his work prevalent in each literary field.

Bourdieu explains the dynamics within the artistic fields with another structure which he calls the *field of power*. One interpretation of this touches on the competition between the artists and writers to establish themselves as acknowledged players in the field. By gaining acknowledgement through their work, their cultural capital, they compete for positions of power within the field so that they can influence the structure of the field. In the literary field, in particular, one important aim of any peripheral writer is to have one of his works become a part of the canon in the field.

This field is neither a vague social background nor even a *milieu artistique* like a universe of personal relations between artists and writers (perspectives adopted by those who study 'influences'). It is a veritable social universe [...] where relations of force of a particular type are exerted. This universe is the place of entirely specific struggles, notably concerning the question of knowing who is part of the universe, who is a real writer and who is not.¹⁹²

Regarding Schulz, his status varies greatly from field to field. On the German philological scene he first appeared with his works on Wolfram von Eschenbach, in particular *Parcival*. Schulz provided the first translation of the poem in Middle High German into Modern German. This translation of excerpts was the forerunner of a comprehensive translation published in two volumes. Schulz' contributions to the field of medieval German literature ran parallel to Karl Lachmann's critical edition of *Parcival*. Schulz was aware of Lachmann's work as several letters written by Lachmann in response to queries from Schulz in the period 1833–36 prove.¹⁹³ He also was aware of his own status as a novice within the field in opposition to Lachmann's position as a renowned expert. This move can be interpreted as an attempt by Schulz to improve the quality of his work and, by enlisting the name of one of the leading figures in the field in his publication, have a better chance of receiving favourable reviews. Lachmann's name also adds symbolic value to Schulz'

¹⁹² Bourdieu, 'Field of Power, Literary Field and Habitus', p. 164.

¹⁹³ Pfeiffer-Belli, 'Karl Lachmann an Albert Schulz (San Marte)', 317–320.

publication and Schulz mentions him several times in the foreword to the first edition of his *Parcival* translation in 1835, written in Naumburg.¹⁹⁴

If his translation is generally reviewed as a legitimate product of quality in the literary field, it is more likely to become a part of the canon and subsequently attract a greater audience. Of course, Schulz, in his modesty would not express this directly, so he respectfully asked for Lachmann's advice on several translation problems. The original letters from Schulz to Lachmann were not included in the collection so we can only infer the tone of Schulz' initial letter from the tone of Lachmann's reply in the manner of a tutor or teacher to a student. Despite the general tenor, Lachmann does not adopt a patronising attitude but is rather encouraging Schulz to carry on with his efforts and improve his standards. He begins the letter very respectfully:

Hochgeehrter Herr und Freund!

Für das mir sehr werthe Geschenk Ihres Parzivals sage ich Ihnen den verbindlichsten Dank. Ich glaube gewiß, daß diese sinnige und zweckmäßige und verkürzte Darstellung¹⁹⁵ des Inhaltes dem Gedicht nothwendig Freunde gewinnen muß, die sich wohl durch die Schwierigkeit abschrecken ließen. Ueber diesen Theil Ihrer Arbeit kann gewiß kein Zweifel sein, daß er höchst erfreulich und dankenswert ist.¹⁹⁶

Thus Lachmann acknowledges Schulz' effort as a good attempt to increase the interest in German medieval literature among the general public by making the treasures of literary heritage available for them. Lachmann, despite being a philologist, is thus able to see the philosophical rationale behind Schulz' endeavour in a Fichtean and Schlegelian sense of educating the general public. With these easily readable excerpts Schulz can also hope to gain a larger readership for future publications which may help to improve his status in the field.

After recognising the merit of Schulz' first project, Lachmann then proceeds to give Schulz constructive criticism by pointing out several inaccuracies in Schulz' first translation attempt. Lachmann makes it clear that, in order to gain the recognition of the specialist audience, the standard of the full text translation must be improved. This first example of Schulz seeking a mentor among the leading scholars in the field of Germanic studies is followed by his later attempts to gain the recognition of his works by the Brothers Grimm.

¹⁹⁴ Albert Schulz, 'Vorrede zur ersten Auflage' in *Parcival, Rittergedicht von Wolfram von Eschenbach; Dritte verbesserte Auflage* [3rd edn] (Halle: Max Niemeyer, 1887/1836), pp. v–xix.

¹⁹⁵ Lachmann is referring to Schulz' first publication of *Parcival, ein Rittergedicht in Auszügen mitgetheilt von San-Marte*, 1833.

¹⁹⁶ Pfeiffer-Belli, 'Karl Lachmann an Albert Schulz (San Marte) Berlin d. 4. August 1833' *ZdFA* 87(4), 1957, 317.

Fiedler-Rauer observes that Schulz used his connection to them to develop further as a scholar and to increase the prestige of his publications:

Er selbst bemühte sich stets um den Kontakt zu den Meistern seiner Zunft und suchte besonders den Rat der Brüder Grimm. Nicht zuletzt hatte Wilhelms lobendes Wort in den Göttingischen Gelehrten Anzeigen dazu beigetragen, dass seine Übersetzung ein wahrer Publikumserfolg wurde. In der Hausbibliothek der Grimms befinden sich noch heute viele seiner Werke.¹⁹⁷

The connection to Wilhelm Grimm persisted over several years. On 28 August 1842, he replied to Schulz' letter and thanked him for the translation of the *Mabinogion* in the *Arthursage*. Grimm also confirms the connection via Lepsius, as he ends the letter with a postscript 'Carl Uhde hat mir in diesen tagen grüße von Lepsius, den er gesters in London getroffen hatte, mitgebracht, Gott wird in ferner beschützen.'¹⁹⁸ [These days Carl Uhde has send me Lepsius' regards, whom he met in London yesterday. My translation]. The content of the letter will be analysed in chapter six among the other reviews of Schulz' German translation.¹⁹⁹

Several years later, when Schulz embarked on the field of Welsh medieval literature, his arrival as a scholar from the continent was seen in an entirely different light. The interest of European researchers in Welsh literature was seen as a confirmation of its importance by early Welsh language activists in the first half of the nineteenth century. The originally purely scholarly interest was used as a political tool to justify the promotion of the Welsh language and the revival of the eisteddfodau. This development is somewhat reflected in another Bourdieuan assumption on the field of power.

Bourdieu claims that the agents, – writers and artists, – apart from the competition among themselves, also face the struggle for recognition among the upper classes of a given society. Thus, he sets the field of power of the agents within a larger field of the dominating social classes by stating that '[t]hose who enter this completely particular social game participate in domination, but as dominated agents: they are neither dominant, plain and simple, nor are they dominated [...]'.²⁰⁰ This concept of the agents being neither

¹⁹⁷ Heiko Fiedler-Rauer, 'Magdeburger Gralshüter' in *Berliner Zeitung*, Humboldt University online archive <http://www2.hu-berlin.de/presse/zeitung/archiv/00_01/num_5/15.html> [accessed 28 October 2008].

¹⁹⁸ National Library of Wales, MS 16603C. fol. 18 in *Letters of Jacob and Wilhelm Grimm*, 1827–57.

¹⁹⁹ Ibid., The letter is falsely attributed to Pertz in the description in the catalogue, since the handwriting is not too clear. 'Ten letters from Wilhelm to Georg Heinrich Pertz, 1828-1857 (items 7–16), and a letter from Wilhelm [?to Pertz], 28 August 1842 (item 18), containing references to King Arthur and to the *Mabinogion*.' The mention of the *Arthursage* and the form of address in the letter 'hochgeehrter regierungsrath' definitely point towards Schulz. Also, Wilhelm Grimm addressed Pertz with 'freund' [friend] in the other letters but not in letter no. 18.

²⁰⁰ Bourdieu, 'Field of Power, Literary Field and Habitus', p. 164.

dominant nor dominated is quite difficult to grasp if our thinking is centred on the agents, since Bourdieu explicitly states that he is not looking at the artists and writers themselves nor the power they hold or lack thereof but rather at the relations between themselves and between them and the occupants of the correspondent field of power:

Rather they occupy a dominated position in the dominant class, they are owners of a dominated form of power at the interior of the sphere of power. This structurally contradictory position is absolutely crucial for understanding the positions taken by writers and artists, notably in struggles in the social world.²⁰¹

In the Welsh literary field in the 1830s and 1840s, this distinction between the dominated producers of literary goods and the dominant patrons is much less defined, as several members of the upper class themselves became involved in the literary field – most notably Lady Charlotte Guest and Lady Augusta Hall. The most significant contribution to the literary field was made by Lady Charlotte with her translations into English of the twelve medieval Welsh tales which she called *Mabinogion*, following William Owen Pughe's example in this. The fact, that an English-born gentry woman studied medieval Welsh to the point that she would be able to produce perhaps the most successful translations of Welsh literature, earned her the admiration of many of her contemporaries and the help of notable scholars in the Welsh field, such as John Jones (Tegis) and Thomas Price (Carnhuanawc), and also lesser known mentors such as Evan Jenkins, rector in Dowlais.²⁰² Lady Charlotte profited from the publicity that her predecessor William Owen Pughe had generated with his first attempts at translating the Mabinogion tales. Where his translations were met with criticism, she succeeded in making the contribution of the century to the Welsh fields, whose effects still can be felt today.²⁰³ The ambience on the Welsh field in the 1830s also played a part in her success, as pioneers such as Pughe and the early eisteddfod movement based on a romanticized view of Welsh history, both invented and promoted by Iolo Morganwg, had laid the foundations for the pro-Welsh sentiment among the gentry of South Wales several decades later. The favourable view of Welsh culture was complemented by a romanticizing view of the Welsh landscape, a sentiment shared by Lady Charlotte.²⁰⁴ It would be wrong though to cast her as a zealous Romantic, as she was a highly skilled, mainly self-taught linguist who studied Latin and Persian.²⁰⁵ She also had

²⁰¹ Ibid.

²⁰² Revel Guest, Angela V. John, *Lady Charlotte Guest, An Extraordinary Life*, (Stroud, Gloucestershire: Tempus publishing, 2007 [1989]), p. 102.

²⁰³ Ibid., p. 97 and p. 99f.

²⁰⁴ Ibid., p. 103.

²⁰⁵ Ibid., p. 32.

a keen interest in literary subjects which she could employ on the stage that the Cymreigyddion provided for her. Besides receiving help by influential members with publishing her translations, she also had some influence on the proceedings at the eisteddfodau of the society. In 1838, it was her influence that brought Henry Hallam²⁰⁶ to present a subscription prize of £60 for the ‘best Essay on the Influence which the Welsh traditions had on the Literature of Europe’.²⁰⁷

The centre of pro-Welsh activities was Llanover Hall. Augusta Waddington, the youngest daughter of an English aristocratic family who had moved to Wales at the onset of the industrial revolution, became one of the most famous patrons of the eisteddfod movement. After a childhood in the upper class and travelling widely, she married the MP Sir Benjamin Hall, and began to promote Welsh culture, or what she considered to be authentic Welsh culture. She is most famously known for fostering two aspects of it, firstly reviving the Welsh national dress and secondly the art of playing the Triple Harp (telyn dair rhes).²⁰⁸ It is reported that she ensured that the noble women attending the eisteddfod were all wearing the Welsh dress made of Welsh wool.²⁰⁹ She is nowadays known as Lady Llanover, a title which she received in 1869, or by her bardic name Gwenynen Gwent. In her endeavours to be a patron to Welsh culture, she had the support of Thomas Price, but the main influence was undoubtedly her friendship with Lady Elizabeth Coffin Greenly, one of the patrons of Iolo Morganwg.²¹⁰ Augusta also sponsored several competitions in various eisteddfodau, including the majority of harps that were the prizes for the successful musicians.²¹¹ Her enthusiastic support of Welsh products also brought a substantial stimulus to the local economy.

Sir Benjamin Hall and Sir Josiah John Guest, their husbands, also supported the literary field by financing substantial subscription prizes. In 1840, both Sir Benjamin and Sir Josiah paid the substantial sum of £10 10s to the main subscription prize of £80.²¹² The example of these two main contributors serves to exemplify the dynamics within the scene: belonging to the most influential families of South Wales at the time, the Guests and the

²⁰⁶ 1777–1859, historian. His most recognised publication is *Introduction to the Literature of Europe in the 15th, 16th and 17th Centuries* (London: J. Murray, 1854 [1838/9]).

²⁰⁷ R. Guest, and A. V. John, *Lady Charlotte Guest, An Extraordinary Life*, p. 109.

²⁰⁸ Rachel Ley, *Arglwyddes Llanofer; Gwenynen Gwent* (Caernarfon: Gwas Gwynedd, 2001), chapters two ‘Arglwyddes Llanofer a’r delyn deires’ pp. 28–54 and four ‘Cerddoriaeth Gymreig yn Llanofer’ pp. 69–78.

²⁰⁹ M. E. Thomas, *Afiaith yng Ngwent*, p. 15.

²¹⁰ Ley, *Arglwyddes Llanofer*, p. 15.

²¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 57.

²¹² *Seren Gomer*, April 1839, (vol. 22, no. 283), p. 119. [The exact sum was £84, according to M. E. Thomas, *Afiaith yng Ngwent*, p. 87.]

Halls awarded several significant monetary prizes for various competitions; the highest subscriptions were awarded to the calls for papers on Welsh literature. Therefore they also exerted a huge power on the literary field by encouraging writers to engage with the topics of their choice. The authors in turn would then influence the current literary scene by their findings and spark reactions to their essays. Schulz, by winning the main prize on such a topic, the influence of Welsh tradition on the literature of three major European literatures, was thus introduced to both the local literary field (by topic) and the field of power (by giving more credentials to Welsh literature with his essay).

Even-Zohar pursues a similar idea when he contrasts the possessors of goods versus the producer of goods. He states that, traditionally, the possessors of the goods are those in a position of power, members of the dominant class, who influence the distribution of cultural goods in two ways: first, they have the easiest access to them and second, they can also determine what the values are, what is a product of culture and what is not.²¹³ As for the producers of goods, their production is influenced by the values set by the potential possessors, the future ‘customers’ purchasing their works. According to Even-Zohar it is essential for them ‘to have their products recognised as values’ and this will obviously result in ‘gaining benefits and privileges’ or, more simply, to have success.²¹⁴ Even-Zohar further emphasises the importance for an artist in having his work canonised, a criterion which we will examine more closely in the next section on ‘the market of symbolic goods’.

In the modern era, beginning in the late eighteenth century, access to cultural goods has become more common, i.e. goods which had been restricted to a small proportion of society have gradually become affordable for larger social groups. This statement finds its reflection in Bourdieu’s notion of cultural production which distinguishes between high-end and low-end cultural goods, or small-scale versus large-scale production. Schulz’ series of books on *Parcival* and its author can also be viewed in this light: the first book with the translation of excerpts being destined at a larger readership as it was smaller, cheaper and could be purchased by a larger audience while his later multi-volume works on Wolfram von Eschenbach were most likely bought by wealthier readers as they could afford the more expensive books. Schulz decisively fights the notion that his full text translation of *Parcival* is directed at a specialist audience and he makes this clear in the preface:

²¹³ Itamar Even-Zohar, ‘Culture-as-goods vs culture-as-tools’ *Papers in Cultural Research* 2005, <http://www.tau.ac.il/~itamarez/works/books/EZ-CR-2005_2010.pdf> [accessed 18 July 2010] (p. 9).

²¹⁴ *Ibid*, p. 10.

Die Uebersetzung ist nicht für die Gelehrten von Fach, und die Forscher mittelhochdeutscher Sprache, welche nur zu häufig die Dichtungen dieser Zunge als ein Mysterium behandeln, das der sprachkundige Laie zu schauen nicht würdig, und welche daher jeden Versuch der Uebertragung von vornherein als Profanierung zu verdammen pflegen, sondern sowohl für dasjenige gebildete Publicum bestimmt, dem es an Muße und Neigung ganz gebricht, sich das Gedicht in der Ursprache zu eigen zu machen, das dennoch aber an dem reinpoetischen Werthe oder der literar-geschichtlichen Wichtigkeit altdeutscher Poesien überhaupt lebhaften Antheil nimmt – als auch das, oberflächlich mit der alten Sprache bekannt, die Uebersetzung als Mittelglied gebrauchen mag, um durch sie sich das Verständnis des Originals selbst zu erleichtern.²¹⁵

With this paragraph, Schulz pursues several aims. Firstly, in the light of the Fichteian *Volkserziehung*, he invites all educated readers with an interest in German poetic traditions to read his translation as it is appropriate for them regardless of their previous experience of medieval German poetry. Secondly, he denounces the predominant relations in the field of power which dictate what is worthy of translation or even who is worthy to receive a translation. Schulz clearly disagrees with the elitism and believes that the high-end culture can be rendered accessible for a wider educated public. Thirdly, Schulz also sees an educational purpose in his translation activity which is linked to the second point of opening the field with restricted access to laymen. With these points, Schulz practically breaks several conventions in the field of high-end cultural production. In chapter six we find the reaction to this disregard for the established rules in the German field. The existence of these conventions is explained by Bourdieu in the context of cultural production.

In order to understand the nature and the rules dictating cultural production we have to examine two opposing movements within the fields. There is an opposition between the field of restricted production on the one hand and large-scale production on the other. In brief, Bourdieu claims that the difference between refined or classical art versus popular art depends on the size of the intended audience. The larger the target group, the more popular and less refined the piece of art will be considered. According to him, the legitimacy of the artist is reversely proportional to his economic success:

Cultural production distinguishes itself from the production of the most common objects in that it must produce not only the object in its materiality, but also the value of this object, that is, the recognition of artistic legitimacy. This is inseparable from the production of the artist or the writer as artist or writer, in other words, as a creator of value.²¹⁶

²¹⁵ Schulz, 'Vorrede zur ersten Auflage' in *Parcival*, 3rd edn, pp. vi–vii.

²¹⁶ Bourdieu, 'Field of Power, Literary Field and Habitus', p. 164.

This issue described by Bourdieu becomes apparent in Lachmann's first letter to Schulz, notably in the above quoted introduction in which Lachmann recognises Schulz' intention to make *Parcival* accessible to a wider audience.²¹⁷ While he believes that drawing in a larger readership is an advantage on the one hand, the standard of such a publication is not good enough to be considered a composition of the highest academic and artistic value. Lachmann's ambiguous stance on easy accessibility versus highly academic or artistic standard can be explained within the context of the time. Rediscovering the literary heritage was one of the key concerns of the later Romantic period, which saw the rise of Romantic Nationalism. So while it was important to publish medieval literature for the greater public for the national education of the people, it was equally important to contribute to the academic corpus on the subject. Lachmann deems Schulz' first attempt sufficient for its purpose but he wants Schulz to raise his standard in the complete translation in order to gain recognition where it matters. Schulz, in contrast, obviously views the first objective as more important as he constantly explains his rationale in the prefaces to his publications. Edward Schröder regards this intention to communicate to a larger audience as the thread that spans across all of Schulz' publications and emphasises his humility and the accessibility of his works.

Der Verfasser bleibt immer eine sympathische Erscheinung: die ausharrende Treue dieses Autodidakten, der zuweilen vergißt, dass ihm das Rüstzeug zum Philologen fehlt, aber sich das doch immer wieder ins Gedächtniß ruft, die Ehrlichkeit, mit der er überall die Quellen und die Grenzen seines Wissens aufdeckt, und das nicht von Selbstgefühl, wohl aber von Eitelkeit freie Streben, einen herrlichen Schatz des Mittelalters allen Gebildeten der Nation zu erschließen.²¹⁸

The above quote can be understood as a verdict on Schulz' position in the literary field. Schröder highlights that Schulz did not have the necessary credentials and tools as a proper philologist at his disposal and was aware of that deficit. Yet, he believes that he can contribute to the national education, in a Fichteian sense, by making the cultural and literary heritage available to the educated public, not only the specialists.

As mentioned earlier, Bourdieu holds that the dynamics within the artistic field are often reversely proportional to those in the economic fields. Thus, artistic legitimacy can be jeopardized when the product becomes commercial. So there must be another form of evaluation which determines the value of a cultural product. Bourdieu calls this institution the market of symbolic goods. One central statement of Bourdieu's theory of cultural

²¹⁷ Pfeiffer-Belli, *ZdFA*, 87, p. 317.

²¹⁸ Schröder, 'Albert Schulz' in *ADB*, 55, p. 197.

practises is ‘The artistic field is a *universe of belief*’.²¹⁹ Since the material value of the goods is not important, it is their symbolic value which increases with their acceptance and later canonisation as part of a cultural repertoire. Thus, the more people believe a certain piece of art to be of value to their culture, the higher it is held in esteem.

In the case of Albert Schulz, we can confirm the opposite dynamic which is due to the nature of the field. Whilst he had moderate success in Germany with his editions and studies of *Parcival* and with his essays on Arthurian literature, his work in medieval German literature did not become a part of the canon in the field. In a similar fashion, he gained some recognition among notable personalities in the Welsh field, such as Thomas Stephens and Lady Charlotte Guest, as several letters and Lady Guest’s diary indicate.²²⁰ Yet, despite his connections to the important people of the period, he and his works were soon forgotten after his death. Schröder describes this situation in the article for the *Allgemeine Deutsche Bibliographie*:

Es steht manches Beherzigenswerthe in 2. und 3. Hefte der „Parcival-Studien“, und auch anderwärts finden sich Hinweise und Ausstellungen, die bisher nicht genügend geprüft und discutiert worden sind – ganz abgesehen von dem, was man einfach wiederholt hat, ohne sich um Schulz’ Vortritt und Vorrecht zu kümmern.²²¹

Schulz’ contributions were mainly overlooked when they could have been relevant.

Schröder even suggests that Schulz’ findings could have been used by later generations of scholars as a foundation of their studies without acknowledging the source. Recalling Schulz’ comments on his own work, he, the Romantic author, intended his publications as a stepping stone for later generations of scholars. Fiedler-Rauer confirms this judgement of the relevance of Schulz’ works and adds that, after Schulz’ death, more modern texts conforming to new academic standards replaced his efforts.²²² The analysis of Schulz membership of different fields and the development of these fields over time should give us an indication why this is the case. Being forgotten after his death could indicate that he was not considered part of the canon. The field theory could give us the tools to determine the factors which blocked the canonization of Schulz. These tools will be used in the examination of the reviews in chapters five and six.

²¹⁹ Bourdieu, ‘Field of Power, Literary Field and Habitus’, p. 164.

²²⁰ NLW, *Letters 1840–1860*, MSS 942C, fol. 111. Thomas Stephens comments on Schulz’ appraisal of the Literature of the Kymry and his parcel which contained two books recently published by Schulz, *Die Sagen von Merlin* (1853) and *Geoffrey’s Historia Regium Britanniae* (1854).

Earl of Bessborough, (ed.) *Lady Charlotte Guest: extracts from her journal, 1833–1852*. (London: Murray, 1950), pp. 135–6. Lady Charlotte acknowledges Schulz’ honesty as a scholar and praises his scrupulousness.

²²¹ Schröder, ‘Schulz, Albert’, p. 197.

²²² Heiko Fiedler-Rauer, ‘Magdeburger Gralshüter’

Another central notion of Bourdieu's theory of fields of cultural production is the *habitus*, a set of predispositions unique to each 'player' in the field.

The *habitus* is the result of a long process of inculcation, beginning in early childhood, which becomes a 'second sense' or a second nature. According to Bourdieu's definition, the dispositions represented by the *habitus* are 'durable' in that they last throughout an agent's lifetime.²²³

Thus, the *habitus* comprises upbringing, formal education, social class or milieu, etc. all of which structure the player's behaviour in the social universe, influencing the cultural production and determining whether or not he can enter certain fields.²²⁴

In Schulz' case, his *habitus* was first shaped by his family background and his education. Schröder's article in the *ADB* describes his background as upper middle class. The latter also reveals that Schulz' ancestors were originally farmers in Brandenburg; from the Reformation, the family tree shows several generations of pastors, and from the eighteenth century the family moved up the social ladder by entering public service, with the latest generations becoming lawyers. Schulz' father and Schulz himself are products of this upward social movement.²²⁵ By association with Lepsius and the literary circle in Naumburg, he added new qualities to this *habitus* which gradually enabled him to extend his cultural actions into other fields. In other words, Lepsius, Lachmann and Grimm all acted to some extent as gateways to the German literary field where he began as a newcomer with his first publication, an excerpt from *Parcival*. This small book served to showcase his abilities to contribute to the field and by respectfully asking for the help of an established player in the field, Lachmann, Schulz strove to develop this aspect of his *habitus*. His eagerness to improve became especially obvious in the second letter to Lachmann in which Lachmann answers a number of questions extending beyond *Parcival* and *Wolfram von Eschenbach*.

The tone of Lachmann's letter is clearly instructional; the hierarchy between the two correspondents is obvious. In a Bourdieuan sense, Schulz' and Lachmann's *habiti* dictate

²²³ Richard Shusterman, 'Editor's Preface' in *The Field of Cultural Production*, ed. by Randal Johnson (New York: Columbia University Press, 1993,) pp. 29–73 (p. 5).

²²⁴ The *habitus* is by no means a completely new invention. Leibniz already used the term *habitus* to explain the actions of a person by looking at the dispositions the agent possesses 'Habitus est ad id quod solet fieri ex agentis dispositione' (Leibniz, Gottfried Wilhelm 'Tables des définitions' in *Opuscules et fragments inédits*, (Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlag, 1988, p. 474.) electronic version on <http://books.google.co.uk/books?id=hKYUakNC3dYC&lpg=PP1&hl=fi&pg=PP1#v=onepage&q&f=false>, last accessed 3 March 2013) [literally: 'Habitus is according to that which usually happens out of the dispositions of the agent.' My translation]

²²⁵ Schröder, 'Albert Schulz' in *ADB*, 55, p. 194.

their interactions with each other. This is also found to some extent in Even-Zohar's central notion to explain the dispositions of people-in-the-culture as the repertoire which is defined as follows: 'Repertoire designates the aggregate of rules and materials which govern both the making and handling, or production and consumption, of any given product.'²²⁶ Furthermore, Even-Zohar references Ann Swidler (1986), namely the definition that culture is a repertoire or 'toolkit of habits, skills and styles from which people construct strategies of action'.²²⁷ Can we thus assume that the Bourdieuan *habitus* and the Even-Zoharian *repertoire* are the same? Not necessarily since Bourdieu stresses that the *habitus* is unique to each player on the field whereas Even-Zohar seems to understand *repertoire* in a larger sense encompassing a group of people in a given culture. Therefore we will henceforth use the term *habitus* when listing the predispositions of a singular person in a given culture while the term *repertoire* will be employed for describing the tool-kit common to a group in a given culture, e.g. the members of the Cymreigyddion society in Abergavenny.

One last question concerning the *habitus* remains: is the *habitus* a constant in an adult person's life? According to Bourdieu, any person can modify his or her *habitus*, within certain boundaries, when changing their living conditions, or even control it through 'awakening of consciousness and socioanalysis'.²²⁸ This stands somewhat in contradiction to the previously mentioned stability of the *habitus*. Bourdieu might have changed his opinion on the unchangeability of a person's *habitus* throughout his career.

Applying the notions of the *habitus* and the *repertoire* to Schulz and his networks, we notice several changes throughout his career as a researcher. Initially, Schulz had very strong predispositions in the field of Law due to his family background and his formal education. The elements relevant for the literary fields originally occupied only secondary positions in his *habitus*, as he did not possess the formal credentials to be considered a philologist or an expert in literary studies. Schulz entered the literary field of German medieval literature as a layman with a deep interest in the subject and a strong drive to increase his knowledge in the field. He was aware of his layman status, as Fiedler-Rauer quotes Schulz' description of himself in a letter to Jacob Grimm as 'Actenmann vom

²²⁶ Itamar Even-Zohar, 'Culture-as-goods vs culture-as-tools', p. 15.

²²⁷ Ibid., p. 10. Referring to Ann Swidler 'Culture in Action: Symbols and Strategies' in *American Sociological Review*, vol. 51.2 (Apr. 1986) 273-286, (p. 273).
<<http://www.ssc.wisc.edu/theoryatmadison/papers/swidler01.pdf>> [accessed 21 March 2013]

²²⁸ Pierre Bourdieu, 'A reply to some objections' in: *In Other Words / Essays Towards a Reflexive Sociology* transl. by Matthew Adamson (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1990), pp. 106-119 (p. 116).

grünen Tisch'.²²⁹ Schulz uses this German phrase to indicate that he is a lawyer or a bureaucrate (Actenmann) and also, more importantly, that he is not an expert in the field of medieval literature. The 'green table' refers to the custom to cover the desk in offices and courts of law in green cloth and it later acquired the meaning of having only theoretical knowledge in a given field.²³⁰

Until now, we have only looked at the representatives of one literary field but Schulz' publications on Welsh literature in 1841 and 1842 were conceived as transcultural contributions to another literary field. The essay of 1840 was written by a German scholar about the significance of Welsh traditions for European literature for a specific audience at the eisteddfod, whereas the English translation in 1841 was aimed at the larger readership in the British field. Finally, the second publication of the essay in 1842 was destined for the German literary field as it disseminated the content of the 1841 essay to another public and also contained the first translations into German of Welsh medieval tales. Therefore, we must look at the dynamics of cultural transfer in the making of the repertoire of a given culture.

Cultural transfer becomes important when we speak of the making of the repertoire of a culture or a field. The members or players in a cultural field may not be aware of this process since they mostly take their repertoire for granted. According to Even-Zohar, the making of a given repertoire is a continuous process with an input varying in intensity and volume.²³¹ It can be shaped either inadvertently by anonymous contributors, whose position in the field remains undetermined, or deliberately by known members who openly participate in the creative process with their name and their reputation.²³² In the case of Schulz' essay being accepted by the Welsh literary field and in return the reception of Schulz' translations of Welsh medieval tales into German, we can view these contributions as clear attempts to shape the repertoire of the receiving culture. In the first instance, the essay was even called for by the competition, so the Welsh literary field was aware of a gap in its repertoire which it wanted to fill with an appropriate product to respond to the perceived need. By presenting his findings from a German point of view to the Welsh field, Schulz transmitted information from his home field to the receiving literary field in order

²²⁹ Fiedler-Rauer, 'San-Martes "Parcival" und seine Beurteiler', p. 541.

²³⁰ Duden Online Version, entry 'Tisch' <<http://www.duden.de/rechtschreibung/Tisch>> [accessed 2 November 2013].

²³¹ Even-Zohar, 'The Making of the Repertoire and the Role of Transfer' in *Papers in Cultural Research 2005* <<http://www.tau.ac.il/~itamarez/works/books/EZ-CR-2005.pdf>> [accessed 18 July 2010] (p. 70).

²³² Ibid.

to fill the perceived blanks there. A year later, with the publication of his translations of the *Mabinogion* into German, he introduced new cultural content to the German field, thus becoming a cultural mediator.

Schulz' second attempt at contributing to a cultural repertoire was not as directly anticipated as the essay but he seemed to perceive that his home field, in general, was receptive to the mediated content. Indeed, judging by the reaction of Susemihl, the critic of Schulz' German republication of the essay and three translations of Lady Guest's *Mabinogion*, any elucidation of the origin and history of Welsh traditions were very welcome in the German literary field. The contemporary research climate of the Late Romantic period was conducive for publications in the field of the literary history of mankind and a hitherto overlooked culture such as the Welsh was perceived as a gap, as Susemihl notes:

Kein Gegenstand der britischen Geschichte ist so wenig oder so ungenau bekannt wie die Handlungen und der Charakter der Briten nach dem Abzuge der Legionen bis zur normännischen Eroberung. Die Geschichte anderer Völker in jeder Periode ist wohlbekannt; doch wenn wir versuchen, der Geschichte auf den Grund zu kommen, so treffen wir nichts als Dunkelheit, Zweifel und Ungewissheit bei jedem Schritte.²³³

Susemihl asserts that the history and culture of Britain after the withdrawal of the Romans until the arrival of Normans in the eleventh century is virtually uncharted territory and therefore any contribution to enlighten the academic community would be an important step forward. In Even-Zohar's theory, the perception of a cultural entity, that is a group sharing a common repertoire, can render the repertoire more open to new influences if the group feels that they can improve their repertoire with the imported elements.

The question that arises from this process is the following: which imported contributions actually become established parts of the repertoire and are then fully transferred into the culture? As Even-Zohar sees it, a new element becomes a part of the receiving culture when not only the product but also the need for it is imported. This could be for example importing black pepper and then also the recipes where it is needed. The receiving culture develops a taste for dishes with the taste of pepper and the cultural item 'black pepper' has become fully integrated in the culinary repertoire.²³⁴ Texts can be imported in a similar way as Even-Zohar describes it:

²³³ Ernst Susemihl, 'Die Arthursage und die Mährchen des rothen Buchs von Hergest', p. 933.

²³⁴ Even-Zohar, 'The Making of the Repertoire and the Role of Transfer', p. 73.

[T]hose who import texts from one culture to another, for instance via translation, may be performing a successful act of transfer if they may have managed to make the semiotic *models* of these texts integral parts of the target repertoires on various levels of socio-cultural activities.²³⁵

In an enumeration of transferable items, Even-Zohar mentions ‘tellable stories’ which would fit in the context of Schulz’ *Mährchen des Rothen Buchs von Hergest*. Whether Schulz’ translations have become an integral part of the repertoire of Germany is a question which has to be answered with ‘rather not’. His translations in Germany did not have the same success as Lady Guest’s had in the English speaking world. However, if we understand the repertoire of a cultural group in the Even-Zoharian sense, it would be possible to view Schulz’ translation as a part of a specialist repertoire, as we could examine the smaller cultural entity of German medievalists or philologists within the larger field₁ of all German readers. The possible impact of Schulz’ essay and translations in the smaller cultural groups, fields₂, can be deduced from the reviews of his contemporaries and the judgement of later scholars who evaluated Schulz’ life and works. In the case of the German reviewer, there was obviously a clash of expectations – Susemihl initially welcomed the new cultural content as he also perceived a gap on the German field, but then expressed his disappointment with the standard of the contribution. The reason for this, a shift from the Romantic paradigm to a modernist approach, will be examined later in detail.

At the beginning of this section, reference was made to Even-Zohar’s description of the two ways of contributing to a repertoire, either openly and in a planned manner or spontaneously and inadvertently. If this train of thought is pursued, Schulz’ essay and translations were not only an open attempt by him to add to the repertoire of first the Welsh literary field and then the German literary field but they also carried the elements of his main influences, which are constituents of his own repertoire, across the literary fields. Through Schulz, Herderian and Schlegelian ideas were carried over to the Welsh literary fields, as Schulz’ methods of examining the dissemination and development of Welsh traditions over time and across borders were heavily based on Herder’s and Schlegel’s ideas. Thus, through the success of his essay, their ideas were also further propagated in the literary fields of Wales and Britain. Schlegel’s works were known in Britain, as his lectures were translated into English in 1815 by John Black.²³⁶ The Romantic historicist approach

²³⁵ Ibid.

²³⁶ A.W. Schlegel, *A course of lectures on dramatic art and literature / by Augustus William Schlegel*, transl. by John Black, (London: H.G. Bohn, 1846, reprint of 1815).

to literature postulated by Schlegel had then become a part of the repertoire by the 1830s and the Cymreigyddion and many other players in the British fields, such as the reviewers of Schulz' essay, appeared to be very partial to its concepts. Meanwhile in Germany, comparative philology had already entered the literary field and caused a shift in paradigm. Fiedler-Rauer recognises this fundamental difference to the predominant orientation in the German field of the period:

Und doch war seine Herangehensweise eine ganz andere, den für ein besseres Verständnis mittelalterlicher Texte hielt er es für unabdingbar, 'in des Dichters Land zu gehen'. Dieser kulturgeschichtliche Ansatz unterschied sich von der zumeist noch sprachhistorisch ausgerichteten Philologie.²³⁷

The stark difference between Schulz and the majority in the field was the use of Schlegelian ideas in prioritising historical understanding over linguistic understanding. Schulz' lack of Welsh language skills was heavily criticised by Susemihl, his main critic, because he was a representative of the traditional philological methodology which relied heavily on linguistic history and therefore a thorough understanding of the language was imperative to produce a treatise of authority on the subject.

Wie erstaunte ich aber, beim Durchlesen der oben erwähnten Schrift [Die Arthursage 1842] zu finden, dass sich der Verf.[asser] ohne die geringste auch nur oberflächlichste Kenntnis der walischen Sprache, mit sehr unvollständiger Benutzung der über diesen Gegenstand bereits vorliegenden Hilfsmittel an eine Aufgabe wagte, von deren Lösung sich die Cymreigyddion Society, ihrer Aufforderung zufolge, mit Recht so viel versprach.²³⁸

Susemihl's judgement of the situation is based on his understanding of the canon, or rather the requirements for canonisation and he also makes an assumption on how the Cymreigyddion Society is supposed to view Schulz' essay. It appears that he is rather astonished that Schulz was awarded the prize which, in Susemihl's opinion was undeserved, based on the faulty methodology. In the British field, however, none of the reviewers commented on the methodological approach. This indicates that the British field had not yet begun the shift in paradigm from Romanticism to Modernism that the German field had already experienced in the decades prior to the publication of the essay in 1841. The critical overview of all reviews of Schulz' essay in chapters five and six will elucidate the different stances on canon and merit in the literary fields.

²³⁷ Fiedler-Rauer, 'San-Martes "Parcival" und seine Beurteiler', p. 546, [punctuation as in original].

²³⁸ Susemihl, 'Die Arthursage und die Märchen des rothen Buchs von Hergest', p. 934.

All three central concepts, – field₁ as the global social space, field₂ as the differentiated cultural fields and the *habitus* as the individual's cultural and social disposition, – come together to form the framework of Bourdieu's theory of the sociology of cultural production. All the agents live in a given field₁ which, in a highly differentiated culture, comprises a series of cultural fields, fields₂, (e.g. field of literature, arts, sports, etc.) which the agents can enter and contribute to according to the legitimation their *habitus* grants them. The *habitus* in return is also shaped by their membership in certain fields. The fields themselves are shaped by their common cultural repertoire and they also include the fields of power which illustrate the struggles for dominance within them. The Welsh field itself can be seen as a field₁, as outlined above, with several fields₂ (literature, art within and the *eisteddfodau* also are contact points of several fields₂).

Lady Charlotte Guest embodies the perfect example of membership in different fields₁ and fields₂ and how the membership in one field also influences the estimation of the player in other fields. She arrived in the Welsh field₁ from a highly ranking address in the English field as a member of the gentry. In the Welsh field, she added economic power to her high social status by marrying Sir Josiah Guest. He in turn profited from her high prestige social address, which included being introduced at the Royal Court.²³⁹ The Guests are a prime example of how both partners can profit from the qualities of each other's *habiti*.

Marriage to Lady Charlotte, [...], represented a significant juncture in John's fortunes. Although increasingly impoverished, Lady Charlotte's family had standing based on time-honoured rank. Lady Holland wrote to her son: 'I have got acquainted with a very remarkably clever, distinguished woman, reckoned by many extremely handsome, Ly C. Guest, nobly born, married to an immensely rich man, who wanted what the Spaniards call *Sangre Azul*, and gave her wealth which she wanted. They are perfectly happy; his riches are in Wales'.²⁴⁰

Furthermore, the combination of her high social status and her industry and intellectual abilities enabled her to move into the Welsh literary field, a field₂ and to gain a prestigious address there, even though women were not seen as capable intellectuals at the time. Lady Charlotte tried to balance her own ambitions in the literary field with the expectations of Society that her gender entailed and succeeded. Her ambitions were not seen as a flaw by the enthusiasts of the *Cymreigyddion* who welcomed her contributions. Moving to Wales was a fortunate coincidence for Lady Charlotte as she found there an intellectual field of great personal interest which was open to her. Revel Guest and Angela John exemplify this

²³⁹ R. Guest, A. V. John, *Lady Charlotte Guest, An Extraordinary Life*, p. 45.

²⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 44.

multi-dimensional membership in several fields in their biography of Lady Charlotte which is organised thematically, each chapter highlighting one aspect of Lady Charlotte's functions in society or, in Bourdieuan terms, her membership in multiple fields. Beginning with her childhood as a young aristocrat and after her marriage fulfilling society's expectations of a woman in the Victorian period in being a dutiful mother and wife, her participations in various fields also include the aforementioned literary field, the noble society with the centre of that field being in London and even the industrial field in Wales. Initially she acted as an assistant to her husband in running the largest iron works in the world but, when his health began to decline, she practically took over her husband's duties and became one of the first business women in Britain.²⁴¹

In the case of Schulz, we can establish his *habitus* based on his social background (growing up in a lawyer's family, his formal education, his contacts at university and at his working places, etc.) and the implications of this *habitus* when he tries to enter new fields such as the philological field or the field of medieval studies. The sources for this characterisation include mainly encyclopedia entries, several articles on Schulz and his work on Wolfram von Eschenbach by Heiko Fiedler-Rauer and some examples of professional and personal correspondence. Furthermore, we can also look at the repertoire of these fields and see if Schulz' *habitus* is compatible with it. This may help us to understand the reactions of established players in those fields to Schulz' contributions and his legitimacy as a contributor. In order to achieve this we can turn to Schulz' biography, the forewords to his books in which he explains his intentions and background, the praise he receives from certain individuals involved in the Cymreigyddion society as well as the criticism directed at his books by members of the community of German philologists and how he reacts to this criticism.

According to Bourdieu, the inhabitants of philological fields in different countries would be part of the same neighbourhood in the larger field₁ since they share a similar background, thus being in the same field₁ but in different fields₂. Thus, by analysing the reactions to Schulz' entrance and contributions to the literary fields in Germany and Wales, we should be able to find out if there is any difference in the rules of the fields. Moreover, it should also give us an idea how to work out explicitly the difference between field₁ and

²⁴¹ Ibid., Table of Contents. The arrangement of chapters in Revel Guest's and Angela John's biography describes the roles that Lady Charlotte had before and after her marriage to John Josiah Guest: The Young Aristocrat, The Wife and Mother, The Educator of the People, The Society Lady, The Intellectual in Wales, The Businesswoman, The Lady of the Manor, The Head of the Works.

field₂. In case we perceive differences, the central question is where do they come from? How are they related to the size, the structure or the composition of the fields? If we can obtain the reaction of different members of the same field to Schulz, this analysis could also give us an idea how the position of the critic within the field could influence his reaction. Furthermore, this analysis should also reveal the dynamics of the field of power Schulz strives to be a part of.

Before moving on to the analysis of the essay itself, the constellation of the Welsh field and its connections to the German field should be examined using the Bourdieuan theories on literary fields and cultural production. In the following section, the conditions that led to Schulz' successful bid will be laid out in detail. It will outline his first encounters with the Welsh field in his research and his most important link to the Welsh field, his brother in law Lepsius and Lepsius' close friend, Christian Karl Josias von Bunsen, the Prussian ambassador to London. Further, the members of the Welsh networks and their significance for Schulz in terms of his progression in the field will be brought to the fore. The key network for his engagement on the Welsh field was the Cymreigyddion society, which organised the eisteddfodau in Abergavenny from 1834 to 1853.²⁴² This society played a central role in the Welsh cultural revival by giving the local culture and economy a boost. Besides this, the Cymreigyddion can also be seen as the catalyst for the emerging interest of the players in the Welsh field in discovering their native literature's position on the larger European field. The call for papers on 'the influence of Welsh traditions on European literature' in 1837 and later, similarly themed competitions are the outcome of the growing awareness of Welsh literature as one sub-field on the larger European field. It also endeavoured to draw the attention of scholars on the continent to the competition, as will be shown below. Schulz' participation is one piece of evidence for this, the Welsh-Breton connection to Rio and La Villemarqué is another.

As outlined in chapters one and two, prior to his research into the scope of Welsh influence on European literature, Schulz had already worked on Arthurian themes from a German point of view. His interest in the field was heavily influenced by the contemporary research

²⁴² Cf. Mair Elvet Thomas, *Afiath yng Ngwent*, Pennod 1 [chapter 1], 'Hanes Cymdeithas Cymreigyddion y Fenni', p. 1, 'Sefydlwyd y Gymdeithas yn Nhŷ Mr. Ioan Michell, [...] yn y Fenni, nos Wener, Tachwedd 22, 1833' [The Society was founded in the house of Mr. Ioan Michell in Abergavenny Friday night, 22 November 1833] and p. 52 the minutes of the final meeting '[18 January 1854] Resolved – Therefore that the undersigned, forming the committee of the said Cymmreigiddion (sic) Society, now give instructions to the Treasurer to discharge forthwith all liabilities and the – Abergavenny Cymmreigiddion (sic) Society be this day Dissolved.'

culture. Schulz was born into the Romantic period in which the exploration of the national literary and cultural heritage was a key factor in creating a national identity. From the 1820s onwards there is evidence of Schulz' interest in medieval German literature, fostered by his links to Lepsius, Koberstein and the Bad Kösen circle. As also mentioned in the introduction, in the year 1833 he published a translation of excerpts from Wolfram von Eschenbach's *Parcival* which was followed by a complete translation based on Lachmann's critical text edition in 1836. Therefore, he was already acquainted with Arthurian materials and owing to his correspondence with Karl Lachmann, he had already gathered information on parallels in other traditions. The aforementioned letter from Lachmann to Schulz, dated 26 October 1835, is the prime example for this, as it contains answers to five questions regarding Chrétien de Troyes, Guiot and Fauriel and even some unspecified transcripts of Grimm's latest research in the field.²⁴³ Schulz confirms this link in the foreword to the German edition of 1842, where he provides the reader with background information on his previous research interests. During his research on von Eschenbach's works, he realised that the beginning of the Arthurian legends up to their dissemination in Northern France and their combination with the Holy Grail had not been thoroughly investigated before. After hearing about the essay advertisement for the 1840 Eisteddfod, his interest in discovering the origin of both narrative strands was renewed.²⁴⁴ For Schulz, the progression from the medieval German field via the French towards the Welsh literary field happened naturally, as he discovered the links while progressing his erudition in the field.

In summary, we can say that Schulz had the necessary 'tools' in his possession and the appropriate background for the task but the question remains how he received information about the competition in the first place. It is very likely that he read about the competition in a supplement to the *Allgemeine Zeitung* or another publication on the continent, as there is evidence that the competition was advertised in various journals and periodicals in Britain and Europe. While it was not possible to retrieve the original announcement of the *Allgemeine Zeitung*, dated 23 March 1840, *Seren Gomer* printed a Welsh translation in the July issue of 1840 of an English article on the interest in Welsh literature on the continent. The anonymous correspondent reports that a German newspaper called *Allgemeine Zeitung* advertised the Cymreigyddion's essay competition. This was obviously done to show to

²⁴³ Pfeiffer-Belli, 'Karl Lachmann an A. Schulz (San-Marte)', 26 October 1835, p. 318.

²⁴⁴ Schulz, *Die Arthursage und die Mährchen des rothen Buchs von Hergest*, p. iv.

the Welsh readers that Welsh literary competitions were important enough to be announced in central Europe.²⁴⁵ The correspondent of *Seren Gomer* thus validates the efforts of Welsh societies within the Welsh field and, by underscoring the interest on the continent in a sub-field of the British field, gives the Welsh field added value in the field of power.

According to this report, several announcements were issued in newspapers and periodicals but none is named except the *Allgemeine Zeitung*. At the time, in 1840, there were several newspapers in print, called *Allgemeine Zeitung*, in Leipzig,²⁴⁶ in Berlin,²⁴⁷ in Halle,²⁴⁸ and in Munich.²⁴⁹ Leipzig, Berlin and Halle would be the more obvious candidates, as they are closer to Schulz' network in Saxony. Here, it should be remembered that from 1837 to 1843, he lived in Bromberg which meant that he had to rely on his connections to provide him with the necessary information. Moreover, as we will see in the introduction to Susemihl's review of the essay in the chapter on criticism, German scholars did have access to English periodicals, in this case the London-based *Athenaeum*.²⁵⁰ It is fairly likely that therefore, Schulz received copies or excerpts from his friends in Naumburg and Kösen.

As already mentioned briefly in the introduction, Schulz may have been encouraged to compose an essay to enter the competition at the Abergavenny Eisteddfod by his brother-in-law Lepsius. From the early days of his career, Lepsius was a close friend of Ambassador Bunsen who had very close and personal links to key figures of the Abergavenny Cymreigyddion, and, due to his long-standing reputation as a literary scholar, was also appointed judge of the competition. Bunsen was thus considered a high ranking player in both fields, a fact which makes him exceptionally suitable as the bridging element from one field to the other. Besides the existing connection to Britain that the Lepsius family had had for decades,²⁵¹ Schulz also benefitted from Lepsius' close

²⁴⁵ *Seren Gomer*, 23, no. 298, July 1840, 'Llenyddiaeth Gymreig (O Newyddiadur Almaenaidd)', p. 199.

²⁴⁶ *Leipziger allgemeine Zeitung*, (Leipzig: Brockhaus) in print 1st October 1837 – 30 March 1843, [all dates and numbers according to the archives of the German National Library]

²⁴⁷ *Allgemeine preußische Staats-Zeitung*, (Berlin: Exped.), in print 2 January 1819 – 30 June 1843.

²⁴⁸ *Allgemeine Literatur-Zeitung*, (Halle: Schwedtschke und Sohn, Leipzig: Kurfürstliche, später Königliche Sächsische Zeitungsexpedition) in print, 1803–1849.

²⁴⁹ *Allgemeine Zeitung*, (Augsburg, München: Cotta), in print 16 January 1807 – 28 February 1890.

²⁵⁰ *Neue Jenaische Allgemeine Literatur-Zeitung*, no. 231, Vol. II, (27 September 1843), p. 934. [said *Athenaeum* should not be confused with the homonymous journal of the Schlegels]

²⁵¹ Schulz, (ed.) *Kleine Schriften.*, p. xii.

Schulz highlights his father-in-law's [Karl Peter Lepsius] role as the main crisis manager in an essay titled 'Rückblick auf die Leiden hiesiger Landschaft in den Kriegsjahren 1806–13 und die zu deren Linderung getroffenen Veranstaltungen, sowie auf die hierbei durch den Westminsterverein zu London in großartiger

friendship to Bunsen in order to be introduced to the Cymreigyddion. Maxwell Fraser states that Bunsen introduced a large number of high-ranking personalities to Llanover.

It was largely through Bunsen's wide circle of diplomatic friends that Sir Benjamin and Lady Hall were able to invite the Danish, Turkish and Sardinian Ambassadors to the house-parties they gave for the Abergavenny eisteddfodau. Bunsen also brought Dr. Carl Meyer, Professor Albert Schulz and Carl Richard Lepsius.²⁵²

It must be said that this is the only instance where Schulz is said to have visited Llanover. There is no mention of his visit neither in any of the Cymreigyddion Society's proceedings nor in the reports about the eisteddfod in 1840. If he had indeed attended the eisteddfod and received the prize in person, newspapers and journals such as the *Caernarvon and Denbigh Herald* or *Seren Gomer* would have indicated so, as they did with other foreign visitors, for instance in 1838 when La Villemarqué attended the eisteddfod. Nonetheless, the above quote indicates that Bunsen was the decisive link for Carl Meyer (the winner of the main prize in 1842), Schulz and Lepsius.

