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Most of you will probably be familiar with the book *Arthur of the Welsh*, the first volume in a series that developed over the years to include volumes on Arthurian material within different linguistic areas - Arthur in French, German, Italian, Spanish, Latin, and the Nordic languages; a Dutch volume is underway. The purpose of the series is to introduce to students, specialists in other linguistic areas and that strange creature, the ordinary reader, an accessible, authoritative and reliable starting point to the subject, expanding and updating the content of the book *Arthurian Literature in the Middle Ages* (ed. Roger Sherman Loomis) which was first published in 1959. *Arthur of the Welsh* was published in 1991, under the editorship of Rachel Bromwich, Alfred Jarman and Brynley Roberts. Two of the three belonged to the oldest generation of scholars: Dr Bromwich was 76 years old and Professor Jarman was 80 when the book was published, and even then a few of us younger participants felt that some of the chapters were rather old-fashioned. Therefore the inviation from the Vinaver Trust to prepare a new volume as an update to *Arthur of the Welsh*, was a challenge to me, that is not to fall into the same trap.

I was very fortunate that Professor Erich Poppe, Professor of Celtic Studies at the University of Marburg in Germany, had accepted my invitation to join me as co-editor, and I would like to take the opportunity to thank him. Our interests overlap but we also have different strengths and that was of great help as the work progressed. It was agreed that it was necesary this time, to extend the field beyond Wales and the Welsh language, and pay due attention to the traditions of all the Celtic languages ​​- although in the end we did not find any Arthurian material in the Manx language, and as such only 5 of the 6 Celtic languages ​​are represented: the three Brythonic languages (Welsh, Cornish and Breton) ​​together with Irish and Scottish Gaelic. Of course, it is quite possible that people in the Isle of Man had been familiar with Arthurian material from Ireland or Scotland, given the close relationship between the three languages, with the Irish/Gaelic languages bridging both sides of the Irish Sea in the Middle Ages so that a great deal of traditions were shared between Ireland and Scotland. Although the emphasis of the new volumeis on the Middle Ages and the early modern period, it was also important that we included modern literature, a previously untouched subject, as well as material derived from the oral or popular tradition.

A quick note about the title. Some would expect the title *Arthur of the Celts*, on the same pattern as *Arthur of the Welsh, the French, the Italians* and so on. I'm sure there would be a ready market for a book with such a title. But from the outset we emphasized that the book’s topic was material in the Celtic languages (not the people). Setting aside the discussions and debates held over the past decades on the ponderous terms, Celt, Celts, Celtic, what we are dealing with are five languages that were ​​spoken and are spoken in countries that are very different to each together. Our field of study is the texts and traditions in those languages, and whilst embracing such terms as 'Celtic' suggests to some a form of cultural unity, in reality not all of the countries follow the same vein in the Arthurian field, as we will later see.

It can be argued - as Leah Tether and Johnny McFadyen did in their *Handbook of Arthurian Romance* (2017) - that the imposition of linguistic boundaries limits and distorts:

.. the language of the Arthurian text in question has become a key means by which we, as scholars, categorize these narratives, such that volumes devoted to the study of this literature frequently divorce text from original context. (p. 2)

And they state that the classic example of this weakness is the series *Arthur of ...* ! Will this be a great weakness in *Arthur in the Celtic Languages*? The readers can judge for themselves. Perhaps this argument was deliberately raising a target, which is fair enough. But there is another side to the argument: that it is necessary to have a thorough knowledge of the languages ​​and the texts and the cultural context in each of the areas compared. However - and this is sadly apparent in the *Handbook* - very rarely, do experts in English and French areas, for example, have an adequate understanding of the Celtic languages ​​and literatures.

In Celtic studies, comparative work was commonplace, usually, from the 19th century, because comparative philology was the starting point of scholarly work in the field, and research on our literatures grew from the philological studies. It is therefore totally natural to compare Welsh and Irish material, for example, in addition to considering the influence of past traditions on current material. And as the early medieval Celtic countries were part of a wider Christian world in western Europe, they participated in the learning and culture of the wider world from the early Middle Ages onwards. This meant that we have a long tradition of reading and copying Latin texts of all kinds, and of incorporating ideas and knowledge from the continent into native literatures. Therefore, these were not isolated, insular cultures, but European cultures in the full meaning of the word. By the 13th century the Welsh people were also receiving and adapting French material; and gradually afterwards English texts left their mark on the growth of our literature. For these reasons, it has always been very difficult for us to avoid considering our literature in a linguistic and cultural void.

