Ca' Foscari
University
of Venice

Master's Degree in
Language Sciences

ex dm 270/04

Final Thesis

Beathadh Sir Gui o Bharbhuic

A Medieval Irish Romance

Supervisor
Ch. Prof. Massimiliano BAMPI

Assistant supervisor
Dr Elizabeth BOYLE

Graduand
Benedetta D'ANTUONO
Matriculation Number 884586

Academic Year
2021/2022

Acknowledgements

This endeavour would not have been possible without my professor and supervisor, Prof. Massimiliano Bampi, who helped me design this research project and constantly supported its realisation. I am incredibly thankful for his precious feedback, patience, and encouragement. As an authentic mentor, he generously shared his expertise and allowed me to fully appreciate the value of philology as a discipline and, perhaps more importantly, as a mindset. I humbly hope that this work will adequately reflect his teachings and that it will properly express my gratitude in a way that words could never do.

I also could not have undertaken this journey without my co-supervisor, Dr Elizabeth Boyle. She carefully and gently walked me through the literary tradition of medieval Ireland and gave me plenty of bibliographical and methodological suggestions to conduct this study. She always believed in me, the only Italian student in her class, and she made me improve from both an academic and personal perspective.

I would like to extend my thanks to Prof. Keith Busby; he kindly advised me in choosing the department of *Sean-Ghaeilge* at Maynooth University to pursue my formation in medieval Irish studies, and he increased my awareness of the contact between the Romance and Celtic traditions. I am also deeply indebted to Prof. David Stifter, Dr Deborah Hayden, and Dr Chantal Kobel; this work could not have been completed without their linguistic, literary, and palaeographical advice. Furthermore, I am thankful that, just as my supervisor and co-supervisor did, they helped me present my research at the *Transitions Postgraduate Conference 2022*, hosted by the University of Bristol.

I would be remiss in not mentioning my family. I am grateful to my parents, Cristina and Luigi, for having granted me the possibility to cultivate my interests, to my wonderful sister, Beatrice, whose belief in me has constantly kept my spirits high, and to our family cat, Tiffany, who has been the silent observer of my study endeavours for sixteen years. Lastly, special thanks should go to my friends, Gaia, Valeria, James, Emma, Giulia, Mairéad, Lydia, River, Marco, and Lucio who have always been by my side, even from miles afar.

Thank you.

Abstract

During the mid- to late-fifteenth century, Ireland produced a corpus of translations of continental literary works, with a well-evidenced predominance of the *romance* genre. Among the eight extant *romance* translations stands the Early Modern Irish version of the Middle English *romance Guy of Warwick*, *Beathadh Sir Gui o Bharbhuic*, preserved in a single copy: the miscellaneous TCD MS 1298.

This study will be divided into a theoretical phase and a practical one. The first will introduce *Guy of Warwick* and *Beathadh Sir Gui o Bharbhuic*, explore the phenomenon of medieval Irish translation, and discuss the codicological context of the Irish version. The second will compare the source text to the target text following the method of *Descriptive Translation Studies*; the major structural, stylistic, and content differences will be brought to the fore, with a view to understanding the reasons behind them.

By analysing a text that has been largely neglected by previous scholarship, this project pursues three main objectives. To begin with, it aims to shed new light on the literary tastes, historical context, and socio-political framework of late-medieval Ireland. Furthermore, it intends to reveal some writing trends of the translator, identified as the prolific scribe Uilliam Mac an Leagha. Last, it hopes to show that Ireland was at the very heart of the dynamics of cultural transition and intellectual conversation that shaped the European Renaissance.

Beathadh Sir Gui o Bharbhuic
A Medieval Irish Romance

Table of Contents

Introduction ... *2*
Chapter I: Guy of Warwick and Beathadh Sir Gui o Bharbhuic ... *5*
1.1 *Gui de Warewic* and *Guy of Warwick* ... 5
1.2 The Auchinleck *Guy of Warwick* ... 10
1.3 The Early Modern Irish *Beathadh Sir Gui o Bharbhuic* ... 16
Chapter II: Medieval Translation and Translation in Medieval Ireland ... *20*
2.1 Medieval translation and *Descriptive Translation Studies* ... 20
2.2 Translation in medieval Ireland ... 23
2.3 First phase of translation ... 26
2.4 Second phase of translation ... 33
Chapter III: Beathadh Sir Gui o Bharbhuic in its Codicological Context (TCD MS 1298) ... *37*
3.1 Fifteenth-century Irish manuscript culture ... 37
3.2 TCD MS 1298: composition, contents, and intertextual connections ... 38
3.3 TCD MS 1298b/c: provenance and patronage ... 42
3.4 Uilliam Mac an Leagha: scribe and translator ... 45
Chapter IV: Structural Modifications in Beathadh Sir Gui o Bharbhuic ... *48*
4.1 The 'exhortation' motifeme in *Beathadh Sir Gui o Bharbhuic* ... 49
4.2 The 'now-we-leave-and-turn-to' motifeme in *Beathadh Sir Gui o Bharbhuic* ... 52
4.3 Personal comments and formulaic endings in *Beathadh Sir Gui o Bharbhuic* ... 59
Chapter V: Stylistic Modifications in Beathadh Sir Gui o Bharbhuic ... *63*
5.1 Modifications of the narrative medium ... 63
5.2 Modifications of the narrative approach ... 71
Chapter VI: Content Modifications in Beathadh Sir Gui o Bharbhuic ... *85*
6.1 Piety in *Beathadh Sir Gui o Bharbhuic* ... 85
6.2 Chivalry in *Beathadh Sir Gui o Bharbhuic* ... 97
6.3 Gaelicisation in *Beathadh Sir Gui o Bharbhuic* ... 106
Chapter VII: Speculum Gy de Warewyke and Beathadh Sir Gui o Bharbhuic ... *114*
7.1 Structural differences: the place of the *Speculum* in Guy's narrative ... 116
7.2 Stylistic differences: Uilliam Mac an Leagha's trends ... 120
Conclusions ... *127*
Reference List ... *131*
List of Illustrations ... *137*

Introduction

The following thesis will explore the Early Modern Irish translation of the Middle English romance *Guy of Warwick, Beathadh Sir Gui o Bharbhuic*. This version places itself within the translation trend that emerged in Ireland during the mid-to late-fifteenth century, which saw the production of a high number of translations from foreign vernaculars, especially English and French (Byrne, 2019b, p. 1).

This corpus of translation literature has received little scholarly analysis, with only a handful of studies having thus far been devoted to it (e.g., Robinson, 1908; Poppe, 2005, 2017). As Byrne suggests (2015, p. 184), Celticists might have disregarded it owing to its externality to the native tradition, while Germanists and Romanists might have been influenced by the forbidding linguistic barrier of medieval Irish.

However, to neglect these adaptations is to miss a precious source for our understanding of late-medieval Ireland, as '[…] the characteristics of the Irish mentality are nowhere better reflected than in the adaptation of foreign literary sources' (Poppe, 2005, p. 205). Indeed, like their continental European counterparts, medieval Irish translators did not tend to produce literal translations: instead, they adapted, abridged, or supplemented their source text to suit Irish taste (Ní Shéaghdha, 1984, p. 2). Considering this peculiarity, the forthcoming investigation will approach the topic through the framework of Descriptive Translation Studies.

This translation theory, developed by Toury in the 1980s, adheres to two fundamental principles. First, it follows a target-oriented method: it is interested in describing translation within the target-text literary system, as it deems it determinant for the outcome of any translation activity (Luft, 2006, p. 91). Second, it adopts a descriptive approach: it aims at understanding the processes undertaken in the act of translation rather than providing a set of norms for effecting the perfect translation (Bassnett, 2002, p. 43). Therefore, the study of *Beathadh Sir Gui o Bharbhuic* will be developed as a comparison between the source and target text, with the objective of understanding the reasons behind the alterations introduced by the Irish translator.

Arguably, the application of modern theories to pre-modern texts might be viewed as an intrinsically anti-historicist activity; however, when it is guided by a critical approach, which considers the differences between medieval and modern textuality, it acquires legitimacy. Furthermore, the widely accepted choice of classifying *Beathadh Sir Gui o Bharbhuic* as a translation already removes it from a medieval context and places it into a modern category, imposing modern expectations upon it (Luft, 2006, p. 85).

The source text employed by the Irish translator does not correspond to any extant witness of *Guy of Warwick*; however, convincing textual clues suggest that he worked on the Middle English metrical versions of the story (Robinson, 1908, p. 2, 5). These are preserved in five witnesses, which contain five different independent redactions of the romance (A, B, C, D, E), representing independent translations from Anglo-Norman source texts (Wiggins, 2007, p. 65).

- Redaction A Couplets, early fourteenth century, language of London. Auchinleck 123–7306; Caius 1–7444; Sloane fragment 1–216 (equivalent to Auchinleck stanza 4, line 7 – stanza 21, line 6; Caius 7315–98)
- Redactions B and C Stanzas, early fourteenth century, language of the East Midlands. Auchinleck stanzas 1–299 (*Stanzaic Guy*) and stanzas 1–127 (*Reinbroun*)
- Reaction D Couplets, very early fourteenth century, Northern language. NLW/BL fragments
- Redaction E Couplets, fifteenth century, language of the North Midlands. CUL 1–11,976; Caius 7445–8218 and 8810–10,231
  (Wiggins, 2007, p. 65)

The target text is transmitted in a single copy: the miscellaneous Trinity College Dublin MS 1298 (*olim* H. 2. 7) (henceforth: TCD MS 1298). The text of *Beathadh Sir Gui o Bharbhuic* is placed in the second section of this tripartite manuscript between another two Irish translations of foreign vernacular texts. Significantly, this section is written in one hand, which, in all likelihood, corresponds to that of the translator, identified with Uilliam Mac an Leagha (Byrne, 2019b, p. 10). Therefore, there are reasonable grounds for considering the extant copy of *Beathadh Sir Gui o Bharbhuic* as an autograph: this rare instance provides an excellent opportunity to analyse the adaptation process without potentially misleading interferences by later scribes (Poppe, 2005, p. 207).

The basis for this comparison will be represented by the current critical editions of the relevant works. As for the source text, Zupitza's edition (1883) of the Auchinleck *Couplet Guy* and *Stanzaic Guy* will be employed.[1] However, if need be, Wiggin's edition (2004) of the *Stanzaic Guy*, edited from the Auchinleck MS, will also be considered. The choice of the Auchinleck version is motivated by the fact that it is deemed the most complete and canonical

[1] The first leaf of the *Couplet Guy* (l. 1-123) is wanting in the Auchinleck MS. Therefore, Zupitza supplies the missing material from the Anglo-Norman version preserved in Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 50, leaf 6, collated with London, British Library, MS Harley 3775, leaf 15. Furthermore, the reader is advised that, for argumentation purposes, the discussions on *Beathadh Sir Gui o Bharbhuic*'s realisation of the 'exhortation' motifeme, the 'now-we-leave-and-turn-to' motifeme, and the formulaic endings will be based on Zupitza's edition (1883) of the fifteenth-century Cambridge, Gonville and Caius College, MS 107.

redaction of *Guy of Warwick* (Djordjević, 2007, p. 28). As for the target text, Robinson's edition (1908) of the only copy of *Beathadh Sir Gui o Bharbhuic* will be followed. However, should critical issues arise, the primary manuscript sources will be consulted as a second point of comparison.

The analysis will be developed in two main phases. The first phase will provide the context for comparison: a presentation of the two texts will be followed by a reflection on medieval and medieval Irish translation, and a codicological review of TCD MS 1298. The second phase will develop the comparison proper: after discussing the structural, stylistic, and content variations, it will provide some insight into the uniquely Irish inclusion of the *Speculum Gy de Warewyke* in the narrative core.

By analysing a text that has been generally devoted rather scanty attention by previous scholarship, this study pursues three main objectives. To begin with, it aims to shed new light on the literary tastes, historical context, and socio-political framework of late-medieval Ireland. Furthermore, it intends to reveal some translating and writing trends of the prolific scribal figure Uilliam Mac an Leagha. Last, it hopes to show that Ireland partook in the dynamics of cultural transition and intellectual conversation typical of the Renaissance centuries.

Chapter I: *Guy of Warwick* and *Beathadh Sir Gui o Bharbhuic*

1.1 *Gui de Warewic* and *Guy of Warwick*

Middle English romances are very rarely original works; rather, they often represent translations of earlier continental French or Anglo-Norman narratives (Djordjević, 2007, p. 27). This is true of some of the most renowned items of this corpus, for instance: *Amis and Amiloun* (*c.* late 13th century), which is a translation of a lost continental French *chanson de geste* (*c.* 11th century), and *Bevis of Hampton* (*c.* early 14th century), which is a translation of the Anglo-Norman *Boeve de Haumtone* (*c.* mid-13th century). The Middle English romance *Guy of Warwick* (*c.* 14th-16th centuries) is no exception to this; in all likelihood, it is the translation of the Anglo-Norman version of the story, *Gui de Warewic* (*c.* mid-13th century) (Djordjević, 2007, p. 27). Despite the lack of direct manuscript evidence, convincing substantiation for this hypothesis seems to be provided by two principal factors: affinity and relative chronology. First, as Djordjević underlined: '[…] textual matching between Anglo-Norman and Middle English is so close that […] we cannot describe such instances as anything but translations' (2007, pp. 27-28). Second, since the first Anglo-Norman copy of *Gui de Warewic* dates to the thirteenth century and the Middle English extant redactions of *Guy of Warwick* were produced between the fourteenth and sixteenth centuries (Djordjević, 2007, p. 29), the posteriority of the latter to the former creates the possibility for a translation activity.

Before proceeding any further, it is necessary to present the respective manuscript traditions. The Anglo-Norman *Gui de Warewic* survives in seven copies, grouped in two redactions, the α-redaction and the β-redaction (Djordjević, 2007, p. 30):

Anglo-Norman (α-redaction)

- E London, British Library, MS Add. 3866212
- F Cologny-Geneva, Bibl. Bodmeriana, MS 168 (formerly Phillipps MS 8345)
- M Cologny-Geneva, Bibl. Bodmeriana, MS 67 (formerly Marske Hall, Yorks., D'Arcy Hutton MS)

Anglo-Norman (β-redaction)

- C Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 50
- G Wolfenbüttel, Herzog August Bibl., MS Aug. fol. 87.4
- P Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, Fonds Français, 1669
- B New Haven, Yale University, Beinecke Library, MS 591 (formerly Cholmondeley MS 13)

The Middle English *Guy of Warwick* is transmitted by five witnesses: three manuscripts and two sets of fragments (Djordjević, 2007, p. 31; Wiggins, 2007, p. 62):

Middle English (manuscripts)

- Edinburgh, National Library of Scotland, Advocates' MS 19.2.1 (henceforth: Auchinleck)
- Cambridge, Gonville and Caius College, MS 107/176 (henceforth: Caius)
- Cambridge, University Library, MS *ff*.2.38 (henceforth: CUL)

Middle English (fragments)

- Aberystwyth, National Library of Wales, MS 572
- London, British Library, MS Add. 14408

The Middle English witnesses transmit five independent redactions of *Guy of Warwick* and represent independent translations from Anglo-Norman sources (Wiggins, 2007, p. 65). Furthermore, the translation preserved by the Auchinleck manuscript has been recognised as the canonical version of *Guy of Warwick*, for various reasons: the early date of the manuscript, its similarity in layout and illumination to the Anglo-Norman witnesses, and the completeness and idiosyncratic nature of its *Guy* narrative (Djordjević, 2007, p. 28).

It is worth addressing the Auchinleck text as a translation, with a view to identifying its source-text(s), its translator(s), and the translation techniques it exhibits. As is quite often the case with medieval translations, the exact source text employed by the translator seems to be lost. However, a study of the translational history of the Auchinleck *Guy of Warwick* can still be attempted. In this respect, Djordjević notes that: '[...] if we cannot establish direct transmission between entire manuscripts, we can do this for individual passages, some of considerable length' (2007, p. 27). By comparing significant passages of the Anglo-Norman witnesses to the Auchinleck translation of them, Djordjević recognised that the vast majority of the modifications introduced by the Auchinleck version appear to derive from a reworked, lost Anglo-Norman recension particularly close to G (2007, p. 34). As a result, the scholar confirmed a remark made by Ewert who, in his edition of *Gui de Warewic*, observes 'the closeness of G to the fourteenth-century redactions of the Middle English text' (1932, pp. 189-190).

Despite giving a remarkable contribution to tracing part of the translational history of the Auchinleck *Guy of Warwick*, Djordjević's hypothesis is problematic. Indeed, some passages of the Auchinleck narrative align with Anglo-Norman witnesses other than G, especially E, or a text fairly close to it (Djordjević, 2007, p. 36). Nonetheless, I believe that the results of the scholar's review could lead to two significant inferences about the source employed for the Auchinleck translation. First, since the source text does not fully correspond

to any of the extant Anglo-Norman witnesses, the case of a lost exemplar is created. Second, the source text was either compiled from different Anglo-Norman sources, very close to G and E, or it contained a version of the story which was later re-worked and altered by G and E; the answer depends on data on chronological primacy which, in the absence of the exact source-text, are problematical to acquire.

In order to speculate on the translator, who has not yet been identified, the compilatory nature of this manuscript must be discussed first. The scribe responsible for *Guy of Warwick* appears to have combined two redactions of the narrative: the *Couplet Guy* (Redaction A) and the *Stanzaic Guy* (Redaction B), realised independently by different redactors (Wiggins, 2007, p. 66). Intuitively, these redactors might have themselves been the translators or they might have been using Middle English translations in turn. In either case, I suppose that the fact that these redactions were composed independently and by at least two different individuals makes it more accurate to refer to translator*s* rather than *a* translator.

As for the translation technique, a comparison between the Auchinleck *Guy of Warwick* and the Anglo-Norman witnesses held to be closest to its lost source text (G and E) suggests a conservative approach on behalf of the translators.[2] The adherence to the source text should not be read as an instance of respect for its authority; this is especially true when the mutable medieval conception of authority and consequent *auctoritas* is considered. Instead, the translators' adherence to his source was merely a manner of facilitating the translation process (Djordjević, 2007, p. 35); this was for the most part allowed by the similarity of the Anglo-Norman lexical, stylistic, and cultural system to the Middle English one (Djordjević, 2007, pp. 38-40).

Lexically, the increasing similarity between the Middle English and Anglo-Norman vocabulary facilitated the translators' operations. As Djordjević notes:

> As more and more French words made themselves at home in English, it became more and more natural for English translators, especially if they worked in a hurry, to reach for the French word instead of racking their brains for an English equivalent or near equivalent. Direct borrowings in Auchinleck include 'valeys' (l. 3876), 'real pauiloun' (l. 3879), 'noise' (l. 3886), 'pini' (l. 3893), 'treitour' (l. 3905), 'glotoun' (l. 3919), 'ransoun' (l. 3922), and 'serue' (l. 3923). (2007, p. 38)

Stylistically, the metrical unit employed for the *Couplet Guy* was considerably similar to that of the Anglo-Norman source text; an Anglo-Norman line of eight to ten syllables could

[2] For further discussion on the conservative translation approach, see Djordjević, I. (2007) 'Guy of Warwick as a Translation', in Field, R. and Wiggins, A. [eds] *Guy of Warwick: Icon and Ancestor*, pp. 34-35. Cambridge: Boydell & Brewer.

have been turned into an English line of roughly the same length with almost no variation. Hence, the resulting translated section would have appeared similar to the source text (Djordjević, 2007, p. 37). Furthermore, Djordjević hypothesises that a large part of the set of formulaic expressions and narrative motives typical of the Middle English *romance* genre and almost ubiquitous in *Guy of Warwick* were also directly borrowed from Anglo-Norman models (2007, p. 42).[3]

Culturally, the contiguity between the Anglo-Norman and English worlds facilitated the translators' rendering of technical words; this is especially manifest in the terminology of arms, fighting, and armour, as many such words were recent loanwords from French (Djordjević, 2007, p. 40). These cultural affinities, together with the linguistic and stylistic ones, ultimately allowed the translators to perform a conservative translation process. This attitude stands at one end of the spectrum of medieval translation; at the other end lies a strongly innovative approach, which, as shall be discussed later in this chapter, was to be applied to *Guy of Warwick* upon reaching the Irish shores.

[3] By contrast, the *Stanzaic Guy* and the *Stanzaic Reinbroun* were more of a challenge for the translators; distributing the content of an Anglo-Norman line within a six-line stanza required a considerable alteration of the source text. As a result, the translated piece would have been quite distant from its source-text counterpart (Djordjević, 2007, p. 37).

(Fig. 1) *Guy of Warwick as a Knight. Introductory illustration to a copy of Le Rommant de Guy de Warwik et de Herolt d'Ardenne (an abridged continental French prose version). London, British Library, MS Royal 15. E. VI, ff. 227r-272r (15th Century)*. Available at: https://sites.nd.edu/manuscript-studies/2018/03/12/guy-of-warwick-the-anglo-norman-guthlac/

(Accessed: 22 September 2022)

1.2 The Auchinleck *Guy of Warwick*

Before proceeding to focus on the Auchinleck *Guy of Warwick*, it seems reasonable to provide an overview of the textual transmission and manuscript tradition of the *Guy* narrative.

As far as textual transmission is concerned, the manuscript record suggests that there was not a single, dominant version of *Guy of Warwick* which underwent a continuous process of copying. Rather, this romance's transmission appears to have been erratic, owing to the lack of contact with a central production force. As Wiggins notes: 'the impulse to translate, copy, or compile *Guy of Warwick* was influenced and inspired at particular moments by specific cultural *stimuli*. Versions emerged and receded at different times and in different locales' (2007, p. 61). This is why *Guy of Warwick* did not achieve a standard form until it began to be printed (Wiggins, 2007, p. 61). Furthermore, the manuscript record suggests that all the versions of the *Guy* narrative were produced in written form; the type of scribal errors found in the extant witnesses (e.g., eye-skips, orthographic revisions, haplography, dittography etc.) dismisses the possibility that this romance was ever transmitted mnemonically (Wiggins, 2007, p. 61). Be that as it may, it is nonetheless important to point out that if *Guy of Warwick* did not know an oral production, it might have known an oral fruition; just as was common practice with Middle English romances, it might have been read aloud from manuscripts (Wiggins, 2007, p. 61).