In 1840, the year of the competition in which Schulz took part, Bunsen's links to the Welsh literary field had been established for decades. During his first term as the ambassador of Prussia in Rome, Bunsen was very active within the literary and philosophical circles of German intellectuals and established through them the links to British dignitaries and scholars. Eventually, in 1817, he married the Welsh heiress Frances (Fanny) Waddington,²⁵³ and, subsequently, Bunsen became involved with the Cymreigyddion society through his wife's family ties. As already mentioned earlier, his in-laws were highly influential figures in nineteenth-century Wales, not only on the literary field but also on the wider cultural, political and economic fields. Frances was the sister of Augusta Waddington, the wife of Sir Benjamin Hall, MP for Monmouth, who became one of the most prominent members of the Cymreigyddion society. By association with the Halls and the Waddingtons, Bunsen quickly rose to an influential position within the society as he was renowned for his competence in linguistics, philology and literary criticism. He had studied Arabic in Munich, Persian in Leiden and Norse in Copenhagen and, after forging his link to Wales, he began to take interest in the Celtic languages and also the Arthurian

Weise gewährte Unterstützung' which indicates that he worked closely with the Westminster Society in London during the Napoleonic Wars.

²⁵² Maxwell Fraser, 'The Waddingtons of Llanover 1791–1805' in *National Library of Wales Journal*, 11/4 (1960), 285–329, (p. 288).

²⁵³ R. Pauli, 'Bunsen, Christian Karl Josias Freiherr von' in *Allgemeine Deutsche Bibliographie*, 3 (1876) p. 542.

tales and their origin.²⁵⁴ In contrast to her sister Augusta's avid interest in all aspects of Welsh culture and her self-perception as a Welsh woman, Frances Bunsen did always see herself as an English woman who had moved to Wales. In fact, it was her husband, the Ambassador, who was the driving force behind the promotion of Welsh language and culture. Unlike his sister-in-law Augusta Hall, he was mainly interested in Welsh from a comparative point of view and he tried to convince his wife Frances of the importance of Welsh from the perspective of European comparative studies.²⁵⁵

For this reason, he and Lepsius were responsible for the wording of the prize question in 1840 which invited submissions on the influence that Welsh traditions had on the literature of Germany, France and Scandinavia. Subsequently, due to his merits in comparative philology, Bunsen was appointed judge in the main literary competition in that year as well.²⁵⁶ Furthermore, he also set the main prize question for 1842, as seen in the letter written by his wife below:

Bunsen is of opinion that for another great prize, it would be more advisable to state the subject thus: On the place which the Cymric language occupies among the Languages of the Celtic family & together with the other branches of the same among the languages of the Indo-European race. The Cymreigyddion Society would by putting this question take the lead in one of the most important enquiries of the age just at the first moment possible.²⁵⁷

In this letter, Bunsen indicates that the subject of the relation of the Celtic languages to the European languages was one of the great academic problems to be solved at the time and even the relation of the Celtic languages between themselves was far from resolved. The issue of the position of the Welsh language in particular was hotly contested at the time, with some scholars claiming that Welsh and Gaelic were but dialects of each other, while others postulated that Welsh was either remotely related to the Semitic languages or was an isolated language. The status of the Celtic languages was a major topic of debate in *The Gentleman's Magazine*, beginning in May 1836 with a letter by 'Fior Ghael', a Scottish scholar who refuted that Welsh is a Celtic language.²⁵⁸ In January 1838, James Logan, an

²⁵⁴ David Thorne, 'Cymreigyddion Y Fenni a Dechreuadau Ieitheg Cymharol yng Nghymru' [The Abergavenny Cymreigyddion and the Beginnings of Comparative Philology in Wales] in *The National Library of Wales Journal* 27/1 (1991), 97–107 (p. 99).

²⁵⁵ Fraser, 'The Waddingtons of Llanover 1791–1805', p. 288.

²⁵⁶ Thorne, 'Cymreigyddion Y Fenni a Dechreuadau Ieitheg Cymharol yng Nghymru', p. 99.

²⁵⁷ National Library of Wales, MS 13182E1, fol. 19, Frances Bunsen, 'Letter of Mme Bunsen, Berne, March 17th 1841' in *Letters of the Cymreigyddion society*. [emphasis as in original, addressee unknown]

²⁵⁸ Fior Ghael 'On the Celtic Language and its assumed dialects' in *The Gentleman's Magazine*, May 1836, pp. 485–487.

Englishman, replies to this with the claim that it was obvious that Welsh and Gaelic resembled each other very closely:

The Welsh could best reply to this part of the letter; and the talented writers of the Principality in numerous works have done so much to prove the present resemblance and ancient identity of the languages spoken of, as must forcibly strike every reader, and convince all, whose minds are not irrecoverably biased, that the Welsh is more 'akin to Keltic than English is to Welsh'.²⁵⁹

This was contested by Fíor Ghael who dedicated a series of letters to the rebuttal of the idea, in the period from February 1838 to August 1839, insisting on his opinion that Welsh was not a Celtic language. His first letter contains a passage the first paragraph of the book of Genesis from the Bible in Welsh and in Scottish Gaelic to show, that they look very different and, apart from a few loan words from Latin, e.g. *Duw* and *Dia*; *beatha* and *bywyd*; and *dhaoine* and *dynion*, had not much in common.²⁶⁰ Logan's letter of July 1838 also resorts to an etymological analysis of the same passage to underpin his argument which shows a slightly better understanding of etymology than that of Fíor Ghael which leads to his conclusion that Welsh and Gaelic have more in common than Fíor Ghael would allow.²⁶¹

In the light of this ongoing debate, which mainly rested on superficial observations and sweeping generalisations, the above excerpt from Bunsen's letter shows firstly the awareness of the important questions in Celtic and European studies and, secondly, the desire to become involved in the debate and to steer it towards a more scientific approach. Bunsen saw the literary competitions of the *Cymreigyddion* as an apt forum to advance the current state of research in this field and also as a means to raise the profile of the *Cymreigyddion* beyond that of a society of mere local interest. The question of the position of the Welsh language among the Indo-European languages was raised for the first time in Britain by James Cowles Pritchard who, in his comparative study *The Eastern Origin of the Celtic Nations* (1831), attempted to prove that the Celtic languages are a part of the family tree of the Indo-European languages, using etymological evidence for this.²⁶² Bunsen wanted a more thorough investigation of the topic and deemed it worthy of a great premium as a further excerpt of the letter penned by his wife shows:

²⁵⁹ James Logan 'Letter' in *The Gentleman's Magazine*, 9, (January 1838), 45–47, (p. 46).

²⁶⁰ Fíor Ghael, 'Letter' *The Gentleman's Magazine*, 9, (February 1838), 139–144 (p. 142).

²⁶¹ James Logan, *The Gentleman's Magazine*, 10, (July 1838), 10, 31–33 (p. 32).

²⁶² Thorne, 'Cymreigyddion Y Fenni a Dechreuadau Ieitheg Cymharol yng Nghymru', 98.

Dr. Pritchard in his Essay has been the first to touch this question from the point of view of the present Linguistic Science since the celebrated author of the Comparative Grammar of the Sanscrit, Zent, Persian, Greek, Gothic, Roman & Scandinavian languages Professor Bopp of the University of Berlin has made the same question the object of a particular enquiry. Mr. Dieffenbach in his Celtica has put together most valuable matter from other quarters. It is generally understood among the Heads of the Linguistic Schools in Germany, France & England that it has hitherto been a great want in that Science & that the Cymri-Gaelic-Erse question has not been understood.²⁶³

In this paragraph Bunsen shows his awareness of the existing scholarship in the field, as he names Bopp and Dieffenbach, both German philologists, who were all interested in resolving the question of the relation of the Celtic languages to the Indo-European family as well as the degree of relationship between them.

Bunsen was frequently involved with the eisteddfodau of the Cymreigyddion from 1838, his first visit to the Eisteddfod, moving into a more active position from 1840 onwards with his first appearance as judge and critical adviser on the prize questions, until the last eisteddfod in 1853, when he also acted as adjudicator, when the main prize was awarded for an essay on the origin of the Welsh native laws. This shows that Bunsen had become a main player on the Welsh field who was regularly involved with the proceedings of the Cymreigyddion society. As seen above, in 1840, Lepsius also had a say in the prize question which shows that at least at that time, he also played a part in the Welsh field.

The combination of personal reasons, opportunities and motivations, which Schulz had prior to the 1840 competition, can be viewed as additions to his *habitus*, which enabled him to enter the Welsh field. On the other hand, the research culture of his period can be understood as the *repertoire* of his home field which allowed excursions into other fields. Both factors, Schulz' developing *habitus* and the favourable *repertoire* of his field of departure, undoubtedly played a major role in his path towards the Welsh field. The popularity of research into the literary heritage of Europe among German scholars is evident in the publications in the first half of the nineteenth century. For example, the *Neue Jenaische Allgemeine Literatur-Zeitung* contains several reviews of German translations of books in French, e.g. a German translation of Hersart de la Villemarque's books, *Barzaz Breiz* (1839)²⁶⁴ and *Chants populaires des anciens Bretons* (1842),²⁶⁵ as well as a review of *Geschichte der volksthümlichen schottischen Liederdichtung* (1846) by Eduard

²⁶³ NLW, MS 13182E1, fol. 19, 'Letter of Mme Bunsen, Berne, March 17th 1841' [emphasis as in original].

²⁶⁴ Ernst Susemihl, *Neue Jenaische Allgemeine Literatur-Zeitung*, vol. III, nos 220–221, (12–13 September 1844), pp. 879–883.

²⁶⁵ V. A. Huber, *NJALZ*, vol. II, nos 170–173, (18–21 July 1843), pp. 691–701.

Fiedler.²⁶⁶ All these reviews are listed under the heading ‘Literaturgeschichte’ or ‘Geschichte der Poesie’. This topic was very much en vogue with the Late Romantic Germans, the generation following Herder’s collection of folk-songs and his works on *Ossian*. As mentioned in the first chapter, the influence of *Ossian*, even after it was revealed to be forged by Macpherson, laid the foundation for the next generation of writers and researchers to engage with folk poetry, its translations and research in comparative literature. Thus, Schulz saw the opportunity to reach a wider audience in Germany with his essay since there was considerable interest in the literary history of Europe as a result of the Romantic Movement. The scholarly community of his period would also take an interest in his essay, since the subject of comparative philology had also recently been raised within the field. The interest of philologists would also influence the reception of his work in the German field, as will be shown in chapter six.

Moreover, the Welsh topic appeared to be a research niche which had not yet been occupied. Besides the ‘obvious’ Celtic cultures, Irish and Scottish (the latter brought to the attention of international scholarship with *Ossian*), research into Persian and Sanskrit poetry bears witness of a fascination with the Oriental and the exotic on the literary field. In the neighbouring field of philology, the interest had shifted east as well, as the recently published theory of a common origin of Sanskrit and the European languages, postulated by Franz Bopp in his publication *Über das Konjugationssystem der Sanskritsprache in Vergleichung mit jenem der griechischen, lateinischen, persischen und germanischen Sprache* (1816) proves. In this early comparative study, the Celtic languages are not included yet. On the literary field, Herder’s collection of folk-songs is a reflection of this, as it contains material from almost every nation in Europe alongside some inclusions of non-European poetry, but there is not a single Welsh entry among the 50 songs in the list.²⁶⁷ Therefore, the uncharted Welsh literary field could be seen as another exotic, exciting territory to explore. Before Schulz’ efforts, no attempts had been made to enrich the German literary field with ancient Welsh imports, as his critic Ernst Susemihl tells us in the introduction to his review of the *Arthursage*.²⁶⁸

²⁶⁶ Eduard Fiedler, *NJALZ*, vol. VII, nos 101–102, (27–28 April 1848).

²⁶⁷ Johann Gottfried Herder, *Werke; 10 in 11 Bänden*, 11 vols, ed. by Ulrich Gaier (Frankfurt am Main: Deutscher Klassiker Verlag, 1985), I, Frühe Schriften 1764–1772, pp. 12–14.

²⁶⁸ Ernst Susemihl, ‘Die Arthur-Sage und die Märchen des rothen Buches von Hergest. Herausgegeben von San Marte (Albert Schulz)’ p. 934.

Susemihl's expectations were high due to the almost complete lack of scholarly research into Welsh early medieval traditions. Apart from limited reference in travel literature, Wales had hitherto remained uncharted territory when it came to giving its cultural and literary heritage a place in the history of poetry. Both August Wilhelm and Friedrich Schlegel attempted to illustrate the literary heritage of various European people in their lectures. However, following Herder's example, Wales does not feature in their elaborations on various European nations except for some side notes when talking about the Celtic languages. So Wales had no profile on the international literary field. To the continental *Bildungsbürger* of the early nineteenth century, Wales had not yet established an identity of its own but it was often seen as a wilder and more primitive part of England. The travel literature of the period, published by Englishmen, reinforced that image.²⁶⁹

Macpherson's *Ossian*, despite being a forgery, and Walter Scott's novels had firmly established the Scottish national identity outside Britain, especially in Germany, while the collection of ancient Welsh poetry of Evan Evans was more or less overlooked.²⁷⁰ It was Grimm's *Irische Elfenmärchen* of 1826 which helped to give Ireland a distinct Celtic cultural identity in the European context.²⁷¹ Scotland and Ireland were thus perceived as cultures of their own, while Wales, from the European point of view, had not yet gained any recognition as a nation within the United Kingdom. The matter had already arisen in 1822 in the notes to their *Kinder- und Hausmärchen*, which contained a section on folk tales of the British Isles, namely of England, Scotland and Ireland, although the annotations mainly highlight elements of Welsh oral tradition, speaking of 'Mabinogion', 'hen Chwedlau' and 'hen Ystoriau', to illustrate the Celtic traditions.²⁷² Despite giving more details on the existence of folk traditions in Wales, the Grimms did not pursue the matter. Wales and its Celtic heritage were marginalized by the overwhelming majority of literary scholars on the continent for almost two decades, until Schulz took the first step. The conditions appeared to be favourable for his publications, as the general interest was clearly present, only the final, decisive incentive was missing. Schulz' personal link to the Cymreigyddion Society via the Lepsius-Bunsen-axis enabled him to take this step onto the Welsh field and make a valuable contribution.

²⁶⁹ Cf. Thomas Pennant, *A Tour in Wales*, 2 vols (Wrexham: Bridge Books, 1991) and J. T. Barber, *A tour through Monmouthshire and South Wales* (London: Nichols and Son, 1803).

²⁷⁰ Evan Evans, *Specimen of Ancient Poetry* (Llandidloes: John Pryse, 1862, repr. of Dodsley's edition of 1764).

²⁷¹ Carol Tully, 'The Celtic Misconnection: The German Romantics and Wales' in *Angermion*, 2 (2009), 127–141, (p. 131).

²⁷² *Ibid*, p. 129.

On the other hand, the aforementioned prelude to Susemihl's criticism of Schulz' essay is evidence of the perception among scholars at the time: by 1840, the antiquarian community was apparently aware of the gap in the research in Welsh poetic traditions. The timing of the foundation and development of the Cymreigyddion also plays into this, as the decade from the late 1830s onwards to the late 1840s marked their most influential time in the literary field. They progressed from being a purely patriotic society, whose interests were centred on local Welsh culture, towards becoming a literary circle with a wider orientation, with the aim of placing Welsh traditions in their context in comparative European literature. By taking this step, they made the *repertoire* of their literary field receptive to scholarly engagement from abroad. Thus, all factors had to come together at the right time to present Schulz with the opportunity to cross over from his field into a peripheral field and make a decisive impact there by winning the main competition at the 1840 Eisteddfod.

The circumstances which enabled Schulz' entry into the Welsh field are closely linked to the development of the Cymreigyddion society itself. After having characterized the major players of the Cymreigyddion Society, the following section will outline a brief history of the pro-Welsh movement from the first steps in the mid-eighteenth century to the vigorous eisteddfod culture of the 1830s and 1840s. This summary will provide the background to the eisteddfod of 1840 in which Schulz competed and won the main prize. The events at previous eisteddfodau are of importance in regard to the timing of his entry and his chance of success, as will be shown subsequently. The Abergavenny Cymreigyddion were one of many societies formed in the first decades of the nineteenth century in Wales to revive the original Welsh culture rooted in Celtic mythological traditions, or rather, what was considered to be genuine and ancient by Welsh national activists like Iolo Morganwg²⁷³ and his followers, or enthusiastic members of the gentry like Lady Augusta Hall. The first societies of this kind were founded outside Wales by Welshmen living in London, with the Cymmrodorion in 1751 in London,²⁷⁴ and the Gwyneddigion in 1770.²⁷⁵ Their purpose was to give Welsh expatriates a forum to practice their culture. After these patriotic gatherings

²⁷³ The legacy of Iolo Morganwg (Edward Williams, 1747–1826) was of particular importance to the rapid development of the Cymreigyddion movement after his death from the 1830s onwards. His ideas of bardic traditions, eisteddfodau, the Gorsedd have continued to shape Welsh cultural life until today, even after his forgeries and inventions had been revealed. (cf. Löffler Marion, *The Literary and Historical Legacy of Iolo Morganwg 1826–1926*, (Cardiff: Cardiff University Press, 2007).

²⁷⁴ The Cymmrodorion were founded in 1751 in London by the three Morris brothers. In fact, it developed out of the first society founded by London Welshmen in 1715, the Most Honourable and Loyal Society of Antient Britons. <<http://www.cymmrodorion.org/our-history>> [accessed 27 November 2012]

²⁷⁵ Davies Leathart, William *The origins and the progress of the Gwyneddigion of London*, (London: Hugh Pierce Hughes, 1831), p. 11.

proved to be successful, the first Cymreigyddion societies began to grow also inside Wales. The society in Abergavenny was founded in 1833 with the aim of promoting Welsh literature, music culture and manufacturing. Activities to celebrate the Welsh language, literature and culture and to advertise local products were held throughout the year but the main event took place each year in autumn, when the Society held an annual eisteddfod to commemorate the founding date, also called ‘anniversary’ or ‘Cylchwyl’. The eisteddfod usually comprised two or three days of parades, performances, competitions, speeches and festive dinners.

Initially, the eisteddfodau were held annually, later biannually or triennially from 1834 to 1853. Prizes were given for a wide range of accomplishments. The main prize was usually awarded to an essay on Welsh literature; other competitions were held to find the best Welsh poetic compositions, odlau, englynion, etc. on appointed topics, Welsh airs and songs, Welsh recipes and Welsh wool products. Calls for papers about the influence of Welsh literature on European literature had been offered since 1836 [one entry which did not receive the prize]; the first prize for an essay on this topic was awarded at the 1838 Eisteddfod.²⁷⁶ The significance of the Abergavenny Eisteddfod was also increasing, and it began to compete for the attention of the wider British public with the eisteddfodau traditionally organised by the Cymmrodorion Society, who had been the first among the Welsh societies to revive the eisteddfod tradition.²⁷⁷ These were usually held outside Wales, mostly in London. In 1837, the *Gentleman's Magazine* gave the title ‘Welsh National Eisteddfod’ to the Abergavenny Eisteddfod 1837²⁷⁸ and called the Cymmrodorion event ‘The Eisteddfod’.²⁷⁹ The rise of societies and eisteddfodau in Wales is also a sign of a shift in the field of power. Prior to the 1830s, most patriotic activities were held outside Wales, thus emphasising the marginal status of Wales. Welsh culture was celebrated and promoted but not in Wales but in large economic centres in England.

²⁷⁶ M. E. Thomas, *Afiaith yng Ngwent*, p. 85. List of topics: 1836 ‘Ysgrifeniadau Gruffydd ab Arthur ... a'r effaith a gafodd ei weithredoedd ar lenyddiaeth Ewropaidd’ [The writings of Gruffydd ab Arthur and the effect that his activities had on the literature of Europe, my translation]; 2. 1838 ‘Yr effaith a gafodd y Traddodiadau Cymreig ar Ddysgeidiaeth Ewrop’ [The effect that the Welsh traditions had on the erudition of Europe, my translation]; 3. ‘Yr Effeithiau a gafodd y Traddodiadau Cymraeg ar Lenoriaeth yr Almaen, Ffrainc a Llychlyn’ [The effects that the Welsh traditions had on the literature of Germany, France and Scandinavia, my translation].

²⁷⁷ History of the Cymmrodorion <<http://www.cymmrodorion.org/our-history>> [accessed 27 November 2012]

²⁷⁸ *Gentlemen's Magazine*, December 1837, ‘Welsh National Eisteddfod’, pp. 631–2.

²⁷⁹ *Gentlemen's Magazine*, July 1837, p. 80.

In 1838, the prize for the best essay on the influence of Welsh traditions on European literature was set to sixty guineas. On recommendation of Lady Charlotte, Henry Hallam was appointed the judge of the literary competition in that year, and among five entries, he awarded the prize to John Dorney Harding, a native of Glamorgan, resident in London. The awarding ceremony sparked controversy about the quality of the essays submitted. The *Caernarvon and Denbigh Herald* reports that, when the name of the winning essay was announced, a lively debate among the people present began:

A question arose amongst some of the members of the society, which gave rise to some discussion as to whether any of the essayists deserved the prize, and a letter from Mr. Hallam was read in reply to a question which had been put to him in this nature. Mr Hallam very properly declined offering any opinion as to the abstract merits of the essays, his decision being required on the question which was the best only. Sir Benj. Hall viewed this matter in its true light and contented that as the prize was announced to be awarded for the best essay, it ought to be awarded in obedience to Mr. Hallam's decision. The venerable president coincided [sic], and after a few observations by Mons. Rio and Carnhuanac, it was announced that the prize was awarded to Mr. Harding.²⁸⁰

This episode shows that while, in the end, Harding's essay was awarded the prize, being the best among the five entries does not necessarily guarantee good quality if the general level of erudition was mediocre. Some of the members objected to the prize being awarded as they apparently did not think it was worth the sixty guineas.²⁸¹ Harding's essay was not recommended for publication, unlike Schulz's essay two years later.²⁸² Therefore, as the result was not satisfactory, according to a faction of the members, it was decided to renew the call for an essay on the influence of Welsh traditions, this time more precisely formulated, on the literature of Germany, France and Scandinavia.

First, the Cymreigyddion society planned to celebrate the eisteddfod also in 1839 and the main prize was supposed to be awarded to the best essay on this topic. During the meeting held on 20 August 1839 it was decided not to hold an Eisteddfod in 1839 but to pause one

²⁸⁰ *Caernarvon and Denbigh Herald*, 20 October 1838, (vol. IX, no. 408), p. 169.

²⁸¹ This evaluation of quality is still practised in eisteddfodau in the twenty-first century. If none of the entries meets a certain standard, the judge(s) may refrain from awarding the prize. Both the 1836 and the 1838 competitions were marked by controversies regarding the standard of the entries. While it was decided that the only entry in 1836 did not merit the prize for obvious shortcomings, the 1838 dispute was settled as shown in the quote. Hallam was a Romantic historian, while Bunsen was an accomplished linguist and philologist. Therefore, by appointing Bunsen instead of Hallam, the Cymreigyddion made a step towards a better qualified judge to ensure that the winning essay was of a higher academic standard.

²⁸² Harding decided to have his winning essay printed by Ibotson and Palmer after the eisteddfod but it was not published. A copy of the essay is held by the National Library of Wales with the following information: *An essay on the influence of Welsh tradition upon European literature*, which obtained the prize proposed by the Abergavenny Cymreigyddion Society, October, 1838 [by Sir John Dorney Harding]. (London: Ibotson and Palmer, [1838?]) with the addition [Not published].

year. This delay would also give the participating scholars more time to complete their research on the topic. Instead, the anniversary of the society should be celebrated in an informal meeting.²⁸³ In a later meeting of the Abergavenny Cymreigyddion society it was decided to hold the Eisteddfod 1840 from October 7–9. If no one had voiced objections directed at Harding's essay, Schulz may have never had the opportunity to enter the eisteddfod competition and therefore would not have had any impact on the Welsh field. In 1838, when the prize question on the Welsh influence on the literature of Europe was advertised for the first time, Schulz was not in the position to take part in it, as he had to move to Bromberg due to his referral. In the foreword to his 1842 edition of the *Arthursage*, he complains about being sent to the academic desert.²⁸⁴ Therefore, it can be assumed that in 1838, Schulz was deprived of his direct contacts and had to rely on mail correspondence with his connections to the academic circles and therefore was dependent on the material they sent him. Furthermore, he may not yet have come across the decisive connection in his own research to rouse his interest in the subject. The timing of the renewed competition call enabled Schulz to embark on his publishing stint in the Welsh and, by extension, also British field.

²⁸³ NLW, MS13958E, *Cymreigyddion Y Fenni Papers 1833–1914*, fol. 120. There is a report about the proceedings of the informal meeting in *Seren Gomer*, 22, no. 290 (November 1839), pp. 343–344.

²⁸⁴ Schulz, Albert, *Die Arthursage* (1842), p. IV. 'Der Abschnitt über die Form der Arthurromane, [...] kann, wie ich sehr wohl erkenne, das wissenschaftliche Bedürfnis nicht befriedigen und will vielmehr nur zur weiteren Erörterung diejenigen anregen, die durch ihre äußere Lage in Besitz von Hilfsmitteln sind. [...] An meinem jetzigen Wohnorte ist dies schlicht unmöglich.'

4. Schulz' winning essay: a Herderian-Schlegelian entry in the Welsh field

Before the essay itself is analysed in its cultural and literary context, the external conditions of its publication will be outlined briefly in the first section of this chapter: the proceedings at the 1840 Eisteddfod – as far as they are relevant to the essay competition –, the verdict of Bunsen, and a brief description of the different text versions of the essay that were composed for different purposes – the original submission in German (1840), the English translation (1841), and then the German revised edition with the added translations of the *Mabinogion* (1842). This introductory section is followed by the detailed analysis of the essay as an adaptation of mainly Schlegelian, to some extent also Herderian, ideas and concepts to a new literary field. Schulz draws from the philosophical and historicist paradigms developed by Herder and Schlegel in order to trace the cultural and mythological history of a hitherto virtually untouched literary tradition.

As previously mentioned, the 1840 Abergavenny Eisteddfod took place after a two year hiatus. The deadline for papers on the influence of Welsh traditions on the literature of Germany, France, and Scandinavia was thus extended, and, in order to ensure that the research for the competition would be more diligently conducted, the prize and the premium were raised to eighty-four pounds. The prolonged time scale gave the organisers additional time to advertise the competition more widely in the hope of attracting more subscribers for the prizes and candidates for submission. The following announcement about the prizes offered at the Eisteddfod was made in a newspaper both in English and in Welsh. The English version of the description for the main prize reads as follows:

Abergavenny Cymreigyddion society subjects and prizes for the 7th anniversary which is intended to be held in the autumn of 1840.

For the best Essay on the Influence which the Welsh traditions have had on the Literature of Germany, France, and Scandinavia.

A Prize of Eighty Guineas. Consisting of a Gold Seal Ring, value £10 s10 and a Premium of 73 10. The Essay to be written either in Welsh, English, German or French. If in German, or Welsh, an English or French Translation is expected to be added. The Essays must be sent in on or before the 1st of May, 1840, directed to the Rev. J. Evans, at Mr. Hiley Morgan's Printer, Abergavenny. The Judges to be hereafter appointed by a Committee of five Gentlemen, chosen by lot from the Subscribers, who have individually contributed the largest Sums to above Prize. The MSS. are expected to be

delivered, carriage free, if the authors are residents of the United Kingdom. The Copyright to be the property of the Author.²⁸⁵

The conditions for the competition were thus laid out very clearly and the prestige is highlighted by the prize money and the formalities for the adjudication process. In terms of field theory, the specifications about the permitted languages of submission are particularly interesting. The committee accepted essays in four different languages, but those submitted in Welsh or German had to be accompanied by a translation in either English or French. This is evidence for the struggles in the linguistic field of power. Despite the fact that the *Cymreigyddion* were a society dedicated to the preservation and revival of the Welsh language and culture, English and French were the preferred working languages which presumably every member of the committee could read. German and Welsh are on a level below the other two languages in the field of power. The knowledge of Welsh or the lack thereof was thus not perceived as a flaw and even candidates without any knowledge of the language were allowed to participate and it did not impede their chances of winning the competition. This issue would be one of the major points of criticism of the essay in the German field, which will be discussed in detail in chapter six.

The Welsh newspaper *Seren Gomer* reports the same conditions for the submission but the Welsh text is preceded by a list of subscribers to the prize. The largest contributions came from ‘C.H. Leigh, Ysw., Arglwydd Rhaglaw, Swydd Fynwy, Syr B. Hall, Barwn, A. S. o Lanofer, Syr J. J. Guest, Barwn, A. S. o Dowlais,’ all contributing £10 s. 10.²⁸⁶ The main subscribers were also the most influential figures on the socio-political landscape of the period. A competition with such a high prize would be expected to draw a wide field of competitors. In the end, however, the number of candidates remained relatively small. According to the report of the *Caernarvon and Denbighshire Herald*,²⁸⁷ there were three entries to the competition with a prize worth eighty guineas. No explicit mention is made of the languages in which the essays were written. The *Monthly Review* speaks of essays ‘written principally in German and in French’,²⁸⁸ whereas the MS ‘A history of the Abergavenny Society’ specifies that one entry was in German and the other two in English:

A subscriptions prize of eighty guineas had been offered for the ‘best essay on the influence which the Welsh traditions have had on the literature of Germany, France and

²⁸⁵ NLW, MS 13958E, *Cymreigyddion Y Fenni Papers 1833–1914*, [no precise reference, only a loose page in the *Cymreigyddion y Fenni* papers in the NLW].

²⁸⁶ *Seren Gomer*, 22, no. 283, (April 1839), p. 119.

²⁸⁷ *Caernarvon and Denbigh Herald*, vol. X, no. 514, (31 October 1840), p. 174.

²⁸⁸ *Monthly Review*, 3.4 (December 1843), 473–487 (p. 473).

Scandinavia'. The president read the adjudication of his Excellency the Chevalier Bunsen, which was critical and elaborate. Three Essays had been received one in German and two in English. The Prize was awarded to the German Essay, the Author of which proved to be Professor Schultz [sic].²⁸⁹

The *Caernarvon and Denbigh Herald's* statement, however, includes the promise, that the two essays by Schulz' and La Villemarqué, will soon be translated into English and printed, so that they can be 'read with delight and information'.²⁹⁰ Therefore, we can conclude that both foreign scholars did not write their originals in English. The victorious essay was handed in under the pen-name of San-Marte, a pseudonym Schulz had already used in earlier publications such as his treatise on provincial legislation in Prussia in 1830, his first *Parcival* translation of 1833 and all his following publications.

In the Welsh newspapers, the result of the Eisteddfod competitions was also widely announced. *Seren Gomer* reports the result of the fourteenth competition on the order of the first day:

14. Am y Traethawd goreu ar Effeithiau a gafodd y Traddodiadau Cymreig ar Lenoriaeth yr Almaen, Ffrainc, a Llychlyn,-- Gwobr o Bedwar Ugain Guni. Y Traethawd i fod naill ai yn Gymraeg, Saesonaeg, Ellmynaeg, neu'r Ffrancaeg; os yn yr Ellmynaeg, neu yn y Gymraeg, disgwyliid Cyfieithiad Saesoneg neu Ffrancaeg. Derbynesid tri Thraethawd ar y testun hwn, ond y wobr a ddyfarnwyd i'r Cadeirdraw Schultz, o Bromberg, yn yr Almaen.²⁹¹

14. For the best essay on the Influence that Welsh traditions had on the literature of Germany, France and Scandinavia – A Premium of eighty Guineas. The essay to be in Welsh, English, German, or French; if in German or in Welsh, a translation into English or French is expected. Three essay were received on this subject, but the prize was awarded to Professor Schultz, from Bromberg in Germany. [my translation]

It must be emphasised that the actual submission cannot be analysed, because the location of the original manuscript in German is unknown. Therefore, the English translation of 1841 will be the focus of the discussion. When analysing the translation instead of the original, we have to rely on a faithful and close rendering of the German manuscript by the translator. In the foreword to the translation, Frances Berrington, the sister of Lady Hall and a prominent member of the Cymreigyddion, explains her rationale for translating Schulz' essay by emphasizing her obligation to deliver a close translation:

²⁸⁹ NLW, MS 11415B, *A History of the Abergavenny Cymreigyddion Society* donated by B. Elyston Price, Chatswood, New South Wales, June 1937, p. 33.

²⁹⁰ *Caernarvon and Denbigh Herald*, 31 October 1840, (Vol. 10, no. 514), p. 174.

²⁹¹ *Seren Gomer*, 23, no. 302 (November 1840), p. 346.

[...] the translator has ventured to lay the following pages before the public; in the hope that to those interested in the subject, the closeness of the translation may, in some degree, compensate for the abruptness of the style, and the repetitions which are occasionally apparent.²⁹²

This paragraph already contains a hint at the translator's critical attitude towards Schulz' composition, which becomes apparent throughout the essay. It is also clear that Berrington deems closeness to the original to be an important criterion for evaluating the task of the translator. The view of translation at the time was dominated by the normative school of thought, that the translator has to convey the words, structure and meaning as closely as possible in the target language. Furthermore, due to the conventions of the different academic discourse, which are typical for the German literary field, the style of the German text appear abrupt to her. Being aware that the departure from the prevalent style of academic texts in the British literary field may appear alien to the readers, she nonetheless endeavours to render the text as faithfully as possible.

Based on the translator's preface, it can be assumed that Berrington did her best to render a faithful and close translation, which transmits Schulz' arguments correctly and coherently into English. Therefore, it should be possible to draw conclusions about Schulz' methodology and the style and structure of his narrative from the English translation. All reviewers of the English essay took Berrington's work for a faithful translation and passed their judgement on Schulz based on her text. The only reviewer who found fault with the translation was the reviewer of the *Foreign Quarterly Review*, who compared the English translation of 1841 with the German edition of 1842. It must be noted, however, that a side-by-side comparison of the republished German version with the English cannot yield reliable results, as the two versions differ in structure and content. Furthermore, the structure of the original is more or less unknown, except for a remark made by Bunsen in his adjudication, referring to the content of third chapter of which he mentions that it covers the entire period of romance in France and Germany. It is not certain whether Schulz himself effectuated the alterations or whether the translator rearranged the essay – considering her interventions throughout the essay, she appears to be an expert in the field who may have wanted to leave her mark on the essay as well. A combination of the two is the most likely option. Prompted by the translator or the editor at the publishing house, Schulz may have agreed to a restructuring of the original essay in order to match the prize

²⁹² Schulz, *Essay on the Influence of Welsh traditions on the literature of Germany, France and Scandinavia*, p. vi, Translator's preface.

question more closely. Therefore we find the partition in five chapters, the first and largest chapter on the influence of Welsh tradition on the literature of France, still divided in three epochs, then the shorter chapters two, three, four and five, on the developments in German and Scandinavian literature, followed by the chapter on rhyme and then another addition, 'Fall of Chivalrous Poetry'. Each of the topics thus was discussed in a separate chapter. There is no direct evidence for the involvement of the translator, but Schulz held her in great esteem and mentions her as 'a dear friend' and speaks highly of her work in the foreword to his translation of Thomas Stephen's *The Literature of the Kymry*. For the German publication, Schulz submitted the essay to another thorough editing process which included changing the structure of the essay, omitting certain details and adding others, not to mention the second part comprising the first translations of the *Mabinogion* into German. The republication was addressed to the German public, whereas the original German manuscript and, subsequently, the English translation, were shaped by the call for essays by the Cymreigyddion society. The wording of the advertisement dictated how Schulz structured his arguments to match the demands.

Trusting the translator's work with regard to structure and content, the translation gives an insight into Schulz' views, his research methods and methodology, his approach to the subject and his use of sources; in short Schulz' profile as a researcher. Through close reading of the essay, two key characteristics are identified. First of all, Schulz appears to be self-conscious as a novice in the field – but he tones down his humility in comparison to his previous publications. The reader is reminded of his preface to his *Parcival* translation where he calls his translation a 'mangelhafte Uebertragung' and a 'Versuch'.²⁹³ While he is still very honest about the grey areas in the field, where his research could not provide him with strong evidence for his argument, he clearly indicates this to his readers. It can be assumed that he felt that, while still displaying his professional honesty, he should appear slightly more self-confident as a competitor. Too much humility could diminish his chances of success in the competition. In terms of the field theory, the essay can therefore be understood as a step forward in the literary field in general, since Schulz now displays a slightly more confident demeanour. The seven years from the first, partial *Parcival* translation to the competition essay mark the first period of learning and finding his place in the periphery of the literary field. Now, moving on, he not only steps into a new field, the Welsh literary field and, by extension, into the British field, but he also seeks to

²⁹³ Idem, *Parcival*, p. x.

improve his position in the German literary field with the publication of the German version as a part of the prestigious series *Die Bibliothek der gesamten National-literatur* in 1842.

Secondly, instead of pure philological and literary analysis of the early sources of Arthurian literature, Schulz produces a more comprehensive piece taking into account the political motivation, socio-cultural and religious implications and author intention. In his argumentation, not only is the text discussed but also the writer, his social and cultural background, his education and his political convictions. This is particularly true for Geoffrey of Monmouth, who was a very controversial chronicler, discredited by many as a liar and a story teller. Schulz, however, views his chief work, the *Historia Regum Britanniae*, as a valuable document of the cultural, political and ideological currents of the period. Thus, Schulz approaches his materials neutrally and objectively, without judging them or labelling them with a text category to which they do not belong – in the case of Geoffrey, ‘accurate historical account’ would be inappropriate but ‘mythological history of the British Isles’ would be a better suited label for his work. Schulz does not use this label in the first version (or the translator did not translate it), but in the 1842 edition Schulz claims that Geoffrey’s work is a part of the ‘Sagengeschichte der Völker’, the mythological history of the people, comparable to the Nibelungen or the Völsunga saga.²⁹⁴ This approach reflects the Herderian view that the earliest literary *Zeugnisse* such as the biblical texts in Hebrew are immensely significant for the study of the history of mankind.²⁹⁵ Schulz’ approach to the subject is also heavily influenced by Schlegelian notions of poetry as an organic, grown phenomenon which unites history, mythology and philosophy. The foreword to his essay lays down these principles as the methodological pillars of Schulz’ work. The organisation of the foreword will serve as the basis for the analysis of the essay later in this chapter.

Further, Schulz also examines the reasons behind the creation of a text. In the case of Geoffrey, the *Historia*, allegedly translated from an even older book in the British tongue, was written to remind the British of their glorious past and to encourage them in their fight against the invasion of the Normans. The Welsh princes had survived the onslaught of the Angles and Saxons and maintained some form of independence, but the Normans exerted

²⁹⁴ Idem, *Die Arthursage und die Märchen des rothen Buchs von Hergest*, p. 17.

²⁹⁵ Koepke, ‘Herder and the Sturm und Drang’ in *Literature of the Sturm und Drang*, ed. by David Hill (Rochester NY, Woodbridge UK: Camden House, 2003), pp. 69-93 (p. 70).

even more pressure on them. Besides the call to resistance, the glorious past from the descendants of Troy to King Arthur, the story was also designed to lift the self-confidence of the Britons. Schulz recognises these intentions in Geoffrey's works and he weaves brief mentions of this into his discussion of the early and the high medieval period.²⁹⁶ His findings and his appreciation of Geoffrey eventually lead to the publication of his German edition of the *Historia* in 1854 where he explains the dynamics in detail.

Besides the analysis of author intention and the text, Schulz also takes into account external factors such as battles, wars, and alliances between rulers, diseases and famines all of which had an influence on the dissemination of the early tales. In later chapters, he also relates the social reality, as for example the rise of the feudal society, to the reception of novel traditions.

Regarding the content and structure of the essay, Schulz had certain guidelines to follow: he structured his dissertation to meet the demands of the call for entries by the Cymreigyddion society asking for essays on the influence of Welsh traditions on the literature of Germany, France and Scandinavia. All three cultures were known to have a rich literary past: the Germans have the *Ring der Nibelungen*, the French have their Carolingian tales and the Provençal troubadours, and the Scandinavians can look back at their Nordic mythology, the *Edda* and many sagas. If an influence of the ancient Welsh traditions on these rich traditions can be found, it raises the profile of the hitherto peripheral Welsh and puts them on the European literary map. Owing to the fact that Schulz deemed France to be the focal point for the dissemination of Arthurian tales, he slightly changed the order of topics, so that the first chapter deals with the influence of Welsh traditions on the literature of France, the second chapter looks at their influence on German literature and the third chapter traces the Welsh influence on Scandinavian literature. The fourth chapter, dealing with the Welsh influence on French literature in terms of structure, does not directly respond to the competition but offers a different angle compared to the approach in the first chapter. Schulz deems it important to include a chapter on the form in which the Welsh traditions were first received in France.²⁹⁷ In so doing, he focusses especially on rhyme and metre. These two aspects of poetry were discussed in particular by August Wilhelm Schlegel, who devoted several of his lectures to the structure of poems, metre and rhythm. This chapter rests heavily on Schlegel's theories.

²⁹⁶ Schulz, 1841, pp. 19–21.

²⁹⁷ Idem, 1841, p. 95.

The fifth chapter is entitled 'The Fall of Chivalrous Poetry' and gives an overview of the Renaissance and the onset of modern times, the end of the feudal society.

Before analysing the chapters, the content of each will be outlined briefly. The first chapter focuses on France and is by far the most detailed. It is divided into four sections, of which the first three deal with the different stages of tradition from the earliest fragments to the onset of the Early Modern Period, roughly a thousand years of literary history. The first epoch, spanning 600–1066, dealing with early Arthurian traditions, where Arthur is the focal point of a national rally against the invaders. Schulz uses the title 'Arthur the National Hero' for this sub-chapter. He offers two different types of sources for his argument: the ancient Welsh poems and the Latin chronicles compiled by monks in various monasteries. In his 'literature review', he cites ten different chronicles or histories ranging from Gildas in the sixth century to John of Fordun in the fourteenth century. His sources on the earliest Welsh sources about the *Cynfeirdd*, the bards who allegedly lived in the fifth to seventh century are rather meagre. Schulz uses the chronicles in two ways: first, he shows his knowledge of the canon of texts of the period and secondly, he arranges them into a sort of dialogue to illustrate how the political and social situation of the period shaped the writer's perception of past events, thus reflecting the points he advanced in his foreword. The Welsh poems, on the other hand, are used as proof of the authenticity and potential age of the Arthurian material and Schulz adds a few references to German versions of the Welsh original characters to make his point. Further, he notices the change in representation of Arthur from the earliest sources before 800 to those of the ninth to eleventh centuries. From a 'commander in battle' Arthur is elevated in several steps to a heroic king and saviour of his people, and from the twelfth century onwards, of Christianity in its entirety. In order to explain this change, Schulz recalls the early history of Britain, beginning with the Roman Conquest and the arrival of Christianity. Then he identifies the pressure of the pagan Angles and Saxons on the British and several outbreaks of epidemic diseases as the reasons why many Britons sought refuge in Brittany and settled there. He uses the history of the early Welsh exiles in Brittany from the seventh to the eleventh century to support his argument of cultural contact between Wales and Brittany. Using the historical framework as his theoretical framework is a recurrent practice; in each chapter, Schulz acquaints his readers with episodes of medieval Provence, Germany and Scandinavia, focussing on alliances and wars between the rulers which facilitate or hinder cultural transfer, the transfer of traditions in particular.

The second period sees a thematic shift towards an honourable Christian king and his valiant knights, underlining the development of chivalrous literature from 1066 to 1150. Schulz begins the chapter with a brief summary of the findings in the first, highlighting again the key words ‘Arthur and his companions in their primitive and historical character’ and the ‘transit from history to fable’.²⁹⁸ As he had already done in the first chapter, Schulz identifies the cultural contact with Northern France via Brittany as the major factor in the thematic changes and seeks to prove the Breton element in the new genre of tales with place names. After his short excursion into toponymy,²⁹⁹ Schulz returns to the more familiar field of history. He sketches the main events in Wales and in Brittany in the eleventh century, contrasting the recurring feuds between the Welsh princes and the Anglo-Saxon kings with the peace in Brittany, where poetry and tradition could flourish under continuous succession of kings in an undivided, independent and respected state. The whole section mirrors the previous argumentation in the earlier period from Julius Caesar to the tenth century, which contained similar material mainly about socio-political history and several details from other fields such as onomastics.

The second collection of circumstantial evidence begins in 1066. Schulz highlights the role of the Bretons in the Norman Conquest, fighting alongside William the Conqueror and defeating the Anglo-Saxon armies. In his historical account, he inserts a prophecy of Merlin from Geoffrey’s book and then goes on to explore the mythological implications behind it, foretelling that the British would conquer the Anglo-Saxon invaders. Schulz interprets this in two different ways: first, from the perspective of the Bretons, who once had to flee Britain. For them, returning to their former homeland with the mission to conquer their former oppressors must have felt like a triumph and therefore gave rise to heroic poetry with the focus on a figure of national identification: ‘No time could have appeared more fit for representing Arthur as the great conqueror of the world.’³⁰⁰ Secondly, from the perspective of the Welsh, the prophecy in conjunction with the defeat of the Anglo-Saxons at the hands of the Norman army and with them the Breton forces would serve as instigation to resistance.³⁰¹ Schulz views the Conquest as an inspiration to

²⁹⁸ Schulz, 1841, p. 32.

²⁹⁹ Here, regarding the Veneti (behind the name Vannes) and the Venedoti (behind the name Gwynedd), Schulz commits an obvious mistake to which the translator adds a long comment. This dynamic between author and translator will be explored in the chapter on the reactions to Schulz’ essay; Bunsen obviously being the first to engage with the treatise, the translator being second before the essay was reviewed by various journals.

³⁰⁰ Schulz, 1841, p. 37.

³⁰¹ Ibid, p. 38.

produce politically motivated literature while other scholars of his time thought of it as a kind of revenge, among them A. W. Schlegel. Schulz, however, does not believe this, as the reality for the Welsh princes did not change for the better and he thinks that hearing tales of a glorious British king of kings would have felt like a humiliation.³⁰²

The late twelfth and early thirteenth century is also the time when the first chivalrous romances appear. Schulz lists seven principal works, first, the *English Romance of Merlin* [not dated]; secondly the *Tales of Arthur*, based on the chronicle of Geoffrey and later amplified in the second work on Merlin and the *Morte d'Arthur* [not dated]; thirdly the *English Tristan* of Thomas Brittanicus which served as a model for the German poem *Tristan and Isolde* by Godfrey of Strasbourg (1217); fourthly, *Iwain, le Chevalier au Lion*, composed in French by Chrestien de Troyes around 1180 and adapted into German by Hartmann von Aue around 1200, based on Welsh allegories; further an English version of *Lancelot du Lac*, transmitted by Hugo de Morville to Ulrich von Zatzikofen during his imprisonment in Vienna; and then two Welsh romances, the Welsh *Geraint* (Erek) which had recently been translated by Lady Guest and previously put into French by Chrestien de Troyes and later into German by Hartmann von Aue and, finally, the Welsh *Peredur*, which became *Percival* in French, also translated by Lady Guest.³⁰³ Strictly speaking, these romances inspired by the ideas of chivalry already belong to the third period by the date of their estimated composition, but Schulz lists them in this chapter since he sees them as the outcome of the social, political and cultural changes of the period after the Norman Conquest of Britain. These changes made the feudal society receptive to the ideas of chivalry and created a whole new genre of literature to mirror the ideal society. The time frames given for each chapter are thus merely guidelines for the readers, while Schulz favours a thematic approach; in this section of chapter one, the second period of tradition, it is the shift to a feudal society which is at the root of a new literary movement. This thematic approach is also behind the organisation of the next section, where Schulz introduces a new theme.

³⁰² Ibid, p. 37.

³⁰³ Schulz, Albert 1841, see list on pp. 39–40. In fact, the three romances *Owain*, *Geraint* and *Peredur* are classified as *Y Tair Rhamant*, the three Romances, which may have Welsh original roots, what Schulz calls the 'purely Welsh character'. The adaptations of Chrétien de Troyes are most likely the origin of their chivalric French form in which they were further disseminated. Schulz knew of the Welsh origin of the two latter romances, but *Owain* had been published by Lady Guest under the title *The Lady of the Fountain*, so the Welsh connection was not obvious to him, although he included Hartmann von Aue's comment (nach Wälschen Verbildern dichteten). Lady Guest published the three romances in one volume but only the two latter were recognised by Schulz.

The third part focuses on religious influences and traces the new motif of the Holy Grail in Arthurian literature after 1150 until the sixteenth century, the advent of Protestantism. The religious theme, Arthur as the defender of Christianity against the threats of the Pagans, was already discussed in the first period, where Nennius already spoke of the pilgrimage of Arthur to Jerusalem. The core development in the religious field, however, features more prominently in the third and final period of the Arthurian tradition. Schulz compares Arthur to Charlemagne, who was famous for his campaigns against the Saxons and mass baptisms. The second major element in Schulz' argument in the third section of chapter one is the inclusion of the motif of the Holy Grail in the Arthurian romances. He traces the development of the theme of the valiant knights of Arthur's Round Table and the mirrored ideal of the Christian knights on a mission to find and bring home the Holy Grail. Schulz contrasts these two different images of the Knights of Arthur as opposed to the Knights of Christ, the Templars. Thus, the third sub-chapter on the later period of the Arthurian romances rests heavily on comparative approaches which Schulz borrowed from A.W. Schlegel in order to adapt them for his discussion of the parallel developments in factual and fictional history. This approach will be discussed towards the end of the chapter in the analysis of Schulz methodology.

The fourth and final section in chapter one is dedicated to 'fable' and deals with original Welsh tales such as the *Mabinogion*.³⁰⁴ Schulz begins the chapter with an explanation of his understanding of the national character of the mythology of different peoples; an approach which is centred on Herderian and Schlegelian ideas. Schulz' adaptation thereof focuses mainly on the influence of the conversion of the various pagan peoples of Europe to Christianity. Schulz postulates that the time frame and the manner of the conversion left obvious traces in the national mythological traditions. The Celtic peoples had been Christianised earlier than the Scandinavians; therefore the national character of their traditions is visibly different. The actual discussion of the *Mabinogion* follows these preliminary remarks; Schulz credits Lady Charlotte Guest with the translation into English, stating that she dedicated them to her children. In the end however, he expresses his doubts that 'stories for Children' is a correct label for these tales and suspects a later mistake in translation:

³⁰⁴ Schulz, 1841, p. 65 and Table of Contents.

On the other hand, Wales was not so raised above civilization of the rest of Britain and the continent, that it should *then* present these tales, which excited an enthusiastic interest in the most distinguished men of the ages as *Stories for Children!*³⁰⁵

The remainder of his argument on the date of composition and the stage of the development of the *Mabinogion* is based on his observations on the earliest poems of the bards and the representation of Arthur in them compared to Arthur in the *Mabinogion*. It should be noted that Schulz, at the time of writing the essay, could only have read the first two tales that Lady Guest had already translated: *The Lady of the Fountain* and *Peredur, Son of Evrawc*, both of which feature Arthur. His statements on the *Mabinogion* are thus limited to these two which are thought to be modelled on the French romances of *Ivain, le chevalier au lion* and *Parcival*.

The second and third chapters of the essay on the dissemination of the Welsh traditions in Germany and Scandinavia belong to the same period as sections three and four of chapter one, from the late twelfth century until the end of chivalrous literature. This means that the development in the earlier periods in France (discussed in the first two sections of chapter one) was crucial for enabling the stories to travel across linguistic and political boundaries. In the chapter on the course of Welsh traditions in German literature, Schulz traces their arrival towards the end of the twelfth century via France, their reception, the flourishing chivalrous poetry and then the eventual decline at the end of the Middle Ages. He had, in fact, already included some of the chief works of German poets of the high medieval period in the list of the principal chivalrous romances: the German adaptation of *Tristan und Isolde* in a poem by Godfrey of Strasbourg, the German versions of *Iwain, le Chevalier au Lion* and *Erek [und Enide]* by Hartmann von Aue, as well as the German rendering of *Lancelot du Lac* by Ulrich von Zatzikofen.³⁰⁶ So it is quite surprising, that he did not add the German version of *Percival* to this list, as Wolfram von Eschenbach was Schulz' main research area prior to embarking on the Celtic field. Schulz begins the chapter with an explanation as to why it is not as detailed as the previous chapter on France. He thought that an in-depth analysis of what he calls 'the interior developments' would benefit the readers' understanding of the early period, as 'the first passage of tradition is a strange land'³⁰⁷ Recalling the dissemination process in France, where the figure of Arthur superseded Charlemagne as the focal point for heroic tales, Schulz draws a

³⁰⁵ Schulz, 1841, p. 72. [emphasis as in original]

³⁰⁶ Ibid.