Furthermore, it has been well-known since the 18th century that there was a relationship between our Celtic material and the Arthurian literatures that developed in continental languages: from the 12th century onwards the fashion for Arthurian legends spread like wildfire to produce literary texts in nearly every European country, from the Nordic countries in the north to Iberia and Italy in the south. As the earliest sources dealing with Arthur and some of the heroes associated with him are Welsh and Welsh-medium, the question was raised early on regarding the exact relationship between narratives or motifs in French romance, say, and that in early Welsh poetry. Indeed, in the past, one of the weaknesses of Arthurian studies, in Welsh in particular, was concentrating excessively on the relationship between the raw material of the Welsh traditions and the Continental literatures, perhaps at the expense of basic studies of the Welsh texts as literature. A lot of time and energy was wasted trying to prove whether the origin of certain characters or stories was Welsh or continental, rather than trying to deepen our understanding of the texts. And nationalism rather than scholarly study often drove the argument on both sides. Another problem was that scholars dedicated time and energy swirling in this stagnant pool instead of doing necessary basic work: (such as) preparing standard editions of the Welsh texts, seeking to date manuscripts or linguistic changes in more detail and accurately, or studying the Welsh texts as literature for a Welsh audience, literature relating to a particular place, period and culture, developing appropriate guidance to evaluate texts as *sui generis* literature rather than judging them according to a measure developed for literatures produced in very different circumstances. (e.g. the *Peredur* tale).

This brings us back neatly to the old *Arthur of the Welsh* and the need to update it. Since the publication of the volume in 1991 the research landscape in the field has been transformed. Certainly, there has been less theorising on the origins of Arthurian narratives or motifs! Rather than seeing our texts as archaeological areas to excavate in order to discover that *A* in Welsh or Irish is the basis of *B* in a French text, the emphasis, fortunately, has been on empirical work. Therefore there isn't a chapter in the new book hypothesising about how the Arthurian legends’ core material were transferred from Wales and/or Cornwall to the continent. It is a fact that contintental writers from the 12th century onwards have grasped narrative material that was undoubtedly rooted in the Brythonic languages, and that those continental writers have developed and reinterpreted the material for new audiences. It is also a fact that the Welsh, at a later date, discovered that some of these later texts from the Continent could be adapted or translated by identifying Artus, Guenièvre, Yvain, Perceval etc. with the indigeneous Arthur, Gwenhwyfar, Owain, Peredur, and thus adding to the old native stock of stories about the Welsh characters. In *Arthur in the Celtic Languages* the emphasis is uncompromisingly on the texts - we may be criticized for this, but for us, theories must be developed on textual evidence, rather than the text being a handmaid to the supremacy of theory. And one of the biggest developments since publishing *Arthur of the Welsh* is that our knowledge of the texts themselves has been strengthened and extended.

The accessible corpus of texts was increased.

**New texts** came to light. The most noteworthy example is the Cornish play *Bewnans Ke* discovered in 2000. This meant adding a brand new text to the corpus but also greatly increasing our knowledge of the Cornish language and the literary tradition.

Thanks to the development of **new media**, numerous sources became more accessible through the digitization of manuscripts (websites such as: Irish Script on Screen, the National Library's Digital Gallery website, and Early Manuscripts at Oxford University, which include texts in Welsh, Irish and Cornish; Gallica (BnF) etc.). In addition to providing easy access to including numerous manuscripts, these electronic resources opened new areas in terms of interpreting and questioning texts, and also facilitated the comparison of hands, formatand other codicological aspects that can inform textual history.