As to the manuscript tradition of *Guy of Warwick*, the romance survives in three manuscripts and two sets of fragments, copied between *c*. 1300-1500. Such witnesses, synthetically listed earlier in this chapter, have been given detailed palaeographical and codicological descriptions by Wiggins and I shall quote them below:

- Aberystwyth, National Library of Wales MS 572 and London, British Library, Additional MS 14408 (NLW/BL). Early-fourteenth-century fragments in a Northern dialect. These eight vellum bifolia were cut up in 1473 for use in the binding of a pair of books. Now badly stained and damaged, the manuscript was evidently a neat but modest production with some rubrication, detached initials, and four columns, of around fifty lines, per page.
- Edinburgh, National Library of Scotland, Advocates' MS 19.2.1. ('Auchinleck' Manuscript), *ff.* 108ra–175vb (Auchinleck). A miscellany of mainly English items copied in London by six scribes c. 1330–40. The manuscript is constructed of twelve booklets, mainly (including Guy of Warwick at the head of Booklet 4) copied by Scribe 1, who also orchestrated the organisation and compilation of the volume. The book's visual scheme indicates the intention to produce a unified volume; however, discrepancies between the booklets reveal a production process that must have involved many 'fits and starts' and which probably included the

incorporation or adaptation of some pre-existing textual material. LALME maps the language of Scribe 1 to London/Middlesex; Scribe 3 to London; Scribe 5 to Essex; and Scribes 2 and 6 to the Gloucester/Worcester border. The manuscript now contains 334 vellum folios and 44 texts. Although best known for its substantial collection of romances, it also includes saints' lives, religious and didactic pieces, items of basic doctrinal instruction, complaint, chronicle, and a macaronic poem. The manuscript is defective at both ends and its current state may only represent around three quarters of the original length of the book. An attractive, spaciously set out volume, it is in double columns of approximately forty-four lines with blue and red initials and was originally decorated throughout with a programme of miniatures (now mutilated). The 'Reinbroun' material, copied by Scribe 5, is packaged as a separate romance and visually divided from Guy with a new miniature.

- London, British Library, Sloane MS 1044 (item 248) (Sloane). A single-folio fragment from the fourteenth century, originally in the library of John Bagford (1650–1716) and acquired after his death by Sir Hans Sloane (1660–1753). The leaf is written in an even Anglicana Formata in fifty-four-line double columns on good vellum. It is decorated with enlarged initials and paraphs in red and blue ink; rubrication is also used to highlight the detached initials and for the brackets that link couplet rhymes. Although now much trimmed the leaf measures 300 x 200mm; that is, more than a third larger than folios in Auchinleck. Evidently it was once part of a large, well-produced, and perhaps rather impressive book. With such a small sample it is difficult to draw any conclusions about the language of the scribe; most notable is the appearance (8x) of <heo> she, a form which retreated to the Southwest and West Midlands during the fourteenth century, although this does not exclude London as a possible place of production.
- Cambridge, Gonville and Caius College, MS 107/176 (Caius). A single-text manuscript produced in London in the 1470s. This is a carefully produced volume of 136 vellum leaves (paginated), 263 x 177mm. The text is copied by two highly competent professional scribes, who write in versions of Secretary and Bastard Secretary scripts. The layout is spacious: on each page is a single, ribbony, thirty-line column of verse, ruled in ink and padded around with generous margins. Throughout are blue initials with red filigree lacework. The opening page has an eight-line gold initial from which extends a fine spray-work border; the liner has been identified by Kathleen L. Scott as the English border artist of Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley MS 283. The second part of the story of Reinbroun is omitted.
- Cambridge University Library MS *ff*.2.38 (olim More MS 690), fols 161r–239r (CUL). A large 'household' type collection containing works of basic religious instruction, didactic lyrics, and saints' lives followed by an almost unbroken sequence of nine romances. The earliest watermarks, identified by Pamela Robinson, are from 1479–84 though it is quite possible the book was not produced until the early years of the sixteenth century. Constructed of two large booklets copied by a single scribe in a mixed cursive script, this is a paper manuscript of 247 folios (approx. 297 x 205mm) written in double columns of thirty to forty lines and

modestly decorated throughout with red initials. The contents and dialect make it most likely to have been produced in the North Midlands: the language of the scribe has been localised by LALME to Leicestershire and the book contains items that also populate the collections of Yorkshire scribe Robert Thornton and Leicester scribe John Rate. The commencement of the second part of the story of Reinbroun is indicated by some features of the ordinatio and a rubricated initial.
(2007, pp. 62-65)

As mentioned, these witnesses contain between them five different independent redactions of the romance, which represent independent translations of Anglo-Norman source texts (Wiggins, 2007, p. 65). Namely, these are distributed as such:

- Redaction A Couplets, early fourteenth century, language of London. Auchinleck 123–7306; Caius 1–7444; Sloane fragment 1–216 (equivalent to Auchinleck stanza 4 line 7 – stanza 21 line 6; Caius 7315–98)
- Redactions B and C Stanzas, early fourteenth century, language of the East Midlands. Auchinleck stanzas 1–299 (*Stanzaic Guy*) and stanzas 1–127 (*Reinbroun*)
- Reaction D Couplets, very early fourteenth century, Northern language. NLW/BL fragments
- Redaction E Couplets, fifteenth century, language of the North Midlands. CUL 1–11,976; Caius 7445–8218 and 8810–10,231

Once the textual tradition of *Guy of Warwick* has been presented, the manuscript compilation and the production and reception contexts of the Auchinleck version of the romance may be assessed.

As for the compilation of the manuscript, important clues are given by the juxtaposition of the *Couplet Guy* (*ff.* 108ra-146vb) with the *Stanzaic Guy* (*ff.* 145vb-167rb). It has been claimed that this mid-text stylistic change has to be ascribed to a single redactor who valued its artistic potential; switching from couplets to stanzas meant switching from an epic tone – apt to the action and violence characterising Guy's early life – to a lyrical one – suited for the redemption and reflection marking Guy's later life (Wiggins, 2007, p. 66). The hypothesis of an intentional juxtaposition is, I suppose, strengthened by recent scholarship on the organisation of miscellaneous manuscripts; medieval compilers tended to follow a precise plan for textual selection and disposition, with a view to influencing the interpretation of a text.[4]

[4] For a discussion on the mechanisms behind the compilation of composite manuscripts and on the hermeneutical consequences of textual disposition see Pratt, K. et al. (2017) *The Dynamics of the Medieval Manuscript: Text Collections from a European Perspective*. Göttingen: Göttingen University Press. For an in-depth analysis of the relevance of manuscript context to the study and interpretation of Old French verse narratives, see Busby, K. (2002) *Codex and Context: Reading Old French Verse Narrative in Manuscript*. Amsterdam-New York: Editions Rodopi B.V.

Hence, it might be posited that Scribe 1 wanted his readers and/or listeners to perceive Guy's life as a move from epics to lyrics, from heroic action to religious devotion. However, this interpretation is made less likely by crucial pragmatic factors. To begin with, the linguistic differences between the *Couplet Guy* and the *Stanzaic Guy* suggest that Redaction A and Redaction B were composed independently and by different redactors (Wiggins, 2007, p. 66). Moreover, a farther probative element is the fact that Redaction A (*Couplet Guy*) stops at approximately the same point in both the Auchinleck and other witnesses (Wiggins, 2007, p. 66). Considering that, as mentioned, the five witnesses of *Guy of Warwick* are independent of each other, Wiggins notes that it is very likely that Redaction A never continued beyond this point or that an important exemplar was damaged at some early stage (2007, p. 66). Therefore, rather than hypothesising a stylistic plan on behalf of Scribe 1, it would be more sensible to explain the juxtaposition of the *Couplet Guy* with the *Stanzaic Guy* as the result of a compilatory effort, aimed at creating a unitary narrative of Guy's legend by combining two different versions (Wiggins, 2007, pp. 66-67). This *modus operandi* would not be a first in the compositional process of Middle English romances. Due to the generally limited availability of exemplars, scribes had to endeavour to produce complete versions of literary works by amalgamating whichever manuscripts they could access (Wiggins, 2007, p. 66).

As for the production context, the Auchinleck *Guy of Warwick* appears to have been the result of a collaboration between Scribe 1 and a patron. Even though Scribe 1's identity is still unknown, the fact that he managed to access texts containing both Redaction A and Redaction B suggests that he was a well-connected individual (Wiggins, 2007, p. 67). The Auchinleck patron is also still unidentified, but information on his social position can be retrieved from the reception context. More specifically, the Auchinleck *Guy of Warwick* seems to have been intended for the bourgeois audience of 'Edwardian' London (Wiggins, 2007, p. 67). Consequently, the manuscript patron could have been an 'aspirant middle-class citizen, perhaps a wealthy merchant' (Pearsall and Cunningham, 1977, p. 8). The reception environment also accounts for some content peculiarities in *Guy of Warwick*. To start with, Hanna hypothesises that the romances in the Auchinleck manuscript were produced for an audience who was equally interested in civic and royal culture (2005, pp. 116-117). The readers of the Auchinleck were not expecting trivial stories; rather, they were keen on reading a serious romance, which balanced the polished courtly dimension with a pragmatic analysis of the social responsibilities of knighthood (Wiggins, 2007, p. 68). These expectations probably led to the peculiar combination featured in *Guy of Warwick*: the predominantly courtly narrative of the romance is accompanied by a detailed interrogation of chivalry, an exploration of the conflict

between *armes* and *amors*, and a scrupulous analysis of counsel, honour, faith, penitence, justifications for violence, and rationale for wars (Wiggins, 2007, p. 68).[5] Furthermore, it has been posited that the reception context was responsible for the presence of another theme: the question of Englishness and the expression of national identity (Rouse, 2007, p. 95). Certainly, the Auchinleck *Guy of Warwick* does not leave any doubt about Guy's nationality, as he is addressed as an Englishman. However, the insistence on Guy's English identity seems to be less developed in the fourteenth-century redaction of *Guy of Warwick* than in its later revisions by a Middle English redactor (Wiggins, 2007, p. 69).

If the revisions to the Auchinleck version enhance Guy's English identity, the fifteenth-century redactions transmitted by CUL and Caius insist on Guy's morality and chivalric status. In comparing the CUL and Caius *Guy of Warwick* to the Auchinleck version, Wiggins highlights:

> The unique additions and excisions in CUL and Caius are of interest because they reveal shifts of expectation among later readers regarding the purpose and function of the romance. [...] This shift towards a more idealised version of chivalry could be described as characteristic of the fifteenth-century versions and, if anything, is even more obvious in the Caius *Guy of Warwick*.
> (2007, p. 72)

These changes in expectations and contents were promoted by the contemporary Burgundian phenomenon of the chivalric revival, aimed at restoring the knight's image as a living example of loyalty, truth, hardiness, *largesse*, and humility (Wiggins, 2007, p. 79).[6] As shall be discussed in due course, this current also left an imprint on the Irish *Beathadh Sir Gui o Bharbhuic* (Byrne, 2016b, pp. 77-80).

The CUL text exhibits a great effort to smooth over some of Guy's rougher edges in order to present a more even and admirable example of chivalry (Wiggins, 2007, p. 71). This change is realised in two principal senses: Guy becomes more diplomatic and respectful of etiquette and social mores. For instance, in one of his first disputes with Otus, Guy prefers lying down his glove to punching his main antagonist in the teeth. Likewise, Guy demonstrates a more courteous behaviour in his altercation with Earl Florentine's son; his opponent, instead,

---

[5] The audience's demands are reflected in all of the Auchinleck romances, which present a double nature: on the one hand, they are imbued with historical and legal concepts; on the other, they express traditionally royal concerns, such as advice to princes and courtly love.

[6] For discussions on the spread of the chivalric revival to England and the renewed interest in tournaments from the 1460s with the accession of Edward IV, see Barber R. (1993) 'Malory's Le Morte Darthur and Court Culture under Edward IV', in Carley J.P. and Riddy F. [eds] *Arthurian Literature XII*, pp. 133-156. Cambridge: Brewer, and Barber, R. (1996) 'Chivalry and the Morte Darthur', in Archibald E. and Edwards A. S. G. [eds] *A Companion to Malory*, pp. 19-35. Cambridge: Brewer.

shows a higher degree of aggressiveness, which makes him uncourteous (Wiggins, 2007, p. 71). The different and straightforwardly honorific representation of Guy could explain one of the greatest differences separating the CUL *Guy of Warwick* from the Auchinleck redaction; the lack of an introspective moment focused on Guy's failings as a knight. This section, which in the Auchinleck ultimately leads to an examination of chivalry, would have been superfluous and redundant in a text which was entirely targeted to present an irreproachable version of knighthood from the outset (Wiggins, 2007, p. 72).

The Caius version, as anticipated, vividly reflects the alteration caused by the chivalric revival; therefore, it is worth approaching this witness in more detail. The text of the Caius unites parts of Redaction A and Redaction E respectively and, just like the Auchinleck some one hundred and fifty years before, it seems to have been compiled by scribes associated with the London commercial book trade (Wiggins, 2007, p. 72). When the text of Redaction A presented by the Caius is compared to its Auchinleck counterpart, it is immediately apparent that the former omits many passages and lines. Rather than resulting from an alleged defective exemplar, these differences seem to stem from a self-conscious process of abridgement (Wiggins, 2007, p. 72). In particular, they were targeted to polish Guy's story: the most violent, morally questionable, or unchivalrous scenes were eliminated. From a macroscopic and episodic perspective, these include the omission of the Florentine episode in which Guy kills Earl Florentine's son and decimates his court; the Clarice episode where Guy becomes so forgetful of Felice that he only narrowly avoids marrying another woman; several episodes involving personal revenge and vendettas between Guy and his rivals Otous, Morgadour, and Berard; the omission of the story of Guy's son Reinbroun. From a microscopic perspective, a significant reduction in the overall body count and an emphasis on Guy's chivalric qualities combine to produce a morally impeccable portrait of the hero (Wiggins, 2007, pp. 72-74). The considerate and planned revision of the *Guy* narrative realised in the Caius text raises the question of whether it was produced in response to a particular request or commission. The most eligible candidate in the contemporary historical context is Richard de Beauchamp (1382-1439), the then-Earl of Warwick. The Earl was, in all likelihood, interested in restoring the family's reputation in a troubled historical period. His father, Thomas de Beauchamp (1338-1401), endeavoured to overthrow the king, Richard II; he was then charged with high treason and imprisoned in the Tower of London. In 1399, he was released under the condition of forfeiting all his titles and estates, which he would have only gained back with Henry IV's ascension to the throne. Making the most of their legendary ancestor by boasting about his deeds and irreproachable behaviour seemed the best way to re-establish the Beauchamp

family's high reputation (Wiggins, 2007, p. 76). However, the absence of direct evidence of a link with the Beauchamps does not allow this hypothesis to go beyond the speculative stage (Wiggins, 2007, p. 76).

1.3 The Early Modern Irish *Beathadh Sir Gui o Bharbhuic*

The Early Modern Irish translation of *Guy of Warwick*, *Beathadh Sir Gui o Bharbhuic*, was produced as part of the 'second phase' of medieval Irish translations (Byrne, 2019b, p. 3). In order to present this text, it is fundamental to consider its manuscript context and its production and reception environments.

Beathadh Sir Gui o Bharbhuic is transmitted in a *codex unicus*: the composite manuscript TCD MS 1298. A detailed study of the codicological context will be carried out in Chapter III; however, it is worth introducing some essential pieces of information. The text appears in the second section of this threefold manuscript, written towards the end of the fifteenth century by a single hand, that of the prolific Irish scribe Uilliam Mac an Leagha, who was probably related to the contemporary Mac an Leagha family of medical scribes (Byrne, 2016a, pp. 290-292). The textual disposition is of interest as the text is placed next to two other translations of continental works: *Sir Bevis of Hampton*, which traditionally accompanied *Guy of Warwick* in its transmission, and *Recuyell of the Historyes of Troye*. Not only that, but stylistic trends shared by the three translations in this section suggest that Mac an Leagha was not only the scribe but also the translator of these texts (Byrne, 2016b, p. 78). The provenance of this section of the codex is also quite confidently retrievable. An examination of the *marginalia* suggests that they were both owned by the same cadet branch of the Fitzgerald family: the Fitzgeralds of Allen, in Co. Kildare (Byrne, 2016a, pp. 289-295, pp. 298-301).

As to the production context, the connection to the Fitzgeralds of Allen might be relevant; as shall be argued in Chapter III, this Gaelicised Norman family is very likely not only to have owned but also commissioned the romance translations in TCD MS 1298 from Uilliam Mac an Leagha (Byrne, 2016a, pp. 294-296). As such, Uilliam Mac an Leagha's translations appear to have been placed in a more conventional production environment for romances: the Hiberno-Norman noble families outside the Pale, the area of English influence. This kind of secular *milieu* was the alternative to a less common line of transmission for romances, represented by religious orders (Byrne, 2015, p. 190); in particular, a significant role in the translation of continental European literary works seems to have been conducted by the Franciscans (Byrne, 2019a, p. 7). However, the background of the other agent in the production

process, that is the translator, suggests that religion was still involved, even if just obliquely. Indeed, as the six other manuscripts produced by Uilliam Mac an Leagha show, '[...] this scribe's main sphere of activity would appear to have been religious, devotional literature' (Poppe, 2006, p. 38). Therefore, the production context of *Beathadh Sir Gui o Bharbhuic* seems to be mixed, as it combines secular patrons with a religious scribal figure; as will be argued later, the latter component seems to have directed a considerable share of the translation choices.

As for the reception context, two significant phenomena shaped the readers' interests when *Beathadh Sir Gui o Bharbhuic* was released: the Burgundian Renaissance and the chivalric revival (Byrne, 2016a, pp. 298-301). The Burgundian Renaissance, the cultural efflorescence which expanded from the court of Burgundy, promoted the valorisation of classical figures and a deep reverence for the cult of chivalry and the idea of crusading (Byrne, 2016a, pp. 298-301). The chivalric revival, born out of the Burgundian atmosphere, aimed to promote a new ideal of chivalry: the knight had to be celebrated for his moral and religious worth rather than his military exploits (Wiggins, 2007, pp. 78-79). These movements, as shall be demonstrated in dedicated chapters, appear to have notably influenced the content and stylistic choices of the translator.

Identifying the language and source of *Beathadh Sir Gui o Bharbhuic* equally poses some problems. The language, which O'Donovan characterised as 'pure and of great value to the Irish scholar' (1836-1840, p. 167), has been identified as Early Modern Irish. This label does not refer to a standard language in the formal sense but rather to a period in the language's history (*c*. 1200-1650). The exact source of this translation is still unknown; however, as was assumed long ago by O'Donovan and O'Curry, style and content provide convincing textual evidence for its being English (O'Donovan, 1836-1840, p. 167; O'Curry, 1878, p. 193).

Stylistic clues are primarily found in proper names and titles. As Robinson highlights:

> More than two-thirds of the Irish names are either natural equivalents of the English or can be explained without difficulty as transformations of them. There are seven substitutions, and six names of new persons and places occur without any equivalent in the English. These additions and substitutions are hardly to be regarded as the invention of the Irish author but probably stood in the English source.
> (1908, p. 5)

Despite this abundance of clearly English-derived personal names, it is essential to note that several other names are ambiguous; they might derive equally from French or English source texts or are so distorted that it is difficult to draw conclusions from them. Nonetheless, many

nominal forms can be more easily explained by assuming an English intermediary between the Irish *Beathadh Sir Gui o Bharbhuic* and the Anglo-Norman *Gui de Warewic* (Robinson, 1908, p. 3). Two prominent examples may be considered. First, the Irish *Uront*: this nasal development brings it closer to Middle English *Heront* (*Eront*) than Anglo-Norman *Heraut* (*Heralt*). In this case, the Irish translator was probably replicating a variation made by the English scribes, who inserted an additional <n> at the end of the Anglo-Norman source text: this might have been the result of a misreading of the minims, whereby a <u> was interpreted as an <n>, or an intentional modification to naturalise the foreign form to the English names. Second, the Irish *Pani* and *Gincadh*: once again, the nasal developments recall Middle English *Pani* and *Gincharde*, as opposed to Anglo-Norman *Pauie* and *Guichard*. However, the most probative stylistic clue in favour of an English source is provided by titles; the constant use of the English <sir> (*Sir Gui*, *Sir Heront*) and the use of the Gaelicised form of the English <king> (*Cing o Niubie, Cing Herrneis, Cing Caulog*) almost incontrovertibly point to an English source (Robinson, 1908, p. 3).

Content cues appear in the comparison between the Irish translation and the versions of the *Guy* / *Gui* narrative found in the Middle English and Anglo-Norman cycles respectively. As it stands, none of the French texts is in close relation to the Irish, while the Middle English metrical versions, which generally agree with each other in the plot, are closest to it (Robinson, 1908, pp. 4-5). Therefore, the study of *Beathadh Sir Gui o Bharbhuic* should be based on a comparison with the *Couplet Guy* and *Stanzaic Guy*, preserved in their most complete and canonical form in the Auchinleck manuscript (Djordjević, 2007, p. 28).

Unlike the Middle English translator of the Anglo-Norman *Gui de Warewic*, Uilliam Mac an Leagha adopted an innovative translation approach. The discussion of the reasons behind such innovations represents the core of this thesis and will be addressed in dedicated chapters. However, for introductory purposes, it is best to anticipate the content and style variations noted by previous scholarship on the text. From a content perspective, the essential modifications introduced in *Beathadh Sir Gui o Bharbhuic* have been summarised by Robinson (1908, pp. 6-8) and by Richmond (2021, pp. 244-256). Both scholars observe that the Irish translation shows considerable independence from the English narrative. More specifically, despite containing the most relevant episodes of the English, it includes several additional incidents and details, which increase the emphasis on Guy's chivalry and piety. From a stylistic perspective, Robinson observes that the manner of narrative of *Beathadh Sir Gui o Bharbhuic* is thoroughly Irish, presenting accumulations of alliterating adjectives and adverbs, and

Richmond underlines the adaptation's vivid religious tone and search for realism (Robinson, 1908, p. 11; Richmond, 2021, pp. 244-256).

The forthcoming, detailed study of the reasons behind the modifications introduced by *Beathadh Sir Gui o Bharbhuic*, pursued by Chapters IV, V, VI, and VII, will be illuminating for two main reasons. First, it will disclose the particular nature of medieval translation as a process of acculturation of a foreign narrative into a new socio-cultural context (Djordjević, 2000, p. 9); *Guy of Warwick* was brought closer to and integrated into the Irish reality. Second, it will show the active role of Ireland in the contemporary broader European intellectual conversation (Byrne, 2019b, pp. 13-21; Cronin, 1996, p. 40).

Chapter II: Medieval Translation and Translation in Medieval Ireland

2.1 Medieval translation and *Descriptive Translation Studies*

In medieval Europe, the translation process was different from our modern understanding of it. If modern translators seek to convey in a different language both the substance and the form of their source, medieval translators seem to have been primarily interested in '[...] acceptability [to the recipients] rather than adequacy [to the source text]' (Djordjević, 2000, p. 9). They were prepared to change their source quite thoroughly: the narrative structure, style, and content were adapted to the receiving literary tastes and socio-cultural framework (Poppe, 2004, p. 75). As such, translation was actually a process of literary acculturation, whose products may be better defined as adaptations rather than translations and whose agents could perhaps be viewed as authors in their own right (Poppe, 2004, p. 75). Still, it is essential to specify that the extent of variation that could be exercised on the source depended on the text type. As a rule, biblical translations were excluded from modification in that they transmitted the Word of God (Djordjević, 2000, p. 9). Moreover, possibilities of changes were reduced in the area of pragmatic translation: to maintain their functionality, the original content of medical, philosophical, and scientific texts was generally preserved (Cronin, 1996, p. 21).