³⁰⁷ Ibid.

comparison to the arrival of the much altered Welsh traditions in Germany. By the time the Arthurian tales reached the German peoples, those already had a flourishing tradition of epic poems themselves, such as the *Ring of the Nibelungen*, the tales around Siegfried and the Burgundian kings. When the Welsh material in its transformed, chivalric French form arrived, the feudal system was already firmly established, dating back to the days of Charlemagne, who united most of Western and Central Europe under his rule. The socio-political reality thus made the society more receptive to a genre of literature, whose purpose, as Schulz described it previously in chapter one section two,³⁰⁸ is primarily the depiction of an ideal feudal society with chivalrous knights performing valiant deeds and an honourable Christian king who presides over his knights. The theme of the Round Table had already entered the process of thematic development at the stage when these romances were received in Germany.

The third chapter of the essay analyses the influence of Welsh traditions on the literature of Scandinavia. In its form, it differs significantly from the chapters on the dissemination of Arthurian literature in France, consisting of ten pages of very densely written text, divided into six very lengthy paragraphs, often filling more than a page. The only indication of structure within these paragraphs are the first line indents to mark the beginning of a new argument. As in the previous chapter on the influence of Welsh traditions on the literature of Germany, the absence of footnotes is striking. This chapter contains only two. Schulz uses predominantly indirect quotes and references in the text, e.g. alluding to ‘The Traveller’s Song’ or the works of Geoffrey of Monmouth and Kiot mentioned in earlier chapters, but often he simply lists facts, persons and dates without revealing the sources from which he had gathered the information. The sources which he mentions in brackets in the text include also encyclopaedia. The whole chapter resembles an encyclopaedia entry in style and content, as Schulz packs it full of facts and does not provide much in-depth analysis. This is probably due to his unfamiliarity with the subject, as he had not done research in this area before, whereas he had some experience in the German and French fields. With the time constraint, it is quite likely that he had to resort to consulting encyclopaedias and reviews. Unlike the previous chapter on Germany, Schulz does not deem it necessary to write an introduction, informing the reader about the scope of ‘the literature of Scandinavia’ or about any other framework for his analysis. Instead, he begins immediately with historical context and his interpretation thereof, by asserting that the

³⁰⁸ Ibid.

dissemination of Celtic traditions in Scandinavia would seem rather impossible in the light of the fact that ‘hostile expeditions of the Angles, the Saxons, the Danes, and the Normans, [...] disturbed England’.³⁰⁹ Although the focus of this chapter is on Welsh traditions in Scandinavia, Schulz first examines the relations between the Anglo-Saxons and the Danes. Schulz hints at a conflict between the Anglo-Saxons and the Danes and at the dominant influence of Danish on the literature of the Anglo-Saxons. The main argument advanced in the chapter rests on Schulz’ understanding of productive versus unproductive cultural contact to explain the delayed dissemination of Arthurian tales in Scandinavia. Owing to the fact that the peoples of Scandinavia converted to Christianity much later than the peoples of Central and Western Europe and that the introduction of a feudal organisation of society also happened at a later date, Schulz comes to the conclusion that the peoples of Northern Europe were unable to receive the literature until the right conditions were in place.

Having summarised the content of Schulz’ essay, attention will now move to his methodology. In the foreword to his essay, Schulz gives his readers the tools to understand his point of departure and his methodology in four concise points. In each of the four paragraphs, he lays down his principles of working with medieval literature and historical accounts of that period. The close examination of his main arguments and his use of sources and historical and factual evidence has revealed that he borrows several key concepts from Herder and the Schlegel brothers. Schulz begins the foreword with these introductory words:

In the intellectual life of a people, Heroic Tradition forms a separate organization, to which belong its own laws of development. It has appeared to us, that in the history of early Tradition, there are four points especially to be considered; and we will commence by demonstrating them, in order to explain the principles by which we have been guided in the researches that form the subject of the following pages.³¹⁰

The core of this chapter will explain each of the four points or principles in detail, trace their origins in the writings of Herder and the Schlegel brothers, and then examine how Schulz applied their theories to the subject of Welsh traditions and their development and dissemination across Europe. The four points cover the origins of tradition, its purposes and mechanisms, and the conditions for its development and intra- and inter-cultural transmission. The first principle of Schulz’ theory holds that all poetic traditions have a

³⁰⁹ Schulz, 1841, p. 84.

³¹⁰ Schulz, 1841, p. 5. [capital letters and spelling as in original]

historical origin because in the earliest periods of basic social organisation of humanity, factual history and traditional poetry were not yet separate genres but were often interwoven. This reflects Friedrich Schlegel's stance on the oldest genre of poetry:

Es ist die Poesie in ihrer ursprünglichen Gestalt selbst, oder die Sage und Heldendichtung, welche nicht bloß in dem Gebiete der Kunst eingeschlossen ist, sondern eben so sehr der Geschichte, und zwar der Urgeschichte des Menschen und der Natur angehört.³¹¹

F. Schlegel develops his viewpoint here from the Herderian position on the significance of the biblical texts which the latter also reads as mythological poetry. Mythical and heroic poetry thus are at the root of all tradition and cannot be disregarded when the early history of mankind is examined. Schulz agrees with Herder and F. Schlegel on this and uses this principle for his examination of the ancient Welsh traditions. Besides borrowing the concept from F. Schlegel, Schulz is also influenced by August Wilhelm Schlegel, for whom mythology is at the root of all tradition believing that the Ancient Greeks developed poetry, history and philosophy from their mythology.³¹² Schulz taps into this and applies A.W. Schlegel's verdict on the development of one of the high cultures of Antiquity loosely to the development of the Welsh traditions and how they left their traces in medieval poetry and historiography.

In his later lectures, A.W. Schlegel employs this principle when he says that he expects most important revelations about the history of humanity from the discovery of Indian mythology, history and literature,³¹³ thus treating them as equally important sources for the most ancient history. He considers the beginnings of tradition long before the advent of writing, saying that:

[e]he die Schreibkunst geübt wurde und solange noch keine poetische Überlieferung bei einem Volke vorhanden ist, muß die Geschichte der Vorfahren sich gar bald in gänzlicher Dunkelheit verlieren; da jedoch die historische Sage einen Anfang haben muß, so wird sie, wie alles Unbekannte, unbegreiflich an die Götterwelt angeknüpft, und die ältesten bekannten Fürsten, die Erbauer großer Städte und die Anführer von Kolonien wurden als Göttersöhne betrachtet.³¹⁴

³¹¹ Friedrich Schlegel, 'Über nordische Dichtkunst, 1812' in *Sämtliche Werke von Friedrich von Schlegel*, 10. (Wien: Schmidt, 1825) pp. 65–108, (p. 68).

³¹² A.W. Schlegel, *Kritische Ausgabe der Vorlesungen*, I, Vorlesungen über philosophische Kunstlehre; Jena 1798; Erster Teil; Poetik, pp. 1–125 (p. 49).

³¹³ A.W. Schlegel, *Kritische Ausgabe der Vorlesungen*, II/1, Ueber Literatur, Kunst und Geist des Zeitalters. pp. 197–288 (p. 221).

³¹⁴ A.W. Schlegel, *Kritische Ausgabe der Vorlesungen*, I, p. 56.

Here, Schlegel seeks to explain the ways of remembering and transmitting history in cultures before script was invented. Record keeping happened from generation to generation through story-telling which meant that historical events underwent significant changes and amplifications within a relatively short period of time. Schlegel obviously had the early peoples of Antiquity in mind, a concept which Schulz again takes from the more ancient context and applies to the rich oral tradition in early medieval Wales, when he speaks of the mingling of historical figures with mythological characters:

History is the principal basis of Tradition; and at a later period it is from History that the elements for the further development of Tradition are drawn; but it springs and grows at a period when Poetry and History are confounded together, and the truth of Tradition is never doubted[.]³¹⁵

With this statement, however, Schulz takes A.W. Schlegel's idea one step further. He uses Schlegelian theory about original poetry as a point of departure to explain what happened later in the medieval period, when the original tales were both conflated and amplified when they were committed to writing for the first time. With this statement, Schulz expresses his view on how storytelling moved from oral to written tradition. He holds that the deeds of both historical and mythological figures, who share similar characteristics, are collected and compiled into one heroic tale centred on one primary figure, disregarding chronology, internal logic and stylistic coherence. Schulz exemplifies this interrelation with the remark that '[o]n this account we see historical personages appear in the land of Fiction, and historical facts appropriated to fabulous Heroes, often occasioning the greatest anachronisms and most heterogeneous combinations.'³¹⁶

The second part of Schulz' first principle is thus clearly based on ideas voiced by the Schlegel brothers. It indicates how Schulz is going to treat early textual evidence of the figure of Arthur and also how he treats writers like Geoffrey of Monmouth, as seen above. Schulz is aware of the fact that there may have been a historical figure, an outstanding leader, or even several different characters who inspired the later fabulous tales around Arthur and his knights of the Round Table. This principle appears on several occasions throughout the essay, in particular in the chapter on the influence of Welsh traditions on France, yet Schulz also draws parallels in the German and Scandinavian traditions. The tendency to conflate and amplify tales is exemplified first when Schulz compares the descriptions of Arthur in the ancient Welsh poems of the sixth century to those of later

³¹⁵ Schulz, 1841, p. 5. [capital letters as in original]

³¹⁶ Ibid.

epochs. In the first chapter on the earliest occurrences of Arthur, he notes in his discussion of Aneirin, that Arthur plays a secondary role and that Geraint is the true hero of the battle of Llongborth who deserves the full attention of the poet. By the ninth century, however, Arthur has become the central focus of the adventures and his role has been expanded. He concludes his argument for concentration of heroic deeds on one focal figure with a direct question to the reader: ‘Do we not see at the present time, that the deeds of inferior warriors are attributed to the commander in chief, and the acts of ministers to kings?’³¹⁷ He explains this tendency with the natural course of remembering: ‘Posterity required a centre, around which she could group her recollections of subordinate heroes; the natural centre was the king;[...]³¹⁸ In fact, the entire rationale for the essay is built upon the first principle, since Schulz chooses perhaps the most central figure in medieval literature throughout Europe, King Arthur, who he places in a socio-political context for each of the three stages of tradition identified in his first chapter. The thematic development of the character of the ideal king provides the connecting thread throughout the essay.

The question of amplification and modelling tales on existing figures is also found in Schulz’ comparative approach to actual historical figures such as Charlemagne and the Templar Knights and their significance for the development of chivalrous literature centred on King Arthur and his Knights of the Round Table: in the discussion of the third period of traditions he raises the question, why the Provençal traditions forsook Charlemagne as the heroic Christian king in favour of Arthur, a mythical king with no certain sources for his existence. In the tenth century, Schulz admits, Charlemagne was the focal point of heroic poems in France just as Arthur was in Wales, and in the eleventh century, the scope of the poems was extended but then a shift in focus happened in the second half of the twelfth century. Schulz explains this with Charlemagne’s deeds being so well accounted for, that he was too firmly established in factual history:

He lived for ever in their [the writers of the period] memories, as the patron of Christianity, – the invincible barrier against the assaults of Paganism. It is on this account, that the romances which represented him fighting against the pagans, could not assign him any other place than that which tradition had already accorded to him. Tradition in this case would have been its own destroyer.³¹⁹

In other words, Charlemagne was unsuitable as a nucleus for heroic and chivalrous poetry because the detailed historical records of his reign rendered the inventive spirit of tradition

³¹⁷ Ibid, p. 30.

³¹⁸ Ibid.

³¹⁹ Ibid, p. 43.

and poetry powerless and robbed it of its creative potential. Taking up the key points from his introduction, Schulz claims that the purpose of tradition was not the exact rendering of historical facts, although some factual history actually lies at the heart of it. This again echoes Schlegel's understanding of the common origin of both history and poetry. In the romances of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, the description of chivalry in itself became the object of the epic, creating an ideal world for its own.³²⁰

The first principle of historical events or institutions shaping poetic traditions also applies to Schulz' discussion of the inclusion of the theme of the Round Table in the Arthurian traditions at the end of the second period (1066–1150). Schulz states in a footnote to the introduction to the third period that '[t]he Round Table is neither mentioned by the ancient bards, nor by Nennius, nor in Geoffrey's Chronicle. This is worthy of notice'.³²¹ In the following paragraph, he explains why he believes that a historical Welsh institution may be behind the creation of the Round Table:

As far as my knowledge carries me, its institution is first noticed in the *Brut d'Angleterre*, which Robert Wace (1150) rendered into 18000 octosyllabic verses, after a Latin translation by Geoffrey of Monmouth from a Breton book. The first book contains the origins of the Round Table, its feasts, tournaments, and knights. It was publicly read at the English Court. Wales and Brittany certainly must have known of the royal and princely table, with its places of honor, concerning which the Laws of Howel Dda contain much, (Turner's *Vindication* p. 95, 96.) and that is the historical origin of the Round Table; but the account of the *Brut* cannot be older than knighthood, or chivalry itself; nay, it even presupposes it already in a flourishing state, which it was in those countries about 1100, or, at the earliest, at the end of the eleventh century; – certainly not before 1066.³²²

The theory of the Round Table originating in the Welsh native laws is a very original thought, as it further develops the Schlegelian theory of history being at the origin of poetic traditions. From the early, oral period of traditions, Schulz takes the concept into the medieval period and attempts to show how an actual institution sparked a whole new theme in poetry. After consulting the quoted source, Turner's *Vindication*, there is a hint at how Schulz arrives at the conclusion that the concept of the Round Table originates in the Welsh Laws. In Turner, there is no mention of the Round Table but the focus lies on the different classes of bards and their places and duties at the royal court. Turner basically rephrases the Laws of Hywel Dda:

³²⁰ Ibid.

³²¹ Ibid.

³²² Ibid., p. 47.

That Bards existed in Britain in and before the tenth century, is obvious to all who inspect the laws of Howel Dha. He reigned soon after the year 900. His laws not only mention the bards, but speak of them as a regular and established order of men. They are described as being in an organised state in different ranks and degrees, with various duties and emoluments assigned to them, and as forming an important and respected part of the royal household.

The one called Bardd Teulu, was the Bard of the family. There was also a Bardd Cadeirioc, who was superior to the others. He is also called the Pencerdd, the chief of song; and he was the Bard who had obtained the Cadair. The other Bards were in some degree subjected to him, for no Bard was to ask for any thing without his leave, while he held the office, excepting Bards from other sovereignties.³²³

Turner's purpose in this excerpt is to date Hywel Dda, to paint a vivid picture of the life at the medieval court in Wales and to place the bards in their historical context. The second paragraph explains the terminology of the bardic order and establishes the hierarchy between the different positions:

At the three principal feasts, the family bard was to sit near the penteulu, the head of the household. The importance of this position, we may estimate by observing a preceding law, which dictates that the penteulu was to be the king's son or nephew or brother, or a person of suitable dignity. He was to give the harp to the Bard, who was to sing to him whenever he please. The Bardd Cadeirioc was one of the fourteen who sat at the king's table near the judge of the court.³²⁴

The only mention of a table occurs at the end, where it is mentioned that there were fourteen who had the right to sit at the table of the King. Schulz apparently interpreted this statement as the origin of the Round Table. He was aware of the commonly entertained opinion, that Wace was the first to describe the Round Table in detail, yet he brings in his own original interpretation of older sources based on his Schlegelian view of the merging of history and literature.

Another key observation can be found in the first introductory paragraph, namely the claim that 'Tradition springs and grows at a period when Poetry and History are confounded' and Schulz takes it up as his second principle, clarifying what he meant with it:

The *organic life* of Tradition is seen in the tendency to unite different tales which were previously entirely independent of each other; and here we recognise the want of that unity, which belongs to poetic fiction.³²⁵

³²³ Sharon Turner, *A Vindication of the genuineness of the ancient British poems of Aneurin, Taliesin, Llywarch Hen, and Merdhin, with specimen of the poems* (London: Longman and Rees, 1803), p. 95. [Aneurin was the customary spelling in the nineteenth century, whereas Aneirin is the preferred spelling today. Aneirin will be used throughout in this thesis, except in direct quotations from original material]

³²⁴ Turner, pp. 95–96.

³²⁵ Schulz, 1841, p. 5 [emphasis is mine].

Schulz views tradition as an organic process, as a part of the intellectual life of a certain people – as much as the people themselves are alive, so are their stories. Here, he primarily draws from the Herderian idea that the soul of a given people, regardless of their status, can be found in their songs and is key to understanding their history.³²⁶ Schulz takes up this idea when discussing the songs of the ancient Welsh bards, the *cynfeirdd*, and extends it further to cover also other genres of fictional writing, including poems, prose tales and fictional histories such as Geoffrey’s of Monmouth’s *Historia Regum Britanniae*.

He begins the essay by comparing King Arthur to ‘the single root of a gigantic tree, whose branches, for nearly ten centuries, spread over the whole of Europe, until in modern times it withered away together with the last remains of Chivalry’.³²⁷ This metaphor seeks to capture the attention of the reader and introduces Schulz’ account of early sources on Arthur, reflecting once more A. W. Schlegel’s organic metaphors of flowers and plants when reviewing the poetic history of the European peoples. Schulz’ use of the image of poetry as a living, growing entity also reflects the metaphors used by A. W. Schlegel in his translations of Romance poetry, the *Blumensträuße* (1803). Apart from comparing the process of translating poetry with making flower bouquets and thinking of poetic schools as flowers, from budding to withering,³²⁸ Schlegel explicates the purpose of historical recordings in his Berlin lectures where he claims that a simple listing of facts is too banal and limits mankind’s development.³²⁹ The process of choosing the content of a ‘history’ reveals the philosophy and the evaluation of past events by the contemporary writer. For Schlegel, recording history signifies also recording the ‘Bildungsgeschichte’, the history of civilization and the history of philosophy and art, showing the infinite progress of mankind

³²⁶ See Herder’s foreword to his collection of Nordic folk-songs where he justifies the purpose of collecting the traditions even of peoples considered ‘savage’ or ‘semi-savage’ (wilde und halbwilde Völker) so that we can fully appreciate their intellectual life, their way of thinking, unspoiled by civilization.

‘Wie aber nun diese Völker, die Brüder unsrer Menschheit *kennen*? Bloß *von außen*, durch Fratzenkupferstiche und Nachrichten, die den Kupferstichen gleichen: oder *von innen*? Als Menschen, die Sprache, Seele, Empfindungen haben? Unsrer Brüder! – Kein Mensch wird in einem Philosophischen Jahrhunderte, wo nichts als Menschlichkeit genannt, geliebt und gebildet wird, die *Notwendigkeit* und *Vorzug* der letzteren Kenntnisse leugnen. [...] nicht bloß reden von dem was sie nicht sind – Menschen wie wir! Policirte Nationen!! und Christen!! – sondern *was sie sind*! Uns treues Abbild ihrer Denkart, Empfindungen, Seelengestalt, Sprache, nicht durch fremdes Gewäsch wie jedem durchjagenden Europäernarren etwa der Kopf steht, sondern in ihren eigenen treuen *Merkmale* und *Proben* geben – Wir sind bei ihren Liedern!’ Johann Gottfried Herder, *Werke. 10 in 11 Bänden*, 11 vols, ed. by Ulrich Gaier (Frankfurt am Main: Deutscher Klassiker Verlag, 1990), III, Volkslieder, Übertragungen, Dichtungen.

³²⁷ Schulz, 1841, p. 7.

³²⁸ Strobel, Jochen ‘Blumensträuße für die Deutschen. Schlegel als Übersetzer und Literaturhistoriker’ in: *Der Europäer August Wilhelm Schlegel: romantischer Kulturtransfer – romantische Wissenswelten*, eds York-Gothart Mix, Strobel Jochen, (Berlin, New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2010), pp. (p. 177).

³²⁹ Schlegel, August Wilhelm, *Kritische Ausgabe der Vorlesungen* I, p. 188.

towards the highest goals. Despite this idealistic view of general progression through art and poetry which is the same for all mankind, Schlegel still identifies a national, local and temporal element to the artistic expression of a given people in a given period: 'Der ewig rege Kunstgeist bildet sich immer von neuem aus dem Stoffe jedes Zeitalters, aus jeder bestimmten Umgebung gleichsam einen Körper an, organisirt sich eine Gestalt.'³³⁰ He further develops the image of an organic, non-linear process with an illustration of the varying 'texture' of poetry:

Je nachdem nun dieser Stoff widerstrebender, oder tauglicher und bildsamer ist, wird auch die äußere Organisation der Kunst gröber oder zarter ausfallen, und es wird ihm mehr oder weniger gelingen, sich darin frey zu bewegen, und sich mit aller Fülle, Energie, Leichtigkeit und Evidenz zu offenbaren. Dieß ist es, was man mit dem Ausspruche meynt, ein Volk, ein Zeitalter sey poetischer als das andere. Dieser Mangel kann freylich bis zur gänzlichen Negation gehen: und eine solche Prosa in den Gesinnungen, Ansichten, Sitten, Einrichtungen, etc. kann in einer Nationalität so fixirt seyn, daß sie ohne eine ganz neue Ordnung der Dinge nicht aufzuheben ist, und daß so lange wahre Poesie und Kunst unmöglich bleiben.³³¹

In this excerpt, Schlegel pronounces his preference for finer, productive poetry as opposed to unproductive, bland prose. Once a nation has become too entrenched in an unpoetical manner of expressing itself, only a total revolution can rekindle the creative and poetic spirit of the nation. Ewton summarises and relativises this:

Schlegel has a deep sense of the significance of history for man and of its relevance for art and literature in general. National literatures can only be understood when the nations themselves are understood.³³²

Schlegel's notion of the waxing and waning of poetical abilities of a certain people is clearly adopted by Schulz. He comments on the level of poetry of various periods throughout his essay, for example when he classifies the ancient Welsh poems of the bards as lyrical and not epic, 'their language without art, but rich and vigorous, and their rhythm, inspired by the deeds before them, and imitating the tide of the battle, is heroic and inspiring.'³³³ Again, Schulz' background in the Romantic school comes into play, in particular A. W. Schlegel's theories. According to Schlegel the ideal language is poetic language. In his opinion, most languages in his time have lost their poetic character but he believes it can be restored. He also introduces criteria to establish to what extent a language has maintained its poetic element. If a language is equally intelligible in prose

³³⁰ A.W. Schlegel, *Kritische Ausgabe der Vorlesungen* I, p. 191.

³³¹ Ibid.

³³² Ewton, *The Literary Theories of August Wilhelm Schlegel*, p. 98.

³³³ Schulz, 1841, p. 20

and in poetry, it has a higher degree of poeticity, as Schlegel explains in his lectures in Berlin in 1801:

Das ist klar, daß eine Sprache und der Geist einer Nation um so poetischer ist, je weiter sich die Sphäre der Verständlichkeit erstreckt, je stärkere Abweichungen vom prosaischen Sprachgebrauch möglich sind, ohne selbst dem großen Haufen unverständlich zu sein.³³⁴

Using this principle as a guideline, the Celtic languages were perceived to possess a higher degree of poeticity by the Romantics. Herder's argument of the different ages of a language also agrees with this stance, as he holds that a given language was at its most poetic in its youth and that songs were the most natural manner of remembering events:

Und dieses jugendliche Sprachalter, war bloß das poetische: man sang im gemeinen Leben, und der Dichter erhöhete nur seine Akzente in einem für das Ohr gewählten Rhythmus: die Sprache war noch sinnlich, und reich an kühnen Bildern: sie war noch der Ausdruck der Leidenschaft, sie war noch in den Verbindungen ungefesselt: der Periode fiel aus einander, wie er wollte – Seht! Das ist die poetische Sprache, der poetische Periode. Die beste Blüte der Jugend in der Sprache war die Zeit der Dichter: jetzt sangen die *ἀοδοί* und *ραψοδοί*: da es noch keine Schriftsteller gab, so verewigten sie die merkwürdigsten Taten durch Lieder: durch Gesänge lehrten sie, und in den Gesängen waren nach der damaligen Zeit der Welt Schlachte und Siege, Fabeln und Sittensprüche, Gesetze und Mythologie enthalten.³³⁵

The ideal state of a language's poeticity in its youth, described by Herder, can be applied to the Celtic languages in the early stages of their traditions. Schulz works with Herder's assumption in the first chapter of his essay when he describes the language used by the bards when performing at the courts of the Welsh princes. He even uses Herder's expressions of a rich and vigorous language, which illustrates the passion of the moment, or reflects the storm of the battle. He also refers to the Herderian ideal when he explains how the language in the *Prophetia Merlini*, chapter seven within the *Historia Regum Britanniae* differs in its poetic nature from the language used in the rest of the chronicle, the former sounding like a recital of a poem while the latter being dry and factual, typical for a chronicle. Schulz connects this to the emergence of Arthur as a mythical king, as the account, when it reaches the time when Arthur allegedly lived, suddenly changes and becomes 'spirited, rich, and florid, until his work appears to assume the character of a

³³⁴ A.W. Schlegel, *Kritische Ausgabe der Vorlesungen*, I. Die Kunstlehre [Berlin 1801–1802], p. 406.

³³⁵ Herder, *Werke*, 10 in 11 Bänden, I, p. 183.

complete epic poem'.³³⁶ This wording ties in the idea of language and poetry as organic, evolving entities.

Schulz explains this with the closeness of the bards to the events recorded in song which must have been at the origin of the poetry used in the *Prophetia Merlini*. He contrasts the original compositions with poems of later periods which are more refined, because a new generation of poets had their own agenda behind their taking the old myths and wrapping them in a new guise. This adaptation of the Schlegelian view of the poetic ages of a people and the Herderian view of the degree of poeticity of a language, linked to each other, finds its climax in the final chapter 'The fall of chivalrous Poetry' where Schulz explains how it was no longer productive as poetry. At first, the increasing condensing and amplifying in later stages of tradition, which he describes as follows:

[f]antastic fêtes and processions, ridiculous ornaments both in dress and arms, [...], the most whimsical vows, pilgrimages and tournaments, the most extravagant devotion in love [etc.], all that the ancient poets pointed out over-ran life in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.³³⁷

Secondly, the change in society in the sixteenth century made it impossible for chivalrous poetry to survive, as with the religious wars and the rise of Protestantism in its puritan forms, romantic poetry quickly fell out of favour.

Schulz' methodology marks a clear departure from the purely literary and philological approach that the majority of scholars exhibited at the time, when Karl Lachmann had laid down the foundations of modern text criticism³³⁸ and the Brothers Grimm had already made their chief contributions to philology and linguistics. Schulz had some basic understanding of the principles of literary analysis, gained while working on his previous publications, but he deemed the philological approach alone insufficient to truly understand the origin, the life and the development of traditions. Beyond the textual analysis, external factors must also be considered, echoing the Romantic school. Schulz was aware of Grimm's superior skills in philology, fully knowing that he himself did not possess the necessary knowledge in language history, etymology and systematic grammar.

³³⁶ Schulz, 1841, p. 19.

³³⁷ Ibid., p. 109.

³³⁸ As explained in chapter one of this thesis, Lachmann developed the stemmatics method which is considered the foundation of modern, philological text criticism. It compares manuscripts based on common errors which happened from one instance of copying to the following. Once the succession of copies is established, the texts are assigned letters, A for the oldest text, which served as the original for several copies.

In the discussion of the true origin of the Arthurian poetry, Schulz knows that with his means he cannot arrive at the ultimate conclusion:

In any case there is but one method whereby to resolve these doubts, and to throw light on this obscurity; it is by a most impartial, indefatigable, and searching criticism of all sources, whether Welsh or Breton. It would require a second Jacob Grimm, to construct the historical grammar of the different Celtic dialects particularly of the Cymry and the Bretons, from the earliest period to the nineteenth or at least to the fifteenth century, to enable us to place each document in its true position, [...] ³³⁹

Thus, in the above section, he admits that he would need to be a scholar of Grimm's stature to find an answer to the questions: '*To whom do Arthur and his warriors owe their poetical resurrection – To the Welsh, or to the Bretons? – Was it in Wales, or in Brittany, that he was chosen as the centre of this new creation?*' ³⁴⁰ Despite acknowledging his deficiency, Schulz nonetheless includes his own viewpoint, as he continues the sentence with a list of factors that must be considered to arrive at an accurate conclusion:

[...] and to judge by the language, descriptions of manners, historical facts, arts, and other points indicative of its contents, of the date of each document, and place it in its proper situation; to purify it from the extraneous matter of later interpolations, to reinstate all the noble sentiments, in a word to restore, by the most minute and, at the same time, elevated criticism, sustained by a profound knowledge of every thing relating to those periods, to clear, we say, this literature from the dust of an honourable partiality, from the pedantry of antiquaries, from old errors, and spurious authorities. ³⁴¹

In his description of the ideal criticism of ancient sources, Schulz reveals both his admiration for the work of philologists like Grimm and Lachmann and his hidden criticism of the philological method alone. He emphasises the need to consider also the cultural and historical elements in the poems, not only the linguistic aspects. His description could be interpreted as a recommendation that the best result is obtained by combining the skills of a philologist, a grammarian, a historian, and a literature professor. In his analysis of A.W. Schlegel's *Blumensträuße*, Strobel summarises this viewpoint, noting that all aspects of national culture together form the organic nature of literary history: '[d]ie organische Einheit der Literaturgeschichte erschließt sich freilich erst einer Gesamtschau, die alle nationalen Kulturen und sämtliche Phasen der Abfolge in Rechnung stellt' [...] ³⁴² [The organic unity of literary history only becomes visible in a comprehensive overview that considers all national cultures and all epochs in chronological order, my translation]. This

³³⁹ Schulz, 1841, p. 27.

³⁴⁰ Ibid., p. 22. [emphasis, punctuation and capitalization as in original]

³⁴¹ Ibid., pp. 27–8.

³⁴² Strobel, 'Blumensträuße für die Deutschen. Schlegel als Übersetzer und Literaturhistoriker', p. 177.

statement describes exactly Schulz' rationale in the essay favouring the broader approach instead of a meticulous text criticism.

Schulz continues in this vein when outlining his third principle:

[t]radition grows and increases, both from the repetition of favourite histories in a modified form, and from multiplying and amplifying the deeds of Heroes, so that if we possess only recent compilations, it is often very difficult to distinguish the original matter from that which is added at a later period.³⁴³

This point is also closely related to the principle that F. Schlegel employed for his attempt to date the earliest fragments from which Macpherson composed his *Ossian*. He also believes that bards and poets of different periods accumulated heroic deeds and attributed them to one figure, creating anachronisms and illogical relations:

In der Poesie sind die Väter oft jünger als ihre Söhne; ist eine berühmte That, ein großer Held der Sage einmahl gegeben und im Gesange beliebt geworden, so werden ihm von späteren Sängern und Barden leicht Gefährten und Nachfolger in ähnlicher Laufbahn, Söhne, Väter, und oft eine ganze Reihe von Ahnen und Nachkommen zugestellt, und es wird an dem ersten Gedichte immer weiter fortgedichtet.³⁴⁴

With the above judgement on the transmission of ancient Scottish traditions from their roots in the so-called Dark Ages through the medieval period, F. Schlegel provides Schulz with an effective means to analyse the different strata of tales and traditions which were added at a later stage to the original core material. The organisation of the essay reflects this principle, since Schulz decided to structure his argument according to the additions of new characters and story-lines to the core traditions found in the ancient poems of the Welsh *cynfeirdd*.

Schulz illustrates this most aptly in the chapter on the merging of the Holy Grail with Arthur and his knights. He includes a mythological genealogy which unites the Northern and the Southern constituents of the tales. He illustrates this connection by linking Arthur's family tree with that of Percival in a graphic representation which he had already used in his major work on Wolfram von Eschenbach. This is made clear in the title 'Teste poemate 'Percival' Wolfrani [sic] von Eschenbach'. This mythical genealogy assumes a common ancestor for Arthur and Percival: Mazadan, who had two descendants, Lassaliess and Brickus, the former being the great-great-grandfather of Percival while the latter is the father of Uther Pendragon and thus the grandfather of Arthur. This genealogy is very

³⁴³ Schulz, 1841, p. 6. [spelling and capitalizing as in original]

³⁴⁴ F. Schlegel, 'Über nordische Dichtkunst, 1812', p. 87.

interesting as it contains British elements, the original names of Arthur, Uther Pendragon and Gwalchmai/Gawan on one side, and the continental names, mostly French and Provençal such as Lamire, Gamuret de Anjou and his wife with a German name, Belacane Herzeleide. By including the depiction of the family tree introduced by Wolfram von Eschenbach, Schulz illustrates the inter-cultural significance of Arthurian literature, as characters with names in several different languages appear as members of one family. It epitomises Schulz' viewpoint on cultural contacts in medieval Europe and it is also a sign of the growing awareness of the relations between the different branches of the European languages, as comparative linguistics and philology were evolving disciplines at the beginning of the nineteenth century. Franz Bopp's comparative study *Über das Konjugationssystem der Sanskritsprache in Vergleichung mit jenem der griechischen, lateinischen, persischen und germanischen Sprache* (1816) was followed by his lecture in Berlin 'Über die celtischen Sprachen vom Gesichtspunkte der vergleichenden Sprachforschung' (1838).³⁴⁵ According to Bunsen, he had raised several questions in this lecture which he had been unable to resolve.³⁴⁶ This was the motivation for Bunsen to set the topic for the eisteddfod in 1842. Johann Kaspar Zeuss' *Grammatica Celtica*, which was the first comprehensive comparative study of the Celtic languages, was not published until 1853, so the status of the Celtic languages had not yet been resolved at the time of the 1840 competition.

Schulz, however, does not refer to any comparative studies and concentrates on developing his third point on the organic and poetic aspect of tradition. He emphasises his Schlegelian view of tradition while being aware of the importance of text criticism as a vital tool to determine the course of a tale through the centuries, as seen in the previous quote above. He also acknowledges the importance of examining the circumstances of each period of tradition:

[t]his [the additions made during the course of tradition by poets of later ages] is the first indication of a departure from the essentially poetical principle of Tradition. Every poet belongs peculiarly to the age in which he lives; and at all periods a desire exists to comprehend whatever interests and agitates at the time being.³⁴⁷

³⁴⁵ Published in *Abhandlungen und Sitzungsberichte der Preußischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* (1838, 187–272) and reprinted in *Kleine Schriften zur vergleichenden Sprachwissenschaft* (Leipzig: Zentralantiquariat der Dt. Demokrat. Republik, 1972), pp. 149–234.

³⁴⁶ NLW, MS 13182E1, fol. 19, 'Letter of Mme Bunsen, Berne, March 17th 1841'.

³⁴⁷ Schulz 1841, p. 6. [spelling and capitalizing as in original]

This is an adaptation of A.W. Schlegel's view that poetry is at the very root of tradition and thus literature on the one hand, and history on the other hand. It is another clear statement of Schulz' comprehensive view of poets and writers as children of their periods. He vividly pictures the poets in their environment, especially as he describes the old Welsh bards of the sixth and seventh centuries: 'There we accompany Llywarch Hên to the combat with his host Cynddylan, with Geraint and Cadwallon; we hear the harp of the venerable bard lamenting the fate of his children, slain by the enemy.'³⁴⁸ Schlegel explicitly states his methodology as a critic in his Berlin lectures of 1803 with the following:

[u]nser Bestreben hingegen ist darauf gerichtet, die Kunstkritik so viel möglich auf den historischen Standpunkt zu führen, d.h. wiewohl jedes Kunstwerk nach innen zu in sich beschlossen seyn soll, es als zu einer Reihe gehörig nach den Verhältnissen seiner Entstehung und Existenz zu betrachten, und aus dem, was zuvor gewesen und was darauf gefolgt ist oder noch folgt, zu begreifen.³⁴⁹

Here, Schlegel defends his method as a critic, not only limiting his criticism to the artwork itself in its internal unity, but taking into consideration external factors at the moment of its creation, as well as the history of its precursors and its impact on future artists. Schulz' methodological approach to the Welsh traditions is clearly Schlegelian, which explains why he includes several detailed passages, in which he explains the social and political history of the period to his readers. He places particular emphasis on the history of Brittany and how the events between the ninth and the eleventh century may have been conducive to a poetical revival of the Arthurian core material.³⁵⁰

This Schlegelian idea is also reflected in his fourth and final principle, in which Schulz engages again with the development of tradition and how it is shaped by the 'change in customs, the principle tendencies and political and intellectual interests of the age'.³⁵¹ First, this principle serves to explain the variations that traditions may be submitted to within the same culture by the same people and secondly, Schulz extends it to the transmission of traditions from one culture to another. This is of particular importance for his essay as he traces the journey of Arthurian traditions from Britain to Brittany and then via France towards the East and North, leaving their mark on the literatures of Germany and Scandinavia. According to Schulz, traditions, when meeting another culture with its own

³⁴⁸ Schulz, 1841, p. 20.

³⁴⁹ Schlegel, *Kritische Ausgabe der Vorlesungen* II, Dritter Teil: Vorlesungen über die Romantische Poesie [1803–1804], p. 6.

³⁵⁰ cf. Schulz, 1841, pp. 22–27 and pp. 35–38.

³⁵¹ *Ibid.*, p. 6. [spelling and capitalizing as in original]

history and traditions, are modified and thus acquire a new nationality. He explains that this principle of nationality in traditions is key in understanding the development of traditions from their earliest sources to their latest forms:

In this manner we must follow up our researches upon the influence of the Welsh Traditions on the literature of Germany, France and Scandinavia – an influence not every where the same, but differing according to the Times and Places where they were found.³⁵²

This principle is flagged up by Schulz in several instances throughout his discussion of the dissemination of the Welsh traditions across centuries and boundaries. He begins to employ it in the earliest period of traditions pre-1066, where he discusses the state of Wales and Brittany at the time, asking which influence the social and political circumstances in both countries potentially had on the development and transmission of literary traditions. When he elaborates on the question whether Wales or Brittany are the cradle of the poetic revival of Arthur and his warriors, he begins by stating the principle for his argumentation:

Tradition is not wafted from country to country, like a light seed at the mercy of the winds. It is a part of the intellectual life of the people to whom it belongs, and could not take root beyond the limits of the material and intellectual power of that people.³⁵³

This refers back to the Herderian influence on Schulz' thinking. The image of the seed taps into the idea of organic growth of tradition and literature (second principle) as well as the importance of cultural contact and the readiness of the culture to receive foreign influences (fourth principle).

The next step in Schulz' argument is highlighting the problem of the scarcity of written and sources dated before 1000 beyond any reasonable doubt. This makes it nearly impossible to come to a definite verdict on the issue Welsh versus Breton roots based on factual evidence only. Therefore, Schulz moves on to convince his audience with circumstantial evidence and logical conclusions based thereupon. This process usually begins by listing the established historical facts, which were widely accepted as correct. In this instance, Schulz recalls what is known about Britain and Brittany from the time of Julius Caesar until the Roman legions retreated:

It is generally admitted that the first inhabitants of Britain were Celts, and that Armorica, the country between the Loire, Seine, and the sea, was at the time of Julius

³⁵² Ibid., 1841, p. 20.

³⁵³ Schulz, 1841, p. 22.

Caesar inhabited by Celts, of whom, in Pliny, we find traces as far as the Pyrenees, and that, according to Caesar and Tacitus, Britain and Armorica were peopled by a kindred race.³⁵⁴

The above quote provides evidence of Schulz' preference for including authorities of Antiquity to validate the points he advances. In the course of his argument, he refers to several Latin chronicles in order to establish a social history of the area. Instead of simply listing dates and events, Schulz places special emphasis on the feelings and opinions of the people, as the following excerpt of an unnamed chronicle proves:

In 448 [446], the Britons reluctantly solicited the help of the Romans: 'There is not,' they said, 'a place that we can flee to – driven by the barbarians into the sea, and thrown back by the sea among the barbarians, there remains to us but the choice of death from the sword or the from the waves of the sea.'³⁵⁵

Schulz does not reveal his source, Gildas' *De Excidio et Conquestu Britanniae* or the same passage in Bede's *Historia Ecclesiastica gentis Anglorum*, but the above quote aims to illustrate the plight of the Britons under the pressure of the different Germanic invaders, the Angles and the Saxons chief among them, and the Britons' plea to the Romans to come to their aid. The choice of this emotive reference could have been motivated by his target audience, knowing that he wrote for an audience with a strong interest in the Welsh national cause. The historical account continues in this style, always providing insights to the people's life and their experiences. The sources which Schulz is quoting also serve this purpose. Besides advancing his argument for either Briton or Breton influences with social history, Schulz also draws from onomastics, arguing for the British origin of the early medieval inhabitants of Brittany with Cornish and Devon place names found in Brittany. He explains the waves of emigration also with other factors than the pressure of the Angles

³⁵⁴ Ibid.

³⁵⁵ Ibid. Schulz most likely translated himself from Gildas' *De Excidio et Conquestu Britanniae* chapter 20, or from Bede's *Historia Ecclesiastica gentis Anglorum* Book 1, Chapter 13, since J.A. Giles' English translation of Gildas was only published in 1841. Gildas' Latin passage reads: igitur rursum miserae mittentes epistolas reliquiae ad agitium romanae potestatis uirum, hoc modo loquentes: 'agitio ter consuli gemitus britannorum;' et post pauca querentes: 'repellunt barbari ad mare, repellit mare ad barbaros; inter haec duo genera funerum aut iugulamur aut mergimur;' nec pro eis quicquam adiutorii habent. [Giles' English translation below]

Giles' English translation *The works of Gildas and Nennius* (1841): 20. Again, therefore, the wretched remnant, sending to Aetius, a powerful Roman citizen, address him as follows:– "To Aetius, now consul for the third time: the groans of the Britons." And again a little further thus:– "The barbarians drive us to the sea; the sea throws us back on the barbarians: thus two modes of death await us, we are either slain or drowned." Both passages quoted from the letter to Aetius are also found in Bede's chronicle, with the addition of dating the letter to the year 23 of the reign of Theodosius the younger, who ascended the throne in 423 AD; so the letter was sent in 446, not 448.

and Saxons, for example the yellow plague (pestitis flava).³⁵⁶ After having informed his readers about the socio-historical background of the area and the period, Schulz continues with socio-political arguments. He lists the rulers of the exiles in Brittany and their conflicts and alliances with the neighbouring kingdoms and principalities, in particular the Frankish kingdom under Pepin and Charlemagne. He characterises the various rulers, highlights their major victories and defeats and, most importantly, evaluates how their contact with other peoples may have contributed to develop and disseminate the ancient traditions. At the end of his meticulous presentation of circumstantial evidence, Schulz summarises his findings and tries to convince his readers of the logic of his arguments with several assumptions combined with rhetorical questions:

If we allow that the Welsh nation loved to cherish with the utmost fidelity the remembrance of Arthur and his warriors, and their exploits, we cannot deny that these recollections must also have been cherished in Brittany – The desire to renew the existence of their primitive country on another soil, is proved by the great number of names, which they carried from Wales and other parts of Britain into Brittany – If the Welsh in their own country, exalted Arthur to the height at which Nennius already found him, decked with the glory of a Saint, and making an expedition to Jerusalem, why should not their kinsmen in Brittany have done the same thing? The Celtic establishment of bards was always common to the two nations; Turner proves their existence from the seventh to the tenth century, why should they not also have existed in Brittany? And if the bards from inclination cherished and maintained the ancient and patriotic remembrances, and if, with a vivid imagination, they entwined authentic history with these traditions; – if, in the seventh century, the Welsh Tales were transported into Brittany, and these stories, altered and remodelled, were carried back to England and Wales, under Mathuidoc in the tenth century, and lastly, if a mixture of the traditions of both Breton and Welsh were again introduced to Brittany, with Alan; – who would decide from the obscure sources, a part of which are at present either inaccessible or not yet critically examined, which portion of the traditions of this period belong to Brittany, and which to Wales?³⁵⁷

This summarises the circumstantial evidence presented in the preceding five pages. It is also an example for Schulz' style of engaging his readers to follow his way of thinking. Furthermore, the final question serves to explain the lack of concrete results due to the circumstances and a still mainly oral tradition. Moreover, Schulz informs the reader that a part of the sources have not yet been critically reviewed and made accessible to the scholarly community. His remark on the current state of research in the field shows that, as explained in chapter three of this thesis, he views his essay as the first step towards the discovery of the hidden treasures of the past.

³⁵⁶ Schulz, 1841, p. 22.

³⁵⁷ Ibid., p. 26–27. [my emphasis]

In the second and third period of tradition, Schulz applies the principle of cultural contact as a vital factor for the development of literature to the transformation of the core material under the influence of the chivalric spirit. Schulz explains this with the changes which the original British material underwent in France and later in Britain under the Normans. Schulz delves deeply into the characteristics of chivalric literature, explaining the historical background for it and the changes in society that were reflected in the literature of the period. He argues that William the Conqueror brought the feudal system to Britain, a socio-political turning point which then found its reflection in literature. In the wake of this, Arthur is no longer the focal point of a national rally but he has a different function in the tales shaped by the changing society and its children, the poets of the period. A. W. Schlegel also argued for a new poetic productivity due to the changes in the feudal society:

Die Ursachen, welche damals [erste Hälfte des 12. bis gegen Ende des 13. Jahrhunderts] eine so große Anzahl von Dichtern ans Licht riefen [...] werde ich bey Gelegenheit derselben Erscheinung in Frankreich besonders in der Provence, aus dem schönen Verhältnissen des ritterlichen Lebens näher entwickeln.³⁵⁸

For the Welsh traditions and the character of Arthur, this development means that he, an originally valiant and previously proactive figure, is now gradually shifting into a chivalric character in the feudal society, a noble king whose knights perform the valiant deeds and he as the king provides the platform for it. From an actual war hero, Arthur drifts into the background but acts as the cohesive factor in the tales. Schulz speaks of this ideal depiction of the new society in the highest tones, as he calls the principal characters ‘heroes represented as warrior-adventurers assembled round Arthur, either in his suite, or as his vassals.’³⁵⁹ In the next passage, he describes their characteristics in detail:

invincible courage in battle, an unwearying desire to fight, an insatiable passion for the most extraordinary adventures, an inordinate ambition, love in its most engaging aspect, an unequalled splendour, the most refined courtesy and gallantry. Such are the characteristic traits of these romances, as they are those also of the most perfect and brilliant chivalry in general.³⁶⁰

The final sentence of this excerpt expands the description of the heroes in the romances to the character of this genre of literature itself. This glowing declaration of the splendour of these romances and the chivalrous spirit in them echoes Schlegel’s view of the Middle Ages. Neither Schulz nor Schlegel seem to view the medieval period as a dark and

³⁵⁸ Schlegel, *Kritische Ausgabe der Vorlesungen*, II, p. 33.

³⁵⁹ Schulz, 1841, p. 40.

³⁶⁰ Ibid.

uncivilised age but rather as a fruitful meeting of North and South. The North-South divide is in fact a development of an older idea, a concept first introduced by Herder in his theories on the origin of languages and the influence of climate on the character and the language of a people. The climate theory is taken up by A. W. Schlegel who took the idea a step further. Schlegel describes the cultural contact which had profound consequences for the cultural and intellectual life of Central Europe as an encounter of opposites:

Aus der Combination der kernigten und redlichen Tapferkeit des Deutschen Nordens mit dem Christenthum, diesem religiösen orientalischen Idealismus ging der *ritterliche Geist* hervor, eine mehr als glänzende, wahrhaft entzückende, und bisher in der Geschichte beyspiellose Erscheinung.³⁶¹

The adjectives used by Schlegel, ‘glänzend’ and ‘wahrhaft entzückend’ are echoed in Schulz’ quote above, where he speaks of ‘an unequalled splendour’ and ‘the most refined courtesy and gallantry’. Schulz mirrors this in his essay, as he also emphasises the ‘invincible courage in battle, the unwearying desire to fight’ which find their counterparts in Schlegel’s description. Both authors’ choice of adjectives highlights their extremely positive view of feudal society. In Schlegel’s opinion, honesty, bravery and stoutness are characteristics of the Germanic North whereas the religious idealism of Christianity arrived from the Orient and where they met, the splendour of chivalry began to shine over Europe. This viewpoint is taken up by Schulz at a later stage: besides sharing Schlegel’s admiring opinion of the High Middle Ages, Schulz also takes up the point of Christianity meeting the wild, brave, pagan Germans in the chapter on the influence of Welsh traditions on the literature of Scandinavia by contrasting two different Germanic peoples. Although the focus of this chapter is on the arrival of Welsh traditions in Scandinavia, Schulz first examines the relations between the Anglo-Saxons and the Danes. Schulz advances that a conflict between the hitherto Christian Anglo-Saxons and the pagan Danes led to a significant influence of Danish on the literature of the Anglo-Saxons. He explains this by highlighting ‘the struggle between the more softened manners of the Anglo-Saxons and those of the savage bands of pirate-invaders from the North’,³⁶² which left a marked impression on Anglo-Saxon poetry. Here, Schulz applies the Herderian theory of the influence climate on the culture and literature of the peoples. He also draws from Friedrich Schlegel’s ideas expressed in the latter’s essay *Über nordische Dichtkunst*, where Schlegel

³⁶¹ A. W. Schlegel, *Kritische Ausgabe der Vorlesungen*, II, Dritter Teil; Vorlesungen über die romantische Poesie [1803–1804], p. 67.

³⁶² Schulz, 1841 p. 84.

uses a similar expression to describe the common cultural roots of Scandinavian and Germanic people:

Jenes alldurchdringende Naturgefühl, welches aus den germanischen Sitten und Einrichtungen des Lebens hervorleuchtet, [...] ist schon in der nordischen Götterlehre und Edda heimisch. Soviel auch der Einfluß des Christenthums und mildere Sitten nachher daran geändert haben, es ist viel von jener alten Denkart und Gefühlsweise, wenn gleich in neuer und verwandelter Gestalt geblieben.³⁶³

Schulz takes up Schlegel's expression of 'mildere Sitten' which is rendered with 'softenend manners' in the English translation, but essentially, he takes Schlegel's idea a step further. Where Schlegel puts the emphasis on the common cultural ground that the Scandinavians and the Germans have, which is still recognisable despite the changes that the old way of thinking and feeling was subjected to, Schulz claims that the conflicting sentiments would have been the reason for cultural confrontations, which left their mark on the poetry of the Anglo-Saxons. In this fight for cultural and political dominance between the Anglo-Saxons and the Scandinavian invaders, the British traditions played no role at first. Schulz supports his argument of the formation of Anglo-Saxon poetry parallel to Scandinavian traditions with two Latin quotes from the *Annals of Alfred of Asserius* which he, deviating from his usual practice, cites directly in Latin in text: 'Saxonica poemata die noctuque solus auditor relatis aliorum saepissime audiens, docibilis memoriter retinebat;' and 'Saxonicos libros recitare et maxime carmina Saxonica memoriter discere non desinebat.'³⁶⁴ He summarises these quotes by affirming that the *poemata Saxonica* are in fact Germanic national traditions which were diffused over the entire area of Germanic influence, including Scandinavia and England. He mentions the *Traveller's Song* and the genealogies of the Heptarchy,³⁶⁵ which begin with Woden or Odin in the North and Wadon in Germany, as a proof of that claim, without explaining what these pieces of literature exactly are, assuming it to be well known among his readership. So although the nature of the song, the genealogies and the Heptarchy remain unexplained, Schulz sees them as

³⁶³ F. Schlegel, 1812, p. 71.