Alongside these electronic facsimilies, teams in Aberystwyth and Cardiff developed databases of Welsh prose from 1300 to the end of the 15th century, databases that, with their powerful and swift search engines, enable us to map words, phrases and orgraphy more thoroughly and accurately.[[1]](#footnote-1)

**New text editions** that help inform linguistic developments: some printed, some only electronic. A noteworthy example in Welsh are the major projects of publishing standard editions of the work of poets who composed between the 12th and the 16th centuries: The Bards of the Princes and the Poets of the Nobility/the cywyddwyr. As praise poetry and elegies, for example, help to date texts in quite detail, the new editions, with their associated work on the historical context, have enabled us not only to date the poems themselves in more detail but also to extend and enrichen our understanding of linguistic changes. This is a new tool for reconsidering the dates of other texts as well, including other legends and prose texts (see Simon Rodway)[[2]](#footnote-2) Peter Wynn Thomas did groundbreaking work in an associated field with his work on dialectical characteristics in Medieval Welsh texts. (I will return to this).

Publishing editions not only facilitates access to unfamiliar or inaccessible texts, but it also often stimulates more research that in turn leads to new discoveries. One example is the Hervé Le Bihan edition of the Breton poem, *An Dialog etre Arzur Roe d'an Bretounet ha Guynglaff*, ('Contest of Arthur King of the Britons/Bretons and Guynglaff'), which appeared in 2013. A happy coincidence was discovering, a little earlier, the manuscript called *Le livre du meunier de Trébeurden* (Trebeurden's miller book), as one illuminates the context of the other in addition to extending our understanding of the cultural context.

A great deal of new research was also conducted on the manuscripts and their scribes, in particular Daniel Huws' work in Welsh. Daniel's innovative volume *Medieval Welsh Manuscripts* was published in 2000and we are avidly awaiting his *magnum opus*, namely the *Repertory of Welsh Scribes*. This is now nearer to being released but with his usual generosity Daniel organized a draft to be available for researchers, therefore it was already possible to benefit from this tremendous work that again sheds new light on the subject.

Remaining with manuscripts, over the last decades the history of the book grew, as an artefact and as a medium for transferring subjects, words and images, to be a fruitful and revealing area of research. Associated with this was an emphasis on the audience or readers, on sponsors or owners, and on the inter-relationship between texts within the same volume or *milieu*. For example in our volume, Aisling Byrne shows the importance of tracing the history of the origins and social context of Arthurian legends in the Irish language in order to understand the purpose and dynamics of these texts from the early modern period.

Another development to be welcomed since the publication of *Arthur of the Welsh* is how scholars in different areas collaborate and share skills and information in order to benefit from everyone's expertise. A perfect example of the advantages of this method of working was the volume of studies on *Peredur*, one of the Medieval Welsh Arthurian legends, which appeared in 2000, edited by Sioned Davies and Peter Wynn Thomas. This volume showed how new research on language and codicology could be used in seeking to establish the date and geographical origin of individual legends. In the case of *Peredur*, combining Peter Wynn Thomas's new research on dialectical traces with Daniel Huws' work on the manuscripts, gave a new insight on the development of the legend in its written form.[[3]](#footnote-3) Equally noteworthy was the fact that the new discoveries, and the pattern of evolution suggested by them, tended to correspond with other contributions to this project, dealing with other aspects: oral presentation traces, for example. or French sources.

These types of empirical research are of course extremely important in their own right, but they are also important if not essential in setting the necessary solid foundations before we can analyze, criticize and appreciate the texts as literature.

Considering the other side of the coin, the emphasis of criticism has changed completely. E.g. in *Arthur of the Welsh*, in the chapter on the *Peredur* tale, there is a discussion on the theory of sovereignty, which was very fashionable at that time. Briefly, the idea being that the young hero on winning a wife or a concubine also wins the land that she possesses: through the marriage ceremony or a sexual act with the woman the sovereignty of the land or kingdom is transferred to the man. This was an old idea, which can be traced to James George Frazer and his volume *The Golden Bough* (1st edition 1890). Under the influence of some studies on Irish literature, which became familiar in Wales through *Celtic Heritage* by Alwyn D. Rees and Brinley Rees (1961), it became fashionable in the 80's to discover traces of the sovereignty myth everywhere, just as W.J. Gruffydd earlier in the 20th century was searching for gods as the basis of characters in *Pedair Cainc y Mabinogi*. Like all fashions these had to yield to new ideas.