The medieval conception of translation, however, lacked an explicit theorisation (Luft, 2006, p. 93). Arguably, translation as a process of literary acculturation had already been practised by the Romans, who translated Greek works by adapting them to the receiving Latin context. Differently from medieval translators, Romans *did* explain their choices in treatises and authorial statements; Cicero encouraged to translate 'non verbum pro verbo' (Copeland, 1991, p. 2), prioritising meaning over wording, and Horace further advised to 'nec verbum verbo curabis reddere fidus interpres' (Copeland, 1991, p. 29). These authors' theories seem to have been known by medieval translators; indeed, references to the translator's intention to translate according to the meaning of the text as opposed to sticking very closely to the source-text phrasing are occasionally found.[7] Nonetheless, except for these few references, medieval translators did not give further insight into how they practised their activity: direct statements about translation are mostly confined to short colophons stating the translator's name and the language of the source text (Luft, 2006, p. 93).

---

[7] For instance, references to this method are found in Jerome's comment on the translation technique he adopted in his version of the Bible ('non uerbum e uerbo, sed sensum exprimere de sensum' (Letter 57 to Pammachius) (Copeland, 1991, p. 48)), in the Anglo-Saxon version of *Boethius*, and in Gruffud Bola's introduction to his adaptation of the *Athanasian Creed* (Luft, 2006, pp. 92-93).

This lack of textual evidence of the methodology followed by medieval translators led some scholars to deny that they were following any at all. In his assessment of late-medieval English translators' familiarity with the demands of their crafts, Burnley claims that they were oblivious to the process and problems of translation. Therefore, their transformation of foreign materials into works suitable to their native literary cultures resulted from an inconsiderate translation strategy rather than a sustained and measured effort (1989, p. 46). Yet, such empiricist claims are based on unjustifiable assumptions: the lack of substantial evidence of medieval translators' ideas on their activity is insufficient proof to conclude that they did not have such discernment. As Luft puts it:

> Translators may have not produced volumes of texts detailing their personal or institutionalised theories on how to best translate their works for specific audiences and/or patrons, but this does not mean that they did not possess such theories. Translators may not have produced course books and instructional materials in order to train translators to produce acceptable and pleasing translations, but this does not mean that they were not trained in their art.
> (2006, p. 93)

Owing to the absence of direct evidence of medieval translation strategies on the one hand and the error of uncritically dismissing their existence on the other, the only feasible way to approach medieval translation literature would entail the application of modern theories; these could help understand some of the motivations and methodologies behind the choices made by medieval translators in their works (Luft, 2006, p. 93). The application of modern theories to medieval texts might appear anti-historicist and anachronistic; however, if guided by a critical approach, mindful of the differences between medieval and modern textuality, it acquires legitimacy. To justify the application of modern translation theories to *Imtheachta Æniasa* and *Stair Ercuil ocus a Bás*, the Middle Irish and Early Modern Irish translations of Virgil's Aeneid and Caxton's *Recuyell of the Historyes of Troye,* respectively, Luft notes that:

> It is important to recognise that by recognising works like *Imtheachta Æniasa* and *Stair Ercuil ocus a Bás* together as elements in a larger set comprising translations, we have already taken them out of their medieval categories and placed them into a modern category, thus imposing modern expectations upon them.
> (2006, p. 85)

Among the various theoretical approaches, the one that seems to best suit medieval translation literature is Descriptive Translation Studies, developed in the 1980s (Luft, 2006, pp. 97-100).

The school of Descriptive Translation Studies distinguishes itself from other modern translation theories for its conception of translation, focus, and method. First, Descriptive Translation Studies view translation as a form of rewriting. This conception was elaborated by

the theorist Lefevere, who defines translators as rewriters, in that '[...] rewriters adapt, manipulate the originals they work with to some extent, usually to make them fit in with the dominant ideological and poetological currents of their time' (1992, p. 8). In his view, ideology and poetics, which are formed and constrained by the workings of patronage and professionalism, are the two major forces which serve to constrain translators; patrons are often responsible for supplying or, at least, heavily influencing the ideology of a translation, while the translator censors himself through belonging to a group of professionals whose standards he is concerned to uphold.

Second, Descriptive Translation Studies demand that the scholar's attention be drawn to the target text: if early translation theory considered the source text as the only determinant of meaning for translation, descriptive translation theory assigned this role to the target text. More specifically, according to Toury, one of the discipline's leading theorists, '[...] translations come into being within a certain cultural environment and are designed to meet certain needs of and/or occupy some slots in it. [Therefore, a translation should be described] within the target language literary system' (1995, p. 12).

Third, the method of Descriptive Translation Studies is descriptive rather than normative. Early translation theorists thought of translation as a quasi-mathematical activity involving the transferral of word data from one language to another; in their search for equivalence between the texts, they only aimed at listing which elements of the source text were or were not represented in the final product. Descriptive Translation Studies, instead, view translation as a profoundly intellectual process whose configuration and outcomes depend on multiple factors. Therefore, the scholars of this field elaborated an *ad hoc* method, best expressed by Bassnett. She affirmed that: '[...] the purpose of translation theory is to reach an understanding of the processes undertaken in the act of translation and not, as is so commonly misunderstood, to provide a set of norms for effecting the perfect translation' (2002, p. 43).

As such, Descriptive Translation Studies appear fit for the study of medieval translations; these were rewritings conceived in and for a specific environment regulating the translator's choices. Furthermore, what is particularly convenient about the theory of Descriptive Translation Studies is that it can be shaped to our needs as medievalists. For instance, Lefevere's idea of translation as rewriting could be expanded by claiming that anthologising is also part of the rewriting process; the codicological context assigned to a translated work is vital to its ultimate interpretation (Luft, 2006, pp. 99-100). In this respect, I would go as far as to maintain that, in the Middle Ages, the translation and transition of a foreign work could not be considered complete without a specific anthologising process.

2.2 Translation in medieval Ireland

As Cronin highlights: '[...] there is little sense in picturing medieval Ireland as a beleaguered outpost of Western culture struggling on the edge of darkness' (1996, p. 40). The peripherality of Medieval Ireland only applied to its geographical position, as the cultural sphere was everything but isolated from the world beyond the surrounding seas. Credit for this is to be given to the intense translation activity which characterised the island for centuries: translation allowed literary communication and exchange between the island of Ireland and England, Scandinavia, and continental Europe (Cronin, 1996, p. 36). The conditions for this exchange were created by the historical events affecting the island; its Christianisation and its occupation by Viking, English, and Anglo-Norman communities caused the importation of new languages and kinds of literature.[8] Mediation and integration between these groups were ensured by the practice of translation; all the idioms spoken on the island featured as both source and target languages, but translations into Irish were the most numerous. The popularity of the Irish language was connected to two factors: first, unlike continental European vernaculars, Irish was on a par with Latin; second, English did not flourish in Ireland until 1500, except in a few small towns and cities (Cronin, 1996, p. 23).

Translations into Irish started to appear in glosses found in manuscripts dating back to the seventh, eighth, and ninth centuries. These annotations translated Greek or Latin words or sentences to be used by Irish monastic teachers or their pupils in deciphering both Christian and non-Christian texts. An example of these glosses is found in the Codex Ambrosianus C. 301, which came to Milan from Bobbio, one of Columbanus's monastic foundations, and was in all probability written in Ireland in the first half of the ninth century (Cronin, 1996, pp. 9-10).

However, Ireland's most notable translation moments are the so-called 'first phase' and 'second phase' of Irish translation. The first phase engaged with classical epics; the Middle Irish period (*c*. 900-1200) saw the translation of works by authors as prominent as Virgil, Lucan, and Statius. The second phase (*c*. late 1300-early 1500) mainly targeted continental European works, especially romances; between the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, no fewer than eight romances were translated into Early Modern Irish.[9]

[8] The languages spoken in the English colony included Norman French, Latin, Welsh, and Flemish, but English was the dominant vernacular (Downham, 2017, p. 317).

[9] *Guy of Warwick*; *Bevis of Hampton*; *La Queste de Saint Graal*; *Fierabras*; Caxton's *Recuyell of the Histories of Troie*; *William of Palerne*; the *Seven Sages of Rome*; and *Octavian* (Byrne, 2015, p. 183).

In the first and second translation phases, translators were both ecclesiastical and lay (Byrne, 2019b, p. 1). The first group was represented by monks working in Irish monasteries in Ireland and on the Continent (Cronin, 1996, p. 8). It comes as little surprise that such an important intellectual activity was placed within the monastic system; indeed, from the sixth to the ninth centuries, Irish monasteries were mainly renowned as places for learning and scholarship (Downham, 2017, pp. 148-149). Furthermore, as mentioned above, it is precisely the Irish monks who deserve credit for the production of the very first fragments of Irish translations (Cronin, 1996, pp. 9-10).

The second group was formed by uniquely Irish figures: the *filid*, brehons, and physicians (Cronin, 1996, pp. 8-9). The members of these categories were professional scholars who dominated Irish cultural life for four centuries, from 1200 to the Battle of Kinsale in 1601. The term *filid*, commonly mistranslated as 'poet', actually refers to a sage or a scholar whose preparation included but was not limited to poetic composition. The brehons were jurists who were trained experts in the ancient laws of Ireland. The physicians tended to come from certain families identified with a particular branch of learning. As translators, these three categories worked on a wide range of texts: medical, literary, scientific, and religious. For instance, the adaptations realised by Uilliam Mac an Leagha, who was in all likelihood related to the Mac an Leagha family of physicians, included both secular and religious texts (Byrne, 2016a, p. 292). When the two groups are considered, it becomes quite evident that translation would involve all sections of medieval Irish society: religious houses, Gaelic-speaking jurists, physicians, and *filid*, alongside Anglo-Norman clerics and English-speaking Crown administrators (Cronin, 1996, p. 9).

The objective of Irish translators was the same as that of their continental European counterparts: the literary acculturation of a foreign source text. The method whereby this objective was achieved perfectly corresponds to Lefevere's idea of rewriting. With a considerable extent of discretion and *inventio*, the translator removed every element that might have sounded anomalous to the Irish reader and integrated components inspired by the native tradition instead.

However, the limitations on modifying religious and pragmatic texts mentioned earlier also stood in the Irish context (Cronin, 1996, pp. 15, 21). The Word of God should have been preserved as much unaltered as possible; changes would have resulted in the potential dismissal of the Church's orthodox dogmas and doctrine. Likewise, texts transmitting philosophical, medical, and scientific knowledge should have been reported faithfully, in order not to compromise their functionality.

Literary texts, on the other hand, received a remarkably flexible treatment: free/literal distinctions were disregarded to meet the expectations of Gaelic chieftains, Anglo-Norman lords, monasteries, and native schools of learning. This trend is close to the one described by Quin with regards to *Stair Ercuil ocus a Bas* and *Togail Troí*:

> While the main theme is on the whole faithfully adhered to, the adapter is by no means a slavish follower of his original. In addition to adopting a peculiarly Irish phraseology and making free use of the commonplaces of native literature he draws wherever it suits him on other sources and alters proper names at will. The result is a tale which except for its central theme is thoroughly Irish.
> (1939, p. 25)

There were, however, some exceptions: for instance, the Irish translation of the *Queste del Saint Graal*, dubbed *Lorgaireacht an tSoidhigh Naomhtha* and surviving in three manuscripts, is considered highly close to the original material. As Ni Shéaghdha highlights:

> The Early Modern Irish translation of the "Quest of the Holy Grail" [holds a unique position] among the extant versions of the Quest, approaching nearer to the original form of the Quest than even the archetype of extant French manuscripts in one or two points at least. [Although] the Irish text is not a translation in the literal sense, to call it an adaptation would imply a much freer use of the material than our translator allowed himself.
> (1984, p. 109)

Furthermore, Cronin notes that, far from being overshadowed by the fluent translation strategies and the adaptation to any translation paradigm, the Irish translator's signature '[…] is everywhere in these medieval translations' (1996, p. 24). More specifically, he claims that:

> The manner in which the [social, political, cultural, literary, and historical] prerogatives of the target culture are interpreted by the translator are in many ways as intensely subjective as the foregrounding of those features of the foreign source text which the translator deems to be irreducibly other. The translators are not passive instruments of aesthetic orders from the target culture but active makers and shapers of the translated texts. (1996, p. 24)

A factor believed to determine the Irish translator's signature is his background; for instance, Cronin explains the markedly interventionistic approach of the translator of *Imtheachta Æniasa* as a consequence of the fact that:

> Many [Irish] translators were trained as poet-scholars in the native schools of learning […] [and], in addition to their study of Irish language and literature, they also studied poetic composition. It was therefore natural for them to adopt, as they did, an

> interventionist approach [whereby they manipulated, expanded, and adapted] non-pragmatic texts.
> (1996, p. 24)

Moreover, I would propose that the translator's signature could also be measured by his professional experience. For instance, as shall be discussed later in this thesis, the highly religious nature of Uilliam Mac an Leagha's scribal activity probably gave a religious motive to his activity as a translator (Byrne, 2015, p. 191).

Eventually, it is worth signalling that the production and circulation of translations, facilitated by the peripatetic nature of scholarship, had visible effects on many areas of Irish life. As Cronin points out:

> The dissemination of scientific ideas, the emergence of two national languages, the birth of literatures in English and Irish, the formation of new ideologies and the spread of religion were crucially dependent on the activities of Irish translators throughout the ages. (1996, p. 31)

2.3 First phase of translation

The ninth, tenth, eleventh and twelfth centuries saw an exponential increase in Irish scholars' engagement with the Classical tradition. If in the Early Middle Ages their literary activity was mainly focused on the late-antique Classical tradition, in the Central Middle Ages it came to address most of the texts now considered part of the Classical canon. This shift resulted in the flourishing of a literary movement which produced a range of translations, or rather adaptations, of stories from Graeco-Roman antiquity into Middle Irish. More specifically, the Irish scholars' interest seems to have been focused on Latin epics and legendary histories (O'Connor, 2014, pp. 2-3).

The creation of this corpus encourages a reappraisal of the position of Ireland in an aspect of Western literary history. It is often believed that the medieval European trend for Classical translations began with the production of the *romans d'antiquité*, released from the mid-twelfth century by French and Anglo-Norman poets. Jan Ziolkowski maintains that 'they paved the way for [...] the equivalents of the "romances of antiquity" in other literary traditions' (2014, p. 24). However, in Ireland, the production of classical translations had already started by the eleventh and probably by the tenth century. By the end of the twelfth century, works as prominent as Virgil's *Aeneid*, Statius's *Thebaid* and *Achilleid*, Lucan's *Bellum Civile,* and Dares' *De Excidio Troiae Historia* were already circulating in Middle Irish translations (O'Connor, 2014, p. 4).

Ireland's chronological primacy cannot be verified for every work from this corpus; if *Togail Troí* is generally accepted as the first European vernacular translation of *De Excidio Troiae Historia*, other Irish classical adaptations are still of dubious date and probably later than their continental European equivalents (O'Connor, 2014, pp. 4-5). What can instead be asserted with a reasonable degree of confidence is that this translation movement was born independently of continental ones. Irish scholars did not need the Anglo-Norman *romans d'antiquité* to develop an interest in the canonical Classical tradition (O'Connor, 2014, pp. 4-5).

As O'Connor suggests, the stimulus to start producing this corpus was by and large created by the existence of another body of literature seemingly unique in Early Medieval Europe: the *scéla*, to which late-nineteenth-century scholarship has assigned the Germanic label *sagas* (2014, p. 5). Linguistic clues and historical references lead us to believe that the first sagas were probably composed in the eighth century and took their extant form in the ninth or early tenth centuries; it is pretty sure that, by the tenth and eleventh centuries, a large and varied corpus of sagas existed (O'Connor, 2014, p. 9). When the absolute chronology of the production of classical translations (10th-13th century) is considered, it would seem that the move to adapt Classical narratives into Irish was part of a general upsurge in the writing of sagas.[10] Therefore, after two centuries of saga-writing (8th-10th century), Irish scholars were ready to bring stories from Graeco-Roman antiquity into the saga corpus (O'Connor, 2014, p. 10). Hence, it appears that, if most continental European traditions needed the external trigger of the Anglo-Norman and French *romans d'antiquité* to trigger their interest in producing classical translations, Irish *literati* were encouraged by an in-stimulus coming from their very own tradition.

It is worth illustrating how the Irish rewriting process was applied to Classical epics. Classical source texts were adapted in terms of language but also, and foremost, in terms of native narrative norms. In particular, classical epics' structure, style, and contents were considerably altered to emulate the closest native equivalent of these long narratives about the past, the sagas (Irish: *scél(a)*).

[10] The original label for Irish sagas was *scéla*: a *scél* was a piece of information or a story in narrative form and of unspecified length, which was written in prose but might have contained embedded verses. The *scéla*'s stance was essentially historical: they were concerned with narrations about the legendary Irish past or more recent history; for this reason, they read as linear sequences of events, yet sometimes preceded by prequels, called *remscéla* (O'Connor, 2014, p. 7; O'Connor, 2013, p. 34). *Scéla* were usually anonymous and were principally written in monasteries until the twelfth century, when Church reforms moved secular learning into the hands of learned families (O'Connor, 2014, p. 7). For further information on the Irish *scéla*, see O'Connor's (2014) 'Irish Narrative Literature and the Classical Tradition', in *Classical Literature and Learning in medieval Irish Narrative*, pp. 6-9. Woodbridge: D.S. Brewer.

As to the structure, a radical change was the elimination of the *in medias res* opening technique of epics in favour of the sagas' linear storyline. O'Connor notes how this choice was meant to make these works acquire the same (pseudo)-historical dimension as sagas (2014, p. 20). To reinforce the appearance of veracity, prologues furnishing the background of the core narrative were often inserted (Poppe, 2004, pp. 76-77; O'Connor, 2014, p. 20). In this respect, I would posit that the addition of prologues also stemmed from an intent to imitate another feature typical of Irish sagas; the narrative core of a *scél* was almost always preceded by one or more *remscéla*, miniature fore-tales or prequels which gave a genealogical context to the saga or linked it with other native stories.

When the style is considered, the primary and most evident change consisted in what Fulton (2014, p. 45) calls 'remediation', that is, the change of the narrative medium: verse sources were turned into prose. This choice was primarily motivated by the fact that prose was the typical medium for sustained narrative in medieval Ireland (Poppe, 2005, p. 209). Significant exceptions are the eight-century poems ascribed to Blathmac and the tenth-century biblical narrative *Saltair na Rann* (Poppe, 2005, p. 209).[11]

The Irish preference for prose is likely to derive from the fact that Irish authors considered the majority of native narratives as part of the textual genre 'historia' (Poppe, 2007, p. 19). The Irish understanding of the term 'historia' appears to have been mainly influenced by Isidore of Seville: in his *Etymologiae*, he states that '*historia* is the narration of things done, through which those things happened in the past are sorted out' and he stresses its truth-value by specifying that '*historiae* are the true things that have been done' (*Etym*., I, xli.2; *Etym*., I, xliv.5); therefore, Isidore presents 'historia' as a form of textualised memory (Poppe, 2007, p. 20). [12]

The term 'historia' entered the Irish language as a loanword: *stair*/*stoir*; significantly, the word *stair* was explicitly associated with specific narrative genres in medieval Irish texts. In particular, direct evidence for this connection is found in two poetic-legal texts and in a poem from *Lebor Gabála Érenn* (Poppe, 2007, p. 20). The poetic-legal texts defined *stair* as 'the cattle raids and the destructions, and the thirty major tales and sixty minor tales' (Breathnach, 1987, p. 159; Binchy, 1978, p. 3, l. 1106); the poem conceived *stair* as 'the feasts,

[11] For further discussion on these exceptions, see Tristam, H.L.C. (1989) 'Early modes of Insular expression', in Ó Corráin, D., Breatnach, L. and McCone. K.R. [eds], *Sages, saints, and storytellers: Celtic Studies in honour of Professor James Carney*. Maynooth Monographs 2. Maynooth: Maynooth University.

[12] Evidence that Isidore's definition of 'historia' was adopted in the Hiberno-Latin context is provided by the seventh-century computistical manual *De Ratione Computandi*, which states 'historia, in qua narrantur gestae rerum' (history, in which the accomplishments of deeds are narrated) (Poppe, 2007, p. 20).

the sieges, cattle-raids, destructions, thirty tales and sixty minor tales' (Macalister, 1939, p. 2, l. 118). As Poppe comments:

> In contrast to Latin texts' abstract definition of the tasks of *historia*, to narrate the accomplishments of deeds, no such attempt is made here. Instead, some of the textual narrative genres that belong to *stoir* in the author's view are given – with reference to the generic classification of the medieval Irish tale-lists and the major and minor tales which make up the repertoire of the learned poet. They constitute, by implication, the main body, or cycles, of what has come to be called 'medieval Irish literature'. The tale-lists, which are a central critical achievement of the medieval Irish literati, classify narratives by event-types: for example, destructions (*togla*), cattle-raids (*tána*), wooings (*tochmarca*), battles (*catha*), terrors (*uatha*), voyages (*imrama*), death-tales (*oitte*), feasts (*fessa*), sieges (*forbassa*), and adventures (*echtrada*). In these passages, *stoir* is not only described as an area of knowledge required for the learned poet but is also further defined by examples of its constituent parts taken from the generic categories of the tale-lists.
> (2007, pp. 21-22)

The perception of these genres as members of the broader category of 'historia', intended as truthful textualised memory, is evidenced in the Latin colophon to the *Táin Bó Cúailnge* in the Book of Leinster (*c.* last quarter of the 12th century) (Poppe, 2007, p. 23). After a traditional *explicit* ('The account and the story and the end of the *Táin* so far') and a request to transmit the narrative unchanged ('A blessing on everyone who will learn the *Táin* faithfully in this form and who will not add another form to it'), the scribe switches from Irish to Latin and specifies:

> But I who have written this story [historia], or rather this fable [fabula], give no credence to the various incidents related in it. For some things in it are the deceptions of demons, other poetic figments; some are probable, others improbable; while still others are intended for the delectation of foolish men.
> (O' Rahilly, 1967, p. 136)

Poppe notes that in this passage the scribe indirectly implies that 'historia' was the unmarked and expected interpretation of the textual genre *tána* (cattle-raids) (2007, pp. 23-24). The perception of narrative genres as 'historia' was probably what caused the preference for prose; in the medieval West, this form was held to have an inherent truth value. As O'Connor remarks:

> In the Middle Ages, the concept of poetic licence – bending the truth for the sake of literary effect, inviting the audience to become complicit in a game of make-believe – was much less readily applicable to prose writers than to poets from Homer, Ovid and Virgil to their medieval Latin imitators. By contrast, to write in prose was to tell nothing but the truth, or at least to appear to do so.
> (2014, p. 19)

Furthermore, it is worth mentioning that a valuable parallel for the Irish conception of narratives as 'historia' and the consequent employment of prose is provided by Icelandic textual culture (Poppe, 2007, p. 22). Some scholars (Ólason, 2005; Sørensen, 1992; Ross, 1998) agreed that stories contained in the *Íslendingasögur* are narrated as history. More specifically, they seem to have participated in a project of creation and textualisation of Icelandic history (Ólason, 2005, p. 105, 112). Such an intention has been delineated by Sørensen and summarised by Ross:

> Meulengracht Sørensen characterises the saga in terms of its transformation of past events into fictive form, but in a fashion that proclaims both the narratives' truthfulness and its traditional base. […] [The] historical past, which was recognised as lost, came to be recreated as narrative and as literature. History became literature, and literature was history. […] [As] Meulengracht Sørensen has rightly asserted, medieval Icelanders recreated the past as saga literature, and that literature became history for them.
> (1998, pp. 49-50)

I would suggest that this shared conception of narratives as *historiae* requiring a prose form might be advocated as a reason for an aspect noted by Poppe (2005, p. 209): foreign classical and medieval verse narratives were remediated into prose in both Irish and Icelandic adaptations.[13] The analogy between the Irish and Icelandic traditions cannot, however, be extended to the Old Swedish one. As shown by the *Eufemiavisor* collection of *romance* translations (*Herr Ivan lejonriddaren*, *Hertig Fredrik av Normandie*, *Flores och Blanzeflor*), the verse form of medieval romances was retained in the adaptations. More specifically, the original metre was converted into the *Knittelvers*, consisting of 'rhymed couplets with usually four beats to a line' (Hunt, 1975, p. 170).[14] It is essential to note that the form chosen by Old Swedish translators was primarily determined by the genre of the text: the *Eufemiavisorna* were reproduced in *Knittelvers* since romances traditionally appeared in metre.