³⁶⁴ Schulz, 1841, p. 84.

³⁶⁵ The Heptarchy refers to the seven kingdoms in Anglo-Saxon England; a manuscript of the genealogy of the kings of the Heptarchy is kept at the British library in the Royal collection, MS 14B vi 'Genealogical roll chronicle of the Kings of England'.
<<http://www.bl.uk/catalogues/illuminatedmanuscripts/TourHistoryGeneal.asp>> [accessed 28 December 2012] 'The Royal roll dates from the reign of Edward I and represents the most common variant of the genealogical chronicle. Its historical narrative begins with a large round diagram known as the Heptarchy that shows the seven Anglo-Saxon kingdoms. The royal line starts below with Ecgberht, the king of Wessex who united the Anglo-Saxons, and continues down to Edward I, with two further generations of kings added in pencil.'

confirmation of the ‘Anglo-Saxons; attachment to their traditions.’³⁶⁶ The parallel existence of the Nordic gods in Scandinavia and Germany was also postulated by F. Schlegel in the aforementioned essay on Nordic poetry. Schlegel even uses the same example of Odin to illustrate the ancient cult common among all peoples of Germanic origin.³⁶⁷

The epic poem *Beowulf* is another example which Schulz uses to illustrate the interaction between the Anglo-Saxon poetry and Scandinavian elements, since the events related take place in Denmark and various places around the Baltic Sea but also Friesland and the country of the Franks. The Battle of Brunanburg and Beorthnoth serve as further examples for Schulz’ statement that one trait in common of all mentioned above is the absence of any mention of the wars with the Welsh. Wales is not even mentioned in early Scandinavian poems, although most of them tell of journeys to Ireland, Scotland, the Orkneys, the Hebrides, the East Coast of England and even Iceland and Greenland. After this list of destinations Schulz concludes his argumentation with the following statement: ‘But the Northman only carried back dead booty to his icy country – he brought no intellectual riches’.³⁶⁸ This ties into the argument brought forward in the chapter on France, where Schulz explains that a culture first had to become sensitive to the themes in literary traditions before it could receive and disseminate them. Since the Viking raiders of the seventh and eighth centuries were not yet Christians nor were they literate, they had no interest in the existing literary productions or the traditions of oral poetry. In order to be able to appreciate the literature of peoples with whom they came in contact, they first had to admit certain changes in their own culture.

In opposition to the wild, natural image of the North, the South is portrayed in a completely different manner as the origin of the ingredients for the development of chivalrous literature. Schulz traces this literary development to Southern France and pinpoints the rich Provençal lyric poetry as its origin. Here, Schulz mirrors A.W. Schlegel when he claims that ‘[p]oetry attained its highest perfection at the end of the eleventh and beginning of the twelfth century’.³⁶⁹ In his opinion, the chivalrous elements were mainly of Provençal origin. A.W. Schlegel regards the poetry of the Provençal troubadours as the main source for all Mediterranean medieval poetry:

³⁶⁶ Schulz, 1841, p. 85.

³⁶⁷ F. Schlegel, 1812, pp. 71–72.

³⁶⁸ Schulz, 1841, p. 85.

³⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 41.

Auf diese Weise hat die Provenzalische Poesie mittelbar beynahe die ganze südliche bestimmt, wenn sie nicht schon vor der Rückwirkung der Italiänischen Literatur auf die Pyrenäische Halbinsel unmittelbaren Einfluß gehabt, [...] ³⁷⁰

Further, Schlegel holds that romantic poetry flourished and reached its peak on two occasions, first in the eleventh and twelfth centuries and then again in the Renaissance period, the age of Dante, Boccaccio and Petrarca in Italy and the *siglo de oro* in Spain. With regard to the chivalric period, Schulz agrees with Schlegel and takes the latter's reasoning to explain the developments of chivalrous literature in France. Schlegel contrasts the Latin languages with the Germanic languages, the first rather found in the South of Europe while the others are spoken by peoples in the North. He explains this with the great conquering of European peoples dividing the continent between them, the Romans in the southern half and the Germanic tribes in the North. ³⁷¹ As alluded to above, he also saw the meeting of the North and the South as the predisposition for the development of chivalry.

The example of climate theory shows that Schulz uses also other theories advanced by Herder and Schlegel, which do not feature in his four principles. The adaptation of climate theory comes into play when Schulz comments on the climate as a plausible factor when he speaks of the character of a given people. When explaining how the Provençal traditions of the Holy Grail arrived in North France and met with the core of the chivalrous tales surrounding Arthur and his knight, Schulz implies Schlegel's theory in his argument:

This Provençal spirit soon communicated itself to the North of France, and the first Crusade, which emanated principally from Provence, drew with it the inhabitants of the North of France. The Normans had not lost, in their new country, that ancient love of adventure which had conducted their ancestors to the shores of England, France, Spain, and Sicily, even to the heart of Russia and Constantinople; they had not abandoned their love of heroic tales; but they forgot their ancient pagan fables, and their Scandinavian and Germanic traditions, and turned, with avidity, under the serene sky of France, to the Frankish tales of Roland, Formun, and other.

The backbone of Schulz' argument is that the Normans, when they first arrived in France, were wild and untamed pagans of the North. They brought with them their Scandinavian traditions but with the change of climate, they forsook them for tales that were more congruent with the climate of their new home, thus echoing Herder's and Schlegel's theories. Schulz borrows both the concept of the mobility of traditions and the notion of a national character of poetry in the first sentence, where he allows the spirit of Provençal

³⁷⁰ A.W. Schlegel, *Kritische Ausgabe der Vorlesungen* II, [1803-1804], p. 130.

³⁷¹ *Ibid.*, p. 10.

poetry to communicate itself to the North of France. The second part of the quote employs the theory of climatic influences on the character of a given people and how moving into a different climate makes them susceptible to a different form of art.

Having established Schulz as a follower of Herder's and Schlegel's theories, it is important to note that he was not alone in sharing this view of Chivalry and Christianity as the uniting factor in medieval Europe. The Cymreigyddion members appear to have adhered to this opinion as well. Their call for papers to compose essays on the influence of Welsh traditions first on European literature and later specifically on Germany, France and Scandinavia was obviously influenced by the Romantic discourse on a cultural and literary heritage shared by the European nations, as well as the emerging comparative approaches to the European languages mentioned above.

Their agenda appears to be conforming to this Schlegelian theory, assuming that there were connecting elements between the main literatures in Europe. The task was to prove that the Welsh traditions were a part of it, not a mere small peripheral literature which had no value and no influence on the other larger cultures on the continent. Schulz, in this constellation, was an ideal candidate for the competition, as he saw the European past in a similar light to Schlegel. Furthermore, he was capable of taking up the existing concepts within the Romantic discourse and of applying them to the overlooked literary traditions of Wales and their journey across the literary traditions of Europe. He appears to apply Herderian climate theory to the earlier stages of tradition, when he describes the original character of the pagan peoples of Europe – the German and the Scandinavian tribes –, being harsh as the climate where they lived, before they came into contact with Christianity. After having been exposed to the new influences of Christianity and the introduction of feudal society and the chivalric literature that came with it, the formerly rough character was softened by them and they took their place among the nations with the common Christian European heritage.

The disquisition of the religious theme, discussed mainly in the final period of the development with the inclusion of the Grail motive, contains another element borrowed from A.W. Schlegel: the parallel developments in literature and the discovery of symmetries and dualities. The first instance is the discussion of the historical Order of the Templars with their literary counterparts. Schulz contrasts these two different images of the Knights of Arthur as opposed to the Knights of Christ, the Templars. Originally, the

Knights of King Arthur were the ideal of chivalrous and gallant warriors who performed valiant deeds for their chosen Lady. After the merger of the original chivalrous movement with the motif of the Holy Grail, the purpose of their achievements shifts from a courtly towards a religious mission. This symmetry of two concepts of knighthood is borrowed from A. W. Schlegel, who describes the interrelation between mundane and sacred ideals as follows:

Dem Ritterthum stand das Mönchthum symmetrisch gegenüber, und wie jenes aus der Vereinigung des Christlichen mit etwas lebendigem und einheimischen entsprungen war, [...] Um noch eine allgemeine Bemerkung zu anticipiren: die Classische Bildung ist durchgehend gleichartig und einfach; hingegen Heterogenität der Mischungen bezeichnet die moderne ursprünglich, und so suchte sie auch in ihrem Fortschritte immer das Entgegengesetzte zu verbinden. Die Synthesis des Ritterlichen und des Mönchischen sehen wir in der Geschichte der geistlichen Ritterorden, und in der entsprechenden Mythologie [...] die Verschmelzung der Ritterfabel und Legende überhaupt in einigen Ritter-Romanen, wo das aufgegebne Abenteuer um welches es sich dreht, ein mystisches ist, wie im Parcival und Titurell.³⁷²

Here, Schlegel speaks of a synthesis of the monastic sphere with the chivalrous world which is due to the natural tendency of modern thought to seek to unite two opposing elements, reflecting the dialectic thinking of the Romantic period. Schulz uses this idea to explain why the Arthur's Knights of the Round Table merged with the Templars and the Holy Grail. Another sign that Schulz used this Schlegelian symmetry in his essay, is the fact that, at the end of his argument, he also alludes to Parcival and Titurel as Schlegel did in his lecture.³⁷³ Further, he also takes Schlegel's theory behind the creation of the notion of chivalry in a meeting of Northern and Southern traditions one step further. On Schulz' literary map, the Welsh traditions being carried to France from the North were then transformed in France where, with the arrival of the Southern tales of the Holy Grail, they were united with them into one narrative arc. Schulz identifies Parcival / Percival / Peredur as the focal point and the connecting element between the Welsh original traditions, the French chivalrous tales and the Quest of the Holy Grail. The previously mentioned inclusion of the genealogy of Percival also marks the beginning of the detailed discussion of the difference between the Knights of the Round Table versus the Templar Knights and their Quest of the Holy Grail. Again, Schulz uses historical evidence to support his argument that both narrative strands had a separate origin and, due to the thematic parallels, were blended into one epic. He explains this process with the rise of the Order of

³⁷² A.W. Schlegel, *Kritische Ausgabe der Vorlesungen*, II, [1803–1804] pp. 67–68.

³⁷³ Schulz, 1841, p. 53.

the Templar Knights and the idolisation of monasticism in the twelfth century and early thirteenth century. Fusing two inherently different traditions, which only shared one common element, a group of knights, gave rise to a multitude of new creations. After the demise of the Templars, however, the nature of the romances changed, as the poets had to make sense of the new reality. Schulz explains the change with the following passages:

The Order of Templars, [...], had now disappeared with the Kings of the Graal. Amfortas [a character from Albrecht's *Tituel*] alone remains, under the name of Le Roi Pêcheur; but it is only in the continuators of Chrestien who first mention him, under the signification of a *fisher for souls*. His Knights have nothing in common with the Templars; and, in fact, it would not have been prudent if the French poets, after the year 1250, had endeavoured in this manner to exalt an order, against which the most sanguinary and terrible proceedings had been commenced (1304–1314) and which was annihilated as a disgrace to humanity.³⁷⁴

In the above, Schulz exemplifies the modification of the former Holy Grail traditions into a more generic form of Christian Chivalry, including a reference to Jesus Christ as the fisher for souls. By abandoning the Templars, the poets returned to the core figure of Christianity. As the original inspiration for the Quest had disappeared, the poets from the fourteenth century onwards could no longer relate to the motivations in the traditions. Therefore, the content of the later compositions became more random, lacking internal cohesion. Schulz describes this process in several instances. First, he notes a new era of linguistic development, when the older form of language became incomprehensible and therefore the old traditions were rewritten:

All of these [romances where the original connections to both the British and the Provençal elements were still obvious] must be placed between the end of the twelfth and the fourteenth. In the sixteenth century, and even before that time, when the ancient language became inconvenient, they were changed into very thick prose volumes, as the *Roman de Percival* (Paris, 1529) and *L'Histoire du Sangreal*, (Paris, 1523).³⁷⁵

This passage also alludes to the Herderian concept of the ages of a language. In its youth, it is more poetic and once it matures, it develops into prose and thus loses its original poetic creativity.³⁷⁶ Furthermore, drawing from the principles in his foreword, Schulz also highlights the tendency to unite previously unconnected tales and to amplify deeds, even to the point that the resulting story becomes absurd:

³⁷⁴ Schulz, 1841, p. 60.

³⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 59.

³⁷⁶ Cf. Johann Gottfried Herder, 'Von den Lebensaltern einer Sprache', p. 183.

One romance rises from another, and borrows from it; and an enormous mass of the strangest adventures are thus accumulated, without arriving at any satisfactory conclusion. There is no trace of a general plot; sudden apparitions of angels and demons crowd upon each other, while every characteristic trait disappears – there is no character in the persons, – and the tales and personages have no longer any sense or connexion to each other.³⁷⁷

Here, Schulz illustrates in powerful words how the chivalric literature had changed towards the end of the medieval period and how previously absent elements of a newer age became entangled in the ancient stories. He also believes to have identified the guilty parties behind this change, as he continues to lament the demise of ancient traditions:

Whoever has ventured to penetrate this chaos, turns away with sorrow, on seeing the beautiful creations of a sublime poetry disfigured by the monstrous mysticism of a sombre monachism, the ill directed erudition of priests, and an immoderate passion for all that was new and unknown.³⁷⁸

Schulz blames the decline of poetry and the chaotic inclusion of angels and demons on the clergy, as the period in question, the sixteenth century, also saw increasing religious tensions and the growing influence of the Inquisition. The beginning of the European era of witch hunts and mass hysteria also affected the traditions of the time. As the fear of demons grew among the people, these elements found their way into the literature of the period. These increasing tensions also found their way into the now much changed traditions of the former Templars. One of the later romances, *Launcelot of Boron*, is a prime example of the duality of the period, good against evil, angels against demons. Schulz first explains why he chose a passage of said romance in French which is not translated into English. It describes the sinful worldly knights and their chaste, heavenly counterparts.

L'autre jour, jour de la Pentecôte, les chevaliers terrestres (also called La Chevalerie amoureuse) et les *Chevalliers celestes* commencèrent ensemble chevalerie, ils commencèrent ensemble à combattre les uns contre les autres. Les Chevaliers qui sont en péché mortel, ce sont les chevaliers terrestres. Les vrais chevaliers, ce sont les chevaliers celestes, qui commencèrent la quête du St. Graal.

Les Chevaliers terrestres qui avaient des yeux et de cœurs terrestres, prirent des couvertures noires, c'est à dire, qu'ils étaient couverts de péchés et des souillures. Les autres, qui étaient les chevaliers celestes, prirent des couvertures blanches, c'est à dire, virginité et chasteté.³⁷⁹

³⁷⁷ Schulz, Albert, 1841, p. 59.

³⁷⁸ Ibid.

³⁷⁹ Ibid., p. 63, quoting *Revue des deux mondes*, vol. 8, p. 692.

[The other day, Whit Sunday, the earthly knights (also called amorous chivalry) and the heavenly knights began a chivalrous tournament, they began to combat each other. The knights who are in mortal sin are the earthly knights. The true knights are those who commence the Quest of the Holy Grail.

The earthly knights, who had profane eyes and hearts, took black covers, which imply that they were covered with sin and filth. The others, who were the heavenly knights, took white covers, which signify virginity and chastity. My translation]

This allegorical description of a tournament between the earthly and the heavenly knights is heavily infused with religious symbolism. The other name for the earthly knights as knights of love bears evidence of the condemnation of romantic love. This is also reflected by the evocation of virginity and chastity in the final line – two ideals with which the heavenly knights are associated. The use of the colours black for the sinful and morally soiled knights and white for the pure, angelic knights, further highlights the deep division between the two groups of knights. The surprising element is the mention of the Grail as the ultimate quest for the heavenly knights. After the Templars were persecuted and executed by the Inquisition, they were viewed as sinful heretics. The quest, itself, however, remained the ultimate goal for a new cast of knights. Schulz describes these changes in the tales as follows:

Since they could no longer make honourable mention of the templars, it was necessary to invent other means of preserving the Graal up to the period of the Round Table; and it is found in Joseph of Arimathea, who was considered the first British apostle.³⁸⁰

By connecting an apostle to the saga of the Holy Grail, the theme itself could survive, even though the new connection is a very daring fabrication. Schulz explains why the new hero figure is a later addition by French and English monks of the thirteenth century and supports the argument with historical evidence by citing several historic sources.³⁸¹

This example shows once again, how Schulz employs the principles established in the foreword: the figure of Joseph of Arimathea obviously existed, as a sixth century source contains several references to him. At some point in the late thirteenth century, there must have been the need for a new figure for the decaying tradition of the Templars, as they were no longer suitable for the quest of the Holy Grail. A manuscript by Baronius of 1300 is the proof, that a former tale was expanded to fit the existing tradition and thus kept it alive in the changed circumstances of the time. Even Arthur was included anew: in the second and more modern version of the romance of Merlin, he appears now as the founder

³⁸⁰ Ibid., p. 62.

³⁸¹ Ibid.

of the Round Table, which now acquired the significance of the table which was used at the Last Supper.

Schulz concludes the discussion of the transformation of the second strand, the Holy Grail, in the combined Arthurian material with a statement regarding the strongly Christian element that was introduced:

We see on all sides that the poets of the north of France entirely lost the ancient signification of the romance of the Graal, and enveloped it completely in a christian and dogmatic form[;]³⁸²

The mention of ‘dogmatic’ implies the criticism which Schulz had voiced earlier in the chapter. He also comes to the conclusion that the transfigurations, to which the tales were submitted, erased the original British elements: ‘they [the French poets] placed it in the midst of legends and relics, and thus abandoned every element which could be called Welsh’.³⁸³ Therefore, towards the end of the late period of transmission, Schulz focused almost entirely on the religious element, which, as explained in detail above, was in his opinion one of the main factors for the demise of chivalric literature at the end of the medieval period. A deterioration of the climate, famine and poverty, epidemic diseases, the end of feudalism, the rise of the bourgeoisie, the rise of dissenting religious sects, which prompted the foundation of the Inquisition and culminated in Protestantism; all contributed to a significant change in culture and society which distanced the people increasingly from the literature of earlier periods. Recalling his fourth principle, that each poet and each reader are children of their time, Schulz states that the chivalrous literature simply fell out of favour because the audience could no longer connect to its content. Furthermore, the internal coherence was destroyed, after the poets of later stages attempted to make the old traditions appealing to the spirit of a new age.³⁸⁴ In the final chapter, the ‘Fall of Chivalrous Poetry’, he summarises his findings from the section on the period 1150–1500, emphasising the fact that the ancient Welsh and Breton traditions had been so thoroughly altered by the fifteenth century through the inclusion of new themes and figures, that these new compositions had virtually nothing in common with their origins but for a few names. Schulz uses again the concept of the North-South divide to explain the different manner of extinction. In the South, he claims that chivalrous literature was wiped out by poets of a

³⁸² Ibid., p. 64 [spelling as in original].

³⁸³ Ibid.

³⁸⁴ Ibid., p. 60.

newer generation while, in the North, the fall had a more socio-political flavour. Schulz names several examples of negative responses to the literature of a bygone era:

Dante condemned the daughter of Guido di Polenta to the infernal regions for having been led astray by reading Lancelot du Lac, Ariosto in his Orlando ridiculed that fantastic and decrepid [sic] chivalry with the most cutting irony by conducting it into the region of fable; and Cervantes destroyed the passion for chivalrous romances by his biting satire.³⁸⁵

Dante, Ariosto and Cervantes represent the countermovement in the South, while there is no clear campaign against them north of the Alps. Schulz explains the end of the production of Arthurian literature with the liberation of the middle classes from feudalism. He also names Shakespeare as the Janus-like figure, who on the one hand looks back on the splendour of the ancient traditions but on the other hand also looks forward to the modern Protestant world.³⁸⁶ This positive view of Protestantism as the dawn of a Modern Age is not surprising after the condemning verdict on the dogmatic influence which Christianity, read Catholicism, had on the later stages of the Arthurian traditions. Schulz generally sees Christianity as a main factor in the common European cultural heritage, but he is very critical of the increasingly dogmatic form which is reflected in the literature of the later medieval period. He seems to view Protestantism and the Enlightenment as generally positive developments for society but they had a detrimental effect on the poetry of earlier periods.

Before moving on to the summary of the findings of this analysis, the content of the fourth chapter of Schulz' essay on the 'Influence of Welsh traditions on the Literature of France with regard to construction' will be discussed briefly. This chapter on rhyme and metre sits slightly oddly in the whole composition since it marks a distinct departure from the purely historical, literary and philosophical examinations of the Arthurian traditions, the central topic of Schulz' research. He begins the chapter with an explanation of what he believes that the inclusion of this chapter will bring to the essay as a whole:

Hitherto we have only considered the influence which Welsh traditions exercised on the literature of France, Germany, and Scandinavia, from its general tenor; the question now remains as to the influence they exercised from the *Form* in which they were first received in France. We must here mark the distinction between rhyme and metre.³⁸⁷

³⁸⁵ Ibid., p. 110.

³⁸⁶ Ibid.

³⁸⁷ Ibid., p. 95.

He begins the chapter with a definition of rhyme and its history. The accepted view was that classic languages of Antiquity did not use rhyme and the rhythm of poems was not based on accent but on the quantity of the syllables. Schulz' summary of rhyme and metre and the progression from quantitative to accentuated verses is mainly based on Schlegel's lecture on poetic language and syllabic metre.³⁸⁸ After having established the transformation of the formerly quantitative poetry without rhymes into rhyming, rhythmical poetry in Late Latin and the Early Romance languages, Schulz explores the reasons for this. He believes that, on the one hand, it was the cultural contact between the Romans and the Celtic and Germanic tribes which caused the shift, and on the other hand the early missionaries and church teachers, who taught the subject matter of the new faith to their disciples by means of rhythmical, rhyming poetry, contributed to the rising popularity of rhyme. Schulz quotes an instructional poem composed by one of the Founding Fathers of the Church, Ambrose, to illustrate his assertion:

O Lux beata, Trinitas,
O principalis Unitas,
Jam Sol recedit igneus
Infunde lumen cordibus.³⁸⁹

Schulz holds that this short composition by Ambrose is one of the earliest rhyming poems in Latin. He continues to list several bishops and missionaries ranging from the fifth to the seventh century, who composed rhyming poems. He also highlights where they lived and worked, France, Spain, and the British Isles, in order to lead to his next point, the possible Celtic provenance of rhyme. Schulz refers to Turner's *Vindication* and the claim that Taliesin's and Aneirin's poems are genuinely from that period to underscore his point that a Celtic origin of rhyme is highly likely since Taliesin and Aneirin used rhyme as their poetic form of choice for their compositions.³⁹⁰ This does not mean, however, that these bards invented rhyme, since 'the ingenious and refined manner in which they use it proves the contrary.'³⁹¹ Schulz holds that rhyme is much older and that its origin lies most likely in the rich oral tradition of the Celtic peoples. This stands in contrast to the commonly entertained opinion that rhyme is of Arab origin, as Schulz admits subsequently.

The second part of Schulz' discussion of rhyme focuses on alliterative metres of Scandinavian and Germanic origin. Schulz was aware of the existence of alliterative

³⁸⁸ A.W. Schlegel, *Kritische Ausgabe der Vorlesungen*, I, Die Kunstlehre, pp. 414–432.

³⁸⁹ Schulz, 1841, p. 97.

³⁹⁰ Ibid.

³⁹¹ Ibid.

metres in Celtic poetry, which he believed were due to Anglo-Saxon and Northern influences. He quotes Giraldus Cambrensis to show that by the twelfth century, bards composed predominantly alliterative poetry adhering to highly elaborate rules. The section on rhyme ends with a comment on the common origin of the words *reim*, *rime*, and *rhimyn* which are obviously derived from *rhythmus*. Schulz has also heard of *odl* and *cynghanedd* and mentions the terms but apparently, he is uncertain what they signify, therefore he concludes that they must be something unique to the Welsh language. ‘The Welsh have a particular word for a thing that was peculiar to themselves; they call rhyme *odl* and *cynghanedd*[.]’³⁹²

The section on metre is even shorter than the previous section on rhyme which is due to the fact that Schulz had not seen many specimens of Welsh poetry, except the poems discussed by Sharon Turner. He contents himself with the remark that he did not find that Welsh poetry had a preference for a specific type of metre but that the bard chose the rhythm which was most appropriate for the occasion. Therefore he mainly describes the development of the French epic and the early forms of Arthurian poetry from freer metres to their accustomed form, iambic verse of four feet and double rhyme. It becomes obvious that Schulz mainly drew from his previous research on Wolfram von Eschenbach, *Parcival* and its origins and parallels in medieval French literature and merely adds a few fragments of information on Welsh poetry he could obtain at his present location in Bromberg.

The close reading of Schulz’ essay has clearly identified him as a late Romantic, post-Herderian and -Schlegelian scholar. He outlines his rationale in the foreword which undoubtedly draws from both philosophies: the concept of Herder’s *Volksgeist*, his ideas on the earliest monuments of mankind, the age of languages, and the influence of climate on the original character of a given people on the one hand; and the Schlegelian historicist approach, which assumes a common origin of poetry, mythology and history, the organic nature of poetic tradition and, building on Herder’s ideas, the degree of poeticity of a language depending on its age on the other hand. Schulz has obviously absorbed these concepts and applied them to the critical examination of a previously overlooked literary and poetic tradition. The four principles, which he established in the foreword, serve as a guideline throughout the essay and Schulz uses them on many occasions to explain the transmission, transformation, and reception of the original Welsh traditions. In so doing, he takes into account the chronological progression from the earliest fragments in the sixth

³⁹² Ibid., p. 103.

century to the decline of chivalric literature in the sixteenth century on the one hand, and the inter-cultural dimension of Arthurian literature, spreading from Britain via France to Germany and Scandinavia, on the other hand.

The first principle is based on August Wilhelm Schlegel's theory on the common origin of tradition which lies in history, poetry and mythology. While Schlegel developed this idea when speaking of the early days of mankind in Antiquity, Schulz applies this concept to the earliest oral poetry in Celtic Britain and the continuous bardic traditions throughout the medieval period. He also develops it further to explain the early stages of written records of 'history' – history in a Schlegelian sense, which signifies the hybrid genre of history, poetry and mythology.

The second principle is closely related to the first principle, emphasising the organic nature of tradition. Schulz considers that traditions are a central part of the intellectual life of a given people, echoing the Herderian concept of the *Volksgeist*. The study of a nation's songs and poems is essentially a study of their history and key to understanding their soul. Schulz applies this to his examination of the Welsh bardic traditions and their way of recording crucial events for the fate of the nation and extends it further to writers of mythological history such as Geoffrey of Monmouth. The use of organic metaphors and similes underpins the second principle throughout the essay.

Schulz's third principle builds on the two previous, focusing on the nature of recording events in the early stages of history and their development in later centuries. He claims that the traditions grow and expand during the process of copying and transmitting them, since storytellers may add details of similar, previously independent stories to increase the status of the central hero. Schulz calls this process amplification and stresses that the differentiation between the original core of the tale and the material added at later stages is one of the greatest challenges of modern scholarship. This idea is based on Friedrich Schlegel's approach to dating the various fragments of Highland Poetry used in Macpherson's *Ossian*.

Finally, Schulz focuses on poetic tradition as a key to understanding the poet in his time as well as the later generations who receive and pass on the older poetry. The social, political and cultural changes from century to century also shape the manner in which poetry is received, transformed, and transmitted from one generation to another. Each transmitting generation leaves its imprint on the material and, once poetry moves across linguistic and

political boundaries, it is submitted to further changes. Schulz makes use of this concept especially when examining the later stages of chivalric literature on their journey across Europe. The final principle is the most crucial for the essay competition, since it mainly answers the question issued by the Cymreigyddion society. The other three principles, however, act as the logical foundations for the fourth. Schulz' essay is thus a fresh approach to comparative literature and intercultural studies with a pan-European scope.

In the Welsh literary field, his contribution was anticipated eagerly after the slight disappointment with the 1838 essay by Harding. Schulz was seen as the more accomplished scholar and had more experience in the field due to his previous work on *Parcival* – a fact which was highlighted repeatedly in the Welsh and British fields. The following excerpt illustrates the position that Schulz occupied in the Welsh literary field before submitting essay, based on his previous merits, which Harding did not possess:

Y mae traethawd Schulz yn fwy meistrolgar ac ysgolheigaidd nag eiddo Harding. Nid y rheswm dros hynny ydoedd bod *Peredur fab Efwrawc* wedi ei chyhoeddi ym 1839 ac felly fod dwy ran gyntaf Charlotte Guest o'r 'Mabinogion' at ei law. Yr oedd yn well ysgolhaig na Harding ac ymdriniai â phwnc a oedd eisoes yn gyfarwydd ag ef.³⁹³

[Schulz' essay is more masterful and scholarly than that of Harding. The reason for this is not that *Peredur the son of Efwrawc* was published in 1839 and therefore he had the first two volumes of Charlotte Guest's 'Mabinogion' at hand. He was the better scholar than Harding and he worked on a subject that was already familiar to him; my translation]

The comment on *Peredur fab Efwrawc* could be understood as a slight criticism; Schulz could have included the most recent, relevant product in the Welsh literary field to further improve his already comprehensive overview of the Arthurian tales. The appraisal of Schulz' essay continues in a similar vein, highlighting the expectations of the Cymreigyddion and to what extent Schulz was able to fulfil them.

Disgywliai'r Gymdeithas wybodaeth ehangach nag ym 1838 ac fe'i cawsant. Daeth Schulz i'r casgliad y gellid rhannu'r chwedlau i dri dosbarth: y rhai am Arthur yr arwr cenedlaethol o'r flwyddyn 600 hyd 1066, a'u lleoliad yng Nghymru; y rhai am Arthur a'i farchogion a'r Ford Gron o 1066 hyd 1150 (gyda goresgyniad y Normaniaid a thuf sifalri), a'u lleoliad yn Llydaw, a'r rhai am Arthur a'r Seintgreal o 1150 hyd 1500 o Provence dan ddylanwad Sbaen. [...] Ond ni wyddai Gymraeg. Felly yr oedd bwch yn ei draethawd ef eto am na fedrodd roi tystiolaeth i'w gasgliadau o weithiau'r beirdd Cymraeg.³⁹⁴

³⁹³ M. E. Thomas, *Afiaith yng Ngwent*, p. 88.

³⁹⁴ *Ibid.*

[The Society expected more comprehensive erudition than in 1838 and they received it. Schulz came to the conclusion that the tales could be divided into three categories: those about Arthur the National hero from 600 to 1066, placed in Wales; those about Arthur and his Knights of the Round Table from 1066 to 1150 (with the Norman invasion and the growth of chivalry, placed in Brittany and those about Arthur and the Holy Grail from 1150 to 1500 from Provence under the influence of Spain. [...] But he did not understand Welsh. So there was a gap in his essay because he could not use evidence from the Welsh bards for his conclusion; my translation]

Despite the obvious gap in Schulz' essay, that was highlighted by the modern day scholar, it was received very favourably by his contemporaries and none of the reviewers in the British field commented on his lack of Welsh language skills, as will be shown in the next chapter. They were all, in a varying degree, impressed with his approach and the results he obtained. None of the reviewers criticised the division into three epochs as outlined above and the association of them with particular locations in Europe, Wales, Brittany and Provence/Spain. The major debate was therefore not centred on Schulz' findings but on the essay topic itself. Several of the reviewers questioned the relevance of the question of the influence that Welsh traditions had on European literature, probably bemused by the high premium that was paid for researching an insignificant subject. The only debatable issue that arose in the reviews was the question of the origin of the Arthurian tales in Wales or whether they were actually Breton. This dispute also took place in the light of tension on the British literary field, where its sub-fields, the Anglo-centric English and the Welsh field were in a hierarchical conflict. By having their essay topics reviewed in major British journals, the Cymreigyddion as representatives of the Welsh field were striving to improve their position within the larger British field. The importance of their contributions was contested by representatives of the English field as will become obvious in the analysis of the reviews in the next chapter.

5. Reception of the essay in the British field

In this chapter, the critical reception of Schulz' essay in the British literary field will be examined with the help of the theoretical framework of the literary fields which was introduced in chapter three. The critical reception in the British field ranged from very positive (the adjudicator Bunsen, the *Monthly Review*, the *Monthly Magazine*, and *Archaeologica Cambrensis*) to rather critical (*The Athenaeum* and *The Gentleman's Magazine*). Notably, the critical reviews are rather negative about the topic of the essay than of its content, structure and argument. This can be explained by taking into account the underlying struggles for dominance and influence within the British literary field. The Welsh literary field is a peripheral sub-field of the larger British field. Contributions in Welsh to the Welsh field are usually ignored in the British field due to the language barrier. English language entries from the Welsh field, however, are received in the British field, but their origin in a peripheral field, often considered inferior to the main field, impede the recognition of their value. Even the celebration of Welsh culture is subject to this dynamic, the field of power. As explained in chapter three, the eisteddfodau outside Wales in the dominant economic centres such as London and Liverpool had originally greater prestige and found more favourable reception than the patriotic festivals in Wales. Therefore, societies such as the Cymreigyddion had to strive for recognition of their efforts within the larger British field. The participation of foreign scholars in their competitions was seen as a validation and improvement of their position in the British field. This improvement of their position is detectable in the journals of the period regarding the reception of their efforts, as mentioned in chapter three with the label 'National Eisteddfod'. Furthermore, having an important foreigner such as the Prussian ambassador as adjudicator was another factor in the field of power, which added to the merit of the competition. His verdict on the essays would serve as the first validation of the submissions in the Welsh as well as the wider British fields and would lead to more reactions from participants in the field.

The first person to critically receive the essay was the judge Count von Bunsen, as he had to justify his decision to award the main prize to Schulz and not to the more famous La Villemarqué. Bunsen reported in a private letter, which the editors of the *Caernarvon and Denbighshire Herald* obtained, that it was indeed difficult for him to determine the winner between Schulz' and La Villemarqué's entries to the competition:

Royal Academies would esteem themselves fortunate in obtaining *one* essay equal in value to either of *two* which have been received by him on this occasion, and that it has been a work of time and difficulty to him to determine (not which *deserves*) but which to *deprive* of the prize.³⁹⁵

Further, Bunsen gives a very detailed explanation why it was so difficult for him to decide to place Schulz' essay ahead of La Villemarqué's contribution since he still feels that, although Schulz' essay undoubtedly merits the full award, La Villemarqué should have been given some reward in recognition of his efforts as well. First of all, he thinks that both essays arrived at the same conclusion:

That this society has called forth two books (not essays), which, between them, seem to comprise all the materials that can be brought forward, each of which answers the question proposed, and agrees in what is so very satisfactory, viz. in the same result.³⁹⁶

Bunsen's emphasis on the fact that the research, which was conducted independently by two scholars, lead to the same result can be understood as his approval of the veracity of the findings. Secondly, Bunsen also believes that both entries are of high scholarly quality and will be recognised as a significant contribution to the field claiming that 'they will form an epoch in the history of the literature of the middle ages'.³⁹⁷ Because of the similar result and the high quality of both essays, he even goes as far as to suggest to the Cymreigyddion to award a second prize to La Villemarqué:

Should there not be an extra exertion of generosity, as an acknowledgement? The German has undoubted right to the whole prize and premium, but the other ought to have the amount of the latter, or at all event, the sum of fifty pounds presented to him, as a token of acknowledgement for his valuable researches.³⁹⁸

This stands in stark contrast to the prize awarding ceremony two years prior to this competition, described in the previous chapter, where doubts were voiced that any of the submitted essays deserved the prize and the premium. Bunsen continues his eulogy of both essays with the following words:

I know of no instance of any private academy having ever been so fortunate as to call forth once such one production (not to say two) on one of the most intricate questions ever discussed, and never before discussed fairly and with the necessary means; a subject, also important for the general history of literature and civilization, and, finally, so decisive on the claims of the Cymry to a distinguished past in the same.³⁹⁹

³⁹⁵ *Caernarvon and Denbigh Herald*, 31 October 1840, (Vol. 10, no. 514), p. 174. [italics as in original]

³⁹⁶ *Ibid.*

³⁹⁷ *Ibid.*

³⁹⁸ *Ibid.*

³⁹⁹ *Ibid.*

In this passage, Bunsen reveals his affinity with Schlegel's theory of literary history, believing that by studying the history of literature, scholars can examine the history of civilization (*Bildungsgeschichte*) of the ancient peoples. Since there is no copy of La Villemarqué's original essay available, we are unable to compare his literary and culture-historical approach to that of Schulz.⁴⁰⁰ Schulz was, however, up against formidable competition, as the *Caernarvon and Denbigh Herald* confirms, revealing La Villemarqué's background:

[...] we also have the gratifying task of adding, that the second treatise of which the Chevalier speaks in such high terms is, we understand, the production of the Count de la Villemarqué, a Breton, a member of the Abergavenny Cymreigyddion, and who, it may be remembered, with other Breton gentlemen, accompanied Monsieur Rio, to this country, to be present at the anniversary of 1838, and we sincerely hope the suggestion of the learned judge may be adopted, and that he may receive a substantial proof of his literary merits being appreciated.⁴⁰¹

The editor of the newspaper highlights La Villemarqué's credentials, being a member of the Cymreigyddion, while Schulz was not, having already travelled in person to Abergavenny to attend the previous eisteddfod, whereas Schulz had not visited Wales. This high view of La Villemarqué is underpinned by the report in *Seren Gomer*, according to which La Villemarqué was the royal envoy from Louis Philippe of France to the 1838 Eisteddfod.⁴⁰² So it is not surprising that a certain uneasiness about La Villemarqué's essay being disregarded can be detected, and the enthusiastic agreement with Bunsen's recommendation to award the Breton scholar a second prize may point at a desire to

⁴⁰⁰ There is, in fact, an essay on the origin of the chivalrous romances of the Round Table added to La Villemarqué's *Contes populaires des anciens Bretons + essai sur l'origine des épopées chevalresques de la table-ronde*, (Paris: W. Coquebert, 1842), which could be an adaptation of his entry to the 1840 competition. It is, however, structured in a completely different manner to Schulz' essay, explaining in the first part the history of the principal characters of the Round Table, Arthur, Merlin, Lancelot, Tristan, Iwein and Érec while the second part contains the source criticism of the medieval sources for the Welsh and Breton traditions. The main focus of this publication lies on the translations of the tales into French, beginning Perceval and the Quest for the Holy Grail and Owain or the Lady of the Fountain in the first volume and Geraint and Peredur in the second, followed by a critical examination of the Breton sources, contrasting the possible Welsh elements with the supposedly Breton elements. This closing source criticism could also be derived from the essay submitted to the 1840 Eisteddfod. This stands in contrast to Schulz' 1841 publication which was entirely focussed on the essay, whereas Schulz 1842 publication follows the same rationale: the revised essay serves as the framework for the translations.

⁴⁰¹ *Caernarvon and Denbigh Herald*, 31 October 1840, (vol. 10, no. 514), p. 174.

⁴⁰² *Seren Gomer*, 21, no. 274, (July 1838), p. 220. 'CYMREIGYDDION Y FENNI. Mae'r Gymdeithas hon wedi creu cymaint o cynhwrf yn y Byd Llëenyddawl, mal y mae sôn am dani trwy holl Europ, yn enwedig yn Ffrainc, lle y sylwir ar ei Thestunau gyda hyfrydwch hyderus. O herywdd paham, mae LOUIS PHILIPPE, Brenin y Ffrancod, wedi penderfynu dafon CENADWR, ar draul y Llywodraeth, i Gylchwyf nesaf y Gymdeithas.' [spelling and emphasis as in original; 'Abergavenny Cymreigyddion. This society has caused such stir in the literary world that its name has resounded through Europe, particularly in France, where its subjects are noticed with confident delight. For this reason, Louis Philippe, the king of France, has decided to send an ambassador at the expenses of the government to the next anniversary of the society. My translation]

maintain good relations with La Villemarqué. Whether the Cymreigyddion followed Bunsen's recommendation or not is not revealed in the article.

The excerpt printed by the *Caernarvon and Denbigh Herald* is mainly concerned with the general observations about the quality of the essays and does not give detailed information on the actual arguments brought forward in them. The review in the *Archaeologia Cambrensis* of 1846, in contrast, contains substantial excerpts from Bunsen's adjudication from which it is possible to draw the main arguments of Bunsen for awarding the prize to Schulz. The combined verdict of the *Archaeologia Cambrensis*' reviewer on Schulz' essay and the adjudication of Bunsen will be analysed at the end of this chapter in order to maintain the chronology of events.

After Schulz' essay was awarded the prize, his essay was also recommended for translation into English and subsequently for publication. Therefore, the second person to receive Schulz' treatise was the translator. Frances Berrington, who was the sister of Sir Benjamin Hall and therefore held high position within the local cultural and social fields, was appointed to the task of translating Schulz' essay for the British public. Unusual for a translator, she went beyond a simple rendering of the German version into English. She read the essay with the critical regard of a reviewer and added several footnotes in which she added or corrected the information Schulz provided. She is another example of a highly educated lady among the pro-Welsh gentry in South Wales, albeit less famous than her contemporaries Lady Charlotte and Lady Augusta.

In the following sections, the interference of the translator will be examined according to the severity of the intervention, ranging from pure linguistic comments to critical remarks about content and argument to additions of large passages with content which was inaccessible to Schulz. The first instance, where the translator adds her own view on the text, occurs in Schulz' reiteration of Nennius' account of Arthur's pilgrimage to Jerusalem. The comment in a footnote is a linguistic correction and does not interfere with the argument itself. The passage describes Arthur's actions during his pilgrimage, making a cross to be consecrated there and gaining the benevolence of God through praying and fasting so that he might defeat the pagans. Schulz uses this passage to illustrate the image of Arthur as a Christian hero, as it culminates with the account of the legendary twelve battles and the special mention of the last battle where Arthur allegedly slew 840 pagan enemies with his own hand. Schulz compares this with the depiction of Charlemagne in

later sources which praise him as a defender of Christianity.⁴⁰³ Berrington translates all of the above in the body of the text and then comments on Schulz' German translation from the Latin text of Nennius.⁴⁰⁴ In a footnote to the twelve battles, she adds a linguistic remark to this quote, stating that Schulz' rendering of Latin *bellum* as 'Feldzugen [sic] is incorrect in the medieval context as the word *bellum* signified a *single battle*, not an *expedition*'.⁴⁰⁵ The remark about the alleged mistranslation of the word *bellum* is quite a bold intervention for the translator, as she claims to understand the fine semantics of German and Latin better than Schulz. This rather pedantic clarification is the first of many examples where Berrington corrects Schulz' statements or adds information she considers valuable for the readers.

The next level of interference by the translator consists in attempting to clarify Schulz' argument where it lacks a conclusive element. The first example of this is Schulz' discussion of Gildas, the earliest chronicler. He admits he had not seen Gildas' book *De excidio Britanniae*⁴⁰⁶ but he refers to Henry of Huntingdon's account thereof.⁴⁰⁷ According to Schulz, Henry affirms that Gildas corroborates the account of the twelve battles of Arthur found in Nennius. In the eighth battle, Arthur, having suddenly been elevated to the rank of a king, carried the image of the Holy Virgin Mary on his shoulders. Schulz, however, find this account 'suspicious' since he recalls that Geoffrey of Monmouth affirmed in his *Historia* that neither Gildas nor Bede mention Arthur or many other celebrated kings.⁴⁰⁸ The translator comments on this in a footnote saying '[t]his suspicion will appear altogether unfounded, when it is recollected that the work of Nennius is

⁴⁰³ Schulz, 1841, p. 9.

⁴⁰⁴ At the time, there was no German translation of Nennius' chronicle available in German so this is indeed Schulz' own translation from the Latin. Schulz was also the first scholar to publish a critical edition of the Latin text in 1844. This was later superseded by Theodor Mommsen's edition 1894–98.

⁴⁰⁵ Berrington (translator) in Schulz 1841, p. 9. The translator also adds a lengthy quote in an additional footnote (on the same page Schulz quotes Stevenson's editions of *Nennius* in a short footnote), first Stevenson's *Nennius* in Latin, then a summary of the Vatican copy of *Nennius* published by Gunn highlighting the differences to Stevenson's edition. By going into semantic details, she displays her own erudition in Latin and in Medieval Studies, which she highlights in particular by contrasting two different manuscripts of the same passage.

⁴⁰⁶ The book's title is in fact *De excidio et conquestu Britanniae*, Latin text available on <http://www.kmatthews.org.uk/history/gildas/gildas1.html> [accessed 18 March 2012]

⁴⁰⁷ Henry of Huntingdon (c. 1080s – 1155) quotes Nennius' description of the twelve battles in his chronicle *Historia Anglorum* 'The twelfth was a hard-fought battle with the Saxons on Mount Badon, in which 440 of the Britons fell by the swords of their enemies in a single day, none of their host acting in concert, and Arthur alone receiving succour from the Lord. These battles and battle-fields are described by Gildas the historian [Forester's footnote 2: 'Henry of Huntingdon quotes Nennius under this name' (transl. Forester, Thomas, London: Henry G. Bohn, 1853, p. 49)]

⁴⁰⁸ Schulz, 1841, p. 11.

frequently attributed to Gildas. —TR.⁴⁰⁹ In fact, Schulz is right to doubt the existence of a list of Arthur's battles in Gildas' book, as Henry of Huntingdon claims. Gildas does mention Ambrosius Aurelius as a leader who fought the Saxons and, in a different passage, he also mentions the battle of Mount Badon as a decisive victory against the Saxons, but in this context, no leader is named, neither Ambrosius, Arthur nor any other king. Schulz published an edition of *Nennius und Gildas* in 1844 where this fact becomes obvious.⁴¹⁰

Schulz must have realised the anachronism concerning the mention of Arthur in different chronicles, ranging from the early seventh to the ninth centuries. Bede, the oldest chronicle but one, dating to the early eighth century, does not contain any trace of Arthur, but the oldest chronicle, attributed to Gildas in the early seventh century, apparently presents Arthur as a Christian hero with a well-developed legend around his person, as does the ninth century compilation by Nennius. This may have been the cause for Schulz' suspicion that Henry of Huntingdon confused Nennius with Gildas but he was not certain enough to make that claim openly. This instance proves again Schulz' insecurity as a newcomer in the field resulting in a cautious approach without delving deeper into the source criticism. He is content to flag up the anachronism in order to encourage other scholars to find a confirmation for his theory. The translator realizes this and tries to resolve the issue in her footnote marked TR. This intervention goes one step further than the previous one, where she only commented on a semantic question. Here she actively engages with Schulz' argument and tries to improve the reasoning with her input.

The interventions of the translator become bolder throughout the chapter and she even adds new content to the argument, especially from sources that were not available to Schulz on the continent or in languages that he could not read. For instance, she does not agree with Schulz' account of Arthur carrying the Holy Virgin's image on his shoulders and therefore adds another footnote taken from *Hanes Cymru* by Rev. Thomas Price:

Y mae yr ymadrodd '*super humeros suos*' — '*ar ei ysgwyddau*' yn y darn Lladin uchod, yn fy nhueddu yn fawr i dybied fod yr awdwr yn cyfieithu o'r Gymraeg, ac yn camgymeryd yr ystyr. Y gair Cymraeg *Ysgwyd, Tarian*, ac *Ysgwydd, aelod o'r corff*, ydynt mor gyffelyb, yn endwedig mewn hen ysgrifiau, ac mai hawdd fyddai eu camsynied; ac yn lle cyfieithu '*Ar ei darian*', rhoddi '*Ar ei ysgwyddau*'. Ac mae Gruffydd ap Arthur yn rhoddi yr ymadrodd yn fwy eglur, yn y modd canlynol:—

⁴⁰⁹ Ibid.

⁴¹⁰ Schulz, *Nennius et Gildas* 1844, p. 153. Aurelius Ambrosius as a prominent leader is mentioned in the Latin text in §25 while the battle at Mons Badonis is mentioned in §26.

‘Humeris quoque suis, clypeum vocabulo, Priwen ; in quo imago Sanctæ Mariæ, etc.’
‘Ac ar ei ysgwyddau, darian, a elwid Pridwen, ar ba un yr oedd llun y Sanctaidd Fair,
etc’.⁴¹¹

For the English speaking readers she translates it subsequently as follows:

The expression *super humeros suos*, upon his shoulders, in the above Latin sentence inclines me to think that the author translated from the Welsh, and mistook the meaning of the original. The Welsh word *Ysgwyd* a Shield and *Ysgwydd* a shoulder, are so similar, especially in old writings, as easily to occasion mistakes, and to cause the words to be translated on his shoulder instead of on his shield. And Gruffydd ap Arthur (Geoffrey of Monmouth) gives the words more explicitly, as follows: ‘*Humeris quoque suis, [...] Sanctæ Mariæ, etc.*’ Upon his shoulders his shield called *Priwen*, upon which was the image of the Holy Virgin.⁴¹²

The translator also includes Price’s excerpt of the elegy of *Llywarch Hên* upon his son *Gwên* to further illustrate the difference between *ysgwyd* and *ysgwydd*. In medieval Welsh, the letter ‘d’ could stand for both sounds [d] and [ð], especially when occurring finally. The latter is represented by ‘dd’ in modern Welsh.⁴¹³ The translator therefore adds an essential Welsh language source – *Hanes Cymru* by Thomas Price was the latest work in the field, representing the current state of scholarship on Welsh history – to add critical depth to the textual analysis, since the knowledge of Welsh is central to identifying the mistake that the medieval translator made when he translated from Welsh into Latin. In the essay, it becomes obvious that Schulz cannot read the Welsh sources, since his knowledge of Welsh is virtually non-existent. He admits to his lack of language skills indirectly in his discussion of the Welsh language:

The language of the Welsh was *strange* and *disagreeable* to the Normans, they always called it *barbarous*; the Welsh were never very communicative to strangers, and we now deeply lament the patriotic pride of the writers of that day, who *obstinately* persisted in only making use of the *difficult* language of their country, and thus were themselves the authors of the *obscurity* which still veils a large portion of their literature; while Gildas, Bede, Nennius, and others, who wrote in Latin, became the study and delight of all.⁴¹⁴

This passage is of particular interest, as Schulz criticises the Welsh for using their language and thus making their rich literature inaccessible to a larger audience, whereas the

⁴¹¹ Berrington in Schulz, 1841, p. 10, quoting Thomas Price, *Hanes Cymru, a chenedl y Cymry, o’r cynoesoedd hyd at farwolaeth Llewelyn ap Gruffydd; ynghyd a rhai cofiaint perthynol i’r amseroedd o’r pryd hynny i waered* (Crughywel: T. Williams, 1842 [appeared in 14 vols 1836–1842]), p. 261.

⁴¹² Berrington in *ibid.*, her translation of Thomas Price, *Hanes Cymru*, p. 261.

⁴¹³ D. Simon Evans, *A Grammar of Middle Welsh* (Dublin: Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies, 1964 [2003]), p. 7.