In recent years, alongside the revelatory textual work, there have also been new developments in terms of more theoretical readings, which have offered different ways of analyzing and interpreting familiar texts.[[4]](#footnote-4) Among these, one of the most popular and productive was the post-colonial approach. There are good examples in the post-colonial readings of the three medieval Welsh tales *Geraint*, *Owain* and *Peredur*, which equate to three of the French romances Chrétien de Troyes.[[5]](#footnote-5) With *Peredur* in particular, we found that a combination of post-colonial and historicist readings surprisingly correspond with the conclusions based on empirical work on the language and on palaeography and codicology.

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

Apart from having the opportunity to notice developments in research, preparation work for the book gave us an opportunity to notice some of the tendencies in the way in which Arthurian legends developed in different languages: what is in common or corresponds when moving from one linguistic area to another, and also noticing what is different. During the rest of the lecture I will try to provide some examples.

Languages ​​and their literatures do not abide neatly within geographical, political and administrative borders. If we consider the Welsh speaking communities in Herefordshire or Shropshire, a poet such as Gutun Owain, sponsors such as Bychaniaid of Hengwrt, or Elis Gruffydd as an exiled author in Calais. I have already referred to the linguistic and cultural continuum that existed from Ireland past the Isle of Man to parts of Scotland. On the Brythonic side of the Celtic family of languages, there is similar evidence of sharing the same traditions in Cornwall and Brittany in the early periods, although both countries have also developed their own legends. Although Welsh shares some traditions with Cornish and Breton, Welsh literature also followed its own path. And it is in the Welsh language that we find the largest corpus of all the Celtic languages in terms ​​of Arthurian texts and traditions, with the earliest also in the native languages, which of course often refer to events not in Wales but in lands on either side of the modern border between England and Scotland. That is why Professor Kenneth Jackson insists that the Welsh language poem *Y Gododdin* was 'the earliest Scottish poem'.

It appears that there are several reasons for the smaller number of Arthurian sources in Cornwall and Brittany, but it should be noted however that the total number of texts preserved in those languages ​​are fewer. But as in Wales, there are place names in Cornwall and Brittany that can often be linked to Arthurian tales known from the oral or literary traditions (contributions by Oliver Padel, Hervé Le Bihan, Fañch Postic and Hélène Bouget in the volume, comparing Welsh chapters of Scott Lloyd and Elissa R. Henken). But it appears that the range and popularity of Arthurian traditions were at their highest in the Brythonic countries. Together, the Welsh, Cornish and Breton traditions have an extremely important role in the development of Arthurian literature outside our countries. Through the work of Geoffrey of Monmouth, who was indebted to sources from the Brythonic world, Arthur's biography reached a wider European platform and many other native languages ​​eventually.[[6]](#footnote-6) Nevertheless, it must be borne in mind that the Arthurian traditions in the Brythonic languages, from the Middle Ages to the recent period, show a strong awareness that Arthur was an indigenous, native hero, not an imported exotic creature as was the case in every other language. That is probably one of the reasons why Arthur and characters associated with him have remained in our modern literatures: from T. Gwynn Jones and Bobi Jones in Welsh, to Xavier de Langlais and Glenmor in Breton and Caradar in Cornish.

But if the Brythonic languages ​​were the cradle of the Arthurian legends, in time Welsh, Breton and Cornish began to borrow narrative material that developed around Arthur in continental literatures, including those that were originally of Brythonic origin. We see that the linguistic and cultural boundaries in our countries were so thin and pervious, where the native Celtic language would coexist not only with Latin but, in due course, with other languages ​​such as Norman and English in Britain and Ireland, and with French in Brittany. By the late Middle Ages, both Welsh and Irish writers translated, adapted and borrowed material from the French to create new prose texts, whilst the Welsh poets, as Barry Lewis demonstrates, in their desire to compare their sponsors with all kinds of heroes, lifted Arthurian characters from French romances, either directly or through translations.