A further example of stylistic modification is provided by *Imtheachta Æniasa*, the Irish translation of Virgil's *Aeneid*, where Virgil's famously subjective style was replaced by a more detached, concise, and historical one. Virgil's similes were either phased out or excised *tout court*, to meet the expectation of the Irish audience, used to the factual and objective style of

[13] For further information on the use of prose for Old Norse adaptations of Latin texts, see Würth, S. (1998) *Der 'Antikenroman' in der isländischen Literatur des Mittelalters: eine Untersuchung zur Übersetzung und Rezeption lateinischer Literatur im Norden*. Basel: Helbing & Lichtenhahn.

[14] For a presentation of the Eufemiavisor and an in-depth analysis of the translation strategy guiding Flores och Blanzeflor see Bampi, M. (2008) 'Translating Courtly Literature and Ideology in Medieval Sweden: Flores och Blanzeflor', in Viking and Medieval Scandinavia 4, pp. 1-14. Turnhout: Brepols.

native sagas (Poppe, 2004, pp. 74-94). Other stylistic variations concerned narrative devices and lexical choices. To begin with, storytelling techniques typical of sagas, like the extensive use of description, dialogue, and focalisation, were applied to Classical narratives (O'Connor, 2014, p. 18). Furthermore, a wide range of native stock epithets and idioms, the insertion of alliterating doublets or triplets of synonyms, and a prominent tendency to the proliferation of details gave an unmistakably Irish taste to these works (O'Connor, 2014, p. 18).

Last, content underwent a certain extent of remodelling and alteration, too; this was mainly due to the authors' different writing intentions and the divergent contexts where the works were written and received. Once again, the case of *Imtheachta Æniasa* can be brought forward; the digressions expressing Virgil's teleological vision of Roman history contained in Book 8 are either eliminated or considerably abridged by the Irish redactor, who did not share Virgil's interests and intentions (Poppe, 2004, pp. 87-88).

However, as mentioned in the initial section of this chapter, the complete integration of foreign narratives also required a targeted anthologising process. In this respect, it is significant that in the mid-twelfth century Book of Leinster (TCD MS 1339) and various codices from the fourteenth century onwards, classical adaptations were incorporated into manuscripts alongside sagas and other native texts. This convincingly suggests that Classical adaptations were accepted as part of the saga canon despite their foreign subject matter (O'Connor, 2014, p. 11). Therefore, the label 'classical sagas', chosen by modern scholars to refer to the corpus of classical adaptations, seems appropriate.

As shall be seen during the exploration of the modifications affecting *Beathadh Sir Gui o Bharbhuic*, some of these trends continued in the second phase of Irish translation; in a way, they might be considered as essential for any Irish translation activity.

The translation of foreign works had some extent of influence on the development of the native literary tradition.[15] In the case of Classical sagas, the exact degree to which they transformed existing narrative genres remains open to question. The most probable effects appear to be the birth of the *cath* (battle-tale) sub-genre, listed in the Irish tale-lists, the increasing use of an ornamented prose style in heightened passages, and the development of new or newly confident large-scale forms for sagas set in Ireland (O'Connor, 2014, p. 10). However, it also seems possible that another effect of these translations was the addition of a Graeco-Roman dimension to the framework of Irish synthetic history. Through cross-cultural

[15] The degree of influence of translation literature on the receiving tradition has been investigated by the polysistem theory, described in Shuttleworth, M. (1998) 'Polysystem Theory', in Baker M. [ed.] *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. London: Routledge.

comparisons, Irish authors added the world of Graeco-Roman pagan antiquity among the natural points of reference for the legendary past of Ireland (O'Connor, 2014, p. 11). Before Classical sagas, the only point of comparison between the history of the Irish people and that of the continental European ones was the Old Testament; scenes and characters from the sacred scriptures were exploited in historical, legal, and literary text to insert Ireland within the broader scheme of salvation history artificially. The translation of Classical works allowed Irish learned scholars to expand their horizons by creating connections between the Gaelic people and the history of Troy or Rome to assess further Ireland's position in world history (O'Connor, 2014, p. 11).

During the late fourteenth, fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries several powerful Hiberno-Norman lords acted as sponsors to a large-scale revival of Irish literature and learning. The conditions for this large-scale patronage were created by historical factors. The gradual Gaelicisation of Norman lords, the migration of small tenantry back to England, the ravages of the Black Death in the areas under English control, and English military involvement in France left much room for restoring or enriching the Irish tradition with both translation and native literature (Cronin, 1996, p. 23).

This phenomenon of cultural promotion had two consequences. First, it resulted in the phenomenon known as 'manuscript revival'; older texts containing Middle Irish sagas and Classical sagas were copied into new manuscripts, like the Book of Ballymote (Royal Irish Academy, MS 23 P 12). Second, it opened the 'second phase' of translation; continental European and English histories and romances were adapted into Early Modern Irish. This bidirectional movement of reviving the literary past and building the literary future was first described by Flower, who notes that:

> The poets and historians of the older type were reviving and recasting the ancient tradition, as may plainly be seen from the great manuscripts which began to be written at this time. [...] [In the meantime] in another type of book written by medical scribes or under the influence of the new religious orders, the European literature of the time begins to make its appearance in an Irish dress.
> (1947, 121)

O'Connor observes a cause-effect relationship between these activities. In particular, he claims that: '[...] it is hard to resist the conclusion that the revival in copying old adaptations was somehow linked with the contemporary move to produce new adaptations' (2014, p. 17).

2.4 Second phase of translation

The late Middle Ages saw the surge of the 'second phase' of Irish translations: several Latin, English, French, and Anglo-Norman works were adapted into Early Modern Irish (Byrne, 2019b, p. 2; Downham, 2017, pp. 316-317). Fixing a relative and absolute chronology for the translated texts is, however, problematic; the adaptations are preserved in manuscripts dating back to the mid-fifteenth century onwards, but some may well have originated at some earlier point. A temporary solution to this problem has been proposed by Byrne, who claims that: '[...] we are probably on firm ground if we identify translation from foreign vernaculars as primarily, but not necessarily exclusively, a fifteenth- and early-sixteenth century phenomenon' (2019b, p. 2).

Translation activities were principally in the hands of two groups, first identified by Flower: the increasingly Gaelicised religious orders, especially the Franciscans and the Hiberno-Norman families (1947, pp. 115-120). Both of these categories participated in and benefited from international networks of cultural exchange, be they religious or courtly (Byrne, 2019b, p. 4).

The translated genres corresponded to the most influential modes of writing in contemporary Europe: *romance, chanson de geste*, and travel accounts. Among the *chansons de geste* features the Irish adaptation of *Fierabras, Stair Fortibrais*, found in the last section of TCD MS 1298 and another seven witnesses. As for travel accounts, this period saw the adaptation of *The Adventure of John Mandeville* (*Eachtra Sheóin Mandavil*), transmitted by three manuscripts, and the adaptation of Francesco Pipino's Latin translation of Marco Polo's *Travels* (*Leabhar Ser Marco Polo*), found in the Book of Lismore.

Nonetheless, it seems that the most appreciated and translated genre in late-medieval Ireland was *romance*, a three-hundred-year-old genre which had not entered the island yet (Byrne, 2019b, p. 11). Rather than from the manuscript record, which is considerably reduced, this kind of judgement can be articulated by referring to library inventories. Particularly relevant to this purpose is the Kildare Rental (London, BL MS Harley 913); this document preserves two inventories (1497-1500; 1531) of the Fitzgerald Earls of Kildare, the most powerful magnates in late-medieval Ireland. The ratio presented by the books in the Kildare Rental suggests a prominence of *romances* over other genres, such as history, biographies, and manuals of conduct and chivalry (Byrne, 2016a, pp. 297-299).

However narrow, the extant manuscript tradition can still lead us to draw some inferences on the Irish interest in *romance*. To begin with, it might be assumed that attention

was primarily devoted to narratives which were already well-known overseas (Byrne, 2019b, p. 11). Indeed, the surviving corpus of Irish romance adaptations includes some of the most renowned works: *Guy of Warwick*, *Bevis of Hampton*, *La Queste de Saint Graal*, *Fierabras*, *Caxton's Recuyell of the Historyes of Troye*, *William of Palerne*, the *Seven Sages of Rome*, and *Octavian*. Furthermore, I believe that the manuscript tradition of the Irish *Octavian* (*Sechran na Banimpire*) might suggest that the *romance* genre remained popular for a remarkable amount of time. Indeed, this text is preserved in a manuscript dating to as late as the seventeenth century, which was probably a copy from a much earlier exemplar (Byrne, 2019b, p. 3).

Even though the identification of source texts is still quite problematic, many of these translations seem to have been realised from sources coming from England and written in English (Byrne, 2019b, p. 2). The prevalence of English sources did not depend on alleged English cultural supremacy and prestige. This inference is supported by internal evidence. Medieval translated works typically featured comments on their status as translations or the language of their source; this was aimed at increasing the authority of a translation by making it descend from a prestigious linguistic source. Significantly, if Irish translators *did* include these comments in translations from Greek, Hebrew, Latin, and French, they nearly always omitted them in translations from English; this strongly suggests that Irish scholars did not see Englishness as an added value to a text (Byrne, 2019b, pp. 21-22). Furthermore, the very 'Englishness' of most of the sources was questionable; the majority actually were translations of French or Anglo-Norman source texts. A far more likely explanation for the predominance of English sources is that English territorial incursions and the presence of settlers from England facilitated the importation of English texts as opposed to French or Anglo-Norman ones (Byrne, 2019b, pp. 21-23).

The translation method employed in this second phase still matches Lefevere's concept of rewriting; romances were considerably modified to accommodate the expectations of Early Modern Irish audiences (Cronin, 1996, p. 22). The adaptation process will be dealt with in detail when addressing the specific case of *Beathadh Sir Gui o Bharbhuic*; however, for the time being, it is worth introducing some shared structural, stylistic, and content modifications which generally affected the corpus of Irish romances.

As far as the structure is concerned, Irish translators modified the typical *romance* division into episodes and sub-episode; the most straightforward change consisted in eliminating the 'exhortation' motifeme, where the minstrel calls for the audience's attention. The purpose of this choice was to conceal the narrator's presence, which rarely emerges in native Irish literature (Poppe, 2005, p. 210-211).

Stylistic modifications reflect those introduced in the 'first phase' of translation. On a macro-level, the *romance* couplets and tail-rhyme stanzas were turned into prose; since *romances* were narrative texts, the Irish audience would have expected them to appear in prosaic form (Poppe, 2005, p. 209). On a micro-level, the lexical choice and the expressive tools were rooted in the native late-medieval Irish prose tradition (Poppe, 2005, p. 228).

The content was modified following patterns established by both the production context and contemporary European trends. The religious, monastic context in which these romances seem to have travelled in Ireland caused the romance adaptations to carry a more religious inflexion (Byrne, 2019b, p. 13). The contemporary European phenomenon of the Burgundian Renaissance demanded that these fourteenth-century narratives be rewritten in moral and didactic terms, emphasising the importance of piety and wisdom, together with the codes and moral imperatives of knighthood. These alterations were sometimes so heavy that the very genre of the source text was modified; this happened to the adaptation of *Fierabras*, which 'in its original form is epic, but might be better classified as a romance' (Byrne, 2019b, p. 11).

The effects of the translation of *romances* on the Irish literary tradition were remarkable. First, previously unknown themes, such as the discourse on crusades, became part of the Irish authors' agenda (Byrne, 2016a, pp. 299-300; Byrne, 2019b, pp. 17-19). Second, adaptations of romances are commonly held to have caused the birth of a new native genre, the *scéalta rómánsaíochta* ('romantic tales'); Bruford observes that these narratives began to appear in Ireland at around the same time as the adaptations of romances, making a strong case for an influence of the latter on the former (1969, p. 11). Last, allusions from the European romance tradition also appear in texts belonging to other genres from this period onwards (Byrne, 2016b, p. 88).

The chronological position of *Beathadh Sir Gui o Bharbhuic* within this framework should be addressed. The textual environment of the adaptation and the identity of its translator make dating conjectures slightly more accurate. TCD MS 1298b contains the Irish translation of part of Caxton's *Recuyell of the Historyes of Troye*, which was first printed in 1474; therefore, this year seems a likely *terminus post quem* for the translation of *Beathadh Sir Gui o Bharbhuic*. Based on a range of other manuscripts by Uilliam Mac an Leagha, it is widely accepted that his activity stopped in around 1490; this date can be thus assumed to be the *terminus ante quem* of the adaptation of *Guy of Warwick* (Byrne, 2019b, p. 10).

The chronological window where *Beathadh Sir Gui o Bharbhuic* seems to be placed (c. 1474-c. 1490) raises the question of whether previous romance translations influenced it and whether it influenced later romance adaptations; however, the current uncertainty on the

relative and absolute chronology of the members of this corpus prevents us from drawing reliable conclusions. A more solid relationship of influence can be established between *Beathadh Sir Gui o Bharbhuic* and a native romantic tale, *Stair Nuadat Find Femin*, which also features in TCD MS 1298. It seems likely that *Beathadh Sir Gui o Bharbhuic*, together with *Bethadh Bibuis o Hamtuir*, modelled the structure of the romantic tale, which has 'the "exile and return" structure common to the two [adaptations of the] English romances' (Byrne, 2016a, p. 296).

Chapter III: *Beathadh Sir Gui o Bharbhuic* in its Codicological Context (*TCD MS 1298)*

3.1 Fifteenth-century Irish manuscript culture

The manuscripts produced in fifteenth-century Ireland provide evidence for the dramatic cultural and social changes which were affecting the island at the brink of the Early Modern era (increased agricultural productivity and flourishing of overseas trade; population growth and urbanisation; expansion of English dominion and centralisation of power; Church reform and foundation of mendicant orders; composition of a considerable body of native and translation literature and creation of large compilations of Gaelic and Latin manuscripts) (Downham, 2017, Part II).[16]

Cultural transformations can be discerned through an appraisal of the manuscript tradition: studying what was copied could offer an insight into the reading tastes of late-medieval Irish audiences. To a certain degree, extant witnesses can also be informative on the popularity of specific genres: a genre represented by more witnesses was likely more popular than a genre surviving in few or single witnesses. However, since some manuscripts might have been lost or destroyed, our conclusions on a genre or a text's popularity must remain speculative and conjectural. This *caveat* particularly applies to the fifteenth- and sixteenth-centuries Irish manuscript traditions, which are characterised by an overall scarcity as their members underwent frequent destruction (Gillespie, 2014, p. 10). Therefore, rather than focusing exclusively on the extant manuscript witnesses, it would be more fruitful for Celticists to consult contemporary library records, which might list items that would have later been lost.

The social context of late-medieval Irish manuscript production can be assessed following Gillespie's method:

> The most useful way of reconstructing the social context of [fifteenth-century Ireland] manuscript making is not through issues of illumination, patronage, and ownership, but through the actual process of making manuscripts by focusing on the person who created the artefact: the scribe.
> (2014, p. 11)

This shift of perspective is mainly encouraged by the fact that 'by the later medieval period [scribes] had developed a well-defined working practice with a language to describe their activities [in colophons and marginalia]' (Gillespie, 2014, p. 11). If the information found in

[16] For an in-depth analysis of the social, political, religious, and cultural renovation in late-medieval Ireland see: Downham, C. (2017) *Medieval Ireland*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: Part II (pp. 181-341).

manuscripts (internal evidence) is compared to that provided by annals, chronicles, and chancelry documents (external evidence), the social background of most scribes might emerge. In particular, it seems that the vast majority of fifteenth-century Irish scribes came from professional learned families, primarily legal and medical ones. As such, their activity as scribes was usually accompanied by that of doctors or legal experts at the service of both secular lords and the Church (Gillespie, 2014, pp. 12-13).

When working as scribes, they could have been committed to a wide range of tasks: copying an exemplar, adapting existing texts to suit new audiences, expanding, or contracting a text, integrating individual documents into a more comprehensive composition, and, indeed, translating foreign works into Irish. Therefore, the textual involvement of scribes seemed to go beyond the mere reproduction of texts, as they were very much involved in their production. This, however, should not mislead us into thinking that they could freely exercise their own creativity in the way a modern author would (Gillespie, 2014, pp. 13-14). The expansion, adaptation, and invention of sections of text were always limited and balanced by the necessity of maintaining coherence with the native literary tradition; Gillespie's definition of late-medieval Irish scribes as 'conservators of the stream of tradition as well as adaptors of that tradition' (2014, p. 14) seems to best express their position. Further, in this phase, the occasions for writing were diversified.

In many cases, scribes were writing under commissions from lords, interested in either preserving material significant to their lordship or enhancing their family's cultural authority, as was the case for the Fitzgeralds Earls of Kildare and their rich library of *en vogue* texts. Other scribes wrote for their own use; doctors or jurists provided themselves with medical or legal texts for their own reference or the construction of more prestigious compilations. Another interesting situation was that concerning poets; they tended to produce rough copies of their orally delivered works to try and convince a patron to hire them or to prepare them for later copy in a proper *duanaire* ('poem-book') (Gillespie, 2014, p. 14).

3.2 TCD MS 1298: composition, contents, and intertextual connections

TCD MS 1298 (*olim* H 2.7) is a vellum manuscript measuring 11" x 8". It appears to have been composed of three distinct fourteenth- and fifteenth-century manuscripts, together with a fragment that may come from another. These sections (henceforth: 1298a, 1298b, and 1298c) were probably bound in the late seventeenth century when they came into the possession of Edward Lhuyd (Byrne, 2019b, p. 8). TCD MS 1298's contents were described by Abbot and

Gwynn in their ‘Catalogue of the Irish manuscripts in the library of Trinity College Dublin’ (1921, pp. 78-80).

TCD MS 1298a (pp. 1-238) dates from the fourteenth century and is in the hand of *Lúcás Ó Dalláin*, whose name occurs in a marginal entry (p. 196b *supra*); there are also later additions, including a note by Seán mac Torna (col. 33), the material supplied by two later hands (p. 189), additions by another late hand (p. 195, 227). This volume is not as neatly decorated as TCD MS 1298b/c, and its numbering is mixed, mainly referring to columns and pages. It contains genealogical material and verse; a text of the *Senchus fer nAlban* (‘The tradition of the men of Scotland’); a genealogical tract on the history of the O’Kellys of Hy-Many. According to O’Donovan, this one last text originally formed a distinct volume: in particular, it seems to be a fragment of the *Leabhar Hy-Maine* (‘Book of Hy-Many’), now preserved in the Stowe Collection of the Royal Irish Academy (Abbot and Gwynn, 1921, pp. 78-79).

TCD MS 1298b (pp. 239-375) dates from the late fifteenth century and was composed by a single scribal hand, Uilliam Mac an Leagha. This second volume is relatively uniform in decoration and layout; there are large, interlaced initials at the start of all principal texts, and further smaller interlaced initials are scattered throughout. The visible dirt and wear on the first recto and final verso folios of the manuscript’s major texts suggest that the scribe produced each text as a separate booklet and that these booklets were unbound at some stage in their history to be put together in a single manuscript (Byrne, 2016a, pp. 290-291). The textual selection operated for this manuscript is peculiar as native Irish texts are juxtaposed with translation literature. The volume starts with the remaining folios of an acephalous, hardly legible text, which Abbott and Gwynn describe as ‘the concluding part of a romantic tale’ (1921, p. 79). This is followed by: the only copy of the historical tale *Oided Chuind Chétchathaich* (‘Death of Conn of the Hundred Battles’) (pp. 244-246); *Aislinge Cormaic* (‘Cormac’s dream vision’) (pp. 246-248); the romantic tale *Aided Muirchertaig meic Erca* (‘Death of Muirchertach Mac Erca’) (pp. 248-254); an ancient poem enumerating the heroes who fell at the battle of Clontarf (1014) an explanation why the son of Amlaíb was absent from that battle (pp. 254a 254b); an account of the burial of Brian Boru and the return of the Dal Cais and other Momonians homewards (pp. 256-257). The remainder of the volume presents translations from vernacular texts: *Stair Ercuil ocus a Bás* (pp. 258-299), the translation of parts of an English printed text, William Caxton’s *Recuyell of the Historyes of Troye*; *Beathadh Sir Gui o Bharbhuic* (pp. 300-347) and *Bethadh Bibuis o Hamtuir* (pp. 248-263), the translations of the Middle English romances *Guy of Warwick* and the first part of *Bevis of*

Hampton respectively. The text closing TCD MS 1298b is *Stair Nuadat Find Femin* (pp. 364-375), a romantic tale about Giallchadh, king of Ireland (a.m. 389, according to O'Flaherty), and his son Nuada (Abbot and Gwynn, 1921, pp. 79-80)

I believe that the fact that TCD MS 1298b ends with a romantic tale might be particularly significant. If Abbott and Gwynn's classification of the opening text as a romantic tale is accepted, TCD MS 1298b would be a miscellaneous manuscript which begins and ends with works belonging to the same genre.[17] If this specular textual disposition were intentional, TCD MS 1298b would exemplify recent theories on the existence of compilatory strategies guiding the realisation of composite manuscripts.[18] The hypothesis of intentionality might be somehow strengthened by the fact that efforts toward effects of specularity were deeply rooted in Irish *mise-en-page* techniques; Irish scribes tended to use a device called *dúnadh*, which consisted of the repetition of the initial letter, word, or sentence of a given text at its closure, to signal the borders of that composition visually. However, to go beyond the limits of conjecture, further research on the genre of the opening text and the possible strategies guiding the internal organisation of this manuscript still needs to be carried out.