⁴¹⁴ Schulz, 1841, p. 38. [my emphasis]

Welshmen who wrote in Latin could be read by all educated readers. The choice of vocabulary, in particular the highlighted adjectives and adverbs, is throughout negative and judgemental. The first two phrases showcase the prejudice of contemporaries of the medieval chroniclers, while Schulz' opinion is clear in the second part, where he hides behind the academic *pluralis modestis*. On the other hand, the 'we' could also be understood to include all non-Welsh speaking scholars with an interest in the subject who cannot access all relevant sources for a thorough study of the subject due to their inability to read Welsh. It is also interesting to note that there is no evidence that Schulz ever attempted to learn Welsh. Schulz' comments on the language stand in stark contrast to the objective of the essay and it is not surprising to read the translator's retort. She uses the Welsh source to underline that, if one endeavours to write an essay on Welsh traditions, one should at least have a working knowledge in the language. This point is also taken up by later critics who doubt whether Schulz was qualified to write the essay. Furthermore, the entire explanation of the translator actually occupies more space on the page than Schulz' arguments, highlighting her knowledge in the field. By this strategy, the translator also seeks to establish herself in the argument and, by extension, also in the literary field.

In the course of the first chapter, Berrington also corrects several facts which she believes are incorrect. When Schulz dates the *Historia Regum Britanniae* to 1140 or later, she adds a footnote stating that Henry of Huntingdon allegedly reported to have seen the book on the continent in 1139.⁴¹⁵ Then, from simply correcting a date, she ventures further in subsequent chapters. In the second part the chapter on Welsh traditions in French literature, the translator adds a lengthy footnote to correct an obvious error made by Schulz. To support his argument for Brittany as the focal point of the collection and dissemination of the original Welsh tales, he quotes a passage of Geoffrey of Monmouth taken from Turner's *Vindication* 'Dux Venedotorum Perederus bella gerebat!'⁴¹⁶ He comments on this with 'I know of no Venedoti in Wales, but there were Veneti who inhabited Vannes, near the bay of Morbihan. The Bretons have appropriated Peredur to themselves.'⁴¹⁷ The translator retorts as follows:

⁴¹⁵ Berrington's footnote in Schulz, 1841 p. 18.

⁴¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 33. [Peredur, leader of the Venedoti, fought many battles, my translation]

⁴¹⁷ *Ibid.*

[t]he *Venedoti* are the people of *North Wales*. They are mentioned by Geoffrey of Monmouth as acting in conjunction with the *Demeti*, or people of South Wales, and the other British tribes.⁴¹⁸

She then quotes a passage from Geoffrey of Monmouth in Latin which enumerates the Celtic inhabitants of the Isles of Britain: the Venedoti, Demeti, Deiri and Albani, or North Walians, South Walians, Irish and Scottish, to support her argument and then also refers to other Latin chroniclers such as Giraldus Cambrensis and Alanus de Insulis, all of whom spoke of the Venedoti, thus highlighting that in this case, Schulz' reading for the essay was rather limited or superficial. If he had read at least one of the sources attentively, he might have understood that the Venedoti were indeed natives of Wales. In this instance, the translator uses Latin sources to point out that the information should have been available to Schulz and she further establishes her position in the literary field by showcasing her knowledge of the relevant sources.

Besides correcting the facts presented by Schulz, Berrington also engages with his arguments when it comes to the question which country provided more sources for the Arthurian legends, Wales or Brittany. She criticises Schulz' opinion on the language in which the *liber vetustissimus*, the very ancient book that allegedly is Geoffrey's source, was written. Schulz translates the *Britannici sermonis* as 'Bas Breton', or 'niederbretonisch'⁴¹⁹ [low Breton], but Berrington disagrees in a footnote:

Though under the necessity of following the Author in this rendering of the original words, yet the Translator by no means concurs with him in its accuracy, as it is not said that the work alluded to was written in the *Bas Breton*, but in the *British* [Britannici sermonis.] And it is even maintained by some that the word *Britannia* does not refer to *Brittany* but to *Wales*. The same observation will apply to the word *Breton*, in several other places in this Essay. TR⁴²⁰

This becomes a leitmotif in her appraisal of Schulz. There are indeed numerous instances where the translator adds the word Breton in a footnote and refers back to this comment. Here, the translator clearly endorses the agenda of the Cymreigyddion, staking a claim on the ancient sources for the British that is the Welsh, while Schulz holds the belief that the first written documents, viz. the *liber vetustissimus*, if it actually existed, was more likely to have been written in Brittany than in Wales due to the historical and political

⁴¹⁸ Berrington's footnote in *ibid.*, p.34. She is correct, as Venedoti is at the origin of the name Gwynedd and Demeti is behind the name Dyfed, two ancient provinces of Wales.

⁴¹⁹ *Ibid*, p. 18.

⁴²⁰ Berrington's footnote in *ibid.*, 1841, p. 18.

circumstances which he illustrated in detail in the sections on the early transmission and development of the Arthurian material in the periods 600–1066 and 1066–1150, the first and second stages of tradition.

Considering the interventions outlined above, it is fair to say that the translator exceeded her function of merely translating a source text, but acted more like an editor or reviewer of Schulz' treatise. Beginning with a short comment on the semantics of the translation of a single word, she actively engages with Schulz' arguments and imposes her views on them by adding her viewpoint in the footnotes. By adding sources that were inaccessible to Schulz due both to the geographical and the linguistic distance, she increases the academic value of the essay by giving it more substance. On the other hand, one could argue, she also strengthens her own position in the literary field at the expense of Schulz, since the readers will read her comments alongside Schulz' original arguments and their image of Schulz and the translator will be shaped by them. Schulz' value as a player in the British field could decline due to the translator's actions whereas she manages to establish herself in the literary field through the translation combined with editing the text. At the time, women were a minority in the field as their academic capabilities were often not given full credentials. Acting as a translator for a male author or publishing academic work in the guise of a translation provided women with the opportunity to enter the field 'through the back-door'. In similar vein, Lady Charlotte Guest published her *Mabinogion* under the pretext of dedicating the tales to her two eldest sons Ivor and Merthyr to make her work acceptable in the eyes of her contemporaries.⁴²¹ She accepted William Owen Pughe's interpretation of the name 'Mabinogion' which he suspected was a plural form of 'mabinogi', derived from the Welsh word 'mab' meaning 'boy' or 'son'. He referred to the *Mabinogion* tales as 'Juvenilities', not realising that 'mabinogion' only occurred once in the entire manuscripts at the end of the first branch of the Mabinogi, *Pwyll Pendefic Dyfed*, since the added plural ending –ion, or –yon in medieval spelling, was only the mistake of the scribe, copying it from the line above *dyledogyon* to result in *mabynnogyon*.⁴²²

It is rather doubtful that her translations, had she published them as a scholarly edition, would have had the positive reception throughout Britain and, via further translation by Schulz and de la Villemarqué, also in Europe. Her translations were widely received by the same periodicals around the same time as Schulz' essay. Ernst Susemihl, Schulz' critical

⁴²¹ R. Guest, A. V. John, *Lady Charlotte Guest, An Extraordinary Life*, p. 101.

⁴²² *Ibid.*

reviewer, also reviewed Guest's translations for the *Neue Jenaische Allgemeine Literatur-Zeitung*.⁴²³ He is generally more positive about her work than he was about Schulz' essay. He criticises a few inaccuracies in her notes to the text but in the end, he praises her work with the concluding paragraph:

Zum Schluss noch die Bemerkung, dass man die Gelehrsamkeit und Belesenheit der Lady Guest nicht genug bewundern kann. Man könnte glauben, sie habe sich mit fremden Federn geschmückt; doch wie ich von einer mit ihr genau bekannten englischen Familie höre, ist alle ihre eigene Arbeit. 'She is mad for Welsh,' fügte der Gentleman hinzu.⁴²⁴

Susemihl's review contains several references back to Schulz' German translation, this time without any criticism directed at him. Susemihl even implies that Schulz' translation may be well-known among interested readers:

Über 'Peredur' und 'Geraint' kann ich mich hier ebensowenig verbreiten, da auch diese beiden Mabinogion aus San-Marte's Übersetzung als bekannt vorauszusetzen sind.⁴²⁵

Berrington's translation was crucial in bringing Schulz to the attention of the wider British field. Periodicals showed a reasonable degree of interest. Five reviews dating from December 1841 to April 1846 were published in five different periodicals. The analysis of the reception in these journals will be conducted chronologically, beginning with the first two reviews which were published in December 1841, immediately after the essay's publication in English, by two renowned British journals. Both the *Monthly Review* and the *Monthly Magazine* viewed the essay in a rather positive light.⁴²⁶ The third and fourth reviews were somewhat critical, although the third, a short review published by the prestigious, London-based periodical *Athenaeum* in January 1842, finds the fault mainly

⁴²³ Ernst Susemihl, 'The Mabinogion, from the Llyfr Coch o Hergest and other Welsh manuscripts: with an English translation and notes by Lady Charlotte Guest. Part I–IV, London, Longman, 1838–42.' in *Neue Jenaische Allgemeine Literatur-Zeitung*, 6, no. 99–100 (26–27 April 1847), pp. 394–400.

⁴²⁴ Ibid., p. 400. [spelling as in original]

⁴²⁵ Ibid., p. 399. [spelling as in original]

⁴²⁶ The *Monthly Review*, founded in 1749 in London and discontinued in 1844, was a medium for reviewing books, essays and other academic publications. The *Monthly Magazine*, a similar periodical, was published from February 1796 to June 1843. Both periodicals can be accessed in digital mode at the electronic database of British Periodicals, (all issues available)

Monthly Review: <<http://0-search.proquest.com.unicat.bangor.ac.uk/publication/3079/citation/1426C8AEB3D61AB94E5/8?accountid=14874>> [accessed 30 July 2010].

Monthly Magazine: <http://0-gateway.proquest.com.unicat.bangor.ac.uk/openurl?url_ver=Z39.88-2004&res_dat=xri:bp:&rft_dat=xri:bp:journal:e732> [accessed 30 July 2010].

with the topic of the essay, not with the quality of the essay itself.⁴²⁷ The fourth review by the *Gentleman's Magazine*⁴²⁸ in the February issue of 1842 reflects the views voiced by the *Athenaeum's* reviewer but is more detailed. Furthermore, the *Gentleman's Magazine's* reviewer also aims moderate criticism at Schulz' findings, but still deems the essay worthy of the attention of its readers and, in the end, happens to agree with the majority of Schulz' findings. These four reviews showcase the variation of reception within the larger British literary field, ranging from favourable to critical and condescending. The fifth review by the reviewers of *Archaeologica Cambrensis* was published much later, in the April issue of 1846.⁴²⁹ It defends Schulz' work as well as the choice of topic, thus it can be seen as a response to the two former critical reviews.

The case of Schulz' essay and its reception illustrate the broader background of the power struggles in the literary fields in Britain. The *Archaeologica Cambrensis* functions as the figure head for the Welsh literary field whereas the *Gentleman's Magazine* and the *Athenaeum* represent the British literary field. By publishing a literary periodical, the members of Welsh field sought to establish themselves within the British field and to gain a recognised academic status. The struggle for position reflects the relations within the field of power of Bourdieu. A peripheral occupant of the field attempts to move towards the centre of the field and to establish connections with more members in the field and adjacent fields. The occupants of the central positions in the field rebuke the attempts of the candidates in the periphery to improve their position. The infamous *Blue Books Report* of 1847, depicting the Welsh as an uneducated, immoral and culturally inferior people, can be seen as a manifestation of these tensions in the field of power. This Bourdieuan struggle happens both on the large scale between two cultures, the English core versus the Welsh periphery, as well as on the smaller scale in a given literary field, so for instance in the German literary field, where Schulz' attempt to move towards the centre, occupied by the more experienced players, is thwarted by an already established player, his reviewer

⁴²⁷ The *Athenaeum* was published from January 1828 to February 1929. All issues from no. 1 to 4737 are available online at the data base of British Periodicals. <<http://0-search.proquest.com.unicat.bangor.ac.uk/publication/2299?accountid=14874>> [accessed 30 July 2010].

⁴²⁸ The *Gentleman's Magazine* was published from Jan. 1731 (Vol. 1, no. 1) to Sep 1907 (Vol. 303, no. 2121), available also at the same database of British Periodicals. <<http://0-search.proquest.com.unicat.bangor.ac.uk/publication/1468/citation/1426C8AEB3D61AB94E5/3?accountid=14874>> [accessed 30 July 2010].

⁴²⁹ *Archaeologia Cambrensis* is the flag ship of multi-disciplinary Welsh studies, including history, archaeology, heraldry, genealogy, toponymy, manuscripts, etc. and has been published from 1846 to the present day.

Susemihl. This review will be discussed in the chapter on the reception of the essay in Germany. First, the reviews of the English translation will be examined.

The first review, in the *Monthly Review* of December 1841, is by far the longest of the five, encompassing fifteen pages, although it has to be noted that about half of the review's length are quotes from Schulz' essay to illustrate the statements by the reviewer about the quality of the piece. The prestige of the essay is further enhanced by the fictitious title given to Schulz, 'Professor Schulz'.⁴³⁰ In terms of the field theory, this can be seen as an attempt to give further value to it by elevating the author to a higher academic rank than he actually possessed in reality. Schulz would receive a doctor honoris causae in 1864 but in 1840, he was simply a graduate of the Faculty of Law in Berlin and thus had no academic credentials in a relevant field for the competition. The title Professor Schulz was used for the first time in the reports from the Eisteddfod itself, published in several newspapers in Britain. When the winner of the fourteenth competition of the first day of the Eisteddfod 1840 is announced, Schulz is introduced to the audience as Professor Schultz [sic]. Since this dates back to the first reports about the eisteddfod, it appears to be an attempt by the Cymreigyddion to give additional value to their competition by boosting the academic credentials of the candidates. The higher the apparent ranking of the winner is, the more impact his contribution can have on the literary field. The reviewers of the first periodicals to publish a review of Schulz' essay adopted the title without question. Later reviews simply copied the title from the earlier publications. The reviewer in the *Monthly Review* also tells us that 'several Essays were received from different parts of the continent, written principally in German and French'.⁴³¹ Thus, he does not reveal that there were only three entries to the competition but leaves the statement open, thus increasing, deliberately or otherwise, the prestige of the literary contest by giving it the appearance of a top tier competition in which scholars from all over Europe took part.

Next, 'His Excellency Count Bunsen, Prussian Minister Plenipotentiary', is introduced as the judge appointed to the competition and the reviewer reports that his 'eminent literary attainments rendered him peculiarly qualified for the task'.⁴³² The purpose of listing Bunsen's noble and political titles and his experience in the literary field is to raise the profile of the competition in the estimation of the audience. Considering the background of

⁴³⁰ *Monthly Review*, 3.4 (Dec 1841) Art. IV. 'An Essay on the Influence of Welsh Tradition upon the Literature of Germany, France and Scandinavia. By Albert Schulz. Llandovery', 473–487 (p. 473).

⁴³¹ *Ibid.*

⁴³² *Ibid.*

the journal, it is not too surprising that the reviewer endeavoured to increase status of both the essay and its topic within the British field. The *Monthly Review* was founded by Ralph Griffiths, a London-based bookseller and editor with Welsh ancestry. In the following analysis of the *Monthly Review's* verdict on Schulz' essay, a very favourable attitude towards the Welsh revival and the Cymreigyddion will become apparent.

The reviewer devotes almost an entire page to the discussion of Schulz' introduction which he deems 'deserving of attention'.⁴³³ He highlights Schulz' firm grounding in Herderian and Schlegelian concepts by copying verbatim the introduction '[i]t says that, in the intellectual life of a people, Heroic Tradition forms a separate organization, to which belong its own laws of development.' This is followed by repeating the four main principles, upon which Schulz is going to base his research, almost word by word, only adding the introductory 'first' 'that' and 'when' [the additions are highlighted below, the rest is Schulz' introduction]:

First, that History is the principal basis of Tradition; and that at a later period it is from History that the elements for the further development of Tradition are drawn. *That* History springs and grows at a period when Poetry and History itself are confounded together, and *when* the truth of Tradition is never doubted. *That* it is on this account we see historical facts appropriated to fabulous heroes, often occasioning the greatest anachronisms and most heterogeneous combinations.

Secondly, that the organic life of Tradition is seen in the tendency to unite different tales which were previously altogether independent of each other; *and hence* the want of that unity which belongs to poetic fiction.

There are no indications that the above is a direct quote from the essay but the reviewer rather gives the impression that he is summarizing Schulz' argument. Only the third point of Schulz' introduction is marked as a quote by double inverted commas, however not marking the entire quote as such but leaving out the conclusion: 'This is the first indication of a departure from the essentially poetical principle of Tradition,'⁴³⁴ thus making it appear to be his own conclusion of the third point. The first half of the fourth point, again, is copied without marking it as a citation.

By copying almost the entire foreword verbatim in the review, occupying almost an entire page, the reviewer emphasises the significance of Schulz' approach to the essay. The anonymous author does not link the ideas to their origins in Herder's and Schlegel's

⁴³³ Ibid.

⁴³⁴ Ibid.

theories, so it appears that he does not recognise the background but appreciates nonetheless the historicist approach which Schulz had chosen. The reviewer concludes that the ‘very learned professor has observed these key points throughout his arguments and researches’.⁴³⁵

For most of the critique of Schulz’ essay, the reviewer continues to quote extensively from the text. He begins the discussion of Schulz’ first chapter on Arthur, the national hero from 600–1066 with Schulz’ metaphorical comparison of King Arthur to the root of a gigantic tree whose branches have spread over the whole of Europe over a millennium. The reviewer obviously found the use of Arthur as an illustration of the organic nature of tradition an apt introduction to the chapter. His preference for Schulz’ illustrations of the organic life of poetry and tradition can be observed in several instances throughout the review. One example is the reference to Schulz’ description of the principles how traditions are propagated from one culture to another:

He happily observes that tradition is not wafted from country to country like a light seed at the mercy of winds; for that it is a part of the intellectual life of a people to whom it belongs, and cannot take root beyond the limits of the material and intellectual power of that people.⁴³⁶

The second key topic for the reviewer is apparently the emphasis on the Christian element in the Arthurian traditions from the ninth century onwards. In the introductory paragraph on Arthur, he mainly concentrates on the more elaborate descriptions of Arthur’s deeds in various chronicles (mainly Nennius) and condenses them into the picture of the Christian hero who protects Christian Britain against the pagans. The reviewer thus summarises Schulz’ lengthy argument into one paragraph by putting emphasis on the point that historical figures are incorporated in myths over many centuries, until they have been elevated to ‘miraculous sanctity’, thus endorsing the first point of Schulz’ foreword. He quotes Schulz’ research questions to make the focus of the essay clear to the readers:

To whom do Arthur and his warriors owe their poetical resurrection, – to the Welsh, or to the Bretons? And why should Arthur be selected above all others? Was it in Wales, or in Brittany, that he was chosen as the centre of this new creation?⁴³⁷

In his comment on the research questions, the reviewer alludes to the national motives that are behind the competition:

⁴³⁵ Ibid., p. 474.

⁴³⁶ Ibid., p. 475, quoting Schulz, 1841, p. 22.

⁴³⁷ Ibid., quoting Schulz, p. 22.

To these questions, the author of the Essay before us addresses himself, and in the course of discussing them indicates how Welsh tradition came to have a remarkable influence on the literature of France; thus conferring an honour upon the ancient Britons which their real or supposed descendants in Wales will even at this day fondly accept.⁴³⁸

In this statement the reviewer shows that he fully understands the importance of Schulz' findings for the national cause of the Cymreigyddion society and, indirectly, he hints that Schulz wrote his essay especially to meet the agenda of the society, formulating his results in a manner that emphasises the importance of the Welsh contributions to the Arthurian material. The translator sought to further increase the significance of the Welsh origins by correcting Schulz' label 'Breton' for some traditions with 'Briton' in the footnotes. These may have caught the eye of the reviewer and the above comment could be understood as a comment to the attempts of the translator to emphasise the Welsh origins further. By commenting on it, he brings the issue to the attention of his readers. Thus, it can be concluded that he supported Schulz' findings.

The formulation 'real or supposed descendants', by contrast, expresses a slight doubt about the claim that the Welsh are definitely the descendants of the ancient Britons whose king Arthur was and whether they were actually Celts or belonged to another people. This remark echoes one of the great linguistic and historical mysteries of the time, when the question of the origin of the Celtic languages and their degree of kinship was hotly debated across the journals of Britain. The episode, previously mentioned in chapter three, of exchanges between several scholars in *The Gentleman's Magazine* in the years before the competition illustrates this dispute. The claim, that Welsh is actually nothing more than a dialect of Gaelic and that all Celtic languages are more or less mutually intelligible dialects of each other is countered by the opposite claim that Welsh is not even Celtic, but rather distantly related to the Semitic languages.⁴³⁹ This debate takes place against the background of the appropriation of King Arthur as a British, or more precisely, an English hero. Any proof of a definite Welsh origin for King Arthur would therefore deeply disturb the historical world view of some Anglo-centric scholars.⁴⁴⁰

⁴³⁸ Ibid., p. 475.

⁴³⁹ Cf. a series of 'Letters' in *Gentleman's Magazine* issues Mai 1836 to February 1839. The discussion started with the claim that the language of the Cymru could be a descendant of the dialect of Babel in August 1836; in later issues, the possible Eastern origin and the degree of kinship of the Celtic languages was hotly contested between Fionn Ghael (Scotsman), an anonymous Welsh Antiquary, and James Logan (Englishman).

⁴⁴⁰ Cf. Bryden, Inga 'Ethnology and the Search for Origins' in: *Reinventing King Arthur* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2005), pp. 33-47, (p. 35): [...] the second half of the nineteenth century saw an increased antipathy towards Celtic peoples and Celticism [...], which had developed partly from the immigration of Irish labourers due to

This underlying tendency to national appropriation becomes more obvious in the section in which the reviewer explores Schulz' reasoning as to why Arthur and not Merlin was chosen as the centre of tradition. He refers to Merlin's prophecy that 'Arthur will re-appear', which was a politically motivated prophecy from the twelfth century by Geoffrey of Monmouth to give the Welsh hope in their battles against the threat of the Norman and Marcher Lords. The reviewer then reiterates Schulz' argument for the need for a focal point for posterity and that the King was the *national* centre.⁴⁴¹ In Schulz' argument, however, it reads: 'The *natural* centre was the king'.⁴⁴² This error reveals the nationalistic colouring of the debate around the origin of the Arthurian legends, while Schulz had a different argument in mind. For him, the most important factor for the development of the Arthurian tales was the Schlegelian idea of tradition having the natural tendency to condense and amplify tales and to attribute completely unrelated stories all to one grand personality, most naturally the king. The reviewer, in contrast, seems to view heroic traditions as the earliest manifestations of nationalism, thus showing his orientation in the cultural-political discourse of the period. He also omits the comparison to a similar process in the development of the Charlemagne material, which Schulz used as a model to explain the changes in the narratives from the first original poems about Arthur as compared to the later stages of tradition.

In the first four pages of the review, the anonymous author engages with the topics that are the most important for the on-going debate about the ancient British, read Welsh, traditions within the literary field and highlights the passages of Schulz' arguments which bring to the fore the latter's results. This is a reflection of the cultural-political orientation of the journal as a product of an editor of Welsh origin. The remainder of the review, by contrast, contains far less comment and analysis of the content. Indeed, the reviewer appears not to have had the time to actively engage with Schulz' argument. This explains the increasing number and length of direct quotes from the essay, including one substantial extract encompassing three and a half pages.⁴⁴³ The reviewer explains his choice of the long citation as follows: 'We shall here quote our author at considerable length. The extract will

the Potato Famine of the mid-1840s. So writers faced a problem in trying to reconcile Arthur's role as a national hero with both a contemporary pride in Anglo-Saxonism and a tradition of anti-Celtic sentiment.'

⁴⁴¹ *Monthly Review*, 3.4 (Dec. 1841), p. 477.

⁴⁴² Schulz, 1841, p. 30.

⁴⁴³ *Monthly Review* 3.4 (1841), pp. 477–80.

exhibit the professor's antiquarian learning to advantage'.⁴⁴⁴ This bears witness to the admiration the reviewer has for Schulz:

With a true German industry and talent he [Schulz] must have pursued the study of languages foreign to him,⁴⁴⁵ and with the zeal of a perfect book-worm explored many a library, and deciphered many an ancient document.⁴⁴⁶

This judgement on Schulz' character as a researcher reflects the stereotype of the period about German scholars as excellent philologists and linguists, based on the reputation of internationally well-known figures such as the Brothers Grimm. Even the more critical reviewer of the *Gentleman's Magazine* lauds Schulz' work as a demonstration of diligence, elaboration and clarity typical of German scholars.

The whole of this [essay], which is the result of an industry and perseverance that generally distinguishes German writers, has been so well arranged, and, so far as the subject would admit, with such reference to dates, as renders it easy to be retained on the mind; the language is manly yet temperate, and the point to be established treated with impartiality.⁴⁴⁷

These statements about Schulz' profile as a researcher and the standard of his academic work are in stark contrast to the criticism voiced in the review concluding the discussion of the reception of the essay in its German revised edition, namely the review submitted by Ernst Susemihl in the *Neue Jenaische Allgemeine Literatur Zeitung*, which criticises Schulz' lack of real academic credentials.⁴⁴⁸ Whereas representatives of the British literary field apparently consider Schulz to be a member of the elite circle of scholars in Germany, Susemihl disagrees completely with this judgement.

The reviewer of the *Monthly Review* deals briefly with the content of third chapter of Schulz' history of Arthurian tradition which explains the incorporation of the motive of the Holy Grail into the French chivalric literature. Schulz claims that the saga of the Holy Grail is an addition of tales of the Order of Templars to the original Arthurian material,

⁴⁴⁴ Ibid.

⁴⁴⁵ Ironically, these do not include Welsh. The reviewer, however, seems to be unaware of Schulz' non-existent knowledge of Welsh or he chooses to ignore the hints given by the translator in the footnotes.

⁴⁴⁶ *Monthly Review* 3.4 (1841), 477.

⁴⁴⁷ 'An Essay on the Influence of Welsh traditions upon the Literature of Germany, France, and Scandinavia, translated from the German of Albert Schulz. Llandoverly. 1841.' in *Gentleman's Magazine*, (Feb. 1842), 169–174, (174).

⁴⁴⁸ Ernst Susemihl, 'Die Arthur-Sage und die Märchen des Rothen Buches von Hergest; Herausgegeben von San Marte (Albert Schulz)' in *Neue Jenaische Allgemeine Literatur-Zeitung*, (vol. 2, no. 231), 27–28 September 1843, pp. 933–940.

calling these tales the *Primitive Fable of Provence* originating in Spain and Provence.⁴⁴⁹ The anonymous reviewer summarises Schulz arguments but he also seems to think that these condensed theoretical parts are relatively hard to understand for the average reader when he introduces the next lengthy quote totalling four and a half pages:

But we shall not further detain our readers with an abstract of parts of the essay relative to Arthurian traditions, and the transformations to which they were subjected. [...] We quote a specimen of our author's theory, philosophy and manner concerning fable, especially the Mabinogion, which Lady Charlotte Guest's translations have in some measure made know in our pages.⁴⁵⁰

Following this, the reviewer quotes the entire chapter on the *Mabinogion* directly from Schulz' essay without commenting on it at all. His introductory remark quoted above, however, shows which aspects of Schulz' approach to the material have interested the reviewer in particular: the theory, philosophy and manner. This shows that the reviewer has understood Schulz' point of departure, not delivering a critical literary or philological analysis of the Welsh core materials, but rather concentrating on the thematic and philosophical aspects of the origin of the Welsh traditions. Schulz' main arguments in this chapter are centred around faith, doubt, mythology and Christianity.

After engaging superficially with Schulz' arguments brought forward in chapter one of the essay, the reviewer summarises chapters two, three and four in a very brief manner. The reviewer apparently did not want to discuss Schulz' arguments at length but indirectly tells the audience to read the essay for themselves and to draw their own conclusions from it:

Our author's disquisition on the influence of Welsh tradition on the literature of France, with regard to construction, and also his views relative to the same influence on the literature of Germany and of Scandinavia, *must be sought for in the Essay itself*.⁴⁵¹

The reviewer concludes the essay with a third extract of about two pages taken out of chapter five on the Fall of Chivalry, which again reflects the statement above, that the reader has to read it himself and draw his own conclusions. Overall, this appears to be a quickly written review without a thorough investigation of Schulz' arguments. The writer did not engage with Schulz' reasoning but filled fifteen pages with a few summarizing

⁴⁴⁹ *Monthly Review* 3.4 (1841), p. 481.

⁴⁵⁰ *Ibid.*

⁴⁵¹ *Ibid.*, p. 485.

paragraphs of Schulz' findings, notably the most important ones for the interests of the Cymreigyddion.

Similarly positive views are to be found in the *Monthly Magazine*, which published a short review, one paragraph, of Schulz' essay in their December issue of 1841, addressing Schulz as 'Professor' and claiming that it is '[a] production so full of learning and talent, so rationally elaborated, it has seldom been our lot to peruse'.⁴⁵² The anonymous reviewer also points out the rank and importance of the judge Chevalier Bunsen, who awarded the prize to Schulz. This usage of titles is similar to the *Monthly Review* as it serves again as a means to raise the prestige of the essay in the literary field. Not only the author of the essay is of academic rank, but also the judge is of a high rank in society and therefore the essay has rightfully won the first prize as the eisteddfod. By highlighting the status of both men in various fields, the reviewer acts as a promoting agent in the Bourdieuan sense, increasing the prestige of the essay. Furthermore, the anonymous reviewer also informs his readers about, in his opinion, the most interesting findings of Schulz' researches, namely the account of the *Mabinogion* and the development of Arthurian material from the Welsh origins to the chivalrous romances. The choice of bringing to the fore these particular two of the many topics that Schulz covered hints at the He calls Schulz findings 'singularly interesting' and 'highly instructive', overall using vocabulary with positive connotations. The reviewer concludes his eulogy with recommending the book 'to the judgement of all readers of taste and refinement'.⁴⁵³

A further short review appeared in the January 1842 issue of *Athenaeum*. It praises Schulz' academic efforts but states that the essay's topic is not of any interest to the general public but for a few patriotic Welshmen. The entire review consists of only two sentences as can be seen below:

Schulz' influence on Welsh tradition – Albert Schulz has undertaken, in this essay, to explain the circumstances which rendered the cycle of the romances of the Round Table so popular throughout Europe, that they may be said to have become naturalized in every part of Christendom. He has conducted the investigation with great zeal and ability, but the subject is too antiquarian to interest any but members of the Cymreigyddion Society.⁴⁵⁴

⁴⁵² 'Our Monthly Crypt' in *Monthly Magazine* 6.36 (Dec. 1841), p. 610.

⁴⁵³ Ibid.

⁴⁵⁴ 'OUR LIBRARY TABLE' in *Athenaeum*, no. 741 (8 January 1842), p. 38.

The first sentence starts with an abbreviation of the essay title; with Schulz' name added in italics, it appears as if Schulz himself had had an influence on Welsh literature. The review is marked by a contrast between the alluded popularity of the Arthurian romances throughout Europe and the dismissive judgement that the subject is only of importance to a small group of people in the periphery of the literary field. So, in the words of the *Athenaeum*'s reviewer, the Round Table is an essential part of Christian mythology but researching its origins and the tracking the history of its reception is irrelevant. Here, the historico-political agenda comes to the fore once more, as the English of the Romantic period were trying to claim King Arthur and the Round Table for themselves. Therefore, the emergence of a movement proclaiming the Celtic origin of Arthur irritated the cultural and historical understanding of the contemporary dominant literary field of Britain (the English-centred field) of Arthur as the emblem of ideal Britishness or more precisely Englishness.

By comparison the figure of King Arthur as an English national ideal has received far less attention in the twentieth century. In the nineteenth century, however, the Arthur-matter was considered representative of some form of ideal Englishness, and Britishness, which Scott's, Kingsley's and Gladstone's approaches have already indicated.⁴⁵⁵

Other English-centred journals wrote similarly dismissive reviews, not directed at Schulz' academic abilities but rather at the Cymreigyddion Society and its aims and ideals. The *Gentleman's Magazine*, for instance, discussed the issue of the Welsh revival in detail in a review of Schulz' essay in the February issue 1842. Spanning five and a half pages the review is one of the more detailed and also more critical ones. Generally speaking, the anonymous reviewer shows a relatively positive attitude towards Schulz' work, with some reservations, but a rather condescending attitude towards Welsh literature and tradition echoing the dismissive tone of the *Athenaeum* review. In addition to that the reviewer is continuously attempting to correct or supply additional information to Schulz' findings.

The review itself actually contains only very little about Schulz' essay, as roughly two thirds of the entire text elaborate on the anonymous reviewer's views on the (non-)

⁴⁵⁵ Maïke Oergel, 'The Representative National Individual: The Emergence of Siegfried and King Arthur' in *The Return of King Arthur and the Nibelungen*, (Berlin, New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1998), pp. 192–207, (p. 200). In order to illustrate these approaches, Oergel quotes Kingsley, speaking of 'the magnificent fables of King Arthur and his times which exercised so great an influence on the English mind, and were in fact, although originally Celtic, so thoroughly adopted and naturalised by the Saxon, as to reappear under different forms in every age.' (Kingsley, 'On English literature.' in *Literary and General Lectures and Essays*, p. 263.)

usefulness of keeping minority languages alive and the relations between the Celtic dialects, thus echoing the debate alluded to earlier. Furthermore, he uses the review also to showcase his own knowledge of the ancient Welsh traditions, the triads and the earliest bards. Based on this, he passes judgement on the question whether Brittany or Wales would be the true origin for the Arthurian legends. His verdict is even more in favour of Brittany as the focal point for the dissemination than Schulz', since he thinks that the findings of both Schulz and his predecessor Harding (the 1838 prize winner) are incomplete and promises the reader that he, the reviewer, will endeavour to supply this desideratum.⁴⁵⁶ Furthermore, all mentions of Welsh sources (regardless of whether they were written in Latin or in Welsh) are treated in a very dismissive way. The only instance where he insists on a Welsh origin is where the material is clearly fictional and has no historical truth in it, e.g. the issue with the alleged origin of the British from survivors of the Fall of Troy.

The review starts with an introductory section on 'two Societies in south Wales connected with the pursuits of literature'.⁴⁵⁷ The reviewer states that one of them is concerned with studying and publishing old manuscripts in medieval Welsh,⁴⁵⁸ whereas the other aims at encouraging modern publications in the Welsh language and the raises the question as to which one of these societies has the greater right of existence. The author mocks the endeavours of the Cymreigyddion Society, suggesting that 'with many well-thinking men, keeping alive the original language of the Principality is considered useless, and that the object of the Society, whose motto is Oes y byd i'r iaith Cymraeg, "The age of the world to the Welsh language," is wholly superfluous, [...]'⁴⁵⁹. He hides behind the 'well-thinking men', not stating explicitly whether he counts himself among them or not. The use of the adjective 'well-thinking', however, suggests that he agrees with them. His demeaning choice of words showcases the present struggle within the literary field, and by extension also in the larger social space, between the hegemonic power and the peripheral occupants. The entire review can be seen as a manifestation of the asymmetrical power relations within the British field. Thus, the Cymreigyddion are representatives of the periphery of

⁴⁵⁶ *Gentleman's Magazine*, (Feb. 1842), 169–174, (p. 169).

⁴⁵⁷ *Ibid.*

⁴⁵⁸ The Welsh Manuscript Society was founded by prominent members of the Cymreigyddion Society on 24 November 1836 who decided to establish a society 'for the purpose of printing ancient Welsh manuscripts.' Quote of W. J. Rees, handwritten on the back of a pamphlet in Mair Elvet Thomas, *Afiath yng Ngwent*, (Caerdydd: Gwasg Prifysgol Cymru, 1978), p. 9. It is further reported in Welsh that W. Williams, Benjamin Hall, Carnhuanacwc, Lady Greenly, W. J. Rees, W. A. Williams and John Bruce formed the first committee.

⁴⁵⁹ *Gentleman's Magazine*, p. 169.

the British field, while the *Gentleman's Magazine's* reviewer embodies the hegemonic, central power which exerts its dominant power over the participants in the periphery by denigrating their attempts to gain a better position within the larger field. Calling the efforts of the Cymreigyddion to keep the Welsh language alive 'superfluous' is a clear sign of this hegemonic relation within the field of power.

Moreover, the reviewer supports the argument of those who endorse the maxim 'one language for all' by referring to the Babel incident in the Bible, where God punished the people by giving them different languages so that they could no longer communicate effortlessly with each other. The reviewer thus sees minority languages as a punishment by God for the disobedience of mankind, and it is therefore desirable to abandon them in favour of the dominant language. Using a religious authority, he increases the pressure on the peripheral occupants in order to push them further out of the field. This is especially poignant, since the Bible translation into Welsh by Bishop William Morgan is widely regarded as one of the saving graces for the Welsh language when it was threatened by the rulings against it in the Acts of Union in 1536 and 1543.⁴⁶⁰

Given Schulz' own veiled criticism of the Welsh medieval authors who wrote in Welsh and thus are inaccessible to the majority of scholars, he appears to have shared the views of the reviewer to some extent. There is no evidence that he ever attempted to learn Welsh in order to communicate in the language, but he only focused on the research in the literary heritage of Wales. The reviewer clearly adopts this viewpoint as well: research into the ancient languages of the world is well justified but for the sake of practicality they should no longer be used for communication. He even states explicitly that those who criticise the use of minority languages 'think the Welsh and Gaelic had better, like the Cornish, fall into disuse; for, being now only of real service to the Antiquary, these dialects of the Celtic might be studied in the same manner as the Anglo-Saxon, the Greek and the Latin tongues'.⁴⁶¹ This describes precisely Schulz' motivation of taking part in the competition. He took interest in the obscure history of the Welsh traditions and treats them as an interesting subject for antiquarian studies but he did not consider it necessary to make and attempt at learning the language. In terms of hegemonic relations, Schulz thus inadvertently acts as a representative of a dominant centre, since he unwittingly embodies

⁴⁶⁰ William Morgan, *Y Beibl Cyssegr-Lan : sef yr Hen Destament a'r Newydd*, y cyfieithiad cyntaf i'r Gymraeg, gan William Morgan (Dolgellau: Ad-argraphwyd a chyhoeddwyd, gan R. Jones, 1821 [1588]).

⁴⁶¹ *Gentleman's Magazine*, (Feb. 1842), p. 169.

their view on the position and the treatment of dominated languages with an ancient literary history in the literary field. This is not too surprising since he originates in a dominant culture, speaking a majority language and therefore has a *habitus* that has been shaped by his upbringing in a dominant culture.⁴⁶² The members of the Cymreigyddion obviously interpreted his participation in the competition as a validation of their cause, but after the close reading of Schulz' essay, his motivation for entering the competition tends to agree rather with the stance of the reviewer of the *Gentleman's Magazine* on the importance of antiquarian studies than with the revival of the Welsh language which the Cymreigyddion were promoting.

The reviewer, concluding his introductory musings on the usefulness of the purpose of the Cymreigyddion Society, tries to place himself in a neutral position by saying that '[w]e ourselves, as reviewers, are not called upon to give our opinion on this matter, [...]'⁴⁶³ and he even goes so far to admit that the Society's activities are beneficial for the social, economic, and cultural life of the small town of Abergavenny.

Turning to the essay itself, the reviewer is generally positive about the essay, its translation and the printed edition:

In 1841[sic] another prize was announced, for nearly the same subject, confining the influence to Germany, France, and Scandinavia, when the Chevalier Bunsen, who was appointed to decide, gave his opinion in favour of the German composition of Professor Schulz, at the same time recommending a translation. A translation is therefore now before us, elegantly printed, as are all the works that issue from the splendid press of Mr. William Rees of Llandovery, made by an anonymous author – though fame, gently wafted by a western breeze, whispers a highly-talented lady.⁴⁶⁴

The above extract from the review shows the general respect that the reviewer has for Bunsen, Schulz, the publisher Rees of Llandovery, and the translator, whose identity appears to be known to the reviewer. The reviewer also has generally a positive impression

⁴⁶² Cf. Baudrillard, Jean *The Agony of Power*, trans. Ames Hodges, (Los Angeles: Semiotext(e), 2005/2010), p. 33 on the difference between hegemony and dominance. A dominant relationship is marked by antagonism, the dominated struggling against the power exerted by the dominant force. Hegemony signifies the absence of an open conflict, since the power relations have become engrained in the conscience of the participants. The Cymreigyddion are in the grey zone between these two forms of asymmetric power relations: while their endeavour to revive the Welsh language is a sign of a struggle against the dominant force in the field, reality shows that they have already accepted the hegemon. This becomes visible in the minute book of the society that the use of Welsh in the society's customary proceedings was in decline from the 1840s to the 1850s [NLW MS 13958E]. Schulz is also a part of the hegemonic set-up, since his essay aids the Welsh revival, while it also contains underlying criticism of the use of the Welsh language, making its treasures incomprehensible to foreigners. [Schulz, 1841, p. 38].

⁴⁶³ *Gentleman's Magazine* (Feb. 1842), 169.

⁴⁶⁴ *Ibid.*

of the essay, saying that it ‘merits very great praise’,⁴⁶⁵ but with some reservations, as it disagrees with the reviewer’s view on the questions of the Welsh and Breton influences in the development of the Arthurian traditions. He dismisses the importance of the Welsh elements almost completely and favours the Breton element, claiming that the traditions were mainly kept alive in Brittany, beginning around 660, when Cadwaladyr went into exile to Brittany, taking with him ‘the greatest number of such literary treasures’.⁴⁶⁶ Furthermore, the reviewer advocates that the original traditions were so thoroughly transformed that only traces of the Welsh elements remained:

As Arthur had bravely withstood the pagan Saxons in the defence of his country, his fame was magnified, the mythological poems of Merddin (corrupted into Merlin) were ransacked, and all that could be extracted from them, together with what was to be had from tradition, was worked up into a pretended book of prophecies, to clothe his character with supernatural splendour, and hold out future prosperity for his countrymen.⁴⁶⁷

In this paragraph, the reviewer endorses the first point of Schulz’ literary theory concerning the condensation and amplification of ancient traditions but adds a dismissive tone to it which is visible in the choice of vocabulary: ‘ransacked’, ‘worked up’, ‘pretended book’. In the following paragraph, he mocks the purpose of these prophecies (most likely, he is referring to the works of Geoffrey of Monmouth, chiefly the *Prophetia Merlini*) to instil hope in the Welsh people for a future victory against the English:

Consoling themselves for the loss of Lloegyr (England) with such pleasing delusions, and a retrospect of their former prosperity, which was predicted should return, a chronicle was composed in the *Welsh* language, called Brut y Brenkinoedd, [sic] “Chronicle of the Kings,” beginning with fictitious sovereigns pressed into the service to authorise the affected Trojan descent, and continued as a melange of fable and history to the death of Cadwaladyr in 703.⁴⁶⁸

The dismissive tone is obvious here, as well as the silent agreement with Schulz’ theory on the origin of literature in mythology and history. The reviewer usually does not acknowledge it, but upon close reading of his opinion on the transmission of early traditions, he mostly agrees with Schulz on the early development and general manner of the creation of traditions. The only major difference is the ideological colouring of the narrative. While Schulz maintains a relatively neutral stance throughout with a slight

⁴⁶⁵ Ibid.

⁴⁶⁶ Ibid.

⁴⁶⁷ Ibid.

⁴⁶⁸ Ibid. [emphasis and punctuation as in original]

predisposition towards the Welsh cause, the reviewer uses words with negative connotations when speaking of the socio-political backdrop of the development of the Arthurian legends in medieval Wales. Both Schulz and the reviewer are in accord regarding the importance of Brittany as the focal point of transmission of the traditions across the continent and their development into chivalrous romances, but disagree strongly on the significance of the original Welsh elements. The reviewer is, however, ready to accept and even emphasise the Welsh element in all ‘pleasing delusions’ as he views them as desperate fantasies of a defeated people. In these cases, the reviewer objects to the Breton elements advocated by Schulz. A very interesting example is the discussion of Geoffrey of Monmouth role in the creation of a mythological history of Britain:

[...] but we cannot admit the assertion of Professor Schulz, that ‘the Chronicle of Geoffrey of Monmouth rests expressly on a book in the *Breton* language.’ Happy are we to observe, that his fair translator is of a contrary opinion, and in a note observes that ‘Henry of Huntingdon states that he has seen the Chronicle of Geoffrey on the continent as early as 1139.’⁴⁶⁹

Two aspects stand out: favouring the Welsh element and also relying on the clarification of the translator. It appears that the reviewer did not have a deeper understanding of the subject;⁴⁷⁰ therefore he was dependent on Schulz’ explanations and theories to write the review. In several instances, he tries to contradict Schulz but is unable to counter Schulz’ arguments with strong evidence. He is, however, aware of the translator’s comments and uses them in order to attack Schulz’ statements.

Despite disagreeing with some of Schulz’ findings the reviewer comes to the same general conclusion: the core of the Arthurian tales is most likely based on Welsh folk lore, which was then transformed and augmented in Brittany. He also draws from etymology and onomastics to prove his point, complementing Schulz’ findings on Breton place names in the second phase of development (forest of Breceliande, fountain of Baranton) with some remarks on the mingling of original Welsh names with later Breton additions. Here it is interesting that the reviewer mainly focusses on the Welsh side while Schulz gives more information on the Breton elements.⁴⁷¹ This could be explained with the fact that certain

⁴⁶⁹ *Gentleman’s Magazine*, (Feb. 1842), p. 171. [emphasis as in original]

⁴⁷⁰ There is a sense that the reviewer’s engagement with Schulz and the subject is superficial, resulting in obvious errors such as the mention of the Chronicles of Nonnius, [Nennius, one of the main sources for the early mystification of King Arthur] and the misspelling of Welsh names, such as Brut y Brenkinoedd [sic], Bruit [sic] y Tyssilio, and the Prophecies of Marddin [sic].

⁴⁷¹ Schulz, 1841, pp. 20–21 and pp. 34–35 compared with *Gentleman’s Magazine*, (Feb. 1842), p. 173.

sources were readily available in the British literary field, but Schulz did not have access to them in Germany.

After having added all the background information that, in his opinion, was lacking in the essay, the reviewer finally proceeds to evaluate the essay itself. First, he lists the table of contents, including the five chapters with the appendices on Leonine Verse, German Verse, Ancient Romances of Arthur in various languages and the addenda on the Holy Grail, the Templars and the Knights of the Graal and the Graal and Joseph of Arimathea. By citing the long list of contents, the reviewer acknowledges Schulz' extensive research in the area and echoes the opinion of the previous reviewers that German scholars are renowned for their thoroughness:

The whole of this [list], which is the result of an industry and perseverance that generally distinguishes German writers, has been so well arranged, and, so far as the subject would admit, with such reference to dates, as renders it easy to be retained on the mind; the language is manly, yet temperate, and the point to be established treated with impartiality.⁴⁷²

This shows that the reviewer agrees with the structuring of the essay and that he finds Schulz' division of the different periods of transmission and development clear, logical and easy to follow. The comment on the language is interesting, as it reveals the expectations of the British reader in regard to the style of an academic essay. Although there are differences between the academic narrative traditions in Britain and in Germany, Schulz appears to have found the right tone for his target audience, assertive, but not too bold, and neutral. The reviewer himself, as we have established in this section, is not at all impartial, yet he recognises Schulz' mostly objective view on the question. The remainder of the review consists of a summary of Schulz' principal research results, presented in a positive light, as the reviewer appears to agree with all of them. The final sentence of the review in the *Gentleman's Magazine* speaks of general appreciation and respect for Schulz and the translator:

We may therefore with truth observe, that this is a work conceived with much judgment, composed with much perspicuity, and translated with much taste and elegance, and we can confidently recommend it, as one from which the reader cannot fail to derive pleasure.⁴⁷³

⁴⁷² *Gentleman's Magazine*, (Feb. 1842), 174.

⁴⁷³ *Ibid.*

After the publication of the *Gentleman's Magazine*, there was a four year hiatus until a Welsh literary magazine, the *Archaeologia Cambrensis*, published another review of the essay. The magazine advertised the essay in its first issue of January 1846 alongside Lady Charlotte Guest's translations, the *Transactions of the Cymmrodorion Society* and a number of critical editions of medieval manuscripts such as the *Liber Landavensis*.⁴⁷⁴ This shows that Schulz' essay was considered an important contribution to the Welsh literary field, as it takes its place next to high prestige publications. In the next issue, in April 1846, on the front page of the review section, the editors of the magazine published a very positive review of Schulz' work, which, in fact, consists mainly of an excerpt from Bunsen's adjudication. The anonymous reviewer concedes that 'in attempting an analysis of this remarkable work, we feel that we cannot do better than borrow the words of Chevelier [sic] Bunsen, the Judge on this occasion'.⁴⁷⁵ The reviewer adds a comment regarding the structure of the essay, highlighting the fact that Bunsen commented on the German manuscript and not on the English translation. Therefore the reader of the printed English book should not be surprised to find that the first three chapters on the three Arthurian periods are condensed in one chapter, while an appendix and addenda have been added as well. The reviewer's comment does not reveal who was behind the alterations, neither does he comment on the fact that Bunsen's adjudication did not speak of a chapter on the influence of Welsh traditions on the literature of Germany – as demanded by the prize question. Bunsen hints at this with in the description of content of the third chapter, in which he mentions that it covers the entire period of romance in France and Germany.

None of the other reviews highlighted the structural differences between the original manuscript in German and the printed English translation. This is not too surprising, considering that the editors of the *Archaeologia Cambrensis*, Henry Longueville Jones and John Williams (Ab Ithel) were in close contact with the Cymreigyddion Society and therefore they had access to the original manuscript as it was submitted in 1840. Thanks to the present review, it was possible to reconstruct the structure of the original essay and it is now possible to compare three versions; the original German essay, the English translation and the German republication *Die Arthursage und die Mährchen des Rothen Buchs von Hergest*. Bunsen's adjudication contains a summary of Schulz' main arguments, revealing the structure of the essay:

⁴⁷⁴ *Archaeologia Cambrensis*, 1 (Jan. 1846), p. 21.

⁴⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, 1.2 (Apr. 1846), 192–3 (p. 192).

The author's general view of tradition is exposed in the introduction. According to these principles he establishes in the first chapter that Arthur has been, with an element of fiction progressively changing, the national hero of Wales, from the year 600, to the year 1066, or the epoch of William of Malmesbury. He tries to prove in the same manner, in the second chapter, that the formation of the poetical tales around the Knights of the Round Table, took place in the second period, from 1066 to 1150; or, from the time of William of Malmesbury to the beginning of French and German romance. And here he brings under discussion the relative claims of Wales and Britany [sic]; showing the superiority of the second for the formation of the poetry about most of the knights of Arthur, and of all the personages belonging to his court, as he has established in the first chapter the superiority of the Welsh claims for the traditions respecting King Arthur personally.⁴⁷⁶

Bunsen aptly summarises Schulz' first two chapters in the above, contrasting the difference between the two epochs and their engagement with the Arthurian material. Bunsen also seems to agree with Schulz on the matter of the origin of the core elements of the Arthurian tales, especially the characters, which Schulz places in Wales. The poetic development of the core material into romances, however, happened in Brittany, according to Bunsen's understanding of Schulz' arguments. The third chapter is deemed even more important and original by Bunsen, as can be seen in his choice of words:

It is to the third period, from 1150 to 1500, – or from the dawn to the last glimpse of romance in France and Germany, that the author ascribes, in the third chapter, the formation of the poetry of the Graal, in the romances of Titurel and Parcival. And here he enters into a complete critical analysis of the latter (the first ever given), in order to prove that it consists of two heterogeneous elements; one taken from the Kymri sources, brought only in our days to light, as such, in the important Mabinogi, published by Lady Charlotte Guest; the other a religious one, which, according to him, originated in Provence and in Spain, indicating a remarkable connexion with the symbolic institution and rites of the Knights Templars.⁴⁷⁷

In this paragraph, Bunsen not only highlights Schulz' original work, in particular his pioneering study on Parcival, but also covertly advertises both Schulz' translation of *Parcival* and Lady Guest's translation of the *Mabinogion*. He uses his central position in the literary field to aid new contributors to gain a better position themselves. Furthermore, he also shows his Romantic background by using the word 'romance' as defined by Friedrich Schlegel in the *Athenäum*.⁴⁷⁸ Bunsen also seems to agree with Schulz' opinion on the origin of rhyme as he backs the latter's assertion with positively denoted vocabulary:

⁴⁷⁶ Ibid., p. 192.