It is noteworthy, however, that Irish writers of the Middle Ages had very little interest in King Arthur. As a Brythonic king and hero, Arthur appears for the first time in two translations, a translation of *Historia Brittonum* (*Lebor Bretnach*), in the second half of the 11th century and an adaptation of a French romance *La Queste del Saint Graal* (*Lorgaireacht an tSoidhigh Naomththa*). The date of the latter is uncertain, and dates between the 13th century and 15th century have been suggested. Arthur and some of his associates were transformed into characters in six Irish narrative texts from the 15th and 16th-century, but although these texts are often referred to as 'romances' or 'romantic tales' that should not blind us to the fundamental major differences in terms of *genre* between them and the continental Arthurian romances and even the Welsh texts known by some as 'romances', although the term *romance* is so problematic in the Welsh context (in particular when discussing *Geraint*, *Owain* and *Peredur*). Although Irish historical and geneaological sources from around 600 to 1054 refer to a number of individuals called Arthur, it is probably a name borrowed on its own, that is without associated 'Arthurian' narrative material. It is noteworthy that King Arthur did not leave his trace on the oral and folk traditions of Ireland. In this respect there is a clear difference between Ireland and Gaelic speaking communities in Scotland, where a host of oral traditions, genealogy and place names developed. If the Irish were not greatly interested in Arthur, it has been suggested that one reason for that is that he was not part of the native history of Ireland in the same way as he was in Britain. On the contrary, in the 17th century, Geoffrey Keating states in no uncertain terms that it is impossible to believe that an Irish king would be subordinate to King Arthur ('it is not conceivable that he [i.e., Muircheartach, son of Earc, the Irish king contemporary with Arthur] who was in so much power, should have been tributary to King Arthur '.[[7]](#footnote-7)) He added, referring to William of Newbury and Gerald of Wales,

'it is evident that neither Arthur, nor any other foreign potentate, ever had supremacy over Ireland from the beginning till the Norman invasion; and, moreover, it is not conceivable that the Britons had any control over Ireland, since even the Romans did not venture to meddle with it. '

Therefore Keating saw Arthur as a potential aggressor, as a threat to the concept of Irish independence rather than as a hero who could be adopted and owned as part of the history of that country. In this respect, it is interesting to note that Arthur is also perceived as a threat to sovereignty in the literature and historical texts written in the Scottish language of Scotland.

It has already been mentioned that the Welsh Aruthurian sources are the earliest, certainly going back to the 11th century and probably as early as the 9th century. The first evidence in the other Celtic languages ​​belong to different periods. The level and nature of the interest in Arthur is not the only factor to influence this but also the methods of transferring the material – i.e. orally or in writing - and the period to which the earliest written sources in the language belong. In Breton, the texts we have in the native language are quite late, but we get a fuller picture in looking at earlier Latin sources, and on the legacy preserved in the oral tradition; there was a culture in the native language in the early period but it was recorded in Latin. According to Hervé Le Bihan, the earliest Arthurian text we have in Breton was composed in 1450, namely the contest between Arthur and Guynglaff. (*Dialog etre Arzur Roe d'an Bretounet ha Guynglaff*). In Cornish, *Bewnans Ke*, the only text where Arthur plays a part, belongs to about 1500 - a similar period-however there is evidence that Arthurian legends were known in Cornish in an earlier period. In Scottish Gaelic, there is room to believe that traditions about Arthur were circulating by at least the 15th century, according to evidence in genealogical texts referring to 'Meirbi mab Arthur mab Uther, penfrenin y byd’ (‘... mhic meirbi mhic artuir mhic iubair .i. righ in domain gan rusan’).[[8]](#footnote-8)

In the Celtic languages ​​(with the exception of Irish) Arthur is on his own land - in different locations in Brittany, Scotland, Cornwall and Wales - which is very different to the situation in other languages, where the legends take place in some alternative, exotic or magical land. For some writers on the Continent, (e.g. Chrétien de Troyes), one of the advantages of this was to allow an 'arms' length commentary or discussion on the nature of contemporary society and its problems, or on the power and duties of a kingship, without creating political troubles for the author.