TCD MS 1298c (pp. 376-456) dates from the late fifteenth century and was realised by several scribal hands, which are visible and distinguishable; the illumination of this manuscript is less neat and decorative than that presented by TCD MS 1298b (Byrne, 2016a, p. 291). Like TCD MS 1298b, this volume presents a mixture of translated and native texts: *In Cath Catharda* (pp. 376-417), 'a free adaptation of Lucan's Pharsalia' (Abbott and Gwynn, 1921, p. 80); *Audacht Morainn* (pp. 418-420) and *Tecosca Cormaic* (pp. 420-422), two advice texts; a unique Irish version of Gerald of Wales' *Expugnatio Hibernica* (pp. 422-431), translated from a Hiberno-English version of the original Latin text (Byrne, 2016a, p. 290-291). At the close of the manuscript, we have the Irish translation of the *Inventio Sanctae Crucis* (pp. 432-435), along with *Stair Fortibrais* (pp. 435-456), a translation of *Fierabras*; the *Inventio* typically acts as a preface for *Fierabras* in the Irish tradition (Byrne, 2016a, p. 291). The final manuscript bound into TCD MS 1298 is a fragment reporting the conclusion of *Togail na Tebe* (pp. 457-460), a translation of Statius' *Thebaid*. Since its colophon states that the transcript was finished in 1479, this fragmentary item seems quite contemporary with TCD MS 1298b/c, and, as a

[17] Abbott and Gwynn's classification of the initial text has been accepted by Poppe (*The early modern Irish version of Beves*, 1992) and Byrne (*Cultural Intersections in Trinity College Dublin MS 1298*, 2016).

[18] For a discussion on the mechanisms behind the compilation of composite manuscripts, see Pratt, K. et al. (2017) *The Dynamics of the Medieval Manuscript: Text Collections from a European Perspective*. Göttingen: Göttingen University Press. For an in-depth analysis of the relevance of manuscript context to the study and interpretation of Old French verse narratives, see Busby, K. (2002) *Codex and Context: Reading Old French Verse Narrative in Manuscript*. Amsterdam-New York: Editions Rodopi B.V.

translated text, it would have well suited the preceding contents of the manuscript. Nonetheless, there is no direct evidence to confirm that this copy of *Togail na Tebe* had associations with the other contents of the manuscript in the Middle Ages (Byrne, 2016a, p. 292).

The presentation of TCD MS 1298b/c shows that the two volumes share various features. As Byrne observes: they were written at around the same time; they exhibit a similar illumination, with ornamented initials occurring from p. 244 onwards; they seem to have both been in the hands of the same family at an early stage; similar themes connect their contents (2016a, p. 290). I would suggest that this last feature is essential for two reasons. First, it could indicate the presence of a compilatory strategy in binding two originally separate manuscripts together into a single codex. Second, perhaps more interestingly, the study of the *fils rouges* traversing TCD MS 1298b/c could provide insight into the intended interpretation of these texts. Even though concerted research about the impact of recurring themes in TCD MS 1298b/c on the perception of their texts still needs to be pursued, two leitmotifs which seem to be particularly influential may be discussed.

A first motif was highlighted by Byrne in her study of the intersections between TCD MS 1289b/c: the crusading theme (2016a, pp. 299-300). Not only, as one would expect, is this issue considered by the translations of *Guy of Warwick* and *Bevis of Hampton*, which could be described as enacting two one-person crusades, but it is also addressed by the Irish *Fierabras* (TCD MS 1298c) and the material on the Battle of Clontarf (TCD MS 1298b). The Irish translation of *Fierabras*, *Stair Fortibrais*, is a Charlemagne narrative; Fierabras is a Saracen knight who resists Charlemagne and his vassals only to convert to Christianity in the end. In late-medieval European literature, Charlemagne's exploits against the Muslims and the pagan Saxons were retrospectively seen as proto-crusading endeavours. The native material on the Battle of Clontarf may also reflect, albeit obliquely, the crusading ideology; this battle marked the Viking conquest of Christian Ireland. In medieval Insular writing, there was a strong tradition of considering the Viking wars as proto-crusading stories since they depict Christians fighting against pagan adversaries; indeed, they are sometimes referred to as 'Saracens' (Byrne, 2016a, p. 299-300). It might be claimed that the elaboration of this theme in TCD MS 1298b/c encouraged the reader or listener to perceive the proposed texts as the anticipation or the expression of the battles against the infidels; as a consequence, extreme acts of violence committed by the main characters acquired a religious justification, making them heroes rather than ruthless villains.

I would hypothesise that a second topic influencing the interpretative key of TCD MS 1298b/c was the knight's path towards virtuousness. Indeed, both sections feature the *speculum*

principis genre. In TCD MS 1298b, *Beathadh Sir Gui o Bharbhuic* included material from the *Speculum Gy de Warewyke* in its core narrative. In TCD MS 1298c, two advice texts on native figures, *Audacht Morainn* ('The Testament of Morann') and *Tecosca Cormaic* ('The Instructions of Cormac'), are presented. These *specula principis* might have caused the audience to interpret the manuscripts' representation of knighthood and kingship in instructional and didactic terms.

The textual selection exhibited by TCD MS 1298b/c is also telling about contemporary Irish reading tastes. In particular, it seems that the preferred genres were classical epics, manuals of conduct, biographies and genealogies, historical chronicles, and romances. The predilection for these works seems to have been the effect of trends established by the broader European cultural movement of the Burgundian Renaissance. This phenomenon might also account for the appreciation of a serious, solemn, and religious tone in all the texts of the time, independently of their genre (Byrne, 2016a, pp. 296-298).

3.3 TCD MS 1298b/c: provenance and patronage

Thanks to internal evidence, scholars could quite confidently reconstruct the provenance of TCD MS 1298b/c. The *marginalia* in TCD MS 1298b include several references to members of a minor branch of the grand Hiberno-Norman family of the Fitzgeralds: the Fitzgeralds of Allen in Co. Kildare. The most complete of these entries appears on p. 250 and places its writer 'ag Cill Mhaog re linn Pilip Mic Muiris a nAlmain. 1553' ('at Kilmeague in the time of Philip son of Maurice at Allen. 1553'). Other shorter entries reporting non-scribal names all refer to the Fitzgeralds: the signature of William Fitzgerald appears in a considerably later hand; 'Moris Fisgerat' (Maurice Fitzgerald) appears in large English letters on the final page of TCD MS 1298b (p. 375) and in a much-faded inscription at the bottom of p. 365, in the statement 'misi m mcg' ('I am m. mcg') (Byrne, 2016a, pp. 293-294).

The records about the Fitzgeralds of Allen family present only scattered traces of their history. Furthermore, there are no visible remains of their castle at Kilmeague. However, old Ordnance Survey maps suggest that the foundations of a keep were discernible in the nineteenth century. Interestingly, the *marginalia* in TCD MS 1298c also present at least two visible occurrences of the name of Maurice Fitzgerald: on p. 391, the sentence 'misi moris mc gerailt' ('I am Maurice Fitzgerald') is written in Gaelic script; the exact phrase occurs in a similar or identical hand on p. 408. This reinforces the hypothesis that TCD MS 1298b and TCD MS

1298c were owned by the same family at some stage and encourages scholars to study them as a whole (Byrne, 2016a, pp. 293-294).

One cannot help but wonder if the Fitzgerald of Allen were also the patrons of these two volumes. Various clues seem to point to a positive answer.

First, chronological conditions would have made a situation of patronage feasible. Probative in this sense is the presence of the names of Maurice Fitzgerald and Philip Fitzgerald. From what Kenneth Nicholls reconstructed of the Fitzgeralds of Allen's pedigree, the only likely candidate for the 'Maurice' who wrote in this manuscript would have been one Maurice FitzRichard Fitzgerald, who flourished in the sixteenth century and married a granddaughter of the Earl of Kildare who bore him three sons, including Philip (Byrne, 2016a, pp. 293-294). Maurice's date of birth and death are unknown. However, the fact that he had adult sons living in the first decades of the sixteenth century entails that, in the late fifteenth century, he would have been old enough to commission a book within Mac an Leagha's probable lifetime (*fl. c.*1450) (Byrne, 2016a, p. 294).

Second, the socio-cultural context of the fifteenth-century Fitzgeralds of Allen might have created in them the wish to commission TCD MS 1298b/c (Byrne, 2016a, p. 294). In particular, this family seems to have had a particularly close relationship with the most prolific book collectors of their time, the Fitzgeralds Earls of Kildare. These earls were mainly known for being collectors of Irish manuscripts, and the quantity of texts registered in their inventories suggests that their significance did not lie in their utility. Instead, it is much more likely that these codices were purchased to convey status; this is even more probable if one considers that these manuscripts were often attributed to mystical origin stories or supernatural powers, which increased their prestige (Gillespie, 2014, p. 10). The access to the books owned by this family probably caused the Allens to develop specific literary interests, which they then decided to pursue in books of their own property.

An overview of the reading tastes of the Fitzgeralds Earls of Kildare can be found in the 'Kildare Rental' (BL MS Harley 3756), an inventory recording the Earls' possession in the 1520s (Byrne, *Cultural Transitions*, 2016, pp. 297-298). The interests reflected in this list are strongly similar to those exhibited by TCD MS 1298b/c; most significantly to our purpose, it shows the same predilection for *romance*. In the Kildare Rental, this genre is represented by an English book referred to as *Arthur*, the *Siege of Jerusalem*, a French *Lancelot du Lac* and *Ogier le Danois*. In TCD MS 1298b/c, romance finds its expression in *Beathadh Sir Gui o Bharbhuic*, *Bethadh Bibuis o Hamtuir, Stair Nuadat Find Femin* (TCD MS 1298b), and *Stair Fortibrais* (TCD MS 1298c). Moreover, the Kildare Rental also includes classical works by Virgil,

Terence, and probably Horace, together with French translations of Ovid and Livy. Once again, these interests align with those of TCD MS 1298b/c, which boast their own share of classical works: *Stair Ercuil ocus a Bás* (TCD MS 1298b), *In Cath Catharda* and an Irish abridgement of the *Expugnatio Hibernica* (TCD MS 1298c). Last, the Kildare Rental lists the English translation of the fashionable chivalric manual *Faits d'armes et de chevalrie* by Christine de Pizan. Even in this case, TCD MS 1298b/c present evident correspondences with the Rental: TCD MS 1298b presents material from the *Speculum Gy de Warewyke* and TCD MS 1298c includes *Audacht Morainn* and *Tecosca Cormaic*. Therefore, the similarity between the contents of the Kildare Rental and TCD MS 1298b/c suggests that contacts between the Fitzgeralds of Allen and the Fitzgeralds Earls of Kildare are likely to have shaped the patrons' reading interests and encouraged them to commission a manuscript tailored to their taste (Byrne, 2016a, p. 294).

A final pointer towards a potential Allen's patronage of TCD MS 1298b/c is provided by the relevance of some of its contents to Allen's lordship.

To begin with, the translation of *Bevis of Hampton* in TCD MS 1298b contains a uniquely Irish scene where Bevis visits the Knights Hospitaller at Rhodes. Now, the Fitzgeralds of Allen are known to have had close ties to the Knights Hospitaller at the time of the manuscript's compilation; Richard, the illegitimate son of Maurice, flourished at the beginning of the sixteenth century and was a member of the Knights Hospitaller in Ireland and master of Kilteel, a preceptory twenty kilometres east of the castle at Kilmeague (Byrne, 2016a, p. 295). If the insertion of this episode were an idea of the Irish translator, the possibility of patronage would become more concrete, as the Allens would have had personal reasons to commission the representation of this knightly order in a manuscript. A comparison with the text's Middle English source suggests that this change *was* introduced by Uilliam Mac an Leagha's very own hand: this scene is a significant exception to the rest of the narrative, which closely matches the redaction of the romance preserved in Cambridge, University Library MS Ff 2. 38 and Manchester, Chethams MS 8009 (Byrne, *Cutlural Intersections*, 2016, p. 295).

Moreover, TCD MS 1298b contains the romantic tale *Stair Nuadat Find Femin*, which relates the adventures of Nuada, a legendary figure presented as the ancestor of the Allens. As it turns out, strong connections between *Stair Nuadat Find Femin* and various branches of the Geraldine family can be made. More generally, it could be associated with the Fitzgeralds Earls of Kildare: Nuada gave his name to the town of Maynooth (*Maigh Nuad*, i.e. 'The plain of Nuada'), where they had their principal castle. More specifically, it might have had a vital significance for the Fitzgeralds of Allen; a strand of the tradition has it that Nuada first owned

the Hill of Allen and that he built a fort on it, becoming the forerunner of the Fitzgeralds of Allen as the possessor of the hill. As a result, this version of the story rooted the Allens' ownership of their territory in Irish mythology; this peculiar outcome of *Stair Nuadat Find Femin* might have encouraged the commissioning of TCD MS 1298b. By adding this story to the family's library, the Allens would have achieved a goal shared by most Gaelicised Anglo-Norman families: substituting their identity of foreign colonisers with that of direct heirs of Gaelic ancestors. The hypothesis that the Allens commissioned the composition and inclusion of this text in TCD MS 1298b to Uilliam Mac an Leagha is supported by the fact that this text is in all likelihood an original composition of his and that the copy in TCD MS 1298b is an autograph (Poppe, 2005, p. 207).

Last, TCD MS 1298c includes an Irish abridgement of the *Expugnatio Hibernica*, which is a highly eulogistic account of the involvement of the Fitzgeralds in the twelfth-century conquest of Ireland. The wish to celebrate their ancestors' glorious past seems to be a valid justification for the commission of a manuscript (Byrne, 2016a, p. 294).

3.4 Uilliam Mac an Leagha: scribe and translator

A significant contribution towards the identification of the hand responsible for TCD MS 1298b was made by Quin in the introduction of his edition of *Stair Ercuil ocus a Bás*. In particular, he notes that p. 270 features a colophon which identifies Uilliam Mac an Leagha as the scribe of *Stair Ercuil ocus a Bás*, as it reads: '*Uilliam mac an Legha qui sgribhsit ut bona morte peribit*' (1939, p. 46). Although this colophon appears in the text of *Stair Ercuil ocus a Bás*, an inspection of the hand present in *Bethadh Bibuis o Hamtuir*, *Beathadh Sir Gui o Bharbhuic, Stair Nuadat Find Femin*, and the other materials in TCD MS 1298b suggests that these were also realised by Uilliam Mac an Leagha. This possibility is particularly strong for *Beathadh Sir Gui o Bharbhuic. Some* unusual phrases and characteristic words seem to occur nowhere but in *Beathadh Sir Gui o Bharbhuic* and *Stair Ercuil ocus a Bás*.[19]

However, as far as the translated texts in TCD MS 1298b are concerned, convincing evidence points to the fact that Uilliam's role went far beyond that of a scribe: he was also the translator of these works. The first glimpse of this was caught by Quin, who decided to compare Uilliam Mac an Leagha's version of the *Life of Saint Mary of Egypt, Betha Mhuire Eigiptacdha,* to *Stair Ercuil ocus a Bás* and *Beathadh Sir Gui o Bharbhuic*. The comparison was encouraged

[19] For examples of recurrent phrases and words, see Quin, G. (1939) *Stair Ercuil ocus a Bás*: the life and death of Hercules. Dublin: Irish Text Society.

because these texts were all Irish translations of probably English sources and were all in Uilliam Mac an Leagha's hands. The results of his analysis evidenced that the similarities in grammatical structure, language, and lexical choices were so striking that 'it seems highly probable [...] that in *Stair Ercuil ocus a Bás*, *Beathadh Sir Gui o Bharbhuic*, and *Betha Mhuire Eigiptacdha* we have three texts translated from English sources by Uilliam Mac an Leagha' (1939, p. 40).

This intuition was then expanded by Poppe and Byrne (Poppe, 1992; Byrne, 2016a), who, based on internal comparisons, proposed that *Bethadh Bibuis o Hamtuir* was also a translation of Mac an Leagha's. If this is the case, these texts might all be autographs: such a rare situation would provide a unique opportunity to analyse the adaptation process, as the question of interference by later scribes would not arise (Poppe, 2005, p. 207). However, as Quin himself notes, 'a fuller degree of certainty might be reached by a detailed examination of all texts known to have been transcribed by [Uilliam Mac an Leagha], based on thorough excerpting and a comparison with other texts of the period. In this way, we might arrive at a more accurate assessment of his contribution to Irish literature, translated and native' (1939, p. 40).

Mac an Leagha's professional profile and personal background should be brought to the fore. At present, Uilliam Mac an Leagha's work survives in seven manuscripts:

- Dublin, National Library of Ireland, MS G 9 (c. 15th century)
- Dublin, Royal Irish Academy, MS 23 P 3 A (c. 1467)
- Dublin, Trinity College, MS 1298 (c. 15th century)
- London, British Library, MS Additional 30512 ('Leabhar Uí Maolconaire') (c. 15th-16th century)
- London, British Library, MS Egerton 91 (c. 15th century)
- London, British Library, MS Additional 11809 (c. 15th century)
- Bibliothèque Nationale de France MS Celtique I (c. 1473)

The conspicuous number of his manuscripts might entail that he was either a prolific scribe or one of the most fortunate. Once again, Uilliam Mac an Leagha's contribution to these codices involved both the activity of copying and of translating. More specifically, to him are attributed the translations of hagiographical material from English into Irish, including the lives of Saint Mary of Egypt, Quiricus and his mother Julietta, James Intercisus and Saint Laurence (Poppe, 1996, p. 279-280).

The knowledge of Uilliam Mac an Leagha's professional activity is not matched when his personal background is considered. The information on Uilliam Mac an Leagha's life is scarce: trying to delineate his profile is quite problematic. The most convincing hypothesis is

that Uilliam was related to the learned family of physicians of the Mac an Leagha ('son of the physician'). This would be encouraged by the well-evidenced involvement of the Mac an Leagha family in translating activities, primarily concerned with medical material (Byrne, 2016a, p. 292).

However, the current state of evidence does not allow for precise identification of his name within the Mac an Leagha family. The records of this family present ample references to one Iollan Mac an Leagha, who had at least three sons, Maelechlionn, Eoghan, and Connla, and it has been suggested that Iollam and Uilliam are the same people (Byrne, 2016a, p. 292). Nonetheless, this view presents three weaknesses. First, as Quin notes, the native Irish forename 'Iollan' and the translation of the non-native 'William' are entirely different from one another (1939, p. 25). Second, Maelechlionn calls himself the son of Iollan, never the son of Uilliam. (Walsh, 1947, pp. 210-213) Last, in no manuscript attributed to Uilliam did he sign his name as 'Iollann' (Byrne, 2016a, p. 292). Therefore, it is probable that these figures, while belonging to the same learned family, was not the same person.

As shall be discussed in due course, Mac an Leagha's profile might help explain some modifications featured in *Beathadh Sir Gui o Bharbhuic*. In particular, the fact that Uilliam mainly worked on religious material could explain why a secular narrative like *Beathadh Sir Gui o Bharbhuic* presents highly religious tones and contents.

Chapter IV: Structural Modifications in *Beathadh Sir Gui o Bharbhuic*

Introduction

As Wittig has shown in her monograph *Stylistic and Narrative Structures in the Middle English Romances* (1978), the structure of Middle English romances is episodic; the plot is divided into episodes, which can be defined as large narrative sections focusing on a specific topic. Based on the issue they address, episodes have been classified into 'type-episodes', the most common ones being 'love', 'threatened/rescued marriage', 'separation', 'betrayal', 'revenge', and 'restoration' (Wittig, 1978, pp. 137-141). The whole corpus of Middle English romances suggests that type-episodes were employed somewhat flexibly as their inclusion, omission, repetition, arrangement, and expressive realisation were in the hands of the minstrel (Wittig, 1978, pp. 135-143). Nonetheless, it seems that every romance needed to present the 'love', 'marriage', 'separation', and 'restoration' episodes, combined in two patterns: separation-restoration and love-marriage (Wittig, 1978, pp. 175-178)

The episodic structure is formally marked by regular stanzas or groups of lines called motifemes of the *discours* (Wittig, 1978, pp. 61-62). Scholars have classified them into three main types: the 'exhortation' motifeme, where the poet calls for his audience's attention, the 'now-we-leave-and-turn-to' motifeme, where the minstrel signals the beginning of a new episode or a shift of topic within an episode, and a final, diverse group of motifemes, which includes the poet's comments and formulaic endings to the narrative. All these motifemes, while always retaining their inherent components and functions, can have different concrete realisations.

This kind of segmentation of the narrative into type-episodes was not part of the repertoire of the Irish literary techniques; therefore, when Middle English romances reached Ireland, translators had to make a great effort of accommodation. In particular, they needed to find a way of mediating the episodic system of their source texts through the native literary language. Put it in Saussure's terms, translators needed to find an Irish *parole* to express the episodic structure *langue* adequately. This attempt is particularly appreciable in the case of *Beathadh Sir Gui o Bharbhuic*, which, as this chapter intends to show, accomplishes an efficient transition of the episodic configuration of *Guy of Warwick*. To provide a complete view of Uilliam Mac an Leagha's modes of adaptation of the motifemes of the *discours*, this section will individually address the 'exhortation' motifeme, the 'now-we-leave-and-turn-to' motifeme, and the third, assorted set.

4.1 The ‘exhortation’ motifeme in *Beathadh Sir Gui o Bharbhuic*

The ‘exhortation’ motifeme is employed to announce the beginning of the narrative. Consequently, it is invariably included somewhere in the first stanza or groups of lines of any given romance. This motifeme comprises three main elements: an obligatory nucleus, represented by a call for the audience’s attention, and two optional peripheral elements, constituted by a prayer and a short synopsis. Usually, for an ‘exhortation’ motifeme to be perceived as complete, the obligatory exhortation must be accompanied by at least one peripheral component (Wittig, 1978, pp. 57-58).

The ‘exhortation’ motifeme is wanting in the acephalous Auchinleck *Guy of Warwick*. Therefore, for the sake of argument, the analysis will focus on the ‘exhortation’ motifeme of the Caius recension (*c*. 15th century), as edited by Zupitza (1883). Considering that the ‘exhortation’ motifeme overall structure enjoyed considerable stability throughout the period of *romance* production (Wittig, 1978, pp. 57-58), the later date of this copy does not significantly reduce its suitability for this research.