⁴⁷⁷ Ibid.

⁴⁷⁸ In the 116th fragment in *Athenäum* (1799) Friedrich Schlegel defined the new concept of romantic poetry as *Universalpoesie*, which encompasses different genres, prose and poetry, other arts such as rhetoric, philosophy. A.W. Schlegel based his lecture series of 1803/4 on romantic poetry on this concept.

Of the two remaining chapters, the first (the fourth), considers the influence of Welsh poetry on the poetry of the middle ages, as the preceding researches had established the influence on its materials. Rejecting the opinion of the Arabic or Roman origin of rhyme, he endeavours to prove that the invention of rhyme is *undoubtedly* the invention of the Celtic race. He illustrates this assertion by a *very judicious* selection of facts and evidences.⁴⁷⁹

By using the italicized words to describe Schulz' reasoning, Bunsen shows his agreement with the content of the essay. In his summary of the fifth and final chapter, the judge again commends the results of Schulz' research and reports the findings in a positive light:

The last, or fifth chapter, discussing the nature of the Scandinavian traditions, particularly the Icelandic, and their connexion with the most ancient Anglo-Saxon, as exhibited principally by Beowulf, establishes their originality, fixes their respective age, and shows that those elements in Scandinavian literature which regard the Arthurian cyclus, have the least claim to originality, as they are entirely separated from their own ancient traditions, and evidently taken from the French and German romances.

Again, the verbs 'establishes', 'fixes' and 'shows' present the arguments advanced by Schulz as certain and contain no hint of doubt or ambiguity. Their use suggests that Bunsen sided with Schulz and thought the latter's reasoning to be valid and correct. Overall, Bunsen appears to be very impressed with Schulz' findings and in the final paragraph he states his opinion on the importance of Schulz' essay for the literary field in the following eulogy:

If the investigation of the fourth chapter cannot well be said to be excluded by the words of the prize question, nor unimportant for the solution of the great problem of the originality and relative historical influence of Welsh traditions on the literature of Europe; the object of the last chapter is directly indicated by the words of that question. The conclusion of the whole treatise shows the bearing of the results obtained, upon the general history of European literature and civilization.⁴⁸⁰

This final paragraph, emphasising the importance of Schulz' findings and the research question in general for the pan-European culture and civilization, must have particularly impressed the editors of the *Archaeologia Cambrensis*, as it is in complete agreement with their interests. Therefore it is not surprising that they decided to include Bunsen's adjudication in their review, as, besides highlighting the impact of the essay on the history of literature in Europe, it also effectively summarises the contents, and outlines Schulz' major original results. In so doing, the editors achieved two goals: first, they had a skilful, printable resumé of the essay; and secondly, they received a boost for their agenda by

⁴⁷⁹ *Archaeologia Cambrensis*, 1.2 (Apr. 1846), p. 192. [my emphasis]

⁴⁸⁰ *Ibid.*

printing the verdict of a highly respected member of the British literary field. The conclusion of the review contains a declaration of importance of research into ancient Welsh literature voiced by the anonymous reviewer, thus echoing Bunsen's verdict:

Surely a work like the present, coming as it does, from a learned foreigner, ought to remove some of the sneering doubts, which so many affect to entertain as to the real merits of the ancient literature of Wales, and induce them to come forward to promote the laudable objects of the Welsh MSS. Society.⁴⁸¹

The reference to the 'sneering doubts' was most likely directed at the polemic reviews published in British periodicals. Furthermore, it also engaged the general attitude of the period which did not favour an emerging Welsh literary scene in the British literary field. The first part of the sentence thus fights against the prejudices which sought to keep the Welsh literary field on the periphery and in the hierarchy of literary fields below the British field. By linking Welsh literature and tradition to continental Europe, here highlighted by the mention of the 'learned foreigner', the promoters of the *Cymreigyddion* and the Welsh Manuscript Societies attempted to improve the position of their own sub-field within Britain since international connections were seen as a validator of their own position.

The examination of the reception of the essay in the British field has shown that the ideological orientation of the reviewer plays an important role in his appraisal of the essay and his position within the literary fields. Schulz' academic work appears to be only of secondary importance, while the topic of the essay itself sparked the more significant reactions. The reviewers who were established in the larger, dominant British literary field, were not convinced that the topic of the essay was of any importance for the English speaking academic community, whereas the reviewers with ties to the smaller, marginalized Welsh field welcomed Schulz' essay as a valuable entry to their field, raising its profile within the British academic community. Schulz' methodology and his rationale were accepted by all reviewers as valid and conclusive and the only points of criticism directed at his research were also politically or ideologically motivated, as for example the use of the label 'Breton' versus 'Briton' for the earliest origins of the Arthurian traditions. Although the prize question on the influence of Welsh traditions on the literature of Germany, France and Scandinavia appears to be of purely literary and historical nature, the responses of the reviewers to Schulz' treatise suggest that it had a more significant impact

⁴⁸¹ Ibid, p. 193.

on the British literary field. The aspects on which the reviewers commented reveal their ideological position in the field, whether they wish to improve the position of the peripheral sub-field of Welsh literature on the larger British field or whether they are attempting to halt the progress of the Welsh revival. Schulz thus gets caught up in the struggles in the field of power as his entry to the Abergavenny competition causes several shifts in it. His participation is viewed as validation of the Welsh cause by its promoters since he comes from a dominant literary field and lends his ‘services’ to a peripheral literary field. On the one hand, his German *habitus* with the cultural and academic connotations and his lauded, previous publications elevate Schulz to an estimated player. On the other hand, the existing relations between the Cymreigyddion and high ranking Germans such as Bunsen and Lepsius function as Schulz’ credentials in the Welsh literary field and boost his reputation there. After winning the most esteemed competition at the Abergavenny Eisteddfod, Schulz leaves his mark on the literary field, although his later publications do not find the same attention as his prize-winning essay. Nonetheless, he is remembered, albeit mainly as a footnote, in the Welsh field for his essay until the present day, as the publications of modern day scholars in various fields based in Wales mentioned in the introduction show. To conclude, it can be said that his reputation as a scholar was very positive in the British field of the nineteenth century while the significance of the subject of his research was at the centre of the debate around the Welsh revival, enthusiastically promoted by the supporters of that revival, but dismissed as insignificant by established players in the dominant Anglo-centric field. This duality in the response to him and his work can also be observed in the German field, but in the opposite way. In the following chapter, the restructuring of his essay, the German translations of the Mabinogion, and the reception of the publication of 1842 will be examined in detail to arrive at the stated result: Schulz as a scholar is not given due credit while the subject of the essay is welcomed with anticipation.

6. Schulz' essay in German translation: The German field

After his success in the eisteddfod competition followed by the publication of the English translation and generally favourable reviews of his academic work, Schulz was encouraged to make his research results accessible to his home audience, the German readership. This chapter will examine the reception of the essay in Germany. Firstly, it will outline the editorial changes to which the essay was submitted prior to publication in Germany in 1842. Secondly, the second part of the German publication, the German translations from Guest's *Mabinogion* will be examined with regard to the translation methodology and the rationale underlying the comparative studies which Schulz appended to the translations proper. His presentation of the translations in a pan-European literary context reveals his intent to act as a cultural mediator. Thirdly, the reception of the German edition in the German and the British literary fields will be analysed according to the Bourdieuan field theory. The varying response to Schulz' work in the reviews will highlight the dynamics within the fields.

The first question to arise is to ask what lay behind the reworking process of the German edition. Since Schulz submitted the original composition in German, which was then translated into English, he could have easily published the original manuscript. Instead, he decided to edit the essay in order to adapt it to the new target audience. This shows his awareness of the different expectations and previous knowledge of the intended readership in Britain and in Germany as well as of his own profile in both literary fields. In Britain, he was a newcomer without any publishing record, but was introduced to the field with references to his academic exploits in Germany, namely the work on Wolfram von Eschenbach and *Parcival*. In the British field, these and also his connections to Bunsen served as validators to make him appear more experienced than he actually was. In Germany, on the other hand, the intended readership was already familiar with one aspect of his academic interests or, if not yet, could easily access the books to gain information on his previous work on medieval traditions. Their expectations would, therefore, be different.

Based on this awareness of different reader profiles in Britain and Germany, Schulz made several significant changes in the German edition of 1842, which he lists in the foreword. It was equally important to him to first explain to his German readers what motivated him to participate in the competition. Therefore the foreword begins with a description of his

research output from 1833, including previous publications and the motivation to do further research:

Eine Kritik der Gralssage nach ihrer ersten Entstehung und späteren Verschmelzung mit der Arthursage hatte ich bereits im fünften Buche des zweiten Bandes meines *Lebens und Dichtens Wolframs von Eschenbach* zu geben versucht: der Drang aber, den ersten Bildungsgang der Arthursage bis dahin, daß diese in Nordfrankreich ihren neuen Aufschwung nahm, zu erforschen, war von Neuem durch jenes Preisausschreiben angeregt.⁴⁸²

In the above passage, Schulz informs his readers about his background research for the present book and also uses the opportunity to advertise his related publications to attract a larger readership. His choice of words ‘der Drang [...] zu erforschen, wurde [...] von Neuem durch jenes Preisausschreiben angeregt’ underlines his enthusiasm for exploring the early stages of tradition, in particular the two periods before and after the Norman conquest in 1066.

In the next passage, Schulz also explains the most difficult aspects of the research question, namely the exact timeframe and manner of the migration of the original Welsh tales to Brittany. According to Schulz, as the traditions were mainly transmitted orally and there is virtually no written evidence, the only manner to obtain a satisfactory result is to collect all available data and testimonies and establish the interrelations through the lens of the history of peoples and traditions (*Völker- und Sittengeschichte*). Following this method, however, it is almost impossible to arrive at certain, irrefutable results but rather at a plausible conclusion.⁴⁸³ This explanation once again illustrates how strongly Schulz was influenced by the theories of Herder and A. W. Schlegel on the recording of history and its correlation with literary tradition. History and poetry go hand in hand and the analysis of any given period would not yield a comprehensive picture if one took into account only one of the two sources. Thus, on the first page, Schulz clarifies beyond any doubt his Herderian and Schlegelian research rationale to the reader.

Schulz also highlights the perceived gap in the current research on the Arthurian tales, as their history was, in Schulz’ opinion, discussed incompletely in *Histoire littéraire de la France*⁴⁸⁴, and in Dunlop’s *The History of Fiction*⁴⁸⁵ because both were written without

⁴⁸² San-Marte (A. Schulz) *Die Arthursage und die Märchen des rothen Buchs von Hergest*, p. iii.

⁴⁸³ *Ibid.*, p. iv.

⁴⁸⁴ The *Histoire littéraire de la France* was commenced by Benedictine monks in 1733 with vols 1 to 12 until 1814, when first the Third Class of the Institut de France and later the Académie Française assumed the

taking into account the early stages of the tradition until about the twelfth century, thus stages one and two of Schulz' classification of tradition 600–1066 and 1066–1150. He also criticises that the referenced works did not separate the history of the motif of the Holy Grail from the development of tales centred on King Arthur. Therefore he thought it necessary to conduct an extensive study of both motifs and trace their origin to the point when they merged and became one narrative. Schulz considered the research in this field incomplete and therefore attempted to fill this gap with his two studies. Since the sources were meagre, as mentioned above, Schulz tried to curb any criticism aimed at the objectivity, impartiality and factuality of his research with a reference to his first professional field. In the following passage, he emphasises the importance of his background as a lawyer for the choice of his methodology:

Dem Juristen eigenthümliche Strenge bei Prüfung von Beweisstücken bewahrte vor allzukühnen Folgerungen, und ich fürchte nicht, daß mir der Vorwurf willkürlicher Hypothesen und überdreister Kombinationen wird gemacht werden.⁴⁸⁶

With the above, Schulz indirectly distances himself from what he saw the tendencies in the field of Celtic studies to be uncritical, overly enthusiastic and to jump to hasty conclusions – a prime example of this being the early reception of Macpherson's forgery of *Ossian*. Schulz tries to convince the reader that he is a critical researcher who would not advance an argument which cannot be supported by substantial evidence. These work principles may more often than not lead to incomplete or inconclusive results, as he is not prepared to present hypotheses or conclusions without factual or logical support. This is a sign that Schulz understands himself as a modern researcher and who would like to be perceived as such. This sometimes leads to a conflict with his Romantic background, which becomes visible when he gets carried away in the emotive description of the early medieval period, for example his account of the early history of the British independent kingdoms.

Alle diese Gedichte [von Merlin] sind voll von historischen Beziehungen; sie nennen Namen von Orten, Strömen und Bergen, die sie von Alters her geführt haben; in ihnen erscheinen die zahllosen kleinen Königreiche, in ihrer Unabhängigkeit, mit ihren Zwistigkeiten unter sich, mit ihrer Vereinigung gegen den gemeinschaftlichen

editor's role for vol. 13. The Académie has continuously published volumes for nearly two centuries, with vol. 43 being the most recent, published in 2005. Information in French can be found on the website of the Académie Française: <<http://www.aibl.fr/publications/collections/histoire-litteraire-de-la-france/?lang=fr>> [accessed 24 March 2013].

⁴⁸⁵ The title is actually *The History of Prose Fiction* by John Colin Dunlop (Edinburgh: James Ballantyne and Co., 1814 [London: George Bell and Sons, 1888]), the 1888 edition available online at <<https://archive.org/stream/historyoffiction01dunluoft#page/n5/mode/2up>> [accessed on 2 November 2013].

⁴⁸⁶ Schulz, 1842, p. iv.

Nationalfeind, die Angelsachsen; sie zeigen die kleinen britischen Staaten im Norden der Insel als treue Verbündete, überall der beglaubigten Geschichte entsprechend.⁴⁸⁷

The above summary of the contents of the early Welsh poetry shows that Schulz paints an image of the small British tribes in their fight against the invading Angles and Saxons, seen through the tinted glasses of idealistic Romantic nationalism, glorifying the heroic past. The final line generalises and simplifies the actual historical situation; mostly due to Schulz' lacking language skills to read more widely on the subject. In several instances, however, he is aware of gaps in his knowledge and highlights this for instance in his introduction to the chapter on the form of poetry, which mainly focuses on the phenomenon of rhyme:

Der Abschnitt über die Form der Arthurromane, der dabei nicht wohl zu umgehen war, kann, wie ich sehr wohl erkenne, das wissenschaftliche Bedürfniß nicht befriedigen, und will vielmehr nur zur weiteren Erörterung diejenigen anregen, welche durch ihre äußere Lage in Besitz von Hilfsmitteln sind, um einer solchen mit Erfolg sich unterziehen zu können. An meinem jetzigen Wohnorte ist dies schlechthin unmöglich.⁴⁸⁸

In the final sentence in the quote above we find another subliminal complaint about his transfer to Bromberg and how this affected his research. The central message of the quoted passage resembles the foreword to his *Parcival* translation in 1836, in which he called upon more experienced researchers to build on his earlier work on Wolfram von Eschenbach and advance the current knowledge about the author. In 1842, Schulz again encourages scholars in more fortunate positions to improve the present work. Despite having won the main prize, Schulz is still the same humble young researcher who is fully aware of his shortcomings. He does not assume that his recent success on the British field has become known to the German readership prior to reading the introduction of his book; therefore he operates from more or less the same position in the German literary field which he occupied before winning the essay competition. Schulz mentions the prize question at the beginning of the foreword but he does not explain that it was the prize with the highest premium:

Die im Jahre 1839 erlassene Aufforderung der Cymreigyddion society von Abergavenny in Wales zu einer Preisabhandlung über den Einfluß der wälschen Sagen auf die Literatur Deutschlands, Frankreichs, und Skandinaviens berührte einen

⁴⁸⁷ Ibid., p. 8.

⁴⁸⁸ Ibid., p. iv.

Gegenstand, der [...] von der Literaturgeschichte [...] nicht mit der umfassenden Gründlichkeit behandelt worden war, die er erforderte [...]⁴⁸⁹

This introduction rather emphasises the significance of the research carried out for the competition than the prestige of it. Schulz underscores the importance of the proposed research topic with his remark that there is a gap in the general history of literature which needs to be filled with fresh research results. He downplays his own role in it and puts the weight on the new knowledge gained in the process. He views himself in the light of the first pioneer who needs other explorers to follow him to carry on with the work he began.

In the second part of the foreword, Schulz informs his readers that he has changed the structure of the present publication because he had to adapt the two previous versions, the first destined to a literary competition and the second addressed to the British public, to suit a different audience: the wider German readership. He explains that he had to rework both the section on Merlin as well as the notes that Lady Guest provided with the translations of the three *mabinogi* tales. Schulz justifies his selection with the remark that some notes were not of interest for German readers, while others needed expansion.

Throughout the translations he labels Guest's notes with LG. He also changed the layout of the notes considerably; while Guest published her translations with endnotes only, Schulz uses a mixed strategy of footnotes and endnotes. He uses the footnotes for adding concise information on characters, objects and customs that help the German reader to follow the narrative, while the endnotes provide more detailed explanations about the locations and some principal characters. The usage of notes will be explained further below in this chapter in the section on the German translations of the Mabinogion.

Besides the changes that he announced in the foreword, he also added several passages to the essay where he thought that extra information would be beneficial for his German readers. When discussing Geoffrey of Monmouth, he includes a comprehensive summary of Geoffrey's *Historia Regum Britanniae*, which is absent in the English version. Schulz may have assumed that his British readers were familiar with the content of Geoffrey's work and therefore he only discussed certain thematic, linguistic and poetic features, such as the introduction where Geoffrey names his sources or his analysis of the poeticity of the language, which changes significantly when the narrative approaches the time of Arthur.

⁴⁸⁹ Ibid., p. iii.

For the German readership, however, Schulz retells the entire content while concentrating on the parts on Arthur and Merlin.

In the English version, Schulz only briefly alludes to the bards in medieval Wales, introducing several terms such as the *Bardd Teulu*, the *bard Cadeiriog* and the *Pencerdd* without explaining what these mean. Writing for a Welsh audience, he could assume that these words were familiar, especially in the wake of Iolo Morganwg's neo-bardism and – druidism, the publication of the *Myvyrian Archaiology*, and the works of Evan Evans and William Owen Pughe among others. In the German version, Schulz adds a definition of each:

Ein Barde (**Bard Cadeiriog**) stand als Chef über die übrigen Barden des Hofes. Der **Bard Pencerdd** führte die Aufsicht und Leitung über den Gesang. Der Hausbarde (**Bard Teulu**) hatte Freiland, Roß, Kleidung und manche Vorrechte.⁴⁹⁰

These definitions are followed by a detailed explanation of the life at medieval courts in Wales and how the different ranks of bards played their part. Schulz quotes an excerpt of Giraldus Cambrensis to support his explanation. Schulz thus acts as a cultural mediator, presenting his German readers with a very graphic and idyllic image of a medieval court in a hitherto unknown, or rather overlooked country. This picturesque description taps into the Romantic fascination with the Middle Ages. On the one hand, the glorification of the past was a wide-spread phenomenon in the age of revolutions, – both political and technological, – with its social tensions and uncertainty, when the longing of the people for a simpler life closer to nature with a clear social structure was reflected in the literary interest of the age.⁴⁹¹ On the other hand, this romanticizing style is somewhat at odds with his desire to be a modern, scientific scholar. In the English essay aimed at the British literary field, he did not have to tone it down, as the literary field was still held in the sway of the Romantic period and the first modernist contributions were not made until several years later, e.g. the advent of the works of Thomas Stephens. In the German field, however, the reviewer Susemihl reacted strongly to it and interpreted it as a sign of unprofessionalism, as will be illustrated in the second part of this chapter.

⁴⁹⁰ Ibid., p. 24. [bold emphasis as in original]

⁴⁹¹ Inga Bryden, *Reinventing King Arthur* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2005), p. 2 and Ulrich Müller; Werner Wunderlich, 'The Modern Reception of the Arthurian legend' in: *The Arthur of the Germans* ed. by W.H. Jackson and S. A. Ranawake (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 2000 [2011]), p. 303.

Schulz makes several assumptions about his intended readership. As mentioned above, he provides his German readers with additional information about a nation of the periphery of Europe, its literature, culture and history. On the other hand, he presumes that his readers are familiar with his works, therefore he also omits passages from the original essay when he thinks that he has provided his readers with the information in a preceding publication. For example, he decides to omit the entire discussion of the motif of the Holy Grail as he has already devoted book five of the second volume of his *Leben und Dichten Wolframs von Eschenbach* to the subject:

Zwar thut es mir leid, die Erörterung der Gralssage von der Arthursage haben trennen zu müssen, und mich zu der Bitte genöthigt zu sehen, die gegenwärtige Abhandlung mit dem erwähnten Buch V., Band II., *Leben und Dichten Wolframs v. Eschenbach*, als ein zusammenhängendes Ganzes zu betrachten; allein frühere Verpflichtungen gestatteten weder dort den Abschnitt über den Gral wegzulassen und hier einzufügen, noch war ich zu der Zeit, als jedes Werk erschien, schon im Besitz aller der Quellen, welche zur Geschichte der Arthursage bis zum Jahre 1150 wesentlich erforderlich erschienen.⁴⁹²

The above paragraph is key to understanding the coherence in Schulz' academic work. In it, Schulz implies that his entire published work is to be seen as one entity, one book following the next in a thematic progression; beginning with Wolfram von Eschenbach's work, he broadened his field of expertise towards the medieval literature of France, Britain and Scandinavia. His letters and other publications between 1833 and 1840 bear witness of his progression as a scholar and his path into different networks. His own development thus reflects the subject of the treatise which seeks to prove the presupposition of the *Cymreigyddion*, that the Arthurian traditions were transmitted across most of North, West and Central Europe. It also is a clever way of advertising his previous books to a new readership.

Besides the contextualisation of his treatise in relation to existing publications, Schulz also reveals that he now possesses a greater knowledge of relevant sources in the field. In his chapter on the earliest traditions, he proves that he has now read more primary literature than he had before. When comparing the sources quoted in the English translation with those in the German republication, this becomes obvious. Schulz used a wider range of sources, e.g. a direct quote from Gildas' chronicle, to which he previously referred via an excerpt from Henry of Huntingdon, whose citations from Gildas' work were flawed. Schulz' more profound knowledge of the chronicles contributes to a more critical attitude

⁴⁹² Schulz, 1842, p. V.

towards statements of famous figures in the field. For example, when quoting Gildas he expresses his doubts about [no first name given] Williams', a Welsh historian, supposition that Gildas is identical to the *cynfardd* Aneurin.⁴⁹³ Schulz does not supply more information on the identity of the Welsh historian but it is very likely that he refers to Edward Williams, better known as Iolo Morganwg. John Williams (Ab Ithel) would be another candidate, but at the time of the composition of the essay, Ab Ithel had not yet published anything on Welsh poetry, e.g. his translation of *Y Gododin* (1852)⁴⁹⁴ so it is less likely that Schulz refers to him. This instance shows that Schulz is not always consistent in revealing his sources but only supplies partial information.

Furthermore, in his discussion of the Welsh materials, Schulz also places greater focus on Welsh sources in the first period of traditions from 600–1066. In the English printed version, most sources cited or mentioned in the first period were excerpts from Latin chronicles who mentioned Arthur, the majority actually dating to the eleventh and twelfth century, which fall into Schulz' second and third period of development. In the German edition Schulz concentrates on Gildas and Beda, the only chronicles which actually belong to the first period, and the Welsh poems of the ancient bards Taliesin, Aneurin, Llywarch Hen, and Merdhin. Thus, the chronology of his essay becomes more logical, as he keeps the discussion of the later chroniclers to the second period. Therefore the first and second sub-chapters in German differ significantly from the English version.

This can be explained with added source material. In both the English and the German version, Schulz refers to Sharon Turner's *Vindication of the genuineness of the ancient british poems of Aneurin, Taliesin, Llywarch-Hen, and Merdhin, with specimen of the poems*.⁴⁹⁵ In the English version, which is a close translation of his original submission in German, the reference is followed by a brief general description of the major works of the bards, very much in the style of an encyclopaedia or of a book review. For the original composition of the essay in 1840, Schulz most likely did not have the original book at hand but had to resort to paraphrasing a book review. Therefore, the English translation of 1841

⁴⁹³ Schulz, 1842, p. 4. 'Der wälsche Alterthumsforscher Williams hält Gildas identisch mit Aneurin, was jedoch nicht wahrscheinlich ist.'

⁴⁹⁴ John Williams (Ab Ithel) *Y Gododin : a poem on the battle of Cattraeth*, by Aneurin, a Welsh bard of the sixth century; with an English translation, and numerous historical and critical annotations, by the Rev. John Williams ab Ithel, (Llandoverly: William Rees, 1852). In the foreword, Williams makes it clear that Aneurin and Gildas are two distinct people, not the same.

⁴⁹⁵ Compare Schulz, Albert 1841, p. 20 to Schulz, Albert 1842, p. 7. The fact that the reference to Turner already appears on page 7 in the German publication shows clearly how much Schulz has changed the structure of his essay for the German readership.

did not contain more information on the bards. In the German publication, however, the same reference to Turner is followed by a new reference to a Welsh source, the *Myvyrian archaiology*. He still includes Turner, as he was seen as a part of the canon at the time, but then concentrates on the *Myvyrian*, describing its content in detail, for example how many pages of it are dedicated to the ancient poems, and then he describes the chief works of the most famous bards in more detail than in the original submission.

This would hint at a new link to the Welsh field, because Schulz must have received a copy or at least copied excerpts of the *Myvyrian* from one of his new Welsh acquaintances since the text was not easily available in Germany. Schulz had asked for assistance from key players in the past, as his correspondence with Karl Lachmann demonstrates. Indeed, if we move ahead several years in his career, this assumption is actually proven in Schulz' German translation of the poems of Merlin, the *Afallenau* which he had clearly received in Welsh along with an English translation.⁴⁹⁶ Besides the *Afallenau*, Schulz must also have received excerpts of Taliesin's work already by 1842, as he includes a German translation of *Preiddew Annwn*, one of Taliesin's poems. After winning the competition in 1840, Schulz stood in high esteem with the Welsh members of the Cymreigyddion Society and it is very likely that he received copies of books, which were unavailable to him on the continent. In return, he sent the members of the Cymreigyddion copies of his books, as some of his letters, which are included in the Cymreigyddion papers held in the National Library of Wales, prove a continuous correspondence between the Cymreigyddion and Schulz until 1864.⁴⁹⁷ Schulz had a habit of sending his books to established players in the field, as the letter to Wilhelm Grimm in 1842 proves.⁴⁹⁸

There are two different letters from Schulz to Thomas Stephens in the archives of the National Library of Wales. The first letter is dated to 14 April 1854. Schulz thanks Stephens for his ground-breaking work on the history of Welsh literature, *The Literature of*

⁴⁹⁶ Schulz' *Die Sagen von Merlin* (Halle: Waisenhausverlag, 1853) is dedicated to Bunsen: 'Sr. Excellenz Herrn Dr. Chr. K. J. Bunsen, Ritter, Königlich Preußischem Wirklichem Geheimen Rathe, außerordentlichem Gesandten und bevollmächtigtem Minister, in tiefster Verehrung und Dankbarkeit zugeeignet.' The book itself contains bilingual (Welsh–German) versions of several poems by Merlin and dialogues between Merlin and other characters, e.g. the dialogue between Merlin and Taliesin. These are taken from Thomas Stephens' *Literature of the Kymry* (1849) of which Schulz would publish a German translation in 1864. It appears that Schulz entertained a book exchange with the Cymreigyddion.

⁴⁹⁷ National Library of Wales, MS 942C *Letters 1840–1860*, mainly to Stephens from the 'Cymreigyddion y Fenni' circle of writers and poets and also others, including Théodore Hersart de la Villemarqué, Albert Schulz ('San Marte'), John Ceiriog Hughes ('Ceiriog'), Robert John Pryse ('Gweirydd ap Rhys') and E. A. Freeman; and a few circular letters, etc. Schulz' letters comprise items 280a–280c. He congratulates Thomas Stephens on his success with the book *The Literature of the Kymry* (1849).

⁴⁹⁸ National Library of Wales, MS 16603C. fol. 18 in *Letters of Jacob and Wilhelm Grimm, 1827–57*.

the Kymry and also reveals that he has sent Stephens two of his own books, *Traditions of Merlin* [*Die Sagen von Merlin*] and his edition of Geoffrey's of Monmouth's *Historia Regum Britanniae*. The transcript of the letter shows that Schulz had made several corrections to the letter so that it appears like a draft, with crossed out or partially crossed out words and insertions. The corrections hint at several attempts to rephrase certain sentences and the partly crossed out words 'Gauls', being replaced with Welsh are rather curious. The second item, 280b, contains the draft for a similarly structured letter in French, but not addressed to La Villemarqué. It appears that Schulz began to write his letter in French to Stephens since his French was better than his English. This appears to be the case because the English version reads like a translation from the French. This would explain why Schulz may have confused Gauls and Welsh in the English versions of the letter, since the French word for Welsh is *gallois* and translation is *traduction* in French, leading to a confusion with *tradition*. The third item 280c is the envelope which is signed with 'Professor Schulz, Magdeburg, May 1854, Offering to T. S. his translations of Merlin and Geoffrey of Monmouth in gratitude for the pleasure and benefits derived from the literature of the Kymry'.⁴⁹⁹ This appears to be an addition by either Stephens or the collector of the letters. The English letter is transcribed in its entirety below:

Magdeburg 14 April 1854

Sir,

The undersigned feels himself obliged to express many thanks to the learned author of the "Literature of the Cymru" for the abundant information which this work, full of merit, has furnished him.

He deserves, besides, to prove his gratitude, in fact & deed, by permitting himself to present to you the accompanying works; the "~~Translations~~ Traditions of Merlin" and the "History of Geoffrey of Monmouth".

~~To my knowledge~~ [partly crossed out] As far as I know, your work is the first and only one, that submits the literature of the Gauls Welsh openly and without prejudice to a criticism, which was hitherto entirely wanting to it.

Your excellent work has kindled a flame that has ^{and} spread light over regions where reigned an unpenetrable ~~darkness~~^{obscurity} or at most least only pale and glimmering lights and therefore it cannot fail to be fruitful to the national literature of the ~~Gauls~~ Welsh nor for as the entire sciences.

One of my most agreeable duties has been to spread your doctrines and results over the fields of German literature. How much time shall pass ere the Myvyrian archaiology shall appear in a complete and perfect translation that shall stand a severe criticism.

⁴⁹⁹ NLW, MS 942C *Letters 1840–1860*, mainly to Stephens, fol. 280c.

I pray you infinitely to give me notice of the existence of such a translation. The continent does not rejoice in its acquaintance.

May scientific studies continue to join hands for so great an effort, unseparated nationality or the breadth of the seas.

Accept the assurance of my esteem for you, Sir, with whom I have the honour to be remain

Sir,

Your very humble
Schulz
Councillor royal⁵⁰⁰

The first paragraph of the letter shows that Schulz has received a copy of the *Literature of the Kymry* and in return, he sends Thomas Stephens copies of his two most recent publications, *Die Sagen von Merlin* and Geoffrey's *Historia Regum Britannae*, as presents. The second paragraph highlights Stephens' position in the field as an emerging authority. Schulz thus recognises the high academic standard of Stephen's work and raises it above all others that were published in the field before.

With the sentence '[o]ne of my most agreeable duties has been to spread your doctrines and results over the fields of German literature.' Schulz hints at his plan to translate the *Literature of the Kymry* into German but he does not openly declare his intent. He also expresses his desire to see the *Myvyrian Archaiology* translated but it sounds as if he does not believe that it will happen in his life-time, nor will he be able to translate it. Schulz respectfully requests of Stephens to be kept informed about any translations in the field so that he can access all relevant information on Welsh literary traditions. The final sentence of the letter underpins Schulz' hopes of becoming part of a trans-national and trans-cultural scholarly network. Stephens comments on this parcel in a letter to the Cambrian Society later in 1854:

Dear Sir,

You will be glad to learn that *The Literature of the Kymry* has been favourably noticed in Germany. A few days ago I received a parcel from Williams and Norgate, London, and found it to contain a present from Professor Schulz of two volumes recently published by him, ry. [respectively] *Geoffrey of Monmouth*, with notes and a history dissertation (1854) and *Sagen von Merlin*, or the Tradition of Merddin (1853).⁵⁰¹

⁵⁰⁰ NLW, MS 942C, fol. 280a. The transcription attempts to represent the original as closely as possible, including the crossed out passages and the inserted words in superscript.

⁵⁰¹ Ibid., fol. 111.

Stephens' reaction shows that the reception of his book in Germany was important to the members of the Welsh field. Therefore, he spread the news among his peers in the Welsh field.

The second letter from Schulz to Stephens was written in 1864 after Schulz had finally completed his translation of the *Literature of the Kymry*. This time, he drafted the letter in German, then he wrote a clean copy in German, before he translated it into English.⁵⁰² A transcript of the clean copy in German follows below:

Geehrtester Herr Collega in lauro

So darf ich Sie nennen, da die Ehre des Preises, welcher Ihnen 1848 für Ihre so sehr werthvolle *Literature of the Kymry* zu Theil ward, auch mir im Jahre 1840 von derselben gelehrten Gesellschaft, wenn auch weit weniger verdient, zu erkannt ward. Gestatten Sie mir die Ehre und Freude, Ihnen durch die Anlage den Beweis zu liefern, das Ihr herrliches gelehrtes Werk auf dem Kontinent seine Ehre gefunden und daß Ihre rühmliche Arbeit auch hier weitere nützliche Früchte tragen wird. Denn hier ist die Literatur von Wales noch eine fast völlige terra incognita und doch hängt sie mit einem Theile so auch mit der Literatur des deutschen Mittelalters zusammen. — Reichen sich die königlichen Hoheiten von Großbritannien und Preußen zum heiligen Ehebund die Hände, wie sollten nicht die Gelehrten beider Länder in gleichem Studienkreise sich freundlich begegnen, und ihre Arbeiten fördern und nach Kräften unterstützen.

Dies war mir eine theureliche Pflicht, und ich wünsche aufrichtig, daß meine Bemühung Ihre Zufriedenheit erlange.

Genehmigen Sie die Versicherung der ausgezeichnetesten Hochachtung, mit welcher ich die Ehre habe zu verharren

Geehrtester Herr

Ihr

ganz ergebenster

Dr Schulz Regierungsrath

(San-Marte)

27 März 1864

Magdeburg, Preußen⁵⁰³

The English translation (fol. 105) of the letter is again strewn with corrections and insertions and Schulz uses several abbreviations and shorthands and several words are illegible and can only be inferred from the German original text. Schulz echoes the previous letter, first congratulating Stephens on his achievement of winning the main prize at the Eisteddfod in 1848. Again, Schulz emphasizes that Stephens is the more

⁵⁰² NLW, MS 965E, *Letters 1845–1875* to Thomas Stephens, fols 101–107.

⁵⁰³ *Ibid.*, fol. 107

accomplished scholar and that he was more deserving of the prize than he himself. Schulz enclosed a copy of the German translation with the remark ‘[a]llow me the honor & joy thro’ the **enclosed** to give you the **proof** that your excellent learned work ~~on the Con~~ has met with honor on the Continent & that your famous work also here will bear further useful fruits’.⁵⁰⁴ If we compare this sentence to the original, it is clearly visible that Schulz translated literally word by word from German. He also emphasizes the importance of Stephens’ pioneering work on the Welsh literary field which would be a very valuable addition to other literary fields through translation. Here Schulz acts again as a cultural mediator, importing new cultural and literary knowledge to his home field. He also underpins the importance of the Welsh-German connection by referring to the common literary heritage in the medieval period, the chivalrous romances, and then transposing this image to the present political situation, the intermarriage between the Royal houses of Britain and Prussia. This underscores once more Schulz’ desire to act as a cultural mediator and to increase the collaboration between scholars in both countries.

The letter exchange above proves the connection between Schulz and the literary field in the 1850s and 1860s, while in the 1840s, an existing connection in 1842 can only be inferred indirectly by the improved range of sources that Schulz is able to use for his German edition *Die Arthursage*. Besides adding more relevant sources, Schulz also structures his argument in a more coherent manner. The first page of his essay reflects a rethinking process and a more critical attitude. Schulz still begins his treatise on the Arthurian traditions with the same metaphor as in the English version, comparing the Welsh origins of King Arthur to the root of a gigantic tree which, in the course of a thousand years, spread its branches all over Europe until it withered in the dawn of the modern era, that is with the onset of the Renaissance period. Furthermore, he also adds some popular traditions about Arthur, which were mentioned by the reviewer of the *Gentleman’s Magazine*, such as the connection between Arthur and the constellation of the Great Bear and a Helioarkite divinity on the one hand, and the significance of the number twelve in Arthurian traditions.⁵⁰⁵ Demonstrating that he has read the reviews of his English publication and in particular the condescending tone of the reviewer of the *Gentleman’s Magazine*, Schulz dismisses these popular connections as ‘überschwenglichen Mythos’ in

⁵⁰⁴ Ibid., fol. 105, including all corrections and shorthands.

⁵⁰⁵ *Gentleman’s Magazine* February 1842, p. 173. The reviewer mentions twelve stones in stone circles, twelve expeditions, twelve months of the year, twelve knights, and twelve disciples of Jesus. Compare to Schulz, 1842, pp. 3–4.

the introduction of this German edition.⁵⁰⁶ Despite Schulz' obvious critical attitude towards these mythical connections, he uses them to introduce the figure of Arthur in popular tradition, before going on to analyse the different periods. Here, he shows a very clear and definite approach to the subject matter, condensing and clarifying the introduction of the English version and incorporating it in the narrative of the German version of 1842:

Die Sage wandelt von Jahrhundert zu Jahrhundert in steter Wiedergeburt; in diesem rastlosen Umwandlungsprozeß bekundet sie ihr organisches Leben, und dieses Leben äußert sich, wie die Sagengeschichte aller Völker es bezeugt,

in der Neigung zur Annäherung und Berührung der vorhandenen Sage mit der wirklichen Geschichte;

in der Neigung, ursprünglich unabhängige Sagen mit einander zu verbinden;

in der Neigung zur Erweiterung der Sage innerhalb ihrer ursprünglichen Grenzen.⁵⁰⁷

Schulz thus offers the reader three concise points to bear in mind, a structural improvement to the detached nature of his introduction in the original essay and its English translation. The presentation of his research rationale as a list of three tendencies also aids his readers to remember these key principles. In the discussion of the second period of tradition, he adds several sub-headings to clarify his understanding of the relevant research questions and to supply his readers with necessary information about the topic. Therefore, he adds a sub-chapter, 'Das Bardenwesen',⁵⁰⁸ to give German readers a better understanding of the topic and then emphasises the central research question for the period in the eleventh and twelfth centuries: 'Ist Wales oder die Bretagne die Wiege der neuern Arthursage?'.⁵⁰⁹ Similar to the English version, Schulz arrives at the conclusion, that Brittany is the most likely candidate for the shift from the national hero to the chivalrous king:

Wir sind gezwungen, eine Uebergangsperiode anzunehmen, während welcher Arthur seine *nationale Bedeutung verlor*, und er und seine Helden einen neuen Wirkungskreis gewannen, und sind der Meinung, daß dieser Uebergang der alten Traditionen zu den Romanen, welche wir seit 1150 in reicher Fülle in Frankreich entstehen sehen, wesentlich durch die Bretagne vorbereitet, vermittelt und herbeigeführt worden ist.⁵¹⁰

Here, Schulz implies that already by the mid-twelfth century, the original Welsh character of the traditions had been lost, as Arthur had lost his national significance.

⁵⁰⁶ Schulz, 1842, p. 4.

⁵⁰⁷ Ibid., p. 3. [structure as in original]

⁵⁰⁸ Ibid., pp. 22–28.

⁵⁰⁹ Ibid., pp. 28–37. The research question functions as a sub-heading to break up the structure of the text.

⁵¹⁰ Ibid., p. 33. [emphasis is mine]

Overall, the Welsh element is not as present in his disquisition for the German audience as it is in his argument in the published English essay. There are three reasons for this: first, the essay was first composed for a competition with a distinct national flavour, the Abergavenny Eisteddfod. Therefore, emphasis on the significance of Welsh traditions for the development would meet the expectations of the target audience. Secondly, as seen in the previous chapter, the translator also played her part in increasing the Welsh element in the text through her footnotes. And thirdly, Schulz' increased erudition in the field after additional studies in 1840 and 1841 helped him to a better understanding of the documents of the period. Therefore, his arguments are better supported by evidence in favour of the Breton role in the development of the Arthurian legends. In the original submission, when he was unsure, instead of eliminating the Welsh elements completely as seen in the quote above, – ‘während [...] Arthur seine nationale Bedeutung *verlor*’ – he would leave his argument open – ‘the ancient Welsh national character of these romances is thus *obscured*’.⁵¹¹ For the German audience, Schulz sets aside the Welsh national cause and concentrates on delivering an objective treatise on the subject with a clear conclusion to his argument. For this purpose he sums up his reasoning at the end of the second period of tradition as follows:

Es dürften schon diese, aus den Schätzen englischer Bibliotheken noch leicht zu vermehrenden Beläge hinreichend sein, um darzuthun:

- 1) daß sowohl in Wales wie in Bretagne überhaupt eine Literatur vor dem Jahre 1150 existirt hat;
- 2) daß die Sagen von Arthur sowohl in schriftlichen wie mündlichen Überlieferungen ununterbrochen fortgedauert haben, und rücksichts ihres Inhalts stets im Wachstum gewesen sind;
- 3) erkennen wir aber auch, daß Arthur stets wesentlich vom *national-wälischen* Standpunkt als Kämpfer gegen die Sachsen, und als selbstthätiger Held dargestellt worden ist.⁵¹²

These three points serve to illustrate Schulz' understanding of the inter-cultural dissemination of ancient traditions in Europe: he affirms the claim of the existence of literature in the earlier medieval periods by alluding to the constant growing and changing of traditions through oral and written transmission. Although he mentions the significance of Arthur for the national cause in Wales in this summary, he focusses more on the

⁵¹¹ Ibid., p. 32. [emphasis is mine]

⁵¹² Ibid., 1842, p. 21–22, [emphasis is mine; numbering as in original; in his edited German version, Schulz uses numbering or indents several times for clarity].

discussion of the national character of a people's traditions until the section about the *Mabinogion*. In the introduction to this topic, he illustrates the ancient Celtic mythology in colourful terms and indirectly contrasts it with the Nordic and Oriental traditions:

Es ist dies der alte wälsche und bretagnische Volksaberglaube, die Ruine altceltischer Mythologie, die wälsche wunderbare Märchenwelt. Denn wälsch und bretagnisch, nicht nordisch und noch weniger orientalisches sind diese wohlgesinnten Feen, die den Lanzelot vom See erziehen, diese Riesen, die Owain, Tristan und Peredur niederkämpfen, die bezauberten Brunnen, befriedeten Bäume, die Drachen und Schlangen, die wunderbaren Ringe und Steine mit magischen Kräften, die Dämonen und die lustige Geisterwelt, die noch durch Shakespeare auf's Neue ihr Reich gegründet, alles Wesen und Mächte, die noch jetzt in dem seiner Vorzeit so treugläubigen Wales, wie in Bretagne die Erinnerung mit Pietät und Scheu bewahrt und verehrt.⁵¹³

The choice of words in the above quote shows Schulz' perception of the state of the ancient Celtic traditions, being mere shadows of a much larger mythology. One could argue that all peoples know tales of supernatural beings and Schulz is well aware of that rebuttal to his hypothesis. Therefore he explains how he arrived at the conclusion, that the mythology behind the tales around Owain, Tristan and Peredur is definitely Celtic and does not originate in another culture. For this purpose, he refers to Jacob Grimm's *Die deutsche Mythologie* (1835) and applies Grimm's theory of a national character of the people's tales, which the latter developed for his discussion of the Germanic mythology, to his own Celtic mythology. According to Schulz' interpretation, the timeline of the conversion from pagan beliefs to Christianity plays the most important role in the transformation of ancient myths into what are nowadays called 'fairy tales'. Since the Celtic people adopted the Christian faith earlier than the Scandinavians, the transformation happened at different times and under different circumstances and therefore their character is now quite distinct from the Nordic traditions.⁵¹⁴

In the German edition of 1842, Schulz bases his knowledge of the Celtic mythology mainly on Guest's notes to her translations of the *Mabinogion*, which she translated from the *Red Book of Hergest*. In the English version of 1841, he was unable to refer to Guest's notes so his argument lacks some substance and he resorts to more general observations. In the German edition, he quotes Guest's notes on the different character of the tales, stating clearly that they can be divided into two groups, the Arthurian tales already influenced by

⁵¹³ Ibid., pp. 37–38.

⁵¹⁴ Ibid.

chivalrous ideas (*Y Tair Rhamant*) and the older, native material which differs significantly in form, content and organisation. Schulz seems to agree with her judgement and adds some information from Lhwyd's *Archaeologia britannica* about the *Red Book of Hergest*, saying that, besides the *Mabinogion*, it also contained poems of Llywarch Hen, Merddhin, Taliesin and some younger poets.

Schulz' discussion of the *Mabinogion* in German is more detailed than the English version, with additional sources which add depth to his argument. There are also clear examples of instances where translation can alter the meaning of Schulz' argument. Even though Schulz thoroughly edited the German original manuscript of 1840 before publishing it in 1842, he did not rewrite it completely, leaving much of the text unaltered. It appears that he moved several sections but kept the actual wording. When comparing these passages, some semantic problems between English and German become visible. In the English translation, for instance, we read the following statement about the nature of tradition:

Tradition and fables are always supposed to contain faith and doubt. A tale is a dream of truth, with the full consciousness that it is but a dream. The relater knows that he repeats an imaginative poem.⁵¹⁵

The meaning of the above excerpt is not very clear, especially as the central theme changes from a tale, that is a conscious dream, to a poem. There is no apparent reason why this is the case. In the corresponding passage in the German text on tradition the actual meaning becomes obvious:

Der Mythos und die Sage setzen den Glauben an ihre Wahrheit voraus. Das Märchen ist ein Traum der Wahrheit, und zwar ein bewußter Traum. Der Märchenerzähler ist der phantastischen Erdichtung sich bewußt.⁵¹⁶

The English does not quite capture the meaning of the German, as it plays with the different meanings of the word 'Wahrheit' which can be truth or reality. The second problem arises in the translation of 'Erdichtung' which does not mean the same as 'Dichtung' (= poetry, or poem, as rendered by the translator) but rather 'fantasy, fabrication, invention'. This example shows that the German version as an untranslated text is a more accurate reflection of Schulz' views. Despite possible flaws in her own work, Berrington corrected several mistakes of Schulz, added sources and attempted to clarify apparent inconsistencies or logical faults in the reasoning. Schulz took note of these

⁵¹⁵ Schulz, 1841, p. 68.

⁵¹⁶ Schulz, 1842, p. 40.

suggestions and corrections in the German edition. In fact, he reacted to every single instance of the translator's interference.

Berrington's first comment was on the question whether Gildas actually mentioned Arthur at all or whether Henry of Huntingdon confused the work of Nennius with the older chronicle of Gildas. Not having read Gildas prior to the submission of his essay, Schulz had to rely on Henry's account, which he labels as 'suspicious'. The translator retorts that his suspicions are unfounded as Gildas' work is frequently attributed to Nennius. Schulz reacts to this in the German edition with a thorough criticism of the sources; having read Gildas by now, he quotes the relevant section where Gildas relates the battle of Mount Badon without mentioning Arthur at all. Then he contrasts this with Henry's account which contains the twelve expeditions as Nennius reported them. In paraphrasing Nennius, however, he still maintains the translation error of 'ysgwyd' versus 'ysgwydd', shield versus shoulder, in the narrative,⁵¹⁷ a mistake which was also highlighted by Berrington. In the second section on the development of the motif of the Round Table, however, Schulz uses the correct translation 'shield' instead of 'shoulder' in his summary of Geoffrey's *Historia*.⁵¹⁸

Schulz' more profound knowledge of the source texts, mainly the Latin chronicles, also aids him in strengthening his argument for the important role that Brittany and the Bretons, originally refugees from Wales, played in the tradition and development of the Arthurian material. He refers to Alanus ab insulis, Robert Wace and his *Roman de Rollo*, and the travel report of Giraldus Cambrensis to support his argument that both Wales and Brittany were a very fertile soil for these extraordinary tales to grow, whereas all French Arthurian romances have a Breton origin.⁵¹⁹ Wales provided the raw material for the story arc but Brittany was key in developing this material into the romances that spread over large parts of Europe after 1150. Besides the support of the referenced works, Schulz also remarks that the adjective *britannici*, used by Geoffrey to describe his sources, could signify both Breton and Briton, as the distinction was not clear in the eleventh century. Furthermore, Schulz supplies a detailed history of Wales and Brittany, giving a more substantial account of it in German than in the English version, including details on emigration waves and their reasons. Besides informing his German readership about the historical facts which were

⁵¹⁷ Ibid., p. 5.

⁵¹⁸ Ibid., p. 14.

⁵¹⁹ Ibid., p. 20f.

most likely unknown to them, he also supports his claim that the inhabitants of Brittany are Welsh refugees with linguistic arguments: first, the name ‘Armorica’, the Latinized Gaulish toponym for Brittany, is ‘Ar-mor-uch’ in Welsh, signifying ‘upon sea heights’. He also quotes Giraldus, who, in the eleventh century, claimed, that Welsh and Breton were mutually intelligible.⁵²⁰ In the end, however, he remains undecided on which parts of the most ancient sources were surely Breton and which ones were decidedly Welsh. The lack of written evidence from the ninth to eleventh century makes it almost impossible, Schulz claims, to find an answer to this question. Therefore, he rebukes the translator’s claims that all pre-conquest sources are necessarily Welsh (as for example Geoffrey’s ancient book in the British tongue as the purported source for his *Historia Regum Britanniae*) and asserts that it cannot be decided in all certainty. Nevertheless, he comes to the conclusion that Brittany was definitely the cradle of the chivalrous romances, as it was the meeting point for the Welsh traditions and the French and Provençal materials, and therefore Brittany was crucial in their dissemination across Europe from the late twelfth century onwards:

Wir sind weit entfernt zu behaupten, daß die Sage in Wales um 1000 völlig geruhet, ja gar in Vergessenheit gerathen sei; es werden die unten zu erörternden Mabinogion uns das Gegentheil dartun. Aber für ihre umfassendere, und insbesondere für Frankreich einflußreichere Bearbeitung in der Bretagne berufen wir uns auf das Zeugniß Gottfrieds von Monmouth, der sich ausdrücklich auf ein Buch in bretagnischer Sprache bezieht, und auf die von Wilhelm von Malmesbury u.A.m. erwähnten bretagnischen Schriften und Traditionen.⁵²¹

Schulz thus insists on his interpretation of Geoffrey’s comment on the language of his sources and he also emphasises the significance of Brittany for the overall development of the Arthurian romances. Finally, he also responds to the translator’s blunt statement in the footnotes, where she flagged up his glaring mistake of confusing the Veneti (inhabitants of the area of Vannes in Brittany) with the Venedoti (the inhabitants of North Wales, giving rise to the name Gwynedd). He retains his quote from Geoffrey’s *Vita Merlini* about Peredur’s origin in his narrative, but in this instance, he correctly locates the Venedoti in North Wales, but then goes on to point out that the French romances frequently transpose the location of the hero, now Percival, to Brittany by adding French toponyms such as the forest of Brecehande and the fountain of Barenton. Neither the forest nor the fountain is

⁵²⁰ Ibid., p. 28.