There are also other important differences in terms of the literary forms and *genres*. There is a significant corpus of medieval literature in the native language - in Irish and Welsh – howver prose, not poetry, is the narrative medium and the *lai* or romance is not in rhyme and metre. The only exception is the miracle play (*mystère, mystery play*) such as *Beunans Ke* in Cornish and *Santez Tryphina hag ar roue Arzur* (Saint Tryphina and King Arthur) in Breton. In these plays lay storytelling material could easily be incorporated within the structure of the *genre*, where a worldly story could be redirected for didactic purposes, to sugar the pill of a religious message, or to show the supremacy of the Church over secular leaders.

Similar to plays , the Breton *gwerz*  (a type of ballad), is a form to be performed, a form that developed to be the main narrative medium in the language. Sometimes it is possible to see a link between a medieval written text and a ballad or another form of a legend preserved in the oral tradition and recorded in later sources. Therefore motifs or other elements in the history of a saint's life, whether in Latin or in a native language, will sometimes reappear in a legend or ballad / folk song collected in the 19th or 20th century, even if we cannot prove that one has borrowed from the other, or that they are ultimately derived from the same source. The constant cross-pollination between oral and written traditions, irrespective of the boundaries of social class, is one of the prominent features of the Celtic countries' verbal culture and is an important factor in the development of Arthurian material. Elissa Henken refers in the book to

'the intertwining [*my emphasis*] of literary borrowings, inventions and traditional allusions, of local legends and international tale types and motifs.'

Hervé Le Bihan used another metaphor: *circularité* (cycling) - to describe the same process of transferring material back and forth between oral material and books, between ordinary folk and the learned, from the Middle Ages to the modern period, with the material constantly changing and evolving. Written medieval texts may be indebted to oral traditions; they can also be 'performed' and transmitted orally, while material derived from a written context in turn feeds the oral tradition in place names, in ballads or prose legends. In Welsh, since the 1990's, we have benefitted from Sioned Davies' innovative work on the traces of oracy and performing techniques in medieval Welsh narrative texts, work which has led us to reconsider how the legends referred to as the *Mabinogion* for ease of reference, developed, offering useful guidelines for identifying elements inherited from the oral tradition and distinguishing them from those who are dependent on a written copy or presume a recorded text.[[9]](#footnote-9)

It is likely that this relationship between the spoken word and the written word, relates to the time gap between the supposed period of composition and the earliest written evidence available, as in the case of the *Culhwch and Olwen* legend for example, or the earliest Welsh poems. If a text is attributed to a specific author, there is more hope of at least getting a *terminus post* or *ante quem*, but much of the early literature is anonymous in the manuscripts. Therefore we must turn to all types of indirect, circumstantial evidence in seeking to establish a date and origin. The norm is not a fixed text by an individual author whose name is known to us. In considering a medieval tale in a manuscript, *gwerz* from Brittany or a Scottish ballad, that were collected orally in the 19th or 20th centuries, we must accept that textual uncertainty is normal. We need only look at the manuscript tradition of the *Owain* and *Peredur* tales to see that attempting to establish a 'standard' version of such a text is unsuitable and misleading.

I have attempted to give you a snapshot of the new book's line of enquiry, and at the same time show our progress in terms of researching Arthurian material in the Celtic languages, outlining some of the important changes that have taken place since *Arthur of the Welsh* was published in 1991. I feel that we, as researchers in this area, have made important progress in subsequent years, and I must emphasise how indebted we are to fellow researchers in associated areas, whereby we were able to benefit from their work to shed light on our texts and traditions. And we are mostly indebted to all of our excellent contributors! But this is not the last word on Arthurian material in the Celtic languages. Research must continue to move forward building on the solid foundations established in the past but also not to shy away from replacing the findings of the previous generation. One of my greatest pleasures at my age is to see young researchers bringing new knowledge and ideas and different reading methods for adapting or indeed challenging the findings of the previous generation. I probably will not still be here in another quarter of a century but it would be interesting at that time to look back at *Arthur in the Celtic Languages* to see what new lines were acquired for studying texts and the extent to which today's theories and findings will have been replaced.
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