(I) Opening of *Guy of Warwick*:

> SYTH THE TYME ÞAT CRYST IHESU, / Thorough hys grace & vertu, / Was in þis world bore / Of a mayd without hore, / And be world crystendom / Among mankynd first becom, / Many aduentures hath be wrought / þat all men knoweth nought. / Therfore men shull herken blythe, / And it yndirstonde right swythe, / For they that were borne or wee / Fayre aduenturis hadden they; / For euere they louyd sothfastenesse, / Faith with trewthe and stedfastnesse. / Therfore schulde man with gladde chere / Lerne goodnesse, vndirstonde, and here: / Who myke it hereth and vndirstondeth it / By resoun he shulde bee wyse of witte; / And y it holde a fayre mastrye, / To occupye wisedome and leue folye. / For why as of an Erle y shall yow telle, / How of hym it beefelle; / And of hys stewarde, withoute lesynge, / And of the stewarde sone, / a fayre yonge thynge, / That gentil was and fayre beeseen, / And how he loued a mayden sheen, / The Erles doughter, that was so bryghte, / And how he spoused that swete wyghte, / And how that he reynbroun beegate / All y kanne tell yow that / And how he wente into wildernesse: / All y canne tell yow as it ys. / A wyseman it vnto vs seyd / That it wrote and in ryme it leyd. / I wol it not any longer concell / But open the sentence as ye may fele.
> (Zupitza, 1883, l. 1-36, p. 3, 5, Caius MS)
>
> (Since Jesus Christ was brought into this world by an immaculate maiden and Christendom first spread among humanity, many things have happened, and not everyone knows them. Therefore, ye should pay close attention so that ye might know some thrilling adventures praised for their authenticity, reliability, truth, and virtue. Therefore, all of ye should hear and learn about integrity with great

excitement: those who will be able to understand it should righteously be called wise. To increase your wisdom and stop your imprudence, I shall tell ye a true story about an earl, his steward and his steward's son, a beautiful young man, noble and pleasing to the sight; I shall tell ye how he fell for the earl's daughter, a lovely and splendid maiden who became his wife and bore him a son, Reinbroun; I shall also tell ye how he decided to lead a solitary life in remote lands. I shall give ye a truthful account of these events, which I heard from a wise man and wrote in verse. Thus, I will not conceal this story any longer, but I will start telling it to ye)[20]

The 'exhortation' *allomotif* exhibited by the Middle English source text is singularly complete in that it presents both the obligatory nucleus and the peripheral elements: a religious outline is followed by the exhortation itself and a narrative synopsis.[21] Not only that, but this *allomotif* ends with an introductory statement where the poet accounts for the origin of the story, which he allegedly heard from a wise man and then converted into verse. Once the 'exhortation' motifeme is over, the narrator begins the narrative proper. As it happens, *Beathadh Sir Gui o Bharbhuic* significantly alters the Middle English source text.

(II) Opening of *Beathadh Sir Gui o Bharbhuic*:
Bui iarla soim saidhbir a Saxanaib doshindrudh, diarba comainm Risderd o Bharbhaicc, 7 robúi da iarlacht aigi .i. iarlacht o Bharbhuicc, 7 iarlacht Bocigam, 7 dob fer saidhbir, sochinelach in t-iarla co n-ilimud gacha maithusa.
(Robinson, 1908, p. 16)

(There was an exceedingly rich earl in England whose name was Richard of Warwick, and he had two earldoms, namely Warwick and Buckingham, and a rich and well-born man was the earl with an abundance of all good things)
(Robinson, 1908, p. 97)

The Irish text excises all the conventional components of the 'exhortation' motifeme; no exhortation, prayer, or synopsis is found. Furthermore, no account of the – purported – origin of the tale is provided. The target text begins at the beginning; it substitutes the introductory complexity represented by the 'exhortation' motifeme with a simple, straightforward opening sentence to the narrative.

There are reasonable grounds for considering this transformation as one of the Irish translator's authentic innovations rather than a reproduction of an intermediary Middle English exemplar. More specifically, this is suggested by a connection with the native literary tradition and by the reiteration of this choice in other works by the same translator. The sentence 'There

[20] Unless otherwise stated, the translations of Middle English/Old French passages in this chapter are mine.
[21] The term *allomotif* can be adopted for those variant manifestations of a specific motifeme in any given poem (Wittig, 1978, p. 60).

was an exceedingly rich earl in England whose name was Richard of Warwick' elaborates the introductory formula 'There was an X (+ adjective) in Y, Z his name', found at the beginning of many a mediaeval Irish narrative (Poppe, 2005, p. 211). Indeed, this structure appears in texts as monumental as *The Wooing of Étaín*, *The Destruction of Dá Derga's Hostel*, and *The Tale of Macc Da Thó's Pig*, dating back to as early as the eighth or ninth centuries (Gantz, 1981, p. 20):

- *The Wooing of Étaín*
  'There was over Ériu a famous king from the Túatha Dé Danand, and Echu Ollathir was his name' (Gantz, 1981, p. 39).
- *The Destruction of Da Derga's Hostel*
  'There was once a famous, noble king of Ériu, and Echu Feidlech was his name' (Gantz, 1981, p. 61).
- *The Tale of Macc Da Thó's Pig*
  'There was once a famous king of Lagin named Macc Da Thó, and he possessed a hound' (Gantz, 1981, p. 180).

As Poppe notes (2005, p. 210), the structure 'There was an X (+ adjective) in Y, Z his name', is employed as a substitute for the 'exhortation' motifeme at the opening of another romance adaptation by the same translator: *Bethadh Bibuis o Hamtuir*. The 'exhortation' *allomotif* of the source text is substituted with:

> Bui iarla saidhbir, socarthanach a Saxanaibh doshinnrudh diarba comainm Sir Gyi o Hamtuir, 7 dochaith se da trian a aisi 7 a aimsiri re gaisced 7 re gnathirgail; 7 ni roibhi bancheile aigi risin re-sin.
> (Robinson, 1908, p. 173)
>
> (There was a very rich and charitable earl in England whose name was Sir Guy of Hampton, and he passed two thirds of his time and of his life in warfare and in constant strife; and he had no wife at that time)
> (Robinson, 1908, p. 198)

The hypothesis of Uilliam Mac an Leagha's responsibility for the use of 'There was an X (+ adjective) in Y, Z his name' is reinforced by the fact that this structure also appears at the beginning of the other romance translation by Uilliam Mac an Leagha, *Stair Ercuil ocus a Bás*, in substitution of the substantial prologue featured in Caxton's text:

> Bui ri uasal oirnide don cinel Ghregach, Ampitrionis mac Alisius mic Gorgofon mic Saduirn mic Iuranuis.
> (Quin, 1939, p. 2)

(There was a noble crowned king of the Grecian race, Amphitryon, son of Alcaeus)
(Quin, 1939, p. 3)

Uilliam Mac an Leagha's choice to intervene in the 'exhortation' motifeme seems to have been motivated by his intent to secure his audience's perception of the tale structure and his work's respect for native narrative conventions. The employment of a formula established in the native tradition (Poppe, 2005, p. 211) would have facilitated the public's identification of the beginning of the narrative; on the contrary, the unfamiliar Middle English 'exhortation' motifeme would have probably disoriented the readers and/or listeners. The necessity for the concealment of the narrator's presence (Poppe, 2005, p. 215) might have guided the choice of an impersonal narrative sentence, instead of an introduction exposing his persona. The Irish preference for a non-omniscient narrator (Poppe, 2005, p. 213) was probably the reason for omitting the synopsis component of the 'exhortation' motifeme. Last, the Irish objective of presenting narrative materials as *historiae* rather than *fabulae* (O'Connor, 2014, pp. 20-21) might have led to the elimination of the elusive and vague reference to the (pseudo-)origin of the story: its presentation as an oral account from an unidentified source would have compromised its credibility.

4.2 The 'now-we-leave-and-turn-to' motifeme in *Beathadh Sir Gui o Bharbhuic*

The 'now-we-leave-and-turn-to' motifeme is a formulaic device to signal a shift of topic. There are different components to this motifeme: an obligatory statement signalling the shift ('now we leave'), a compulsory topic sentence introducing the new subject ('and turn to'), an optional exhortation for the public's attention, and an optional reference to the previous events in the tale (Wittig, 1978, pp. 61-62).

Guy of Warwick employs the 'now-we-leave-and-turn-to' motifeme to mark both within- and between-episode transitions. Owing to its nature as a long narrative, the text presents numerous instances of this structure; however, compared to their Irish correspondents, some exemplify the accommodation process more effectively.

- Within-episode transitions

(I) Shift from Felice's description to Guy's father's (episode: 'introduction'):

NOWE we shull leue of hir [Felice] here, / And telle you forthe of our matiere. / Speke we schul of the Stywarde: / The Earl's Steward, well true he was, / and highte Sywarde.
(Zupitza, 1883, l. 107-110, p. 9 Caius MS)

(Now we shall take leave of Felice and proceed further in our story. We should speak of the earl's steward, who was admirably honest and noble)

(II) Shift from Guy's slaying of a dragon in Northumberland to his return to Warwick (episode: 'restoration'):

God graunt hem heven-blis to mede / That herken to mi romaunce rede / Al of a gentil knight; / […] His name was hoten Sir Gii / Of Warwike wise and wight. // Wight he was for sothe to say / And holden for priis in everi play / As knight of gret boundé. / Out of this lond he went his way / Thurth mani divers cuntray / That was biyond the see. / Sethen he com into Inglond / And Athelston the king he fond / That was bothe hende and fre. / For his love ich understond / He slough a dragoun in Northhumberlond / Ful fer in the north cuntré. // He and Herhaud for sothe to say / To Wallingforth toke the way / That was his faders toun.
(Zupitza, 1883, stanza 1, l. 1-3, 11-12, p. 384; stanza 2, l. 1-12, p. 384; stanza 3, l. 1-3, p. 384)

(May God reward with the eternal joy of heaven those who listen to my romance about a noble knight, the wise and brave Sir Guy of Warwick: he was genuinely valiant, excellent in every battle, and of great virtue. After leaving his homeland and traversing many regions beyond the sea, he returned to England and met the noble king Athelstan. I understand that, for his deep reverence for the king, Guy killed a dragon in the northern area of Northumberland. Subsequently, he and Heraud went to Wallingford, his father's hometown)

- Between-episode transitions

(III) Shift from Guy's departure from Felice (episode: 'separation') to the beginning of his redemption pilgrimage (episode: 'exile'):

Now herken and ye may here / In gest yif ye wil listen and lere / Hou Gii as pilgrim yede. / He welke about with glad chere / Thurth mani londes fer and nere / Ther God him wald spede. / First he went to Jerusalem / And sethen he went to Bedlem / Thurth mani an uncouthe thede. / Yete he bithought him sethen tho / Forto sechen halwen mo / To winne him heven-mede.
(Zupitza, 1883, stanza 44, l. 1-12, p. 416)

(Listen now to this romance and ye may hear how Guy lived as a pilgrim: in high spirits, he traversed many far and near lands, where God led him. First, he went to Jerusalem and then he headed to Bethlem, through many foreign places, in a continuous search for new ways to atone for his sins and win the heavenly reward)

These passages realise three different ‘now-we-leave-and-turn-to’ *allomotifs*: (I) contains the compulsory shift-of-focus warning and topic sentence, and the optional reference to the previous matter; (II) features the obligatory shift-of-focus warning and topic sentence, together with the optional exhortation and statement on the preceding events; (III) presents the obligatory shift-of-focus warning and topic sentence, which is particularly extended and contains a full-blown synopsis of the following events.

While retaining their position in the narrative development, the Irish adaptation drastically modifies the above transitions between scenes and episodes.

- Within-episode transitions

(I) Shift from Felice’s description to Guy’s father’s (episode: ‘introduction’):

Co clos fon uili domhun a dethclú itir egna 7 ordan 7 einech, etir cradhbudh 7 ciunus 7 cunnlacht, itir gloine 7 gais 7 glicus, gur bo lán da serc 7 da sirgradh uaisli 7 ardmaithi na cruinne co comcoitcenn. Robúi didiu sdibard uasal, oirbindech ag iarla o Barbuicc an inbuidh sin .i. Siccard a ainm sidhe, 7 dob fer furtill […].
(Robinson, 1908, p. 16)

([Felice’s] fair fame spread throughout all the world for knowledge, dignity, and honor, for piety, gentleness and discretion, for purity, wisdom and prudence, until the princes and nobles of the whole earth were filled with love and longing for her. Now there was at that time a steward, noble and honorable, in the service of the Earl of Warwick, Siccard by name, and he was a strong man and very brave […])
(Robinson, 1908, p. 98)

(II) Shift from Guy’s slaying of a dragon in Northumberland to his return to Warwick (episode: ‘restoration’):

7 Doben Gyi a cenn di, 7 rothomhms hi, 7 robui tricha troigh dó ina fadh, 7 rogluais roime a cenn rígh Saxan, 7 rothaisen cenn in dragun do, 7 romo- ladar cach a coitcinne in comrac-sin. Iar forba in gnima-sin la Gyi adubairt rí Saxan […] Rogab Guy ced agan ríg, 7 docuaid coruigi a baile fein […].
(Robinson, 1908, p. 73)

(And Guy struck off his head, and measured him, and he was thirty feet long; and he went to the king of the Saxons, and showed him the dragon’s head, and everyone praised that fight. [Chapter 33] After Guy had accomplished this feat [he] took leave of the king and went to his own home […]).
(Robinson, 1908, p. 150)

- Between-episode transitions

(III) Shift from Guy's departure from Felice (episode: 'separation') to the beginning of his redemption pilgrimage:

> Conidh i dichuma na Saxanac im Gyi, 7 lorgairecht Sir Heront connici sin. Imthusa Sir Gyi dorinde se oilirthi inmolta in domun co cathraig Iarusalem, 7 as-sin co h-Alexandria, 7 robí se teora [bliadhna] a siubal na cathrach-sin. (Robinson, 1908, p. 77)
>
> (Thus far the sorrow of the English for Guy and Sir Heront's search. As for Sir Guy, he made a praiseworthy pilgrimage of the world to the city of Jerusalem, and from there to Alexandria, and he was three [years] travelling in those cities) (Robinson, 1908, p. 154)

The Irish version omits some components of the 'now-we-leave-and-turn-to' motifeme but maintains others. On the one hand, the compulsory shift-of-focus warning and the optional exhortation disappear; on the other, the mandatory topic sentence and the optional reference to the previous narrative are retained and signalled by specific phrases. The compulsory topic sentence is introduced by: (I) '*Robúi didiu*', (II) '*Iar forba*', and (III) '*Imthusa'*; the optional reference to previous events is introduced by (III) '*Conidh'*. Significantly, throughout the adaptation, the introduction to topic sentences is realized by a wide range of variants: '*imthusa* + topic' ('concerning'); '*iar forbha* + action' ('after'); '*is and-sin / is and-robui* + action' ('(it is) then'); '*aroile la* + action' ('on another day') (Poppe, 2005, p. 218). A close reading of the adaptation shows that, when the shift of topic is marked, the variant phrases are distributed as such:

On-sets	Chapters
dála	2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 10, 11, 13, 14, 17, 19, 20, 21, 23, 24, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 34, 36, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44
imthusa	7, 12, 18, 25, 37, 39
iar forbha	9, 33, 45
is and-sin / is and-robui	15, 16
aroile la	26

The substitution of the 'now-we-leave-and-turn-to' motifeme with the structures listed above seems to have been operated by the translator rather than replicated from a Middle English intermediary. In particular, this is suggested by parallels with the native literary

tradition and the reiteration of the same alteration in other romance translations by Uilliam Mac an Leagha. Phraseological clues primarily suggest the assonance of these patterns with Irish literature: the phrases chosen to introduce the topic and recapitulation statements seem to have been borrowed from medieval Irish long narratives, where they marked the off- and on-sets of large narrative units. The opening '*dála* + new topic' has been defined by Bruford as a 'recognised technique for switching from one character to another […]' (1969, p. 10). For example, in the Stowe recension of the *Táin Bó Cúailnge*, the shift to new topics and characters is marked by 'Iomtusa Con Culainn ann so anosa' ('Concerning Cú Chulainn here now') or 'Dála í Briain' ('concerning Uí Briúin) (Poppe, 2005, p. 223). The closing '*conidh* + recapitulation' surfaces, once again, in the Stowe recension of the *Táin Bó Cúailnge*: 'Conadh é adbar na Tána conuig sin' ('So this is the reason for the *Táin* thus far') (Poppe, 2005, p. 223). A further, subtler connection between the Irish version of the 'now-we-leave-and-turn-to' motifeme and the native tradition has been noted by Poppe in relation to the Irish adaptation of *Bevis of Hampton*: the closing and opening sentences often refer to the preceding or following section of the narrative with nominal phrases used in the so-called Irish tale-lists as terms for narrative genres (2005, p. 218). These are '*aidhedh'* ('death'), '*loinges*' ('exile'), '*comrac*' ('fight'), '*cath*' ('battle'), and '*tochmarc*' ('wooing'). When *Beathadh Sir Gui o Bharbhuic* is considered, such names are found in Chapters 15 ('cath'), 21 ('cath'), 26 ('cath'), 32 ('comrac-sin'), 33 ('tochmarc'), and 37 ('comrac').

The reiteration of the same modality of modification of the 'now-we-leave-and-turn-to' motifeme can be witnessed by comparing some passages of *Bevis of Hampton* and *Recuyell of the Historyes of Troye* to their equivalents in *Bethadh Bibuis o Hamtuir* and *Stair Ercuil ocus a Bás*.

- *Bevis of Hampton*

  The first shift in *Bevis of Hampton* entails the move from the episode relating the death of the hero's father to that featuring Bevis' reactions to this event and his transfer to Sabere disguised as a shepherd. As Poppe notes (2005, p. 225), the transition is marked in divergent ways in the source text and its adaptation. The Middle English recension reads:

  > The messenger away thenne wente / and tolde his lorde, as she had sent. / Nowe wyll we of yonge Beuys telle, / Howe wod he was & howe hym befelle.
  > (Poppe, 2005, p. 225)

> (Following her orders, the messenger took his leave and told his lord. Now we will talk about the young Bevis, describing how desperately he reacted to the news and what happened to him afterwards)

In *Bethadh Bibuis o Hamtuir*, the previous episode is closed with 'conidh i adhaigh iarla Hamtuir sin' (Robinson, 1908, p. 175) ('so that this is the death of the earl of Hamtur') (Robinson, 1908, p. 200), and includes Bibus' argument with his mother, his transfer to Saber, and his disguise as a swineherd. The onset of the next episode is marked with 'dála in imperi iarum' (Robinson, 1908, p. 175) ('concerning the emperor then') (Robinson, 1908, p. 200), and it begins with the emperor's preparations for his wedding with Beues' mother. Its culmination, consisting in Beues' banishment and sale to the foreign traders, is signalled by 'conidh e-sin loinges Bibuis' (Robinson, 1908, p. 177) ('so that this is the exhile of Bibus') (Robinson, 1908, p. 202).

- *Recuyell of the Historyes of Troye*

The first transition marks the passage from the account of the destruction of Boeotia and the conception of Hercules to Juno's discovery of her husband's infidelity. *Recuyell of the Historyes of Troye* does not present a 'now-we-leave-and-turn-to motifeme', nor does it use a particular marker to signal the shift of topic. Significantly, the Irish text *does* signal this shift by using the combination '*conidh* + synopsis' and '*dála* + topic':

> Conidh e toghail cathrach na Botheme 7 geinemain Ircail connigi sin. [Chapter 2] Dála Iubiter iarum docuaidh reime dia chrich budein.
> (Quin, 1939, p. 4, 6)
>
> (That, then, is the destruction of the city of Boeotia (?) and the begetting of Hercules thus far. [Chapter 2] As for Jupiter then he went on to his own country)
> (Quin, 1939, p. 5, 7)

Uilliam Mac an Leagha's decision to alter the 'now-we-leave-and-turn-to' motifeme in this manner was probably influenced by the same intentions guiding his attitude toward the 'exhortation' motifeme. To begin with, the substitution of unfamiliar structures and lexical choices with familiar ones (Poppe, 2005, p. 218) would have allowed the public to follow the pace of the narrative development and perceive the tale's overall design. Moreover, the importance of hiding the narrator's persona (Poppe, 2005, p. 215) was in all likelihood conducive to the omission of the first-person subjects and the apostrophes characterising the 'now-we-leave-and-turn-to' motifeme.

Despite the regularity in modifying on- and off-sets, *Beathadh Sir Gui o Bharbhuic* presents a significant exception to the rule. The end of Chapter 38 closes the section on Guy's pilgrimage to transit to Heraud's search for Roighnebron with:

> Imtus Gyi dorinde sé treiginus ocus irnaighthi ocus oilirthe i ngach tal*am* da rimigh Crist, ocus ni dó labrus in sdair seal ele.
> (Robinson, 1908, p. 82)
>
> (As for Guy, he fasted and prayed and made a pilgrimage in every land in which Christ had journeyed, and the story does not speak of him for another while)
> (Robinson, 1908, p. 158)

The Auchinleck version of the *Stanzaic Guy* does not present this transition as the *Reinbroun* material is preserved as a separate romance in the same manuscript. However, I would claim that the Middle English intermediary used by Uilliam Mac an Leagha *did* contain this transition. Indeed, the section on Guy's pilgrimage is closed by a statement where the narrator refers to the structure of the story itself ('the story does not speak of him for another while'); comments on the text were typical of Middle English romances, as they were part of the third, assorted group of motifemes of the *discours* (Wittig, 1978, p. 62). Therefore, the Irish translator would have been more likely to reproduce this reference to the story from an exemplar rather than add it himself. If this is true, the use of 'ocus ni dó labrus in sdair seal ele', the literal translation of the Middle English 'and the story does not speak of him for another while', would represent an element of continuity between the source and target text. Considering the consistency in substituting the English off-sets with typically Irish structures (e.g., 'conidh + recapitulation') and in omitting the narrator's comments on the text in other romance translations, the question of why the translator did not follow his trend in this instance arises.[22] The hypothesis of a passive and mechanical reproduction is hardly acceptable: Uilliam Mac an Leagha showed a marked intellectual engagement and consciousness throughout the entire process of translation, and it is difficult to believe that, at this particular point, he overlooked the problem. A more reasonable and thought-provoking answer could perhaps rest in his intention to add a slight 'foreign' taste to the target text and, possibly, to try and introduce new *formulae* in the Irish tradition. Yet, to draw more solid conclusions, further research involving a cross-textual comparison between Uilliam Mac an Leagha's translations and potential echoes of this structure in later Irish 'romantic tales' is required.

[22] For example, in his translation of *Bevis of Hampton* (*Bethadh Bibuis o Hamtuir*), Mac an Leagha omits the poet's reference to the text ('the story') found in 'vnder the bryg was syxte bellus / As the story of Beues tellis' (Poppe, 2015, p. 212).

4.3 Personal comments and formulaic endings in *Beathadh Sir Gui o Bharbhuic*

The final group of motifemes of the *discours* includes the narrator's comments on the narrative and the formulaic endings of romances (Wittig, 1978, p. 62). These kinds of motifemes share a specific function; they allow the poet to address his audience and, accordingly, to make it feel more involved in the narration. However, if the poet's comments do not appear to have an established structure like the other motifemes of the *discours*, formulaic endings seem to present a threefold configuration, including a compulsory statement declaring the end of the story, an optional prayer for the characters' souls, for the poet, his audience, or both, and an optional invite to learn a lesson from the tale or reward the poet.[23]

When the poet's comments are concerned, the minstrel frequently interrupts the narrative to warn the audience about the extent of his knowledge of the tale (Poppe, 2005, p. 212). A case in point is found in the transition from the scene where Guy slays a dragon in Northumberland to his return to Warwick. The minstrel explicitly says that what follows is merely his own understanding of the events:

> For his love ich understond / He slough a dragoun in Northhumberlond / Ful fer in the north cuntré.
> (Zupitza, 1883, stanza 2, l. 11-12, p. 384)
>
> (I understand that, for his deep reverence for the king, Guy killed a dragon in the northern area of Northumberland)

Significantly, the corresponding passage in the Irish text does not include any such specification:

> 7 Doben Gyi a cenn di, 7 rothomhms hi, 7 robui tricha troigh dó ina fadh, 7 rogluais roime a cenn rígh Saxan, 7 rothaisen cenn in dragun do, 7 romo- ladar cach a coitcinne in comrac-sin.
> (Robinson, 1908, p. 73)
>
> (And Guy struck off his head, and measured him, and he was thirty feet long; and he went to the king of the Saxons, and showed him the dragon's head, and everyone praised that fight)
> (Robinson, 1908, p. 150).