⁵²¹ Ibid., p. 33.

named in the Welsh original tale. In Kiot's *Parcival*, Arthur's court is even moved to Nantes.⁵²²

With all the corrections prompted by Berrington's footnotes, Schulz succeeded in strengthening his reasoning and increasing the factual correctness of his essay. The intervention of the translator thus had a positive influence on Schulz as a scholar, as he took it as an incentive to broaden his knowledge of the source texts and to deepen his understanding of the history, the period and the countries and cultures with which he was engaging. It also paved the way for his next major undertaking. While the essay certainly was of interest for the German academic audience, it mainly served as a framework for Schulz' follow-up project: making Welsh tales available to the German public, to some extent following in the footsteps of Herder's collection of folksongs, *Volkslieder nebst untermischten anderen Stücken*, (1778/79), later *Stimmen der Völker in Liedern* (1807). Therefore, the second, much larger part of the 1842 edition contained the German translations of *The Lady of the Fountain*, *Peredur the Son of Evrawc* and *Geraint the Son of Erbin*, which were translated into English in 1838, 1839 and 1840 by Guest in the first three parts of her seven-part publication of translations from the Welsh tales from the *Red Book of Hergest*.⁵²³ These three tales form a particular group among the twelve translated by Guest, as they are also called *Y Tair Rhamant*, the Three Romances.⁵²⁴ It is commonly held that they are, in the form found in the *Red Book*, based on French romances by Chrétien de Troyes: *Yvain, le chevalier au lion*, *Perceval, le conte du Graal* and *Erec et Enide*. Guest's original translations were accompanied by extensive notes on the characters, places and customs described in the tales and comparisons to similar traditions in other languages.⁵²⁵

In 1841, when Schulz was preparing to publish his essay in German, the first three tales were available in English, with others in preparation, but not yet published. The reason for this was the rivalry between Lady Charlotte and La Villemarqué which began in 1838. She was already working on her translation of *Geraint* when he arrived in Wales to attend the

⁵²² Ibid., p. 34.

⁵²³ Charlotte Guest, *The Mabinogion: from the Llyfr Coch o Hergest and other ancient Welsh manuscripts* (London : Longman, Brown, Green and Longmans ; Llandoverly : W. Rees, 1849). Each of the seven parts has a special title page, dated 1838, 1839, 1840, 1842, 1843, 1845 and 1849 respectively.

In 1849, the first comprehensive edition of all twelve translations was published in three volumes.

⁵²⁴ R. M. Jones, [Bobi Jones] *Tair rhamant Arthuraidd : gydag arolwg o derfynau beirniadaeth gyfansawdd* (Caernarfon: Gwasg Pantycelyn, 1998).

⁵²⁵ Charlotte Guest, *The Mabinogion* (London: Bernard Quaritch, 1877 [centenary reprint of first edn by John Jones, Cardiff, 1977]). [my emphasis]

Abergavenny Eisteddfod. At first, she was quite impressed with him but soon became increasingly disturbed by his opportunistic behaviour.⁵²⁶ While working on *The Dream of Rhonabwy* in 1839, she heard that La Villemarqué had received a transcript of *Peredur* from Tegid, despite his promise not to give any transcriptions to anyone else. From that moment, she spent up to twelve hours a day in order to beat the Breton count to the press. Within seven weeks she had the English translation of *Peredur* ready for publication, including notes and decorations.⁵²⁷ The fall-out of this race became visible in the 1840 essay competition, to which La Villemarqué submitted an essay which drew heavily on Lady Charlotte's materials, barely acknowledging her work and even insinuating that she had not accomplished the translations herself. Lady Charlotte assumed that it was 'his anger at being unable to forestall her in the publication of *Peredur*'.⁵²⁸

When Schulz prepared his 1842 publication, he decided to include all materials available to him in the *Arthursage*, publishing the German translations of the *Three Romances* alongside most of the notes which Lady Guest provided in her English editions. He dutifully acknowledged the importance of her work for his translations and understanding of the subject, marking every single note which he took from her books with LG. His academic honesty was favourably noticed by Lady Charlotte in her diary.⁵²⁹

Despite making use of most of her work, Schulz did not simply transmit it into German, but adapted it to his target audience. He changed the layout of the translations, providing extensive footnotes in the text instead of working exclusively with endnotes which were Guest's preferred choice of giving additional information to her readers. Schulz also added some endnotes to his translations, mainly on the history and significance of central figures and places in the tales. In text he explained the meaning of Welsh names and cultural particularities to his readers as will be illustrated in the excerpts of Guest's English and Schulz' German translations:

King *Arthur* was at *Caerlleon upon Usk*; and one day he sat in his chamber; and with him were *Owain the son of Urien*, and *Kynon the son of Clydno*, and *Kai the son of Kyner*; and *Gwenhwyvar* and her hand-maidens at needlework by the window. *And if it should be said that there was a porter at Arthur's palace, there was none. Glewylwyd Gavaelvawr* was there, acting as porter, to welcome guests and strangers, and to receive them with honour, and to inform them of the manners and customs of the Court; and to

⁵²⁶ R. Guest, A. V. John, *Lady Charlotte Guest, An Extraordinary Life*, p. 109.

⁵²⁷ *Ibid.*

⁵²⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 110.

⁵²⁹ *Ibid.*

direct those who came to the Hall or to the presence-chamber, and those who came to take up their lodging.⁵³⁰

In the endnotes, Lady Guest provides information on all highlighted characters, in particular on Glewlwyd Gavaelvawr, providing the meaning of the name of the latter ‘The dusky hero of the mighty grasp’.⁵³¹ The significance of having or not having an official porter in medieval Wales is also explained; Guest states that ‘[t]he absence of a Porter was formerly considered as an indication of hospitality, and as such is alluded to by Rhys Brychan, a bard who flourished in the fifteenth century.’⁵³² Schulz’ translation follows her text closely, but limits the additional information to his readers to two footnotes:

König Arthur war zu Caerlleon am Usk. Er saß eines Tages in seinem Gemache; bei ihm waren Owain, Sohn des Urien, und Kynon, Sohn des Clydno, und Kai, Sohn des Kyner; auch Gwenhwyvar und deren Kammermädchen mit Nätherei am Fenster. Wenn man behaupten wollte, es sei ein Thürsteher ¹⁾⁵³³ in Arthur’s Schloß gewesen, so war dies in der That nicht der Fall. Glewlwyd Gavaelvawr ²⁾⁵³⁴ befand sich hier an der Stelle eines Thürstehers, um Reisige und Gäste zu bewillkommen, sie nach Gebühr aufzunehmen, und mit den Sitten und Gebräuchen des Hofes bekannt zu machen, und auch denen zum Führer zu dienen, die zur Halle, in den Versammlungssaal oder in ihr Wohnzimmer gehen wollten.

In the footnotes, Schulz transmits particular cultural information to his readers, explaining the Welsh tradition linked to the position of the porter and on the meaning of his name, translating from Guest’s notes. In general, Schulz provides additional information on some lesser known characters but omits material on others, thus only using a part of Guest’s endnotes. He explained this rationale in the foreword to the essay:

[...], und um jene alten Dichtungen sammt den Anmerkungen der Lady Guest diesem Zwecke diensamer zu machen, mußte ich mir erlauben, die Dekonomie des englischen Werkes zu ändern; nicht alle Anmerkungen der gelehrten Herausgeberin waren für Deutschland von vorzugsweisem Interesse, weßhalb nur die erheblichen unverändert beibehalten und mit L.G. bezeichnet sind. Andere haben, durch meine eigenen Zusätze vermehrt, in den Bemerkungen zu den einzelnen Mabinogion ihren Platz gefunden.⁵³⁵

Schulz faithfully indicates the origin of his notes, whether they are his own findings or a translation of Guest’s notes. He fully acknowledges Guest’s precedence in both the

⁵³⁰ Schulz, 1842, p.3.

⁵³¹ Ibid., p. 42–43.

⁵³² Ibid., 1877, p. 42.

⁵³³ Schulz, 1842, p. 99, ‘Wenn ein Türsteher fehlte, so galt dies als ein offenkundiges Zeichen der Gastfreundschaft [... translation of the entire note by Guest, indicated with the initials LG]’.

⁵³⁴ Ibid. ‘Glewlwyd Gavaelvawr, “der finstere Held mit der mächtigen Faust“, [...another translation from Guest’s notes]’.

⁵³⁵ Ibid., ‘Vorrede’, p. vi.

translation and the research in medieval Welsh traditions. His respect for Guest's work also becomes apparent in the translation itself, since Schulz aims at delivering a target text which is as faithful to the original text as possible. A comparison of the two excerpts above shows that the translation follows the original both in syntax and vocabulary very closely. Some differences in English and German syntax require minor adjustments, such as the rendering of 'Glewylwyd Gavaelvawr was there, *acting as porter*, to welcome guests and strangers' where the gerund has to be translated into German with a different syntactical feature: 'Glewylwyd Gavaelvawr befand sich hier *an der Stelle eines Thürstehers*, um Reisine und Gäste zu bewillkommen'.

There are, however, some instances in the text, where Schulz struggles to find a German correspondent to the English word, as it had not yet been assigned a conventional equivalent. The English word 'satin', which nowadays has been incorporated in the German vocabulary as a loan word 'Satin', is translated in different ways throughout the text. The description of King Arthur and his seat are a good example of this:

In the centre of the chamber King Arthur sat upon a seat of green rushes, over which was spread a covering of flame-coloured satin, and a cushion of red satin was under his elbow.⁵³⁶

In the German translation this is rendered as follows:

Inmitten des Gemaches saß König Arthur auf einem Sitz von grünen Binsen, worüber eine Decke von hellfarbigem Atlas gebreitet; ein Poster von rother Seide lag unter seinen Ellenbogen.⁵³⁷

English 'satin' is once rendered with 'Atlas', once with 'Seide', the first term denoting a form of textile binding, the other the material.⁵³⁸ The German translation thus is more specific. This strategy is used throughout the translation, in all instances when clothes of satin are described. Yellow satin, *pali melyn*, in the Welsh original, plays an important role in the narrative, as it indicates the degree of nobility of the characters. In the medieval period, there was a strict dress code which kind of fabric and which colour was to be worn by esquires, knights, princes, etc. Guest adds a note on this, saying that she translated *pali* either as satin or velvet, depending on the social rank of the character. Knights, for

⁵³⁶ Guest, 'The Lady of the Fountain', 1877 [1977] p.3.

⁵³⁷ Schulz, 1842, pp. 100–101.

⁵³⁸ In textile specialist terminology, atlas signifies a form of textile binding, which is called satin weaving in English. Seide, silk, on the other hand, signifies a type of yarn produced by larvae of the domestic silk moth.

example, were permitted to wear velvet and the colour scarlet.⁵³⁹ In the German translation, velvet is translated as ‘Samt’.⁵⁴⁰ Schulz, however, does not explain the colour and fabric code as he omits Lady Guest’s note.

In summary, it can be said that Schulz followed the traditional methodology in the translation of the English versions by Lady Guest. The main focus is the faithful rendering of the source text, where possible with the same syntactical features. The contextualisation of the translations, however, merits especial attention. Schulz shows his particular interest in comparative literature with an added feature in his version of *Die Dame von der Quelle*. Building on the research focus of the preceding essay on the dissemination of Arthurian traditions across Europe, Schulz also uses the translations to highlight the common medieval literary heritage of France and Germany. In so doing, he shows his intention to act as a cultural mediator, whose aim it is to enrich his readers’ appreciation of literature across boundaries of space and time. Between the translation of Guest’s text and some of her notes, he prints the Middle High German text of *Iwein, der Ritter mit dem Löwen* by Hartmann von Aue as a direct comparison with the French version of *Ivain le chevalier au lion* by Chrétien de Troyes.⁵⁴¹ Thus, he makes three versions of the tale available to his audience: first, the modern German translation of the Welsh version (via Guest’s English translation) to familiarise his readers with the narrative. Then, he juxtaposes the medieval texts. The left hand column contains the German verses, the right hand column the French verses, both numbered according to two unnamed manuscripts or facsimiles. At regular intervals, Schulz interrupts the verses and paraphrases the content of larger passages in modern German prose to provide anchors for his audience. This arrangement of the texts encourages interested readers to engage with the medieval texts. Mostly, Schulz chooses to compare the dialogues in German and French verse and then paraphrases the descriptive parts of the romances. Moreover, the combination of a Welsh, a German, and a French version of the same tale also places Welsh literature on the same level with the other two. Showing, that this is not an isolated case, he follows this pattern also in the section on the

⁵³⁹ Guest, 1877 [1977], p. 46. ‘pali melyn’

⁵⁴⁰ Schulz, 1842, p. 9.

⁵⁴¹ Ibid., ‘*Die Dame von der Quelle*’ pp. 99–125, ‘*Iwein, der Ritter mit dem Löwen* im Auszuge nach dem Französischen von Chrétien de Troyes und dem Deutschen des Hartmann von Aue’ pp. 126–152.

third tale, *Geraint the son of Erbin*, to which he adds a comparative study of *Erec et Enide*, the German and French versions of Hartmann von Aue and Chrestien de Troyes.⁵⁴²

Although the second tale, *Peredur*, is not explicitly provided with a comparative study in the table of contents, it is the corresponding tale to *Parcival*, on which Schulz had conducted most research prior to his engagement with the Welsh parallel story. Therefore, the chapter ‘Bemerkungen zum Peredur’ is based on Schulz’ long study of *Parcival* by Wolfram von Eschenbach.⁵⁴³ He thus uses his latest publication to showcase his previous work. He begins with a summary of the results of his research into the Welsh, French and German traditions, outlining the sparse information on the figure of Peredur in Geoffrey of Monmouth’s chronicle, Aneirin’s poems, the development into a full romance by Chrestien de Troyes, and further transformations in the Provençal traditions with the addition of the motive of the Holy Grail. This chapter can be seen as an addition to the concise version of the chapter on the influence of Welsh traditions on German literature, which occupies only one page in the German edition of 1842, whereas the chapter in the English essay of 1841 ran to eleven pages. Schulz uses much of his study on *Parcival* for his own version of annotations to *Peredur* instead of mainly translating Guest’s comments, as he had done for *Die Dame von der Quelle* and *Geraint Son of Erbin*. In his notes to *Peredur*, he only includes six of Guest’s notes.

The comparative studies of *Peredur*, *Owain* and *Geraint* are impressive examples of Schulz’ vision of comparative medieval literature but it is little advertised. Schulz, modest as usual, only mentions briefly in the foreword, that he has included excerpts of French and German versions of the Welsh Romances to illustrate the development of the various traditions:

Da die mitgetheilten Märchen die vorzüglichsten und berühmtesten Romane Frankreichs und Deutschlands unmittelbar berühren, so erschien es nicht unzweckmäßig, die letzteren im Auszuge nach den zugänglichen Quellen mitzutheilen, wodurch am kürzesten und deutlichsten die formelle und materielle Fortbildung der alten ursprünglichen Stoffe anschaulich gemacht wird.⁵⁴⁴

The emphasis on the formal and material development again shows Schulz’ research focus on the structural and thematic evolution of the tales on their journey across Europe rather

⁵⁴² Ibid., ‘Geraint Sohn des Erbin’ pp. 249–298, ‘Erec und Enide von Chrétien de Troyes und Hartmann von Aue’ pp. 299–320.

⁵⁴³ Ibid., pp. 218–248.

⁵⁴⁴ Ibid., Vorrede, p. vi.

than on linguistic or philological questions. This is also illustrated by the selection for translation of only some of Guest's annotations, for example omitting the notes on the significance of the dress code. Schulz chooses to translate notes which underpin his agenda of presenting the pan-European scope of the Arthurian romances. With the essay, translation and comparative studies, he introduces himself to the German public as a follower of Herderian and Schlegelian traditions.

Before moving to the public reception of Schulz' *Arthursage*, the above mentioned letter from Wilhelm Grimm, which was found in the collection of letters from Grimm to Pertz in the National Library of Wales, will be briefly analysed. The letter was discovered by chance, since the name on it was misread as Pertz instead of Schulz. Two pieces of evidence point undoubtedly at Schulz: first, the mention of his publication *Die Arthursage* and second his title Royal Privy Councillor. In the other letters in the collection, Pertz is usually addressed as 'dear friend' by Wilhelm. In order to analyse the letter, a full transcript of the letter will be given below:

Berlin 28 August 1842

Ich sage Ihnen, hochgeehrter regierungsrath, für das schöne geschenk, das Sie mir mit der *Arthursage* gemacht haben, meinen aufrichtigen dank. Diese mabinogion (Sie werden jetzt auch den 4ⁿ theil besitzen) sind nicht bloß durch ihren inhalt, auch durch ihre form eine merkwürdige erscheinung. Man begreift nicht die seelenlosigkeit neben der doch noch volksmäßigen natur der dichtung und der, wenn auch schwachen doch noch sichtbaren Spuren eines höheren zusammenhangs und einer abhängigkeit von einer belebenden idee. bloße schattenbilder sind es nicht. es muß ein eigenes verderbnis über diese auffassung gekommen sein: die sage scheint vertrocknet, wie die blätter der bäume in der afrikanischen sonne dieses jahres, während die äußere gestalt sich noch ziemlich treu erhalten hat.

Ihrer abhandlung gebührt das verdienst, die puncte, auf welche es ankommt, richtig aufgefunden zu haben, und was Sie zur beantwortung der schwierigsten fragen gethan haben wird jeder, der weiterforschen will, dankbar annehmen. aus einer genauen vergleichung mit den nordfranzösischen dichtungn erwarte ich noch manchen aufschluß. Sie haben in dieser beziehung schon einige glückliche bemerkungen gemacht. am wenigsten begreift man noch wie die wälsche sage in der bretagnischen umbildung eine solche gänzliche umwandlung hat erfahren können.

Ich freue mich allzeit Ihrer treuen und innigen hingebung an diese studien, zumal bei der das erquickende auffrischende gefühl, das geistige thätigkeit dem menschen in jeder lage gewährt.

Nehmen Sie die versicherung meiner und meines Bruders aufrichtiger hochschätzung und schenken Sie uns fernerhin Ihre freundschaftliche gesinnung.

Ihr ergebenster Wilhelm Grimm⁵⁴⁵

Grimm first thanks Schulz for the present, then proceeds to give his own view on the mabinogion tales. He seems to believe that they must have been part of a much larger mythology of which only fragments survived into the medieval period when they were recorded in writing for the first time. This reflects the view of

The second paragraph contains Grimm's appraisal of Schulz' work. Grimm acknowledges that Schulz succeeds in addressing the most important points and he also seems to agree with Schulz' self-depiction as a pioneer in the field. He agrees that Schulz provides a platform for following generations of scholars to deepen the research in the field and he expects important findings to be made in the years to come. This diplomatic answer to Schulz contains both hints at Grimm's Romantic background but also highlights his awareness of the growing trend of modernism in the literary field. The last sentence of the second paragraph subliminally tells Schulz that his answer to the question of transformation of the Welsh traditions in Brittany is insufficient. Grimm dampens the criticism with two polite and benevolent closing paragraphs.

Following the discussion of the private review of Schulz' *Arthursage*, the public reviews will be analysed next. After the major recasting outlined above and approximately one year after the publication of the English translation, Schulz' German edition was printed by Basse in Quedlinburg and Leipzig. It was the subject of two separate reviews, one in the *Neue Jenaische Allgemeine Literatur-Zeitung* (NJALZ)⁵⁴⁶ in Germany, the other in *The Foreign Quarterly*⁵⁴⁷ in Britain. The German review was written by Ernst Susemihl, a scholar and professional translator living in Kirchdorf on the island of Poel. Today, he is virtually unknown for his translations, but in the course of recent digitisation projects, most of his translations from English and French are now accessible to the general public.⁵⁴⁸ The list comprises over forty translations, most notably the novels of Edward Bulwer-Lytton, George Payne Rainsford James and James Grant, some plays of Shakespeare and several works of Alexandre Dumas the elder. His other contributions to the field of literary studies

⁵⁴⁵ NLW, MS 16603C, fol. 18, *Letters of Jacob and Wilhelm Grimm*.

⁵⁴⁶ Ernst Susemihl, 'Die Arthur-Sage und die Märchen des rothen Buches von Hergest. Herausgegeben von San Marte (Albert Schulz)' in *Neue Jenaische Allgemeine Literatur-Zeitung*, (vol. 2, no. 231), 27–28 September 1843, pp. 933–940.

⁵⁴⁷ 'Die Arthur-Sage und die Märchen [sic] des Rothen Buches von Hergest. Herausgegeben von San Marte (Albert Schulz)' in *The Foreign Quarterly Review*, 32, (Jan. 1844), p. 536.

⁵⁴⁸ mainly Google Books and the Münchner Digitalisierungs Zentrum run by the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek

seem to comprise mainly reviews, as he also reviewed Guest's translation of the *Mabinogion* for the *NJALZ*.

Susemihl's highly critical review of Schulz' *Arthursage* was published in two consecutive issues of *Neue Jenaische Allgemeine Literatur-Zeitung* on 27 and 28 September 1843. Susemihl begins the review with a description of the state of Celtic studies, and the fields of Welsh medieval history and literature in particular. He admits that it is one of the darkest corners in literary studies, as no comprehensive research has been done in this field. There is very little information in the Latin sources, as Susemihl refers to Gildas, Beda and Nennius, of which the latter's account he finds rather suspicious. Further, he doubts that there are any manuscripts dating back to the sixth or seventh century, as it is claimed in Wales by some (Susemihl remains rather vague with his statement). The problem of scarce Latin sources is heightened by the difficulty in finding and understanding native Welsh sources. Susemihl also claims that those who are actually capable of reading the medieval Welsh original texts, are divided into two sections who differ significantly from each other in their ideology. While the first group uncritically assumes that all sources are reporting the historical truth, the other group dismisses everything as fable and invention, even the appearance of famous historical figures in the annals of the Welsh people. When it comes to analysing the appearance of famous characters, Susemihl identifies three different approaches. The first claims that there were several persons of the same name which later became collated to one heroic figure. The aim of this group is to establish all the different contributors to the end product, while the second faction dismisses everything as mythical invention. The third party claims that all manuscripts of Welsh antiquity were only written in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, an opinion which, according to Susemihl, is disputed by several Welsh antiquarians. Susemihl does not reveal his sources for his description of the three different opinions entertained at the time, who represents the three factions, nor does he explicitly state his opinion on those positions but in the following paragraph, his very critical attitude towards Celtic and especially Welsh scholars becomes apparent and it can be inferred that he sides with the more critical factions mentioned above.

He reproaches Welsh historians for their enthusiastic, patriotic and uncritical attitude towards their own history and mythological past. He believes that no other people is more prone to this than the Welsh. He accuses them of filtering the material according to their

preferences, only retaining positive aspects without critical questioning, while glossing over everything that was hostile to their national character. Susemihl summarises the current research climate in Wales and its results as ‘die wildeste Romantik, die übertriebenste Erfindung’,⁵⁴⁹ and states that it has been publicised as neutral, factual history. His choice of words, ‘wildeste Romantik’, marks a clear antagonism towards the Romantic period, indicating that he, Susemihl, does not count himself among the Late Romantics, while Schulz can be counted among them. Susemihl is a representative of Modernism, while Schulz, even if he would like to be seen as a modern scholar, represents Romanticism with a penchant towards Herderian and Schlegelian historicism. The opposing forces within the literary field are illustrated even more clearly in Susemihl’s next claim on the tensions in the field of power. The uncritical attitude of the Welsh enthusiasts has sparked the only natural reaction, he says, which is the questioning and rejection of everything by the other faction of overly critical researchers, dismissing even the good and solid facts as fable as, for them, the character of the Welsh is flawed by its blind credulity.⁵⁵⁰ Susemihl is apparently aware of the struggles in the British literary field, where the peripheral Welsh scholars are attempting to establish themselves and to improve their position. His condemnation of these attempts suggests that he sides with the dominant field, but it also shows that he is aware of the biased approach of many Welsh scholars. In the course of the review, this supposition is confirmed, as he reproaches Schulz for making only sparing use of English sources on British history and literary history, all of them sources that Susemihl thinks are indispensable for a thorough study of the subject. Susemihl thus acts as a representative of the core culture and in the centre and of a new, modernist paradigm, while Schulz is the ambassador of the peripheral culture fighting for its place and an outdated methodology which is favoured in the periphery. Susemihl’s demand for a more balanced and scholarly approach, including relevant English sources can be seen as one reason why he appears to doubt Schulz’ competence and the value of his research, as he, Schulz, mainly used French, German and Welsh sources.

Having made his position clear in the dispute around Welsh traditions and their age, their tradition and their veracity, Susemihl eventually approaches the subject of the review, Schulz’ successful essay. Susemihl outlines his own expectations of the competition:

⁵⁴⁹ Susemihl, *Neue Jenaische Allgemeine Literatur-Zeitung*, 27 September 1843, p. 934.

⁵⁵⁰ *Ibid.*

Als ich in dem englischen Athenäum gelesen, dass S.-M. Die von der *Cymreigyddion Society* in Abergavenny an die Gelehrten des Festlandes gestellte Preisfrage: Über den Einfluss der altwalisischen Traditionen auf die Literatur Frankreichs, Deutschlands und Skandinaviens, gelöst habe und ihm der Preis zuerkannt worden sei, sah ich mit Ungeduld dem Erscheinen der vorliegenden Schrift entgegen, indem ich hoffte, über Manches, was mir dunkel geblieben, oder zu dessen Erforschung die mir zu Gebote stehenden Hilfsmittel nicht ausreichten, gründliche und geistreiche Aufschlüsse zu erhalten.⁵⁵¹

Susemihl's choice of words highlights that he expected a definitive solution or answer to the question, and a treatise of sufficiently high standard to become a part of the canon in the field. Schulz' probabilistic approach to the question, not venturing to give an indisputable verdict on the tradition of the Arthurian material, did not satisfy Susemihl's expectations at all. Besides the criticism directed at Schulz' choice and use of source material, Susemihl also reproaches Schulz for daring to submit an essay to the subject when he does not understand Welsh and therefore has to rely on accounts and reviews of the primary texts by biased, native scholars. If he is dependent on the interpretation of the unscientific and enthusiastic scholarly community in Wales, it devalues his research since he cannot produce a neutral and objective treatise. Again, Susemihl's criticism is the voice of Modernism, pointing out the flaws of the Romantic approach to the subject.

Susemihl enumerates the skills he expects in anyone who attempts to research the Welsh, French, German and Scandinavian medieval texts. He highlights that first and foremost the knowledge of Middle Welsh is indispensable, but the candidate must be well-versed in Old French and Old Norse literature as well in order to be qualified enough to understand and establish the connections in medieval European literature. He then expresses his shock in discovering, that Schulz did not possess even the most basic knowledge of Welsh and is also found wanting in his knowledge of the medieval sources in the other languages. This paragraph is a clear denunciation of amateurism which should not have been rewarded with the main £80 subscription prize.

Before delving deeper in the actual critique of the essay, Susemihl concludes his prelude with a rather condemnatory paragraph in which he reveals the rationale behind the criticism. First of all, he asserts the fact that the essay has won a prize does not exempt it from being criticised. Secondly, he wishes to justify the accusations made in his introduction with substantial evidence as the present work should not become a part of the

⁵⁵¹ Ibid.

canon. Susemihl feels it is his duty to highlight its shortcomings to the German public so that it (and subsequently its author, Schulz) will not be recognised as an authority in the field. He fears that its inclusion in the collection ‘Bibliothek der gesammten Nationalliteratur’ would aid the process of canonization and at present, in his opinion, it is far from being good enough to be included. Susemihl holds the collection in high esteem, saying that it is a collection ‘von der man nur Gründliches und Vortreffliches zu erwarten gewohnt und berechtigt ist’.⁵⁵²

This paragraph shows the relations in the field of power between Schulz and Susemihl. Susemihl, with a doctoral degree in a relevant field sees himself as a central player in the field with the necessary credentials to his name.⁵⁵³ He functions as a regular reviewer for the *NJALZ* and is convinced of his authority in the field. Schulz, in contrast, does not have the academic credentials nor are Schulz’ previous publications known to Susemihl, who does not mention Schulz’ work on Wolfram von Eschenbach, apparently unaware also that it was reviewed positively by Wilhelm Grimm in the *Göttingische Gelehrten-Anzeigen*. This stands in stark contrast to the reviewers in Britain who mentioned *Parcival* and the *Life of Wolfram von Eschenbach* as major works by Schulz. Susemihl’s lack of acknowledgement robs Schulz of his credentials in the field and thus makes him appear as a novice with no record in the field.

The critique proper begins with an implied slight of Schulz, as Susemihl claims that the material in Schulz’ his first chapter on King Arthur was taken from Turner’s *History of the Anglo-Saxons*. He points out that Schulz did not cite any other English sources, which reduces the merit of Schulz’ essay. Susemihl suggests the anonymous *Britannia after the Romans; being an attempt to demonstrate the religious and political revolutions of that province in the fifth and succeeding centuries*, (1836) which was cited in the announcement by the *Cymreigyddion*.⁵⁵⁴ This is an interesting piece of information, as the advertisement in the Welsh newspapers did not contain a list of book recommendations for research on the topic. It is possible that the version of the announcement, which was sent to continental newspapers, came with a bibliography. If Schulz received word via his link to Wales through Lepsius and Bunsen, it is likely that he received the original advertisement

⁵⁵² Susemihl, *NJALZ*, 27. September 1843, p. 934.

⁵⁵³ It is not mentioned in the review, but he most likely obtained his degree in literary studies, medieval studies or philology.

⁵⁵⁴ Susemihl states that the book was written by an anonymous author but it is actually Algernon Herbert (1792–1855) who published his work in four volumes.

of the Eisteddfod without book recommendations. Therefore he conducted his research according to the original wording.

Despite recommending *Britannia after the Romans* as a source, Susemihl does not agree with its approach to the subject, being too mystical for his taste, but consultation of it could have provided Schulz with a better idea of the scope of the task. Susemihl implies pointedly that, had Schulz been aware of the importance of the task, he might have refrained from undertaking it in the first place. Furthermore, he accuses Schulz of plagiarism and challenges him with the words ‘S.-M. muss den deutschen Gelehrten wahrlich nicht viel zugetraut haben, wenn er glauben konnte, dass so augenfällige Plagiate unentdeckt bleiben würden.’⁵⁵⁵ Susemihl refers to Schulz’ liberal use of Turner as a source and surmises that Schulz apparently felt guilty about his extensive use thereof, which is why he praises Turner’s work. Susemihl belittles Schulz’ only critical comment regarding his principal source, as he questions Schulz’ analytical abilities: ‘ist S.-M. im Stande, bei Turner eine Prüfung anzuwenden?’ and further ‘S.-M. wundert sich mit Recht über Turner’s Kenntnis der altwalisischen Sprachdenkmäler, da er wenigstens keine zeigt’.⁵⁵⁶ Similarly critical comments are inserted in Schulz’ passage on Turner:

Wer indess Turner’s *Vindication* einer aufmerksamen Durchsicht und Prüfung gewürdigt hat, wird in dem Hauptresultate dennoch, selbst bei dem grössten Skepticismus, seinem mit umfassender Gelehrsamkeit und durchdringendem kritischen Scharfsinn geführten Beweise, dass diese alten Gesänge echt seien, beipflichten müssen, und nur Eins lässt er zu wünschen übrig, das er nicht auf dem Wege der historischen Sprachforschung aus der Sprache jener alten Dichter seinen Beweis geführt hat.⁵⁵⁷

Besides the polemic tone of the comments, their insertion into the argument interrupts its flow and further complicates the structure of the already very complex sentence. Susemihl thus disrupts and devalues Schulz’ attempts as a critical reviewer of Turner’s book. Furthermore, he ridicules Schulz’ point with the remark that, while Turner did not possess sufficient knowledge of the Welsh language, Schulz knew even less Welsh, so how dare he to criticise another researcher for the gaps in his skills when he is not capable of filling them himself.

Susemihl uses the mention of the Welsh language to distinguish himself in the field by presenting his own view on the Celtic languages. He claims to have read all the relevant

⁵⁵⁵ Susemihl, *NJALZ*, 27 September 1843, p. 935.

⁵⁵⁶ *Ibid.*

⁵⁵⁷ Schulz, 1842, p. 7.

recent publications in Celtology and Celtic linguistics and regales his readers with a concise but detailed description of the state of the Celtic dialects while citing several theoretical books on the matter.⁵⁵⁸ He puts Irish, Scots Gaelic, Manx, Welsh, Breton and Cornish, which is already extinct at the time of writing, in relation to each other, grouping them according to their linguistic similarities. Comparable to the reviewer writing on behalf of the *Gentleman's Magazine*, Susemihl uses the review of another author's book to strengthen his position within the literary field by demonstrating his superior knowledge. Almost three of the eleven columns of the entire review are dedicated to Susemihl's own views and to his desire to advertise his own proficiency in the field to the readers of the journal.

Following the section on the Celtic languages, Susemihl dismisses Schulz' chapter on the bards as he only compiled information contained in other sources, augmented with quotations from Turner, therefore not adding any new findings to the discourse. He acknowledges, however, that Schulz formulated the most important research question: whether Wales or Brittany was the origin of the Arthurian tales. The investigation, however, does not result in relevant results and the question remains as unanswered as it was before. Susemihl points out that Schulz should have consulted La Villemarqué's works on Breton traditions in order to arrive at a conclusion. Schulz mentions La Villemarqué's forthcoming book *Les chants populaires des anciens bretons* (1842) which he had not been able to consult because it was published simultaneously with his book. Susemihl refers to the *Barzaz Breiz*, a collection of Breton folksongs which were already published in two different German translations in 1840 and in 1841.⁵⁵⁹ Again, he reproaches Schulz with not consulting works that were available in Germany at the time of the composition of the essay. Susemihl seems to think highly of La Villemarqué although the latter was heavily involved with the Cymreigyddion y Fenni after he had visited the Eisteddfod in 1838 and had been received into the Gorsedd of said Eisteddfod.⁵⁶⁰ Furthermore, La Villemarqué was impressed with Iolo Morgannwg's neo-druidism and he

⁵⁵⁸ Susemihl, *NJALZ*, 27 September 1843, p. 935, mentions *Mount Calvary* and *The creation of the World* as examples for Old and Modern Cornish, plus several bible translations; further H. Roland's *Mona antiqua restaurata, with an appendix containing a comparative table of primitive and derivative words* (London: 1722, 1766) and, as a more recent reference, the aforementioned Pri[t]chard, *The eastern origin of the Celtic Nations* (1831).

⁵⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 936.

⁵⁶⁰ *Seren Gomer*, 22, no. 281, (February 1839), p. 46.

was convinced of the veracity of its roots in ancient bardism.⁵⁶¹ La Villemarqué did also follow Iolo's example of artificially increasing the age of the manuscripts he was using for his editions.⁵⁶²

Despite criticising Schulz heavily for inaccuracies, Susemihl does not show the same scrutiny with La Villemarqué. This is somewhat surprising as he was associated with the same group of Welsh scholars as Schulz, a group which were viewed with some reservation outside Wales due to their uncritical attitude towards Welsh traditions and their age and veracity. Susemihl, having begun his review with severe criticism of such unscholarly credulity, now seems to overlook it in La Villemarqué. He only refers to the glowingly positive reviews of the *Barzaz Breiz* and then adopts them without question. The fact that Schulz had also received mainly positive reviews for his essay seems unimportant for Susemihl. Further, he seems to think that La Villemarqué's work could disprove the historian Henry Hallam's claim that Brittany does not possess any ancient traditions at all. Like Schulz, La Villemarqué had studied law and humanities before dedicating himself to medieval studies and the old folk-songs of his people. The study in relevant subjects, in Susemihl's view, gives him academic credentials which Schulz does not possess. Susemihl is a prime example of the importance of formal credentials within the German field. As Schulz is without any academic qualification in a relevant subject, Susemihl adopts a far more critical stance towards him than to those who fulfil the requirements, such as La Villemarqué. Moreover, he also seems to trust the reviews of their work.

Besides having the appropriate credentials, the knowledge of the canon in the field is also a crucial criterion for Susemihl. In the section on the transformation of the core material of British origin to chivalrous romances in France, Susemihl generally agrees with Schulz's findings. As seen previously, however, he criticises that Schulz's reasoning does not consider most relevant sources and therefore his conclusion lacks validity. Again,

⁵⁶¹ John T. Koch, *Celtic culture: a historical encyclopedia*, (Santa Barbara, Oxford: ABC-Clio, 2005), p. 1076.

⁵⁶² Ibid. Unlike Iolo, his work came under heavy criticism already during his life-time. 'During the 1860s and 1870s the authenticity of the *Barzaz Breiz* began to be criticised by various scholars of Breton, most notably by F. M. Luzel in his *Gwerzioù Breiz-Izel: chants populaire de la Basse-Bretagne* and by Joseph Loth, partly on the particular grounds that the wording of the songs recorded by La Villemarqué had been doctored, and partly because many of the poems were nowhere near as old as he had claimed.' This is true; in the preface to the *Gwerzioù Breiz-Izel vol 1(1868)* Luzel affirms that the *Barzaz Breiz* contains beautiful poetry but has no historic value. In *De l'authenticité de Chants du Barzaz-Breiz de M. de la Villemarqué (1872)* he prints a letter where he openly denounces them as either La Villemarqué's inventions or genuine, but much younger folk-songs which had been edited and 'purified' by La Villemarqué.

Susemihl's criticism in the review establishes a canon of works on the subject, which determines the value of new contributions to the field. Since Schulz does not fulfil these requirements, in the eyes of Susemihl, his work is flawed.

This tenor is repeated in the response to Schulz' treatise on the *Mabinogion*. Susemihl reproaches Schulz with only knowing the three tales that he had translated and only using quotations and reviews from other scholars, when commenting on the other stories. Furthermore, he points out Schulz' uncritical acceptance of Guest's translation as a complete translation. Since she translated the tales for her children, she omitted all indecent or violent passages. These omissions dent the scientific value of her work and therefore Schulz cannot evaluate them, as he does not know their full content.⁵⁶³

Susemihl concludes his review of the essay with a few positive notes. First, he states that the chapter on Scandinavia, in many ways the weakest, is slightly better than the other discussions of the different literary traditions. There are still a few mistakes, mainly copied from Guest's annotations and excerpts from Scandinavian poems. Here, Susemihl admits, that, in Germany, it is difficult to get hold of theoretical works on Arthurian traditions in Scandinavia, and therefore he generally accepts Schulz' use of sources as adequate. In the end, however, Susemihl cannot help but to mention a few references that are available in Germany which Schulz could have consulted.⁵⁶⁴ This admission is rather unique, as Susemihl does not usually accept any excuses from Schulz, when the latter complains about the unavailability of relevant sources in his isolated location. For instance, he blames living in Bromberg for being unable to obtain a copy of Francisque Michel's edition of *Tristan*, a book of which only 200 copies were printed. Susemihl does not think that this is a valid excuse as Schulz could have acquired the book somehow, or borrowed it. He pointedly signs the review with 'Dr. Ernst Susemihl, Kirchdorf auf der Insel Poel', as if he wanted to tell Schulz implicitly that he should not complain about living in Bromberg, as he, Susemihl, lives on a small island and still manages to obtain all relevant sources for his research. As an established player in the field of literary history, Susemihl obviously has his network firmly in place, from which he can obtain all the relevant books, while Schulz is still in the process of building his network.

⁵⁶³ Susemihl, *NJALZ*, 27. September 1843, p. 936.

⁵⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 937.

Susemihl concludes his review with a discussion of the translations of three of Guest's *Mabinogion* added to the essay. Again, he points out that the source text is already without any scientific value due to Guest's omissions but concedes that this is the best part of the book. The only main criticism which he directs at the translations is the fact that Schulz makes it appear as he himself translated from the Welsh and not from the English.⁵⁶⁵ Susemihl's criticism of Schulz is unfounded, as he clearly states in the foreword that, in the annotations to the translations, he used Guest's notes and therefore translated literally from her English version. Also, he never claims to have translated directly from the Welsh but gives credit to Lady Guest for her translations as his source texts.⁵⁶⁶ This shows again Susemihl's overly critical approach to Schulz' work which characterises his review to the end. Susemihl's final remark is a response to Schulz' statement in the latter's foreword where he invites other researchers to continue his efforts, as he is not able to conduct a comprehensive study due to limited access to sources. Susemihl claims that Schulz' attempts have not improved the situation but rather made the gap in the early history of literature even more visible. Damning Schulz with feint praise, according to Susemihl, this is the only merit of his work:

Nach dem Gesagten scheint die Bemerkung fast überflüssig, dass durch S.-M.'s Schrift eine wesentliche Lücke ausgefüllt ist: im Gegentheil sind Die, welche die Literatur eines gründlichen Studiums würdig halten, Dank schuldig, dass er durch seine Schrift jene Lücke noch fühlbarer gemacht hat, indem er es wagen zu können geglaubt, mit höchst oberflächlichen Kenntniss des Gegenstandes vor der deutschen Gelehrtenwelt aufzutreten.⁵⁶⁷

Susemihl's harsh treatment is further underlined by the contrasting positive response in the British periodical press. The *Foreign Quarterly Review* reviewed the essay in January 1844 and highlighted its quality and its importance to the English readers by placing it into its German publication context. Schulz had managed to publish his essay in the 'Bibliothek der gesammten Nationalliteratur', a collection which the anonymous reviewer describes as 'the extensive library of the national literature of Germany', further raising the profile of Schulz as a scholar in Britain. The reviewer also names Franz Mone's *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der Teutschen Helden-Sage*, the first volume of the second division of the

⁵⁶⁵ Susemihl supports his claim with a quote of Lady Guest's remark on Gwalchmai: '...As a proof of the high estimation in which Gwalchmai's powers of persuasion were held, the following extract from the *Myvyrian Archaiology* may be adduced.' Then she juxtaposes the Welsh original text with an English translation. Schulz copies the Welsh text and juxtaposes the literal German translation. Susemihl does not think that the translation is adept as it is from the English into German and not from Welsh.

⁵⁶⁶ Schulz, 1842, p. v-vi.

⁵⁶⁷ Susemihl, *NJALZ*, 27 September 1843, p. 939.

library of the national literature, Schulz' book being the second volume. By placing it next to another high profile publication, Schulz' position in the literary field is further improved.

As the second part of the book contains the translation of Guest's *Mabinogion*, the reviewer dedicates a section on reviewing her translations, thus creating a review within a review. His eulogy on her work ends with the following words:

This is a compliment which the zeal, talents and liberality of that lady well deserve; and the readers of the *Foreign Quarterly Review*, in which honourable mention of *The Mabinogion* has already been made, will look upon the work before us as an evidence that our opinion of the value of Lady C. Guest's exertions in the field of literary antiquities is echoed by the critics of Germany.⁵⁶⁸

This passage shows clearly that not only does Schulz himself profit from the review in terms of achieving a higher status in the literary field in Britain by emphasising the status of the publication series in Germany, but his essay is in turn seen as proof that Guest's translations have gained a good position within the German literary field. The relations within the field of power thus benefit both publications as they both gain status in the reviewer's 'home-field' through emphasising their favourable placement in the other literary field. The other field, the German field, thus becomes as a validating tool for both texts, for Guest's *Mabinogion* simply by being translated for the German field and for Schulz by being a part of the *Bibliothek der gesammten National-literatur*. The reviewer apparently believes that occupying a position in the literary field in Germany is an important factor for gaining more prestige in the British field. Besides the preference for the German field, the reviewer also shows greatest respect for Guest and her work. Considering the implied inferiority complex and the pro-Welsh literature attitude of the reviewer, one could come to the conclusion that a patriotic Welshman is behind the review but one passage contradicts this impression, when describing the characteristics of the essay itself:

This essay, which is very able and ingenious, but tinged with a peculiarity characteristic of the writing of all antiquaries who make the sayings and doings of the Principality the subject of their disquisitions, is here printed, and forms a very fitting preface to the legends, which it introduces.⁵⁶⁹

⁵⁶⁸ 'Die Arthur-Sage und die Märchen [sic] des Rothen Buches von Hergest' in *The Foreign Quarterly Review*, 32, (Jan. 1844), p. 536.

⁵⁶⁹ Ibid.

The reviewer's observation of general characteristics of essays that engage with Welsh traditions, Welsh language and other subjects related to 'the Principality', implies that he is not a zealous patriot but rather a distant observer, yet not particularly patronising or condescending as some of the former reviewers were in their judgement on the essay's subject.

After commenting on the style of the essay, the reviewer criticises the content of the essay.

The objection which we felt, however, to Albert Schulz's essay, as it appears in its English dress – an objection resembling that which the mathematician directed at *Paradise Lost* – namely that 'it asserted everything but proved nothing', remains, as a matter of course, unaltered, by a perusal of the Essay in its original form.⁵⁷⁰

The reviewer's only true criticism is thus directed at the nature of Schulz' research methodology. He would have preferred scientific proof and unambiguous results instead of the probability of certain scenarios postulated by Schulz. Here again, Schulz represents the Romantic spirit, not seeing the final result as the most important finding but rather documenting the organic process, finding proof for the growing, evolving and spreading of poetry instead. The reviewer, by contrast, agrees with Susemihl's position on the aim of research: find a definite answer to the research question.

Further, the reviewer finds fault with the translation and voices his doubts that the translator was actually qualified to translate the essay as he states that

[w]e find from such perusal, that many of the errors with which the English version of it was disfigured, are attributable not to the author, but to the translator's want of familiarity, if not with the subject, at least with many of the mediaeval authors quoted in illustration of it.⁵⁷¹

Here, the reviewer forgets that he does not pass judgement on a literal translation of the essay but on a reworked edition for a different literary field. Therefore, it is impossible to compare both texts side by side. For each text, an effort was made to structure it according to the expectations and the prior knowledge of the intended target audience, so corresponding text passages can be found in different places each the book.

⁵⁷⁰ Ibid.

⁵⁷¹ Ibid.

In the concluding paragraph of the review, the writer thereof asserts the quality of the essay despite the criticism he previously directed at it. Furthermore, he views its importance for the Welsh literary field.

Altogether the book before us is a very curious and interesting one. Its appearance will doubtless be regarded by our Cambrian friends as highly complimentary to the literature of their native country; and must be looked as affording fresh evidence, if such were necessary, of the far-spreading and ceaseless activity of the scholars of Germany.⁵⁷²

In the conclusion, the essay is judged to be a valuable contribution to the literary field of Wales, thus contributing to an improvement of quality and information. Furthermore, the use of personal pronouns in the passage also puts the reviewer's nationality beyond doubt, calling the Welsh 'our Cambrian friends' and 'their native country' therefore suggesting that he is probably a Cymrophile Englishman. It also underlines once more that in the nineteenth century, German scholars were held in high esteem by British scholars, being viewed as industrious, meticulous and eclectic in their interests. Thus the conclusion confirms the veracity of the previous statements. Regardless of their country of origin, British scholars, both Welsh and English, viewed the contributions of a German scholar to their literary field as sign of prestige and increase of value to their field.⁵⁷³

The analysis of the German edition has shown Schulz' awareness of the different target audiences in Britain and in Germany. He adapted the German text to the expectations and the prior knowledge of the average reader in the German field. His editorial choices can be divided into three categories: supplemental information and omission, sometimes combined with reference to preceding texts in the German literary field, and a general re-structuring of the essay. The first category includes added paragraphs on Geoffrey's of Monmouth texts, background information on the bardic orders, and more detailed descriptions of the Welsh sources. Moreover, Schulz reacted to the comments made by the translator in the footnotes of the English version in order to deliver a more accurate piece. Omitted details are found for example in the much shorter first chapter on the Latin chronicles. Instead of discussing the early Latin sources, Schulz discussed the Welsh language sources more in detail, since he had better information at his disposal after winning the competition and gaining access to a new literary network. The re-structuring efforts are also visible in this instance, showing a clearer division between the sources of

⁵⁷² Ibid.

⁵⁷³ Cf. Löffler, *The Literary and Historical Legacy of Iolo Morganwg*, 1826–1926, p. 138, and M. E. Thomas, *Afiaith yng Ngwent*, p. 88.

the different periods of tradition. While the English essay did not adhere strictly to the imposed temporal delimitations pre-1066, 1066–1150, and post-1150, the German essay showed a clearer focus in that aspect. Further omissions in the German text are due to Schulz' previous publications on the theme of the Holy Grail. He refers the interested reader to the second book of his comprehensive work on Wolfram von Eschenbach, where he discusses the origin and transformation of the narratives involving the Grail in great detail. This shows that Schulz views his literary publications as a whole.

Regarding the translations, three characteristics stand out: first of all, the English text by Guest has been rendered as closely as possible into German, following the norm of translation in this period. Secondly, Schulz makes extensive use of her endnotes, acknowledging their origin faithfully. He does not, however, transmit the entire supplemental information to his German readers but selects only the notes that he considers relevant for them. Thirdly, Schulz uses the translations as a framework for his comparative studies, adding medieval French and German variants of the Welsh tales to each translation. In so doing, he places the three different literary traditions on the same level within the literary field, giving the Welsh an equal position compared to the French and the German medieval literature. This establishes Schulz as a cultural mediator between the different literary fields, highlighting his vision of a pan-European common cultural heritage. The idea itself is evidently borrowed from Herderian and Schlegelian cultural philosophy, but Schulz applied it to a peripheral, previously overlooked literary tradition.

The reception of the German edition differs significantly in the German and British literary fields. While the British reviewer of the *Foreign Quarterly Review* was generally positive about the essay, the German reviewer Susemihl criticised it heavily in the *NJALZ*. This can be explained with the different dynamics in both fields: in the German field, Schulz is seen as a rival of the reviewer, a translator and scholar himself. Susemihl, a modernist with high professional standards, objects to seeing Schulz on an equal level on the literary field, since Schulz does neither possess the necessary credentials nor the appropriate academic tool-kit in order to be recognised as an established player. By using his advantage on the field of power, Susemihl compromises Schulz' position in the literary field and effectively lowers his value as a player.

The British reviewer, in contrast, views Schulz' piece as a valid contribution to the German field, despite not being without flaws, and seems to agree in general with Schulz' Late

Romantic rationale in his research. He also points out that the dissemination of Guest's translations increases her status in the larger European field, thus highlighting Schulz' role as a cultural mediator between the fields. In the *Foreign Quarterly*, the *Arthursage* is seen as a validator for Guest's work, while Susemihl views it as an insufficient piece which should not receive the attention of the German scholarly community. Given the overall positive reviews in the British field, Susemihl's harsh criticism seems rather ironic. He disagrees wholly with Schulz' Late Romantic principles and, as modernist, insists on keeping up the professional standards in the literary field. The mixed reception of Schulz' essay in the British and German literary fields led to a different impression of him: in the British, more specifically in the Welsh field, he is mainly remembered for his essay, whereas the German academic community rather remembers his works on *Parcival*, which was the most successful of his books on the German field.

In this case, there is also evidence for Schulz' impact on other fields, most notably in the field of music: Richard Wagner was inspired to compose his famous opera after reading Schulz' translation of *Parcival*. This is proof of the far-reaching impact which Schulz made with his popular translations. Had he not rendered the medieval text of Wolfram von Eschenbach into modern German, this source of inspiration would have been inaccessible for the composer.⁵⁷⁴ This fact will be unknown to the vast majority of music-lovers and Wagner *aficionados*, however, it underscores the picture of Schulz as a peripheral figure who made significant contributions to various artistic fields in different countries. Despite being temporarily successful, he did not achieve a central position therein and therefore did not become part of the canon in the field. Susemihl's hostile reception certainly played a part in it. Schulz' works, however, were remembered without him being remembered, which would explain why he has become a footnote phenomenon.

⁵⁷⁴ Heiko Cf. Fiedler-Rauer, 'Magdeburger Gralshüter' and also Richard Wagner, *Selected Letters of Richard Wagner* (transl. and eds) Stewart Spencer, Barry Millington, (London, Dent, 1987) p. 458. 'A copy of Wolfram's *Parzival* which Mathilde Wesendonck had sent Wagner in the second (1858) edition of San-Marte (Albert Schulz).'

7. Conclusion

The aim of this thesis has been to trace the progress and impact of the lawyer, Royal Privy Councillor, translator, and philologist Albert Schulz in the German and British literary fields of the nineteenth century. The research focus lay mainly on *Essay on the influence of Welsh traditions* which obtained the first prize in the main competition at the 1840 Abergavenny Eisteddfod has been identified as the point of contact between the German and the British fields. The English publication in 1841 was followed by the German edition *Die Arthursage und die Mährchen des rothen Buchs von Hergest* (1842), which also introduced the German translations of the *Mabinogion* into the German field. This rather surprising constellation of events, a Privy Councillor with a degree in Law winning the main prize at an eisteddfod, led to the first of three main aims of this study: first, determining the factors that enabled Schulz to gain sufficient erudition in medieval Welsh traditions to impress the judge and the audience in Abergavenny. The research focused on his social and cultural background besides the formal credentials in Law and administration, and revealed that he had a profound interest in medieval literature, in particular the German poetic traditions of Wolfram von Eschenbach. Schulz' choice of research field was inspired by the emerging Romantic Nationalism, which saw a growing interest in German national heritage. The exploration of medieval traditions and the admiration of feudal society had a decisive impact on the research culture in which Schulz took his first steps a young autodidact scholar. A close reading of his essay revealed that he drew from Herderian and Schlegelian concepts of a common, European medieval heritage, while also being influenced by the Fichteian philosophy of creating a new, national education. The tone of his work reflects Schulz' concern to disseminate his knowledge to the wider, educated public, not only a limited, specialist audience. He was also a follower of the Schlegelian historicist approach to literary traditions, further developing the ideas of A.W. Schlegel to explain the propagation and transformation of Arthurian material over space and time.

Having established the cultural, literary, and philosophical foundations of Schulz, it became clear that these alone would not have enabled him to participate in the eisteddfod competition. The second step in the research therefore focused on his contacts and networks. They played an important part in his development as a scholar, both further fostering his existing interest in medieval literature and providing him with the connections that were necessary to enter the Welsh literary field. Becoming acquainted to the Lepsius

family during his time as assessor in Naumburg proved to be the crucial event in gaining access to transnational scholarly networks. His brother-in-law, Richard Lepsius, introduced him to the literary circle in Naumburg, an emerging centre of German Romantic Nationalism, to which the networks of Klopstock, Lessing, Fichte and Niebuhr had been linked prior to Schulz' arrival in the late 1820s, and, more recently, Koberstein (professor in literature in Landesschule Pforta) and Savigny (Schulz' professor of Law in Berlin), who had a more direct influence on his literary interests. The time in Naumburg set the cultural and intellectual backdrop to Schulz' progression in the literary fields later in his life, adding new qualities to his existing *habitus* as a graduate in Law. Moreover, Lepsius' wide-reaching network enabled Schulz to connect to the Welsh field, providing him with further extensions to his *habitus*. Lepsius had a longstanding work relationship and friendship with the Prussian ambassador in London, Bunsen, who had married a Welsh heiress, Frances Waddington, the sister of Augusta Hall, Lady Llanover. The latter is known as one of the prominent members of the Cymreigyddion society, the organisers of the Abergavenny eisteddfodau. The discovery of this network presented strong evidence for the significance of the period that Schulz spent in Naumburg, as it was instrumental in first fostering his interest in medieval literature and German National Romanticism and then gaining awareness of the competition and the Welsh literary field. In conclusion of the research results of the circumstances, it can be asserted that both the *zeitgeist* and the membership in the transnational networks gave Schulz' the opportunity to compete in the 1840 Eisteddfod.

In contrast to the two previous aims which concentrated on the preliminary events, the third aim of the thesis went beyond the eisteddfod to examine the impact which Schulz' essay and translations had on the literary fields in Britain and in Germany. The English version was published in Britain a year before the German edition with the translations. It was widely reviewed in periodicals in Britain, ranging from very positive to mildly critical reviews. One striking aspect of the reviews was the focus for the evaluation of the essay. Regardless of the tone of the review, each reviewer placed more emphasis on the fact that a German scholar had won a major literary competition and on the significance of the essay topic than on the quality of Schulz' research. This finding led to an evaluation of the situation by means of the Bourdieuan theory of literary fields, the *habitus* of the players in those fields and the dynamics of the field of power, all of which govern cultural production. This perspective aided in uncovering the tensions within the British literary

field, which contains the dominant, Anglo-centric field and the peripheral sub-field of Welsh literature. The reviewers took positions on the field of power, either in favour (*Monthly Review*, *Montly Magazine* and *Archaeologia Cambrensis*) or against (*Athenaeum* and *Gentleman's Magazine*) the inclusion of research into Welsh traditions. Their positioning did not influence their appraisal of Schulz, which was predominantly positive. This could also be explained with the power dynamics within the larger European literary field. The majority of the reviews display great respect for German scholars, whose reputation for meticulous and accurate research is affirmed by the British reviewers. The positive view of Schulz is further underpinned by the use of the title 'Professor' by the majority of the reviewers. Appearing for the first time in the reports from the Eisteddfod in various newspapers, this was seen as an attempt of the Cymreigyddion to increase the prestige of their competition by bestowing higher academic credentials on the participants. It appears to have been effective, since the reviewers adopted the title without question and viewed Schulz' work in a positive light, even if they did not agree with the aim of the competition.

The reception of the essay in the German field constituted the other half of the third aim. The research carried out on the cultural and philosophical background of the period showed that, although there was a strong interest in Celtic literature and culture in Germany, Wales and Welsh literature had not been perceived as a part of the Celtic nations and were overlooked by the majority of scholars. The Welsh language, however, had been studied by comparative philologists such as Franz Bopp in order to establish the relations between the branches of the Indo-European languages. These efforts had not yet reached the literary field per se, but remained within the field of philology and comparative linguistics. Therefore, Schulz' essay in its German edition, accompanied by the translations from Lady Charlotte Guest's *Mabinogion*, disseminated new cultural and literary knowledge to the German field. Given the strong interest in the field in uncovering hidden treasures of ancient traditions, a generally positive reception of the essay could be expected.

The reaction of Susemihl, the reviewer, however, was not favourable at all, treating Schulz' essay very harshly, dismantling it thoroughly in the *NJALZ*. An analysis of Susemihl's review and his background by means of the Bourdieuan theory of cultural production revealed that he, a translator himself, would view Schulz' as a threat to his own

position in the field, especially since he considered Schulz to be inferior in both credentials and skills. Therefore, in order to maintain the professionalism within the field, Schulz had to be prevented from advancing to an established position therein. Furthermore, his arguments showed that he was opposing the cultural-historicist approach to ancient traditions developed by A.W. Schlegel and was adherent to the more modern, philological method. Due to this, Schulz' non-existent knowledge of Welsh was one of the major points of criticism, as Susemihl sought to highlight Schulz' amateurism. The antagonism between Susemihl and Schulz exemplifies the tensions in the field of power where two opposing methods are vying for legitimisation and recognition. From a scholarly point of view, Susemihl's intentions are well justified, as the new modernist approach to literary studies and philology would replace the Romantic historicist tradition.

In the Welsh and British fields, this shift had not yet happened, as the reviews that were analysed for this thesis indicate. The first major modernist in the Welsh field was Thomas Stephens who emerged, first anonymously, as a rigorous critic of the patriotic and uncritical attitude of the *Cymreigyddion*. In the journal *Cambrian*, a series of ten letters by Stephens under his pseudonym B.C.D. was published, in which he denounced the majority of the literary competitions in the *eisteddfodau* as useless, as the selection of subjects did not improve scholarship in the field and 'made a detestable mockery of the *eisteddfod* tradition'.⁵⁷⁵ Although his criticism was justified from the viewpoint of a modernist, the tone was rather harsh and even vitriolic, antagonising the organisers, adjudicators and patrons repeatedly, accusing them of mediocre standards for the *eisteddfod*, letting personal agendas cloud their judgement, resulting in an unprofessional and unscientific attitude. He did not shy away from attacking high-ranking personalities such as the Ladies Charlotte Guest, Hall and Greenly for either 'vicious morality' or 'patronizing literature more for the sake of show than real patriotism'.⁵⁷⁶ Stephens obviously regarded the *eisteddfod*, as it was conducted in these years, as a stage for the gentry to put themselves on display and had nothing to do with a serious literary and artistic competition, since most of the leading personalities were amateurs.

⁵⁷⁵ Marion Löffler and Hywel Gethin Rhys, 'Thomas Stephens and the Abergavenny *Cymreigyddion*: Letters from the *Cambrian* 1842–3' in *National Library of Wales Journal*, 34, available online as a pdf-file at <http://www.llgc.org.uk/fileadmin/documents/pdf/The_Journal_Thomas_Stephens_Loffler_Rhys.pdf>, [accessed 22 September 2013].

⁵⁷⁶ *Ibid.*

In comparison to Stephens' tone, Susemihl's criticism does no longer appear as very harsh. An analysis of both critics shows that the transition from one school of thought to its successor is not a smooth process and creates significant tensions on the literary fields. For Schulz, the shift in paradigm and the resulting tensions, determined how his essay was received on each literary field. The *Essay on the Influence of Welsh traditions on the Literature of France, Germany and Scandinavia* thus entered the Welsh field before the shift of paradigm had happened in Wales, while it was already in full swing in the German field when the *Arthursage* was published. His success on the Welsh and British fields was therefore due to timing; if he had entered a literary competition a decade later, the reception may have been different. On the German field, however, his contribution was already seen in the light of Modernism and therefore criticised accordingly.

This thesis focused on the time period around the eisteddfod in 1840, taking into account the circumstances leading to the competition and the immediate reactions spanning the years 1841–1846 but Schulz' publications on comparative subjects did not stop there. Despite the heavy criticism which he had to face, Schulz nevertheless published another volume containing an explanatory essay followed by translations from the *Mabinogion* and several comparative studies, the *Beiträge zur bretonischen und celtisch-germanischen Heldensage* (1847). This publication was mostly overlooked, only Susemihl reviewed it in the *NJALZ*.⁵⁷⁷ This time, Susemihl was less severe in his criticism, although he still made similar remarks in regard to Schulz' professional standards. He did, however, acknowledge that Schulz had made some progress and compliments him on some findings and also on an improved translation of the Anglo-Saxon saga of Finn and Hergest. Furthermore, as the publication was not submitted to a major literary competition, Susemihl was not as demanding as in his review of the *Arthursage* in 1842. He even recommends it to the general readership with interest in the history of medieval literature:

Schließlich sei das vorliegende Buch, ungeachtet der zahlreichen Ausstellungen, die ich besonders gegen die ersten Abtheilungen desselben habe aussprechen müssen, Allen, die sich mit der Geschichte der Literatur des Mittelalters beschäftigen, mit Wärme empfohlen. Berlin. Dr. Ernst Susemihl.⁵⁷⁸

The different reaction of Susemihl to Schulz' second book on comparative literature can be explained with the different status of the publication. Susemihl was harsher in his criticism

⁵⁷⁷ Ernst Susemihl 'Beiträge zur bretonischen und celtisch-germanischen Heldensage' in *NJALZ*, vol 7, nos 140–141, (12–13 June 1848), pp. 559–562.

⁵⁷⁸ *Ibid*, p. 562.

of the Arthursage, since he thought that the winning essay of a major literary competition must be of an excellent standard. When Schulz' entry did not meet his expectations of professionalism, he used his position in the field to prevent an amateurish work from being canonised as a standard work. The follow-up publication did not carry the same prestige so Susemihl was less demanding in his academic requirements and it seems that he also considered Schulz' intention of being an educator for a broader audience.

Since the *Beiträge zur bretonischen und celtisch-germanischen Heldensage* was only published in German, there was no visible reaction to it in the British literary field. It could not be determined for certain why Schulz did not continue to publish in English, especially after his first publication was successful and received positive reviews. One possible reason could be the decline of the Cymreigyddion society in the late 1840s and early 1850s. Several key figures of the society died in those years, most prominently Thomas Price in 1848 and Sir John Guest in 1852. The anniversaries after 1840 were celebrated biannually, later triennially, with the last eisteddfod taking place in 1853 and the society dissolving in 1854. With the Cymreigyddion disappearing, Schulz was deprived of one major means to participate in the Welsh field. Despite this, the contact with Wales did not break off completely, as he translated Thomas Stephens' *Literature of the Kymry* (1849) into German in 1864. Susemihl, his main critic, died in 1863.⁵⁷⁹ Whether the publication of the German translation fifteen years after the English original was influenced by that, is speculation at present, but it certainly raises the question how Schulz himself viewed his position in the German literary field as a translator from English source texts into German. Did he refrain from publishing further translations after both attempts were treated harshly by Susemihl, the established player in the field? Future research into Schulz' later literary career could reveal the motivations that governed his decisions. The Bourdieuan theory of the laws governing cultural production combined with the Late Romantic profile of Schulz was successful in positioning him in the literary fields in his early career at the emergence of Modernism in the previously Romantic literary fields. Therefore, its application to his later career would certainly give an insight into his movements on the literary fields and by which tensions on the field of power they were directed or even restricted and how he responded to the shift in paradigm in the literary fields.

⁵⁷⁹ Genealogy of Ernst Susemihl
<<http://gw3.geneanet.org/pmlhennings?lang=en&p=ernst&n=susemihl&oc=0&pz=peter&nz=hennings&ocz=0>> [accessed 23 March 2013].

Moreover, the research for this thesis has also revealed that Schulz' grand-daughter Editha Klipstein was a part of transnational cultural networks. Anna Schulz, his younger daughter married a philologist, Friedrich Blass. The Blass family became an integral part of the scholarly community. Their daughter Editha continued as an active agent on the transcultural networks well into the twentieth century, carrying on Schulz' legacy as a cultural mediator. Her life is a reflection of the interests of her grandfather Albert. Unlike him, she had the means to travel to the countries of special interest to Schulz. In her youth, she travelled at least four times to England, Wales and Ireland, meeting many old friends of her grandfather and their descendants or colleagues there; a few of them also visit the couple in turn. Other frequently destinations were Switzerland, Spain, Belgium and France. Following the family tradition of her grandfather, she entertained correspondence with other European scholars and writers such as the Scottish poet Ian Maclaren and the Irish professor John Pentland Mahaffy, Friedrich Blass' colleague and friend in Dublin. In Germany, she met Thomas Mann and Rainer Maria Rilke; the latter introduced her to other writers such as Regina Ullmann and Lou Albert-Lazard. She also had a working connection with Käthe Kollwitz. Editha's biography shows that she, like her grandfather, succeeded in gaining access to the literary networks of her time, the first half of the twentieth century, but her work has remained in the shadow of those of her contemporaries Mann, Rilke, Ullmann and Kollwitz.⁵⁸⁰ The theory which was applied to Schulz could also be employed to discover the dynamics in the literary fields in which Editha participated. The case study of Schulz as a cultural mediator between different literary fields can serve as a paradigm to unearth other forgotten peripheral figures in those fields and to estimate their impact therein.

⁵⁸⁰ Rolf Haaser, 'Lebenschronik' *Editha Klipstein Archiv* <http://www.uni-giessen.de/~g91058/edithaklipsteinarchiv/index_klipst_chronik.htm> [accessed 10 November 2011].

Bibliography

Bibliography of Albert Schulz (San-Marte)

San Marte, *Ueber den Werth von Provinzialgesetzen; mit besonderer Beziehung auf Preußen, ein Wort zur Feier des dritten Augusts* (Quedlinburg, Leipzig: Basse, 1830)

—, *Parcival; Rittergedicht von Wolfram von Eschenbach; Im Auszuge mitgetheilt von San Marte* (Magdeburg: Creutz, 1833)

—, *Leben und Dichten Wolframs von Eschenbach; Erster Band, Parcival; Aus dem Mittelhochdeutschen zum ersten Male übersetzt*, 2 vols (Magdeburg: Creutz, 1836/1841), I (1836)

—, (A. Schulz) *Gudrun, Nordseesage; Nebst Abhandlung über das mittelhochdeutsche Gedicht Gudrun und den Nordseesagenkreis* (Berlin, Posen, Bromberg: Mittler, 1839)

—, *Leben und Dichten Wolframs von Eschenbach; Zweiter Band, Lieder, Wilhelm von Orange und Titurel von Wolfram von Eschenbach, und der jüngere Titurel von Albrecht in Uebersetzung und Auszug, nebst Abhandlungen über das Leben und Wirken Wolframs von Eschenbach, und die Sage vom heiligen Gral*, 2 vols (Magdeburg: Creutz, 1836/1841), II (1841)

—, *An Essay on the influence of Welsh tradition upon the literature of Germany, France, and Scandinavia, which obtained the prize of the Abergavenny Cymreigyddion Society, at the eisteddvod of 1840*, transl. by Frances Berrington, (Llandovery: William Rees. London: Longman, Williams, Hughes. Chester: Parry. Abergavenny: Morgan, 1841)

—, *Die Arthursage und die Mährchen des rothen Buchs von Hergest*, Bibliothek der gesammten deutschen Nationalliteratur, Abth. II, B. 2, [section II, vol. 2] (Quedlinburg, Leipzig: Basse, 1842)

—, *Gross-Polens Nationalsagen, Märchen und Legenden, und Lokalsagen des Grossherzogtums Posen* (Bromberg: Levit, 1842)

—, *Nennius und Gildas* (Berlin: Röse, 1844)

—, *Des Kreuzes Prüfung; Glaubenstragödie* (Magdeburg: Heinrichshofen, 1845)

—, *Beiträge zur bretonischen und celtisch-germanischen Heldensage*, Bibliothek der gesammten deutschen National-Literatur, Abth. II B. 3, [section II, vol. 3] (Quedlinburg, Leipzig: Basse, 1847)

—, *Die polnische Königssage; Nach den Quellen dargestellt und kritisch erörtert von San-Marte* (Berlin: H. Schultze, 1848)

—, *Walter von Aquitanien. Heldengedicht aus dem Lateinischen des zehnten Jahrhunderts, übersetzt und erläutert von San-Marte (A. Schulz)* (Magdeburg: Creutz, 1853)

—, *Die Sagen von Merlin; Mit altwälschen, bretagnischen, schottischen, italienischen und lateinischen Gedichten und Prophezeihungen Merlins, der Prophetia Merlini des Gottfrieds von Monmouth und der Vita Merlini, lateinischem Gedichte aus dem 13.*

Jahrhundert; Herausgegeben und erläutert von San-Marte (A. Schulz) (Halle: Waisenhausbuchhandlung, 1853)

—, *Kleine Schriften; Beiträge zur thüringisch-sächsischen Geschichte und deutschen Kunst- und Alterthumskunde von Karl Peter Lepsius, Königlich Preußischem Geheimen Regierungs-Rath, Landrath a. D. und Ritter des rothen Adler-Ordens IV. Klasse; Gesammelt und theilweise zum ersten Male aus dem handschriftlichen Nachlaß des Verfassers herausgegeben von A. Schulz (San-Marte)* (Magdeburg: Creutzsche Buchhandlung, 1854)

—, *Gottfried's von Monmouth Historia Regum Britanniae, mit literar-historischer Einleitung und ausführlichen Anmerkungen; und: Brut Tysilio, altwälsche Chronik, in deutscher Uebersetzung, herausgegeben von San-Marte (A. Schulz)* (Halle: Anton, 1854)

—, 'Über die Eigennamen im Parzival des Wolfram von Eschenbach' in *Germania*, 2 (1857) Vierteljahrsschrift für Deutsche Alterthumskunde, 386–409

—, 'Wolfram von Eschenbach und Guiot von Provins' in: *Germania*, 3 (1858) Vierteljahrsschrift für Deutsche Alterthumskunde, 445–464

—, *Polens Vorzeit in Dichtung und Wahrheit*, (Bromberg: Louis Levit, 1859)

—, 'Wolfram's Parcival und seine Beurteiler' in *Germania* 7 (1862); Vierteljahrsschrift für Deutsche Alterthumskunde, 55–73

—, 'Schildmaler und Malerwappen' in *Germania* 9 (1864); Vierteljahrsschrift für Deutsche Alterthumskunde, 463–470

—, 'Über die Volkssagen von Ahasverus und Faust im Lichte ihrer Zeit' in *Deutsches Museum* 7, (Leipzig: Brockhaus, 1866), 193–210

—, *Geschichte der wälschen Literatur vom XII. bis zum XIV. Jahrhundert; Gekrönte Preisschrift von Thomas Stephens; Aus dem Englischen übersetzt und durch Beigabe altwälscher Dichtungen in deutscher Uebersetzung ergänzt* (Halle: Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses, 1864)

—, *Rückblicke auf Dichtungen und Sagen des deutschen Mittelalters; literarische Vorträge von San-Marte* (Quedlinburg, Leipzig: Basse, 1872)

—, *Wilhelm von Orange; Heldengedicht von Wolfram von Eschenbach* (Halle: Verlag der Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses, 1873)

—, 'Graal' in *Allgemeine Encyclopädie der Wissenschaften und Künste* 1, 27 ed. by Johann Samuel Ersch and Johann Gottfried Gruber (1877)

—, 'Zur Gral- und Arthursage; Das Schwert des Grals und das Gesetz der Tafelrunde' in *Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie*, 16, (1884) 129–165

—, *Parcival, Rittergedicht von Wolfram von Eschenbach; Dritte verbesserte Auflage* [3rd edn] (Halle: Max Niemeyer, 1887[1836])

Primary sources

Aberystwyth, National Library of Wales, MS 942C, *Letters 1840–1860*, fols 208a–280c, [‘Albert Schulz to Thomas Stephens’, in a collection of letters mainly to Stephens from the ‘Cymreigyddion y Fenni’ circle of writers and poets and also others, including Théodore Hersart de la Villemarqué, Albert Schulz (‘San Marte’), John Ceiriog Hughes (‘Ceiriog’), Robert John Pryse (‘Gweirydd ap Rhys’) and E. A. Freeman; and a few circular letters, etc.]

—, MS 965E, *Letters 1845–1875*, fols 101–107, [‘Albert Schulz to Thomas Stephens’ in a collection of letters to Stephens from a large number of individuals prominent in the life of Wales]

—, MS 11415B, *A History of the Abergavenny Cymreigyddion Society donated by B. Elyston Price, Chatswood, New South Wales, June 1937*

—, MS 13182E1, *Letters of the Cymreigyddion society*, fol. 19, Bunsen, Frances ‘Letter of Mme Bunsen, Berne, March 17th 1841’

—, MS 13958E, *Cymreigyddion Y Fenni Papers 1833–1914*

—, MS 16603C, *Letters of Jacob and Wilhelm Grimm, 1827–57*, fol. 18, ‘Wilhelm Grimm to Albert Schulz’

Archaeologia Cambrensis, ‘Advertisement’, 1 (Jan 1846), p. 21

—, ‘An Essay on the Influence of Welsh tradition upon the Literature of Germany, France, and Scandinavia’, 1.2 (Apr. 1846), pp. 192–193

Athenaeum, ‘OUR LIBRARY TABLE’ no. 741 (8 January 1842) p. 38

Caernarvon and Denbigh Herald, 9, no. 408, 20 October 1838, p. 169

—, 10, no. 514, 31 October 1840, p. 174

Fior Ghael ‘On the Celtic Language and its assumed dialects’ in *The Gentleman’s Magazine* 5 (May 1836), 485–487

—, ‘Letter’ in: *The Gentleman’s Magazine*, 9, (February 1838), 139–144

Gentleman’s Magazine, 8, (July 1837), 80

—, 8, (December 1837), 631–2

—, ‘An Essay on the Influence of Welsh traditions upon the Literature of Germany, France, and Scandinavia, translated from the German of Albert Schulz; Llandovery, 1841’ (February 1842), 169–174

Logan, James, ‘Letter’ in *The Gentleman’s Magazine*, 8, (January 1838), 45–47

Magdeburg, Landeshauptarchiv Sachsen-Anhalt, Rep. C20 I, Ib 352 I & II, [files on Albert Schulz' work as Royal Privy Councillor at the Provincial College]

—, Rep C20 I, Ib 473, [files on Albert Schulz' entire career from his appointment at the Superior Court of Justice in Berlin (1830–33) to his retirement in 1881]

Monthly Magazine, 'Our Monthly Crypt', 6.36, (December 1841), 610

Monthly Review, 'Art. IV. An Essay on the Influence of Welsh Tradition upon the Literature of Germany, France and Scandinavia. By Albert Schulz. Llandovery', 3.4 (Dec 1841), 473–487

Seren Gomer, 'Cymreigyddion y Fenni', 21, no. 274, (July 1838), p. 220

—, 'Cymreigyddion y Fenni', 22, no. 281, (February 1839), p. 46

—, 'Cymdeithas Cymreigyddion y Fenni – Testunau a Gwobryon am y Seithfed Gylchwyl', 22, no. 283, (April 1839), pp. 119–120

—, 'Llenyddiaeth Gymreig (O Newyddiadur Almaenaidd)', 23, no. 298, (July 1839), pp.199–200

—, 'Cymreigyddion y Fenni', 23, no. 290, (November 1839), pp. 343–344

—, 'Cymreigyddion y Fenni', 23, no. 302, (November 1840), pp. 345–46

Susemihl, Ernst, 'Geschichte der Poesie; Die Arthursage und die Märchen des rothen Buchs von Hergest; Herausgegeben von San-Marte (A. Schulz); Bibliothek der gesammten deutschen National-Literatur. Abth. II B. 2; Quedlinburg, Leipzig: Basse. 1842.' in *Neue Jenaische Allgemeine Literaturzeitung*, 2, nos 231–232, (27–28 September 1843), pp. 933–940

—, 'Barzaz-Breiz ; Chants populaires de la Bretagne, recueillis et publiés avec une traduction française, des éclaircissements, des notes et des notes originales, par Th. de la Villemarqué', in *Neue Jenaische Allgemeine Literatur-Zeitung*, 3, nos 220–221, (12–13 September 1844), pp. 879–883

—, 'The Mabinogion, from the Llyfr Coch o Hergest and other Welsh manuscripts: with an English translation and notes by Lady Charlotte Guest. Part I–IV, London, Longman, 1838–42.' in *Neue Jenaische Allgemeine Literatur-Zeitung*, 6, nos 99–100, (26–27 April 1847), pp. 394–400

—, 'Beiträge zur bretonischen und celtisch-germanischen Heldensage' in *Neue Jenaische Allgemeine Literatur-Zeitung*, 7, nos 140–141, (12–13 June 1848), pp. 559–562

The Foreign Quarterly Review 'Die Arthur-Sage und die Marchen des Rothen Buches von Hergest. Herausgegeben von San Marte (Albert Schulz)', 32, (January 1844), p. 536

Secondary Sources

- Barber, J.T., *A tour through Monmouthshire and South Wales* (London: Nichols and Son, 1803)
- Baudrillard, Jean, *The Agony of Power*, trans. Ames Hodges, (Los Angeles: Semiotext(e), 2005 [2010])
- Beiser, Frederick C., 'Savigny and the Historical School of Law' in *The German Historicist Tradition* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), pp. 214–252
- Bessborough, Earl of (ed.), *Lady Charlotte Guest; extracts from her journal, 1833–1852* (London: Murray, 1950)
- Bopp, Franz, 'Über die celtischen Sprachen vom Gesichtspunkte der vergleichenden Sprachforschung' in *Kleine Schriften zur vergleichenden Sprachwissenschaft*, (Leipzig: Zentralantiquariat der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik, 1972), pp. 149–234
- Bourdieu, Pierre, 'A reply to some objections' in *In Other Words / Essays Towards a Reflexive Sociology*, transl. by Matthew Adamson (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1990) pp. 106–119
- , 'The Field of Cultural Production, or: the Economic World Reversed' in: *The Field of Cultural Production*, ed. by Randal Johnson (New York: Columbia University Press, 1993) pp. 29–73
- , 'Field of Power, Literary field and Habitus' in *The Field of Cultural Production* ed. by Randal Johnson (New York: Columbia University Press, 1993) pp. 161–175
- Bryden, Inga, *Reinventing King Arthur* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2005)
- Buber, Martin, *Die vier Zweige des Mabinogi* (Leipzig: Insel, 1914)
- Davies Leathart, William, *The origins and the progress of the Gwyneddigion* (London: Hugh Pierce Hughes, 1831)
- Earle, William 'Bourdieu Nouveau' in *Bourdieu, A Critical Reader* ed. by Richard Shusterman (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1999) pp. 175–191
- Evans, D. Simon, *A Grammar of Middle Welsh* (Dublin: Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies, 1964 [2003])
- Evans, Evan, *Specimens of Ancient Welsh Poetry* (Llanidloes: John Pryse, 1862, repr. of 1st ed. by Dodsley, 1764)
- Evans, John Gwenogvryn (ed.) *The Text of the Mabinogion and other Welsh tales from the Red Book of Hergest* (Oxford: J. G. Evans, 1887)
- , *The Black Book of Carmarthen* (Pwllheli, 1906)
- , *The White Book Mabinogion* (Pwllheli, 1907)
- , *The Text of the Book of Aneirin* (Pwllheli, 1908)

- , *The Text of the Book of Taliesin* (Llanbedrog, 1910)
- Ewton, Ralph W., *The Literary Theories of August Wilhelm Schlegel* (The Hague, Paris: Mouton, 1972)
- Fichte, Johann Gottlieb, *Addresses to the German nation* ed. by Gregory Moore, (Cambridge: University Press Cambridge, 2008)
- Fiedler, Eduard, *Neue Jenaische Allgemeine Literatur-Zeitung*, vol. VII, nos 101–102, (27–28 April 1848)
- Fiedler-Rauer, Heiko, ‘San-Martes Parcival und seine Beurteiler’ in *Zeitschrift für Germanistik* 11, 2001, 538–549
- Fischer, Bernd, *Das Eigene und das Eigentliche: Klopstock, Herder, Fichte, Kleist. Episoden aus der Konstruktionsgeschichte nationaler Identitäten* (Berlin: Erich Schmidt Verlag, 1995)
- Fraser, Maxwell ‘The Waddingtons of Llanover 1791–1805’ in *National Library of Wales Journal*, 11.4 (1960), 285–329
- Gans, Eduard, *Beiträge zur Revision der Preußischen Gesetze*, (Berlin: Duncker und Humblot, 1830–1832)
- Gaskill, Howard ‘Herder, Ossian and the Celtic’ in *Celticism* ed. by Terence Brown (Amsterdam, Atlanta, GA: Rodopi, 1996), pp. 257–272
- , ‘Ossian, Herder, and the Idea of Folk Song’ in *Literature of the Sturm and Drang*, ed. by David Hill (Rochester, NY: Camden House, 2003), pp. 95–116
- Gildas and Nennius, *The works of Gildas and Nennius*, translated from the Latin and with the former translations carefully compared and corrected by J.A. [John Allan] Giles (London: James Bohn, 1841)
- Goethe, Johann Wolfgang von *Truth and Poetry Relating to my Life* (John Oxenford, transl.) (s.l.: The Floating Press, 2008), p. 634
- Gooch, G. P., *History and historians in the nineteenth century* (London: Longmans, Greene and Co. 1913)
- Greenfield, Liah, ‘The Final Solution of Infinite Longing: Germany’ in *Nationalism, Five Roads to Modernity* (Cambridge, MA, London, England: Harvard University Press, 1992), pp. 275–395
- Grimm, Jacob and Wilhelm, *Kinder- und Hausmärchen* (Berlin, 1812–1815)
- Grimm, Jacob, *Irische Elfenmärchen, aus dem Englischen* (Leipzig, 1826)
- Guest, Lady Charlotte, *The Mabinogion: from the Llyfr Coch o Hergest and other ancient Welsh manuscripts* (London : Longman, Brown, Green and Longmans ; Llandoverly : W. Rees, 1849)

—, *The Mabinogion from the Welsh of the Llyfr Coch o Hergest (The Red Book of Hergest in the Library of Jesus College, Oxford)* (London: Bernard Quaritch, 1877[1977])

Guest, Revel and Angela V. John, *Lady Charlotte Guest; An Extraordinary Life* (Stroud, Gloucestershire: Tempus publishing, 2007 [1989])

Hallam, Henry, *Introduction to the Literature of Europe in the 15th, 16th and 17th Centuries* (London: J. Murray, 1854 [1838/9])

Harding, John Dorney, *An essay on the influence of Welsh tradition upon European literature, which obtained the prize proposed by the Abergavenny Cymreigyddion Society, October, 1838* (London : Ibotson and Palmer, [1838?]). [with added remark ‘not published’, held in Aberystwyth, National Library of Wales]

Herder, Johann Gottfried, *Von deutscher Art und Kunst*, ed. by Edna Purdie (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1924)

—, *Werke; 10 in 11 Bänden*, 11 vols, ed. by Ulrich Gaier, I, Frühe Schriften 1764–1772 (Frankfurt am Main: Deutscher Klassiker Verlag, 1985)

—, *Werke; 10 in 11 Bänden*, 11 vols, ed. by Ulrich Gaier, III, Volkslieder, Übertragungen, Dichtungen, (Frankfurt am Main: Deutscher Klassiker Verlag, 1990)

Höltenschmidt, Edith, *Die Mittelalterrezeption der Brüder Schlegel* (Paderborn, München, Wien, Zürich: Schöningh, 2000)

Huber, V. A., ‘Chants populaires des anciens Bretons’ in *Neue Jenaische Allgemeine Literatur-Zeitung*, 2, nos 170–3, (18–21 July 1843), pp. 691–701

Huntingdon, Henry of, *Historia Anglorum*, transl. by Forester, Thomas (London: Henry G. Bohn, 1853)

Jackson, W.H. and S. A. Ranawake, (eds), *The Arthur of the Germans; The Arthurian Legend in Medieval German and Dutch Literature* (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 2000 [2011])

Jones, Owen, Iolo Morganwg, William Owen Pughe and John Thomas, (eds) *Myvyrian Archaiology*, (Denbigh: T. Gee, 1870 [1801–03])

Jones, R. M., [Bobi Jones] *Tair rhamant Arthuraidd: gydag arolwg o derfynau beirniadaeth gyfansawdd* (Caernarfon: Gwasg Pantycelyn, 1998)

Koch, John T., *Celtic Culture: A Historical Encyclopedia*, (Santa Barbara, Oxford: ABC-Clio, 2005)

König, Christoph (ed.), ‘Albert Schulz’ in *Internationales Germanistenlexikon* (Berlin, New York: De Gruyter, 2003), pp. 1681–84

Koepke, Wulf, ‘Herder and the Sturm und Drang’ in *Literature of the Sturm und Drang* (ed. David Hill) (Rochester NY, Woodbridge UK: Camden House, 2003), pp. 69–93

—, ‘Herder’s views on the Germans and their Future Literature’ in *A companion to the works of Johann Gottfried Herder* ed. by Hans Adler and Wulf Koepke (Rochester, NY: Camden House, 2009), pp. 215–232

La Villemarqué, Henri Hersart de, *Contes populaires des anciens Bretons + essai sur l’origine des épopées chevalresques de la table-ronde* (Paris: W. Coquebert , 1842)

Ley, Rachel, *Arglwyddes Llanofar; Gwenynen Gwent* (Caernarfon: Gwasg Gwynedd, 2001)

Löffler, Marion, ‘Der Pankeltismus vor dem Ersten Weltkrieg im europäischen Kontext’ in *Keltologie heute – Themen und Fragestellungen Studien und Texte zur Keltologie*, vol. 6, ed. by Erich Poppe (Münster: Nodus Publikationen, 2001), pp. 271–289

—, *The literary and historical legacy of Iolo Morganwg 1826–1926* (Cardiff: University Press, 2007)

Loth, Joseph, *Les Mabinogion du Livre rouge de Hergest avec les variantes du Livre blanc de Rhydderch* (Paris: Fontemoing et cie, 1913)

Luft, Diana, ‘The Meaning of “Mabinogi”’, in *Cambrian Medieval Celtic Studies* 62 (Winter 2011), 57–80

Luzel, François-Marie, *Gwerzioù Breiz-Izel: chants populaire de la Basse-Bretagne*, 2 vols (Lorient : Edouard Corfmart, 1868–1874)

—, *De l’authenticité de Chants du Barzaz-Breiz de M. de la Villemarqué* (Saint-Brieuc : Guyon Francisque, 1872)

Mac Craith, Mícheál, ‘The “Forging” of Ossian’ in *Celticism* ed. by Terence Brown (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1996), pp. 125–142

Maier, Bernhard, ‘Einleitung zur zweiten Sektion: Deutsch-walisische Kulturbeziehungen. Wales und Deutschland: Neun Jahrhunderte kulturellen Austauschs’ in *150 Jahre ‘Mabinogion’ – Deutsch-Walisische Kulturbeziehungen* (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 2001), pp. 131–140

Masiakowski, Dorotea, *Einheit und Vielfalt im Europabild August Wilhelm Schlegels* (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2002)

McCarthy, John. A., ‘Forms and objectives of Romantic criticism’ in *The Cambridge Companion to German Romanticism* (Cambridge: University of Cambridge Press, 2009), pp. 101–118

Morgan, William, *Y Beibl Cyssegr-Lan : sef yr Hen Destament a’r Newydd, y cyfieithiad cyntaf i’r Gymraeg, gan William Morgan* (Dolgellau: Ad-argraphwyd a chyhoeddwyd, gan R. Jones, 1821 [1588])

Müller, Ulrich and Werner Wunderlich, ‘The Modern Reception of the Arthurian legend’ in *The Arthur of the Germans*, ed. by W.H. Jackson and S. A. Ranawake (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 2000 [2011]), pp. 303–323

- Oergel, Maike, *The Return of King Arthur and the Nibelungen, National Myth in Nineteenth-Century English and German literature* (Berlin, New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1998)
- Pennant, Thomas, *A Tour in Wales*, 2 vols, (Wrexham: Bridge Books, 1991, facsimile repr. of original ed.: London: Henry Hughes, 1784)
- Pfeiffer-Belli, Wolfgang, (ed.) ‘Karl Lachmann an Albert Schulz (San Marte)’ Aus dem Nachlaß der Enkelin des Empfängers: Frau Editha Klipstein‘ in *Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum* 87 (1956/7) 317–320
- Poppe, Erich, ‘The Welsh language in German philology around 1850’ in *150 Jahre ‘Mabinogion’ – Deutsch-Walisische Kulturbeziehungen* (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 2001), pp. 203–221
- Price, Thomas, *Hanes Cymru, a chenedl y Cymry, o'r cynoesoedd hyd at farwolaeth Llewelyn ap Gruffydd; ynghyd a rhai cofiaint perthynol i'r amseroedd o'r pryd hynny i waered* (Crughywel: T. Williams, 1842)
- Pughe, William Owen, ‘The Mabinogion, or Juvenile Amusements, being Ancient Welsh Romances’ in *Cambrian Register* (1795), pp. 177–187
- Sauder, Gerhard, ‘Herder’s Poetic Works, Translations, and Views on Poetry in A companion to the works of Johann Gottfried Herder ed. by Hans Adler and Wulf Koepke (Rochester, NY: Camden House, 2009), pp. 305–330
- Schlegel, August Wilhelm, *Kritische Ausgabe der Vorlesungen über Ästhetik* I [1798 – 1803] & II/1 [1803 – 1827] ed. by Ernst Behler (Paderborn, München, Wien Zürich: Schöningh 1989 [2007])
- , *A course of lectures on dramatic art and literature / by Augustus William Schlegel*, transl. by John Black, (London: H.G. Bohn, 1846, reprint of 1815)
- Schlegel, Friedrich, ‘Über nordische Dichtkunst, 1812’ in *Sämmtliche Werke von Friedrich von Schlegel*, 10 (Wien: Schmidt, 1825) pp. 65–108
- Schmidt, Ricarda, ‘From early to late Romanticism’ in *The Cambridge Companion to German Romanticism*, ed. by Nicholas Saul (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), pp. 21–39
- Shusterman, Richard, ‘Editor's Preface’ in *The Field of Cultural Production, The Field of Cultural Production*, ed. by Randal Johnson (New York: Columbia University Press, 1993) pp. 29–73
- Stephens, Thomas, *The Literature of the Kymry* (Llandoverly: William Rees, 1849 [1876])
- Strobel, Jochen, ‘Blumensträuße für die Deutschen. Schlegel als Übersetzer und Literaturhistoriker’ in *Der Europäer August Wilhelm Schlegel : romantischer Kulturtransfer-romantische Wissenswelten* ed. by Mix York-Gothart and Jochen Strobel (Berlin, New York : Walter de Gruyter, 2010), pp. 159–184
- Thomas, Mair Elvet, *Afiath yng Ngwent* (Caerdydd: Gwasg Prifysgol Cymru, 1978)

Thorne, David, 'Cymreigyddion Y Fenni a Dechreuadau Ieitheg Cymharol yng Nghymru' ['The Abergavenny Cymreigyddion and the Beginnings of Comparative Philology in Wales'] in *The National Library of Wales Journal* 27/1 (1991), 97–107

Tombo, Jr. Rudolf, *Ossian in Germany*, (New York: The Columbia University Press, 1901)

Tully, Carol, 'The Celtic Misconnection: The German Romantics and Wales' in *Angermion, Yearbook for Anglo-German Literary Criticism, Intellectual History and Cultural Transfers*, 2 (2009), 127–141

Turner, Sharon, *A Vindication of the genuineness of the ancient British poems of Aneurin, Taliesin, Llywarch Hen, and Merdhin, with specimen of the poems* (London: Longman and Rees, 1803)

Wagner, Richard, *Selected Letters of Richard Wagner*, transl. and ed. by Stewart Spencer, Barry Millington (London: Dent, 1987)

Wiehle, Martin, 'Albert Schulz' in *Magdeburger Persönlichkeiten*, Magdeburger Schriftenreihe (Magdeburg: imPULS Verlag, 1993) , p. 99

Williams, John, (Ab Ithel) *Y Gododin : a poem on the battle of Cattraeth, by Aneurin, a Welsh bard of the sixth century; with an English translation, and numerous historical and critical annotations, by the Rev. John Williams ab Ithel* (Llandoverly: William Rees, 1852)

Zeuss, Johann Kaspar, *Grammatica celtica; E monumentis vetustis tam hibernicae linguae quam britannicae dialecti, cambricae, cornicae, armoricae nec non e gallicae priscae reliquiis construxit* (Lipsiae, apud Weidmannos [Leipzig: Weidmann], 1853)

Online sources

Cirlot, Veronica, *Mabinogion* [Spanish translation] Madrid 1982

<<http://www.scribd.com/doc/18031366/Anonimo-Mabinogion>> [accessed 23 September 2012]

History of the Cymmrodorion, the Most Honourable and Loyal Society of Antient Britons.

<<http://www.cymmrodorion.org/our-history>> [accessed 27 November 2012]

Description of Peniarth 11 <<http://www.rhyddiaithganoloesol.caerdydd.ac.uk/en/tei-header.php?ms=Pen11>> [accessed 11 November 2011]

Duden Online Version, entry 'Tisch' <<http://www.duden.de/rechtschreibung/Tisch>> [accessed 2 November 2013]

Dunlop, John Colin, *The History of Prose Fiction* (Edinburgh: James Ballantyne and Co., 1814 [London: George Bell and Sons, 1888]), [the 1888 edition is available online at <<https://archive.org/stream/historyoffiction01dunluoft#page/n5/mode/2up>> [accessed on 2 November 2013]

Editha Klipstein Nachlass kept at Frankfurt University <<http://www.ub.uni-frankfurt.de/archive/klipstein.html>> [accessed 10 November 2011]

Even-Zohar, Itamar, 'Culture-as-goods vs culture-as-tools' in *Papers in Cultural Research 2005*, pp. 9–14, <http://www.tau.ac.il/~itamarez/works/books/EZ-CR-2005_2010.pdf> [accessed 23 March 2013]

—, 'The Making of the Repertoire and the Role of Transfer' *Papers in Cultural Research 2005*, pp. 70–76, <http://www.tau.ac.il/~itamarez/works/books/EZ-CR-2005_2010.pdf> [accessed 18 July 2010]

Fiedler-Rauer, Heiko, 'Magdeburger Gralshüter' <http://www2.hu-berlin.de/presse/zeitung/archiv/00_01/num_5/15.html> [accessed 28 October 2008]

Genealogy of Ernst Susemihl

<<http://gw3.geneanet.org/pmlhennings?lang=en&p=ernst&n=susemihl&oc=0&pz=peter&nz=hennings&ocz=0>> [accessed 23 March 2013]

Gildas *De excidio et conquestu Britanniae*,

<<http://www.kmatthews.org.uk/history/gildas/gildas1.html>> [accessed 18 March 2012]

Haaser, Rolf *Editha Klipstein Archiv* <http://www.uni-giessen.de/~g91058/edithaklipsteinarchiv/index_klipst.htm> [accessed 10 November 2011]

> [accessed 10 November 2011]

—, *Editha Klipstein Archiv Chronik* <http://www.uni-giessen.de/~g91058/edithaklipsteinarchiv/index_klipst_chronik.htm> [accessed 10

November 2011]

Herbert, [Algernon], *Britannia after the Romans*, being an attempt to illustrate the religious and political revolutions of that province in the fifth and succeeding centuries, (London: John G. Bohn, 1836), [online version available at

<<http://www.archive.org/stream/britanniaafterro00herbuoft#page/n23/mode/2up>> ,
accessed 11 November 2011]

Herder, Johann Gottfried, *Briefe zur Beförderung der Humanität*, 1793–1797, 2 vols (Riga: Hartknoch, 1793–1707, [online version available at <<http://www.zeno.org/Literatur/M/Herder,+Johann+Gottfried/Theoretische+Schriften/Briefe+zur+Beförderung+der+Humanität>>, accessed 21 March 2013]

—, *Ideen zu einer Philosophie der Geschichte der Menschheit*, vol. 4 book 16 [online version <<http://www.textlog.de/5666-2.html>>, accessed 21 November 2013]

‘Histoire littéraire de la France’ Information on the series by the Académie Française: <<http://www.aibl.fr/publications/collections/histoire-litteraire-de-la-france/?lang=fr>> [accessed 24 March 2013]

History of the Savigny-Haus in Marburg <<http://www.uni-marburg.de/fb01/geschichte>> [accessed 16 September 2012]

Leibniz, Gottfried Wilhelm, ‘Tables des définitions’ in *Opuscules et fragments inédits*, (Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlag, 1988), p. 474, [online version available at <<http://books.google.co.uk/books?id=hKYUakNC3dYC&lpg=PP1&hl=fi&pg=PP1#v=onepage&q&f=false>>, accessed 3 March 2013]

London, British Library, Royal collection, MS 14B vi ‘Genealogical roll chronicle of the Kings of England’, <<http://www.bl.uk/catalogues/illuminatedmanuscripts/TourHistoryGeneal.asp>> [accessed 28 December 2012]

Löffler, Marion and Hywel Gethin Rhys, ‘Thomas Stephens and the Abergavenny Cymreigyddion: Letters from the *Cambrian* 1842–3’ in *National Library of Wales Journal*, 34, available online as a pdf-file at <http://www.llgc.org.uk/fileadmin/documents/pdf/The_Journal_Thomas_Stephens_Loffler_Rhys.pdf>, [accessed 22 September 2013]

Lübbe, Hermann, ‘Gans, Eduard’, in *Neue Deutsche Biographie*, 6 (1964), p. 63, [online version available at <<http://www.deutsche-biographie.de/pnd118689479.html>> , accessed 8 November 2011]

Magdeburger Häuserbuch, <http://www.magdeburg-tourist.de/media/custom/698_4882_1.PDF?1216809345> [accessed 17 September 2012]

Nörr, Dieter, *Savignys philosophische Lehrjahre*, Studien zur Europäischen Rechtsgeschichte, 66 (Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 1994) [google book preview available online at <<http://books.google.co.uk/books?id=RzmuqDT0rmYC&printsec=frontcover#v=onepage&q&f=false>>, accessed 13 September 2012]

—, ‘Savigny, Friedrich Carl von’, in *Neue Deutsche Biographie* 22 (2005), p. 470–473 <<http://www.deutsche-biographie.de/pnd118605909.html>> [accessed 12 December 2011]

Nutt, Alfred, 'Celtic Myth and Saga. Report of Research during the Years 1892 and 1893' in *Folk-lore*, 4, September 1893, 365–387. [online version available at <<http://www.jstor.org/stable/1253383>>, accessed 12 September 2012]

OED online version, 'definition: auscultator' <<http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/13238?redirectedFrom=auscultator#eid>> [accessed 16 September 2012]

Pauli, R., 'Bunsen, Christian Karl Josias Freiherr von' in *Allgemeine Deutsche Bibliographie*, 3, (1876), pp. 541–552, <http://daten.digital-sammlungen.de/bsb00008361/image_543> [images 543–554] [accessed 10 November 2011]

Schmidt, Erich, 'Koberstein, August' in *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie*, 16, (1882), pp. 360–363. <http://daten.digital-sammlungen.de/bsb00008374/image_362> [images 362–365] [accessed 11 November 2011]

Schröder, Edward, 'Schulz , Albert', in: *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie*, 55, (1910), pp. 194–197 <<http://www.deutsche-biographie.de/pnd109482263.html?anchor=adb>> [accessed 7 November 2011]

Settgast, Jürgen, 'Lepsius, Karl Richard', in *Neue Deutsche Biographie*, 14, (1985), pp. 308–309 <<http://www.deutsche-biographie.de/pnd118727699.html>> [accessed 11 November 2011]

Steffenhagen, Emil Julius Hugo 'Gans, Eduard' in *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie*, 8, (1878), pp. 361–362 <http://daten.digital-sammlungen.de/bsb00008366/image_363> [images 363–364] [accessed 10 November 2012]

Stemmatology, the Lachmann method <<http://www.textualscholarship.org/stemmatology/index.html>> [accessed 20 April 2012]

Swidler, Ann, 'Culture in Action: Symbols and Strategies' in *American Sociological Review*, vol. 51.2 (Apr. 1986) 273–286, (p. 273) <<http://www.ssc.wisc.edu/theoryatmadison/papers/swidler01.pdf>> [accessed 21 March 2013]

Tacitus, *Germania* <<http://www.thelatinlibrary.com/tacitus/tac.ger.shtml>> [accessed 4 December 2011]

Voigt, Irma Elizabeth, *The Life and Works of Mrs. Therese Robinson Talvj* Published Ph.D. Thesis (University of Illinois, 1913, published by Deutsch-amerikanische historische Gesellschaft Chicago) p. 38, <<http://archive.org/details/lifeworksofmrsth00voigrich>> [accessed 12 October 2012]

Wegele, Franz Xaver von, 'Lepsius, Karl Peter', in *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie*, 18 (1883), <online transcript: <http://www.deutsche-biographie.de/pnd116945885.html?anchor=adb>> [accessed 1 October 2013]