[23] Two examples may be mentioned. King Horn ends with: '(compulsory statement on the end of the story:) Her endeth the tale of Horn / That fair was and noght unorn./ (optional prayer:) Make we us glade evre among, / For thus him endeth Hornes song. / Jesus, that is of hevene king, / Yeve us alle His swete blessing. / Amen.' (Drake et al., 1997, l. 1539-1545); Octavian's closure reads: '(compulsory statement on the end of the story:) And thus endis Octovean, / That in his tym was a doghety man, / (optional prayer:) With the grace of Mary free, / Now, Jhesu lorde, of heven kynge, / Thou gyffe us alle thi dere blyssynge. / Amen, amen, par charyté! Amen.' (Hudson, 2006, l. 1843-1848).

Evidence for ascribing the omission of personal comments to the Irish translator can be found in the reiteration of this strategy in a parallel situation in another romance translation of his: *Bethadh Bibuis o Hamtuir* (Poppe, 2005, p. 212). A contrastive example is provided by the account of the death of Bevis' wife, the English sentence 'His wife was dede, I understond' (His wife was dead, I understand) lacks the poet's remark in the Irish translation. Essentially, Uilliam Mac an Leagha's removal of these remarks might have been shaped by the aforementioned (pseudo-)historical intent and by adoption of the external storytelling approach of native Irish narratives (O'Connor, 2014, p. 20-21). To begin with, referring to the narrative material as the poet's understanding automatically entails its loss of certainty and credibility; the omission of such comments was thus a *sine qua non* to give the Irish version the *scéla*'s truth-like value. The omission of a statement exposing the narrator's presence would have respected the aforementioned preference for an external, detached relation to the narrative material (Poppe, 2005, p. 215).

The Irish realisation of the narrative's ending, which features Roighnebron's final return to Warwick, is much distanced from its Middle English form. Before proceeding to the comparison, however, a methodological premise must be made; since the last *folia* of the *Reinbroun* narrative are wanting in the Auchinleck manuscript, the following comparison will be based on the Corpus MS copy of it, edited by Zupitza (1883).

(I) End of *Reinbroun*:

De ceste estorie uoil fin faire: / Plus nen uoil desore traire. / Bel ensaumple i peut em prendre / Qui bien la siet e ueut entendre / De pruesce amer, leaute tenir, / De tuz biens faire e mal gerpir, / Orguil , richesces auer en despit: / De Guion nus aprent le escrit / Ceo est la summe de la ualur, / Ke tut guerpi pur sun creatur. / E cil qui en la sainte trinite / Un deu est par sa pite / Nus doint en terre si servir, / Ke ali en glorie puissums venir. / Amen.
(Zupitza, 1883, l. 21-34, p. 674 Corpus MS)

(I want to end this story here. Those who paid close attention to the story of Guy, who was extremely virtuous in that he abandoned everything for his Creator, could learn a valuable lesson from it: if they want to conquer the heavenly glory, they must love prowess, seek justice, pursue good and abandon evil, loathe pride and all riches, and serve God on earth. Amen)

This formulaic ending contains all the elements of relevance: the compulsory announcement of the story's conclusion, the invitation to understand the moral behind the tale and a prayer for the public's salvation.

(II) End of *Beathadh Sir Gui o Bharbhuic*:

> 7 Tangadur a Saxanaibh iar-sin, 7 ní rug Roignebron béo ara mathair ann, 7 doglac sé oighrecht a shenathar cuigi .i. iarlacht o Berbuic, 7 tug sé barúntacht do Sir Heront, 7 ilimud maithusa ele rechois.
> (Robinson, 1908, p. 97)
>
> (And after they came to England, and Roighnebron did not find his mother alive there, and he took possession of the heritage of his ancestors, namely the earldom of Warwick and the earldom of Warwick and the earldom of Buckingham; and he gave Sir Heront a barony, and great riches besides)
> (Robinson, 1908, p. 172)

The formulaic ending is replaced by a simple narrative sentence, which limits itself to reporting the final events of the story without additional commentaries, prayers, or apostrophes to the public. There is a strong possibility that the translator made this choice; in particular, this is suggested by a reiteration of the same substitution in *Bethadh Bibuis o Hamtuir*. The Middle English *Bevis of Hampton* is closed by a decidedly minimalistic formulaic ending, which contains the obligatory reference to the end of the story and the optional prayer for God's blessing:

> Here endyth a good tale of Beues of / Hamtoun, that Good Verriour. / Amen.
> (Kölbing, 1885, p. 218, l. 4333-4335)
>
> (Here ends the great tale of Bevis of Hampton, the valorous warrior. Amen)

In a similar way to *Beathadh Sir Gui o Bharbhuic*, *Bethadh Bibuis o Hamtuir* removes this formulaic ending and closes the story with a basic narrative sentence:

> Dála Esgobard iar-sin, rogab se ag inrudh na luingi [le lamaibh…ibh], ocus rogab cuan, ocus do[rith] roime cum na cathrach.
> (Robinson, 1908, p. 198)
>
> (As for Esgobard then, he began to row the boat [with his hands] […], and came to harbor, and ran to the city)
> (Robinson, 1908, p. 220)

The modification of formulaic endings seems to have been primarily motivated by Uilliam Mac an Leagha's intent to shape the foreign material to conform to native narrative conventions; in particular, he respected the preference for a detached, external narrator, as opposed to a highly empathetic, exposed one (Poppe, 2005, p. 215). Still, it is essential to note that in this instance, Uilliam Mac an Leagha respected the native narrative norms only partially, as he did not include a *coda* at the end of the *Guy* tale (Poppe, 2005, p. 223). Typically, Irish

narratives featured a final statement referring to the text's content, title, or tale type, most commonly realized through the structure mentioned above '*conidh* + recapitulation' (Poppe, 2005, pp. 222-223). Therefore, the complete absence of a *coda* in *Beathadh Sir Gui o Bharbhuic* and in *Bethadh Bibuis o Hamtuir,* is particularly striking, mainly because it seems to result from an intentional choice. First, even in the remote possibility that Uilliam Mac an Leagha's actual Middle English exemplar did not contain a formulaic ending, he could have added a *coda* to keep pursuing his effort of compliance with native conventions, yet he did not. Second, and more significantly, the same anomalous circumstance repeats itself at the end of another romance translation of his, *Bethadh Bibuis o Hamtuir*. However, the hypothesis of an intentional omission is somewhat weakened by the fact that the other romance translation by Mac an Leagha, *Stair Ercuil ocus a Bás*, regularly ends with a coda: 'Conidh i stair Ercuil 7 a bas connicci sin. FINIT' ('So this is the story of Hercules and his death thus far' (Poppe, 2005, p. 223). Therefore, the hypothesis of a planned omission must remain speculative: major certainty can only be accomplished when a deeper study of Uilliam Mac an Leagha's scribal and translating trends is completed.

Chapter V: Stylistic Modifications in *Beathadh Sir Gui o Bharbhuic*

Introduction

The intent of literary acculturation of a foreign text demanded that its stylistic features be adapted to the receiving context. Changes in style tend to reflect strong stylistic norms of the receiving literary tradition (Poppe, 2005, p. 208), as they can constantly be verified by means of comparison with native texts and, in the Irish tradition, with adaptations from the 'first phase' of translation. In *Guy of Warwick* and *Beathadh Sir Gui o Bharbhuic*, this acclimation was developed at the levels of the narrative medium and narrative approach.

5.1 Modifications of the narrative medium

The observation of *Beathadh Sir Gui o Bharbhuic*'s treatment of the narrative medium shall begin by considering a large-scale modification: the remediation from verse to prose (Poppe, 2005, p. 209). This conversion is more likely to have been an intended modification by the translator than a mere replication of an English intermediary. To start with, 'prose did not become widely used for English vernacular narrative until the late fifteenth century, when Arthurian legends and chivalric romances appeared for the first time in prose' (Poppe, 2005, p. 209). Moreover, prose had always been the typical Irish medium for sustained narrative in native and translated texts (Poppe, 2004, p. 76). Uilliam Mac an Leagha's choice to remediate *Guy of Warwick* was probably due to the same reasons as those guiding the remediation of Classical epics in the 'first phase' of translation. First, the narrative nature of romances demanded that they be presented in prose (Poppe, 2005, p. 209): hence, to integrate *Guy of Warwick* into the Irish corpus of narratives, its couplets and stanzas had to be remediated. Second, converting *Guy of Warwick* into a form which was usually conferred an inherent truth value in the Middle Ages (O'Connor, 2014, p. 19) would have respected the Irish perception of the majority of native narratives as 'historiae' which needed to be related credibly (Poppe, 2007, p. 19).

A smaller-scale variation in the narrative medium of *Beathadh Sir Gui o Bharbhuic* has been claimed to be its frequent employment of synonymic sequences of nouns, adjectives, and adverbs (Robinson, 1908, p. 11). Each chapter of the Irish adaptation presents uncountable instances of these groups; however, to acquire an adequate perception of this stylistic aspect, it is worth providing some examples:

(I) Nominal synonymic groups:

- '[…] fear and terror seized Guy' (e.g., Robinson, 1908, p. 116)
- '[…] after winning victory and triumph' (e.g., Robinson, 1908, p. 125)
- '[…] his sense and reason left him entirely' (e.g., Robinson, 1908, p. 117)
- '[…] he fell in a swoon and a fainting fit' (e.g., Robinson, 1908, p. 100)

(II) Adjectival synonymic groups:

- 'They fought with each other a battle, fierce, bloody, and very deadly' (e.g., Robinson, 1908, p. 104)
- 'The rich, prosperous lord [of Bruges]', 'the fierce, strong lord of Bruges' (e.g., Robinson, 1908, p. 108)
- '[…] he struck him a strong, brave, blow', 'and Guy gave him a swift, sudden blow' (e.g., Robinson, 1908, p. 150)
- '[…] the bright, early dawn of the morning' (e.g., Robinson, 1908, p. 161)

(III) Adverbial synonymic groups:

- 'Guy fought skilfully, fiercely, and savagely against those warriors' (e.g., Robinson, 1908, p. 108)
- '[…] they fought with each other bravely and bitterly, mightily, manfully and madly' (e.g., Robinson, 1908, p. 161)
- '[…] and the Duke gave Guy three kisses fondly, fervently, faithfully' (e.g., Robinson, 1908, p. 112)
- '[…] when Sir Heron saw them, he sprang quickly and very lightly' (e.g., Robinson, 1908, p. 114)

The use of synonymic sequences is likely to have originated in the translation process, as this was one of the identifying stylistic traits of Irish ornate prose from the Middle Irish period onwards (Robinson, 1908, p. 11). Therefore, Uilliam Mac an Leagha might have decided to fill his text with strings of synonyms to harmonise *Guy of Warwick* with native stylistic conventions and, accordingly, to integrate it into the new literary tradition.

Moreover, I would suggest that the use of synonymic groups in *Beathadh Sir Gui o Bharbhuic* led to a further variation at the level of the narrative medium. Some identical synonymic groups are constantly repeated in the narrative, and they come to constitute a stock of *formulae*. Aside from a few exceptions, most formulaic structures are absent in the Middle English version. Relevant examples for both situations are:

(I) New formulae

- ‘brave, valiant knight’ or ‘strong, valiant knight’ (Robinson, 1908, p. 103, 106)
- ‘fight a fight’ or ‘fight a battle’, ‘win the victory’ or ‘win the triumph’ (Robinson, 1908, p. 159, 170)
- ‘fear and terror seized’ or ‘anger and great rage seized’(Robinson, 1908, p. 116, 139)
- ‘without peace, or rest, or repose’ (Robinson, 1908, p. 119)
- ‘and dropped dead, without life’ (Robinson, 1908, p. 144)

(II) Replicated formulae

- ‘a swoon and a heavy faint’ or ‘and a swoon and a fainting fit’ (Robinson, 1908, p. 111, 146)
- ‘(three days) without food, or drink, or sleep’ (Robinson, 1908, p. 116)

There are reasonable grounds for believing that these synonymic *formulae* were *ad hoc* insertions by the Irish translator. First, the use of recurrent formulaic structures is evidenced in native texts; for instance, it is attested in *Togail Bruidne Dá Derga*.[24] This Middle Irish saga presents a long description sequence developing a repetitive question-answer pattern within the ‘watchman device’ (Gantz, 1981, pp. 77-102); before attacking the hostel and its guests, the *watcher*, Ingcél, reports what he is seeing and asks the *interpreter*, Fer Rogain, to explain. The components of this sequence are constantly marked by the repetition of identical formulaic expressions: Ingcél’s vision is introduced by the sentence ‘I saw [something]’ and ends with ‘Explain that, Fer Rogain’; the man’s explanations are introduced by ‘Not difficult that’ and end with ‘Woe to him who carries out this destruction [of the hostel]’; Fer Rogain’s warning is followed by Ingcél’s answer ‘You do not rule me, […] clouds of blood will come to you’; the following vision by Ingcél is introduced by another character, Lomnae Drúth, who asks ‘After that, what did you see?’ (e.g., Gantz, 1981, pp. 92-93).

Second, the style of the Irish *formulae* translating Middle English equivalents suggests a neat intervention by Mac an Leagha. The Middle English equivalent for ‘a swoon and a heavy faint’ / ‘a swoon and a fainting fit’ is ‘adoun (he) fel aswounie’ (‘and (he) fell in a swoon’) (Zupitza, 1883, l. 557, p. 32), without mentioning a faint. The Middle English equivalent for

[24] *Togail Bruidne Dá Derga* (The Destruction of Dá Derga’s Hostel) was written in the earlier part of the Middle Irish period, in either the tenth or eleventh century and it largely draws on Old Irish material. The saga is centred on the over-king Conare Mór of the Érainn dynasty and tells the story of his ascension to kingship and tragic fall (O’Connor, 2014, p. 2).

‘(three days) without food, or drink, or sleep’ is ‘thre days (he) no ete mete non’ (‘(he) ate no food for three days’) (Zupitza, 1883, stanza 232, l. 5, p. 574) or ‘mete and drink sche finde him wold’ (‘(she would find) food and drink’) (Zupitza, 1883, stanza 281, l. 11), where ‘sleep’ is never mentioned. As it appears, the Irish equivalents always add at least another synonym, in these cases ‘fainting fit’ or ‘sleep’; this detail strongly recalls the mentioned native predilection for synonymic groups (Robinson, 1908, p. 11). Therefore, I believe that creating new formulae and adapting existing ones might well be considered part of Uilliam Mac an Leagha’s efforts to emulate native stylistic trends and better integrate *Beathadh Sir Gui o Bharbhuic* in the Irish context.

Furthermore, the narrative medium of *Beathadh Sir Gui o Bharbhuic* seems to have undergone a Gaelicisation process. It might be claimed that this stylistic naturalisation is most evidently visible in the text’s lexical choice of personal names, place names, and common names. The Gaelicisation of personal names has been explored by Robinson, who notes that ‘[…] more than two-thirds of the Irish names are either the natural equivalents of the English or they can be explained without difficulty as transformations of them’ (Robinson, 1908, p. 5). In the editor’s list appear:

Middle English	Irish
Segwarde	Siccard
Heraude	Heront
Yorauld	Uront
Guichard	Gincadh
Amiral Cosdram	Ambrail Coscran
Amyrabel	Mirabala
Ozelle	Uisin
Amis de la Mountaine	Aimistir Amunndae
Jonas	Jonutas
Triamour	Craidhamar
Elmadan of Tyre	Eliman o Tiber

Robinson, however, did not dedicate equal space for discussion to the presence of Gaelicised place names, which is briefly signalled in the footnotes of his edition. It might be claimed that the most significant examples surface in Chapter 2 and Chapter 45. In the description of the participants in the three-day Norman tournament, Chapter 2 includes: ‘[…] the sons of the king of Spain, and of Africa, and of Greece, of France, of Sicily, of Hungary,

of Fuardacht, and of Deolann and of the four tribes of Lochlann' (Robinson, 1908, p. 102).[25] The place names Fuardacht, Deolann, and Lochlann are likely to have been inserted by Mac an Leagha, as they are all established in the native literary tradition.

Fuardacht seems to coincide with the mythical land of Uardha, the land of the cold (Robinson, 1908, p. 102); the king of this reign is presented in *Caithréim Conghail Chláiringhnigh* ('Martial Career of Conghal Cláiringhneach'): 'A king ruled the kingdom of Uardha whose name was Nabgodon mac Ioruaith; and he was in the wise – he had a good and fitting wife, Bebid, daughter of Dornglan […]' (MacSweeney, 1904, p. 71).

Deolann, which should probably be emended to Dréolainn (Robinson, 1908, p. 102), is found in various Irish stories (Hyde, 1899, p. 179), most notably in the popular narrative *Eachtra cloinne rígh na h-Ioruaidhe* ('Adventures of the Children of the King of Norway'); one of the king's sons, Buinné Rough-strong, chances upon the agonising king of Dreolainn during his mission to Asia:

> '[Buinné Rough-strong came] upon a great valiant champion with his breast against a great rock of stone, and he was full of wounds and gashes and his blood was leaving him. Buinné Rough-strong saluted him, and that valorous hero answered […]: "Dréolainn is the country in which you are and I myself was the king of it"' (Hyde, 1899, p. 179).

Lochlann is a renowned place name in medieval Irish narratives. In the earliest texts, it is generally associated with Norway (Downham, 2011, p. 190). In later Irish tales, it coincides with '[…] any of the Viking territories and could readily be translated as "Denmark"' (Byrne, 2014, p. 297). Finally, in the late Middle Ages, the term's meaning extended to all of Scandinavia (Downham, 2011, p. 190). Significantly, inserting references to Lochlann seems to have been a trend in medieval Irish translations of continental European works, further suggesting a direct intervention on behalf of Mac an Leagha. To begin with, in the Irish translation of the Latin *Pseudo-Turpin Chronicle*, the title 'Othgherus ri Lochlann' (Ogier, King of Lochlann) replaces the original 'Ogerius rex Daciae'. Moreover, the Irish version of the Middle English romance *Octavian* features one 'Denis, King of Lochlann', a unique character who appears in no other text from Ireland or elsewhere (Byrne, 2014, p. 297).[26]

[25] The Middle English does not mention the origin of the knights, but only comments on their number: once Guy and his comrades arrive to the tournament, they saw 'mani a knight […] cominde' (many knights coming) (Zupitza, 1883, l. 854, p. 48).

[26] The various meanings of the placename Lochlann in literary contexts are discussed in MacCana P. (1962) 'The influence of the Vikings on Gaelic Literature', in O Cuív B. [ed.] (1962) *Proceedings of the International Congress of Celtic Studies*, *Dublin 6-10 July 1959*, pp. 78-118. Baile Átha Cliath: Institiúid Ard-Léinn Bhaile Átha Cliath; Ní Mhaonaigh M., 'Literary Lochlann', in McLeod W., Fraser J.E., and Gunderloch A.[eds] (2006), *Cànan & Cuitar/ Language and Culture*, in *Rannsachadhna Gàidhlig 3*, pp. 25-37. Edinburgh: Edinburgh

Last, when relating the fight between Roighnebron and the king holding Earl Aimstir Amundae as a prisoner, Chapter 45 takes a direct distance from the Middle English version. The Auchinleck poet depicts the king as a 'knight […] of fayri' ('magical/elvish king') (Zupitza, 1883, stanza 85, l. 10, p. 659), whereas the Irish translation presents him as 'the King of the Sídh' (Robinson, 1908, p. 170). This specification confers a sharp Gaelic dimension to this character as the Síde (from: 'síd, síth', literally meaning 'mound, otherworldly hill') was an essential component of the native literary imagery: it was the place where Irish learned tradition placed the otherworld.[27] As Gantz specifies:

> The location of the otherworld – which should not be confused with the Classical underworld- is uncertain: sometimes it is to the west, over the sea; sometimes it is in the south-west of Ireland (where it may be called the 'House of Dond', Dond being a chthonic deity); but usually it is found in the great pre-Celtic burial mounds of the Síde, of which the most important in the tales is Brúig na Bóinde, today's New Grange. […] The Síde is, not surprisingly, a stylised, idealised version of the real […] [world]: everyone is beautiful, and there is an abundance of beautiful things, and the joys of life are endless – hunting, feasting, carousing, perhaps even love.
> (1981, p. 15)

The Gaelicisation of common names is possibly most effectively exemplified by a detail in Chapter 1; among Guy's military abilities is the fact that '[…] he defeated the men utterly at every kind of feat'. Significantly, the meaning of 'feat' is conveyed by the word 'lamach', whose proper meaning is 'hurling' (Robinson, 1908, p. 98). Once more, this choice seems to be aimed at naturalising foreign material. More straightforwardly, this is suggested by the fact that 'lamach' created a direct link with an activity attested as part of the Irish culture from as early as the thirteenth century. More obliquely, the preference for 'lamach' over other equivalents was not new in the history of Irish translation literature; for instance, the phrase 'láich lais', meaning 'the hero's hurling', is used to refer to the military acts of Achilles in *Togail Troí* (Stokes, 1881, l. 2036) and of Aeneas in *Imtheachta Æniasa* (Calder, 1907, l. 754). In conclusion, it seems that Uilliam Mac an Leagha made a considerable effort to facilitate the relocation of *Guy of Warwick* into the Gaelic system of references. This way, he would have secured his audience's appreciation and understanding of the text.

University Press; Christiansen R. Th. (1931) *The Vikings and the Viking Wars in Irish and Gaelic Tradition*. Oslo: I Kommisjon hos J. Dybwad.

[27] Paraphrasing Gantz, the people of the Síde are shadows, who do not have physical strength for fighting and whose distinguishing trait is their power of transforming themselves (and others) into birds and animals (1981, p. 15). For further discussion on the nature of the Síde see Gantz, J. (1981) Early Irish Myths and Sagas. London: Penguin Books.

I would posit that another facet distinguishing *Beathadh Sir Gui o Bharbhuic* from its Middle English version is the stylistic treatment of the 'watchman device', a technique employed in classical and medieval European and extra-European literature. Before comparing the realisation of this widespread device in the source and target text, it is necessary to present its main features. In its conventional form, the 'watchman device' consists of a *watcher* describing what they see to a second person, the *interpreter*, who explains the *watcher*'s vision. Most commonly, the vision features an approaching enemy from whom the *watcher* and the *interpreter* need to defend themselves (O'Connor, 2014, pp. 173-174).

Such a configuration was subject to a significant degree of flexibility and variation, depending on the tradition where this narrative technique was used. In the Irish tradition, the 'watchman device' was given an exceptionally elaborate and descriptive nature and was frequently featured in Middle Irish sagas. In the saga corpus, the 'watchman device' tends to exhibit a delineated bipartite structure. The first half consists of what Sims-Williams (1977, pp. 95-133) has called the 'erroneous' or 'riddling' section: a watcher describes a set of natural features like mist or lightning which are later correctly identified as properties of an invading host, such as the warriors' breath or their flashing eyes. The second half is more realistic: a messenger describes individual warriors and troops in a more conventional, mimetic manner (O'Connor, 2014, pp. 173-174).

Beathadh Sir Gui o Bharbhuic's way of developing the 'watchman device' testifies to a stylistic adaptation process. On the one hand, the instances where *Guy of Warwick* employed this narrative technique were generally retained. On the other, the Middle English passages underwent expressive accommodation. A representative case in point is the scene where the Lombards and the Duke of Louvain come to fight against Guy, who is protecting Earl Aimbri:

Middle English

> An arnmorwe aros sir Gij, / & clethed to him his compeynie. / Bifor therl þan þai ferden, / & a gret crie pai herden, / Of þe barouns of the cite. / Anon oxed Gij the fre / Of þat noise what it was. / A squier told him al þat cas: / the douke steward Loyer / For present he comeþ to iusti here / Ghif he finde wiþ whom to do, / that ani knight durst cum him to.
> (Zupitza, 1883, l. 5045-5057, p. 288)
>
> (In the morning, Sir Guy woke up and convocated his retinue. They were riding in front of the earl, and they heard a great cry from the barons of the city. Guy

immediately asked what the reason for that noise was, and a squire said that duke Loyer's steward was coming to that place to find a knight to duel with)[28]

Early Modern Irish

Iarna clos-sin don iarla 7 da muindtir doronsad anoir do Sir Gyi. Is ann-sin docualadur gair 7 greadan 7 eidhme amluatha, etréna ar fud na-cathrach co comcoitcenn. 7 Rofhiarfaigh Sir Gyi fochuin na n-eidhme-sin, 7 adbert aroile fris gurb iad sluagha seghmura, sircalma na Lobeine 7 laechrad linmur, lanarrachta na Lumbairdi tanic do gabail cathrach na Gormisi.
(Robinson, 1908, p. 59)

(When the earl and his company heard that, they paid honor to Sir Guy. Then they heard a shout and a clamor and cries of distress and helplessness throughout the whole length of the city. And Sir Guy asked the cause of those shouts, and somebody told him that it was the crafty, bold hosts of Louvain, and the numerous, brave warriors of Lombardy, who had come to capture the city of Gormisi) (Robinson, 1908, p. 138)

Both versions feature the 'watchman device' identifying elements: a *watcher* perceives something, and an *interpreter* expounds it. However, the Irish version distinguishes itself from the Middle English version by substituting the synthetic expression 'a gret crie' ('a great cry') with a sequence of nominal synonyms ('a shout and a clamor and cries of distress and helplessness').

This expansion is likely to have been introduced by Uilliam Mac an Leagha, as it is connected with native techniques. As stated previously, the use of synonymic sequences was typical of late-medieval Irish prose (Robinson, 1908, p. 11). Furthermore, the employment of synonymic accumulation in the 'riddling' section of the 'watchman device' was not a first in the Irish literary tradition. For instance, in Recension II of the *Táin*, Mac Roth's perception of the arrival of the Ulster warriors is depicted as such:

Tánic Mac Roth reime d'fharcsi maigi mórfharsing Mide. Nírbo chían do Mac Roth dá mbáe and co cúala inní, in fúaim 7 in fothrom, in sestán 7 in sésilbi
(O' Connor, 2014, pp. 174-175)

(Mac Roth came forward to reconnoitre the great plain of Meath. Not long was he there when he heard a noise and a tumult and a clamour)
(O' Connor, 2014, pp. 174-175)

[28] Unless otherwise stated, the translations of Middle English/Old French passages in this chapter are mine.

The reason why Uilliam Mac an Leagha decided to adopt native expressive techniques in the 'watchman device' probably lies in his attempt to meet the expectations of his audience and facilitate the integration of *Beathadh Sir Gui o Bharbhuic* into the native corpus of translation literature.

5.2 Modifications of the narrative approach

The Irish adaptation distinguishes itself from its source owing to its narrative approach. On a macroscopic level, the distance is created by a more limited extent of the narrator's omniscience and by a more detached stance towards the story. On a microscopic level, the divergence is due to an increased religious tone and the insertion of realistic details.

Poppe notes that the narrator's omniscience in medieval Irish romance translations '[…] appears somewhat less explicit than in the Middle English texts' (Poppe, 2005, p. 213). In *Guy of Warwick,* the narrator can access the characters' thoughts and emotions, while in the Irish version, he does not appear to hold this knowledge. As one might expect, this difference is more evident in psychologically challenging scenes, where the characters have to face important decisions: the English narrator's knowledge of the protagonists' inner flows of thoughts is not in the least matched in the Irish adaptation.

A valid case in point is the passage where Guy decides to leave Felice and embark on a pilgrimage of atonement.

(I) Guy leaves Felice to start his pilgrimage:

Middle English

> To a turet Sir Gii is went / And biheld that firmament / That thicke with steres stode, / On Jhesu omnipotent / That alle his honour hadde him lent / He thought with dreri mode, / Hou he hadde ever ben strong werrour, / For Jhesu love, our Saveour, / Never no dede he gode. / Mani man he hadde slayn with wrong; / 'Allas, allas!' it was his song, / For sorwe he yede ner wode. / […] // Than com Feliis sone anon / & herd him make rewely mon / Wiþ sorwe & care among. / 'Leman', 'sche seyd, 'what is þi thought? / […] [Guy said:] 'For his loue ichil now wende / Barfot to mi liues ende, / Mine sinnes for to bete'.
> (Zupitza, 1883, stanza 21, l. 1-12, p. 400; stanza 23, l. 4-7, p. 400; stanza 26, l. 3-6, p. 402)
>
> (Sir Guy went on a turret and looked at the starry firmament: he was overwhelmed by the daunting thought that he had been a strong warrior, but he had never done anything good for the love of Jesus our Saviour, the Almighty, who had given him so much honour and success. When he was struck by the

thought that he had wickedly killed many men, he started crying, ‘Alas, Alas!’ and he was so sorrowful that he wanted to die. Soon after, Felice came and heard him weeping with great despair. ‘Lover’, she said, ‘what is in your thought?’. […] [Guy said:] ‘For his love I will now walk as a pilgrim until the end of my life, to atone for my sins’)

Early Modern Irish

Iar coimlinad da fichet la do Sir Gyi a farradh a bancheile, robui in aroile aidhchi 7 ingen an iarla, 7 a n-ucht ar fuindeoig an t-sheomra, 7 adubairt Sir Gyi: […] ‘A Fheilis’, ar-sé. ‘ni lia relta doci tu sa firmamint na duine torchair lem-sa ar do gradh-sa; 7 da mad do grad Dia dodenuind sin dobeth se buidech dim; 7 dogen foghnadh do Dia festa’.
(Robinson, 1908, p. 76)

([...] One night [Guy was in the chamber with] the daughter of the earl, and Guy said: ‘Felice, [...] not more numerous are the stars in the firmament than the men who have fallen at my hands because of my love for thee; and if it had been for the love of God that I had done it, He would be satisfied with me; and now I will do service unto God. [...] I will go to traverse the land that my Lord Jesus traversed’)
(Robinson, 1908, p. 153)

There is a noticeable gap between the English narrator’s omniscience and that of the Irish narrator. The former is immersed in Guy’s mind: he exposes the hero’s regrets about his past and anxieties about his future. After the narrator has anticipated the character’s ideas to the audience, he lets him confirm them in a conversation with his wife. By contrast, the Irish narrator does not seem to be aware of Guy’s feelings, as he does not mention Guy’s state of weariness. Instead, he immediately opens a verbal exchange between Guy and Felice, where the hero confesses the reasons for his unease and the solution he intends to adopt. The English narrator knows what Guy ‘thinks’ (‘bethoughte’), and the Irish can only access what Guy ‘says’ (‘adubairt’).

It is hard to believe that the move from an omniscient to an external narrator was already part of the exemplar; on the contrary, it seems to have been introduced by the translator. To begin with, this modification appears as one of the translator’s trends; throughout the story, the narrator keeps delegating the release of new narrative information to the characters themselves. There is only one instance where he shows a minimal degree of omniscience: while presenting Felice’s despair after Guy’s departure, he says that ‘she took Sir Guy’s sword, and she would gladly have driven it through herself’ (Robinson, 1908, p. 154). Moreover, the preference for

an external narrator was part of Irish narrative techniques, applied to both native literature and translated texts from the 'first phase' of translation; the narrator's information was transferred to the characters, giving the illusion that they were acting and speaking for themselves (Poppe, 2004, p. 84; Poppe, 2005, p. 213).

The predilection for non-omniscience can also be witnessed in the Middle Irish saga *Togail Bruidne Dá Derga*, where the largest share of narrative information is conveyed through prophecies and omens made by the characters. In this saga, the role of auguries frequently limits the narrator's activity; he has little to add to events that predictions have almost entirely covered. Significantly, most of the events occurring in the central scene of the 'destruction' ('togail') of the hostel are anticipated by prophecies. Consequently, the narrator exhausts this section in a few paragraphs (O'Connor, 2013, pp. 129-130). Owing to its reiteration and closeness to the native literary tradition, the shift towards a lesser degree of omniscience seems to have been part of Uilliam Mac an Leagha's acculturation strategy.

Another tendency characterising the narrative approach of late-medieval Irish romance translations is the passage from an emphatic to an unemotional representation of the events (Poppe, 2005, p. 213). Intuitively enough, this divergence emerges in episodes with an inherent strong dramatic charge; an illustrative example could be the description of Felice's despair after Guy leaves her to embark on his pilgrimage.

Middle English

> The levedy bileft at hom in care / With sorwe and wo and sikeing sare; / Wel drery was hir mode. / 'Allas, allas,' it was hir song, / Hir here sche drough, hir hond sche wrong, / Hir fingres brast o blode. / Al that night til it was day / Hir song it was, 'wayleway,' / For sorwe sche yede ner wode. // Hir lordes swerd sche drough biforn /And thought have slain hirself for sorn / Withouten more delay. / To sle hirselven er the child wer born / Sche thought hir soule it wer forlorn / Evermore at Domesday, / And that hir fader hir frendes ichon /Schuld seyn hir lord it hadde ydon / And were so fled oway. / Therfore sche dede his swerd ogain / Elles for sorwe sche hadde hir slain / In gest as Y you say. / Arliche amorwe when it was day / To chaumber ther hir fader lay / Sche com wringand hir hond. […] / For sorwe that sche hadde that stounde / Aswon sche fel adoun to grounde, / O fot no might sche stonde.
> (Zupitza, 1883, stanza 34, l. 4-12, p. 408; stanza 35, l. 1-12, p. 408; stanza 36, l. 1-3; l. 10-13, p. 410)
>
> (Guy left his lady at home in great despair, sorrow, pain, and terrible lovesickness; she was deeply distraught. She kept crying 'Alas, Alas!', she tore her hair and harmed her hand so severely that her fingers became covered in blood. For the entire night, until it was morning, she continued screaming 'wayleway!' and was so hurt that she did not

want to live anymore. She took her lord's sword and considered killing herself to end the pain without delay. However, she thought that, by slaying herself and the child in her womb, especially on a Sunday, she would have forfeited her soul, and she felt that her father and each of her friends would have assumed that her lord had killed her and ran away. Therefore, she discarded his sword, with which, as the story says, she would have wanted to kill herself for sorrow. Early the next morning, she went to her father's chamber [and told him that Guy had left]. Because of the pain she was feeling at that time, she fell to the ground in a swoon, as she could not stand on her feet anymore)

Early Modern Irish

Dála ingine in iarla iar n-imthecht do Sir Gyi uaithi, dobi tri la 7 tri haidhci ina seomra gan biadh gan colladh, 7 tug si cloidemh Sir Gyi cuicci, 7 rob ail a ligen trithi budhein. 7 Adubairt: 'Domuirbhfinn me fein', ar-si, 'acht muna beth a uaman orum co n-aibeorthaigh comad e Sir Gyi domuirbfed me'. 7 Docuaidh iar-sin mur a roibhi a hathair, 7 roindis do Gyi do imthecht. Adubairt in t-iarla: 'Is dod derbadh-sa dorinde se sin'. 'Ni hedh co deimin', ar Felis, '7 ni feiceab-sa co brach è'. Dála in iarla iar clos na scel-sin do, dothoit se a n-anmainne.
(Robinson, 1908, p. 77)

(As for the earl's daughter, after Sir Guy had left her, she was three days and three nights in her chamber without food or sleep; and she took Sir Guy's sword, and she would gladly have driven it through herself. And she said: 'I would kill myself', said she, 'but that I fear it would be said that Sir Guy killed me'. And she went to her father after that and told him that Guy had departed. The earl said: 'It is to test thee he has done that'. 'Not so indeed', said Felice, 'and I shall never see him again'. As for the earl, after he had heard this news, he fell down in a swoon)
(Robinson, 1908, p. 154)

These passages illustrate the different extent of emotional involvement in the narrative. The Middle English version enhances Felice's sorrow by reporting her laments (the interjections 'Alas, Alas!' and 'Wayleway'); further, Felice is said to have had a psychosomatic reaction as she fainted in front of her father out of despair. Instead, the Irish narrator limits himself to reporting her actions and lets her express her feelings in short statements, which bear a cold and rational tone; moreover, this version does not mention Felice's falling into a swoon. As such, the English emotion-oriented account becomes event-oriented in the Irish.

I would propose that this divergence was created by Uilliam Mac an Leagha instead of being carried by an English intermediary. First, the preference for a detached account is reiterated in another dramatic scene, that of the killing of Guy's beloved lion and its death in front of its master.

Middle English

When Gij wold his way he nam, / Vnto his in þat he cam. / Þe lyoun no folwed him nought, / In an erber he slepe wel soft. / Than was þe steward goinde, / Into an orchard alon cominde. / Vnder a windowe he him seye / Wher pe lyoun lay wel neye, / For to resten him in a wro. / 'Bi god,' quaþ þe steward þo, / 'The lyoun lith here now slepeing.' / Seyd Morgadour in his thought þenking. / A scharpe wepen þer forth he drough, / & þe lyoun þer wip he slough. / De lyoun afrayd up stert, / As he þat was to deth y hert. / Ac a maiden þat y seye / & grad to the steward an heye: / 'Sir stewaru, þat was inel y smite. / In vnworpschip it worþ þe atwite'./ The lyoun him goth forþ groning, / His guttes after him draweing. / To Gyes in he is y go, / In a chaumber he fond him þo: / At his fete he fel doun in þat stede, / To hauen of him socour at nede. / His hondes he gan to licky: / Dat was his loue, sikerly. / When Gij þat lyoun wounded seth, / For sorwe him þought his hert clef. / 'O lord,' he seyd, 'God almight, / Who haþ þe so iuel y dight? / þat mi lyoun hath y slawe me, / Y nold it wer don for this cite, / No þat þer to bilonge. / So michel sorwe me hath afong.' / In swiche wretthe & grame anough. / His gode swerd wiþ strengþe he drough; / Setthen on his stede he wond, / His swerd y drawe in his hond: / To the court he com prikeing. / Wele hij seyen bi his lokeing / that hy is sori & swithe wroth / Alle oghaines him þai goth.
(Zupitza, 1883, l. 4309-4352, p. 246)

(When Guy went on his way, the lion did not follow him but went sleeping smoothly in a garden. Then the steward entered the garden and saw the lion under a window, where the animal was lying in a corner. Morgadour thought aloud: 'By God,' said the steward then, 'The lion is asleep'. He grabbed a sharp weapon and hit the lion with it; the lion, scared, rose abruptly as though he had been hurt to death. A maiden saw the entire scene and shouted to the steward: 'Sir steward, that was a terribly evil action, and it will cause you great dishonour'. The lion, moaning and dragging its own entrails, searched for Guy, and found him in a chamber: it fell at his feet to seek help. It began to lick his hands out of its true love for Guy. When Guy realised that the lion was severely wounded, he was so hurt that he felt his heart crumble. 'O lord', he said, 'God Almighty, who has done such an evil action? Who has injured me by killing my lion? Whoever was, caused me unmeasurable sorrow. In such wrath and rage, he mounted on his valuable steed, with his sword in his hand, and he rode to court: everyone, just by looking at him, could tell that he was deeply sad and desperate)

Early Modern Irish

Aroile lá dia roibhi Sir Gyi a caithem a coda ar bord inn imperi, robui an leoghan an lá-sin fo bun croinn ina colladh isinn erber, 7 a tarr a n-airrdi re grein, 7 roconuic sdibard in imperi mur sin é, 7 tug sathadh sanntach sleghi isin leoghan, 7 docuir trit hi, 7 roleig a abac 7 a inathar re cosuibh. Eosgrech 7 rosgairt in leoghan co lanmór,

> 7 docuaidh mur a roib Sir Gyi 7 rocrom fona cosuibh, 7 a inathar amuigh, 7 dothoit iamm, 7 torcair marbh gan anmain. Dála Sir Gyi iar-sin, rogabh a sdét, 7 docuaidh uirre, 7 roglac a cloidem, 7 docuaidhi in t-imper, 7 fochtuis do chach a coitcinne cia romarbh a leoghan, 7 ni fnair a fhis ag aennech. Dála Sir Gyi, adubairt gidhbe ró-innosudh dinté romarbh an leoghan co tiubhrad a luagh dó .i. mili pnnt d'ór alainn, aithlegta, 7 ni fuair a fhis ann.
> (Robinson 1908, p. 54)
>
> (One day when Sir Guy was eating his meal at the emperor's table, the lion was asleep in the arbor that day at the foot of a tree, and its tail up towards the sun, and the emperor's steward saw it lying thus, and gave the lion a mighty thrust with his spear, and pierced it, and let out its vitals and its entrails at its feet. The lion howled, roared loudly, went to Sir Guy, and crouched at his feet, and its vitals outside of it, and it fell down thereupon and dropped dead, without life. As for Sir Guy, then, he took his steed, and mounted it, and seized his sword, and went [to] the emperor; and he asked everyone who had killed his lion, and he did not find out from anyone. As for Sir Guy, he said that if anyone would tell him who killed the lion he would give him his reward, a thousand pounds of beautiful, refined gold; and he did not find it out then)
> (Robinson 1908, p. 133)

The degree of emotional involvement is notably different in the excerpts. The Middle English account emphasises the dramatic charge of the event by reporting Guy's rage and sorrow outbursts and his invocations to God; the reader can sense Guy's pain as he sees his dear animal die. The Irish text, instead, reports all the facts leading to the lion's death more objectively; the lion's interactions with Guy are drastically reduced, and Guy's despair or anger are not mentioned. After the animal's violent death, Guy goes to court to find out who killed his lion and get revenge on it, but, unlike in the English version, he is not represented as 'sori and swithe'.

Moreover, it might be posited that the probability of the Irish translator's contribution is supported by parallels with the Irish corpus of translation literature. More specifically, a connection emerges between the representations of Felice's reaction to Guy's departure and Dido's response to Aeneas's parting in the Middle Irish Classical saga *Imtheachta Æniasa*.

<u>Latin</u>

> Reminders, sweet while fate and the god allowed it, / accept this soul, and loose me from my sorrows. / I have lived, and I have completed the course that Fortune granted, / and now my noble spirit will pass beneath the earth. / I have built a bright city: I have seen its battlements, / avenging a husband I have exacted punishment / on a hostile brother, happy, ah, happy indeed / if Trojan keels had never touched my shores!" / She

spoke, and buried her face in the couch. / "I shall die un-avenged, but let me die," she cried. / "So, so I joy in travelling into the shadows. / Let the cruel Trojan's eyes drink in this fire, on the deep, / and bear with him the evil omen of my death.
(Kline, 2014, l. 651-664)

Middle Irish

When Dido had uttered all these words, she went into the sleeping-chamber she used to sleep in along with Aeneas, and she went into the bed in which they used to be, and she lifted up the bed, and shed tears, and bared the sword that was in her hand, and fell upon it, and killed herself, for without Aeneas she preferred her death to her life.
(Calder, 1907, p. 59)

If Virgil's Aeneid devotes considerable space to describing the woman's feelings and unbearable pain, the Irish adaptation substitutes the attention for emotions to that for events. Hence, it seems that by representing Felice's reactions in a detached and objective way, Uilliam Mac an Leagha was also emulating trends established during the 'first phase' of translation; in this manner, he would have ensured the adaptation's integration into the corpus of translation literature.

The narrative approach of *Beathadh Sir Gui o Bharbhuic* is also distinguished by an increased religious tone (Richmond, 2021, pp. 250-252). The pious tenor of the adaptation is primarily realised by the insertion of additional religious references; two such incorporations occur in the Irish realisation of Guy's love declaration to Felice (Richmond, 2021, p. 250) and, I suppose, in the preparation for Guy's combat against Amoront.

(I) Guy's love declaration:

Middle English

'Felice the feir, merci! / For godes loue & our leuedi, / that y þe no finde mi dedliche fo, / For godes loue herken me to! / No longer hele y nille, / Al that sothe tellen y wille. / thou art the thing that y most gherne, / Fro the no may mine hert terne; / Opon al oþer y loue þe, / Y no may it lete ded to be. / Vnder heuen no thing nis, / Noither gode no qued y-wis, / that y for þe don yl nolde, / To lete þat liif don y wolde. / thou art mi liif, mi ded y-wis, / Withouten the haue y no blis; / Y loue þe and tow nought me, / Y dye for þe love of þe. / Bot thou haue merci on me, / For sorwe ichil me self sle, / For wistestow þe heuinisse, / He sorwe and the sorinisse, / That me is on night and day / (Bi trewe loue siggen ich it may) / & tow it might with eyghen se, / Thou wost haue merci on me.'
(Zupitza, 1883, l. 347-376, p. 20, 22)

(‘Felice the beautiful, have mercy! For the love of God and Mary, do not treat me as an enemy and, for the love of God, listen to me! I do not want to hide the truth any longer, but I want to tell it to you: you are what I desire the most; my heart cannot separate from you; I love you more than any other lady, and I cannot cease my love for you. There is nothing on this earth, either good or evil that I would not do for you; I would do [everything] to bring our love to life. You are my life and death, and I cannot be happy without you. I love you, and you do not love me, but I would still die for my love for you. Have mercy on me now, for my pain is about to kill me, for the sorrow, grief, pain, and sufferance that I feel night and day / (Caused by my pure love for you, I dare to say) / and [if] you might see it with your own eyes, you would be willing to have mercy on me’)

Early Modern Irish

7 Docuaidh Gyi a cinn na ree-sin mur a roibhi Feilis co fíraibeil, 7 doroine umla 7 anoir di. 7 Adubairt: ‘A maighden milla, malachdubh, 7 a ainner aluind, ilcrothach’, ar-sé, ‘tabur furtacht co firaibheil form a n-anoir na trinoidi co tairisi, uair ni fheduim rún na riaghail ar mo ghalur budesta. Uair ata a lan am curp 7 am com dot sherc-si 7 dot sirgradh ar adhnudh 7 ar fhadudh, 7 ni ba buan mo beth gan bas 7 gan bithég, muna fagar cuman mo gradha uaíd-si, a rigan uasal’, ar-se.
(Robinson, 1908, p. 18)

(Guy went directly to Felice, and paid her respect and honour, and said: ‘O gentle maiden of the black eyebrows, and O fair damsel of many beauties’, said he, ‘grant me help full truly and faithfully in honour of the Trinity, for I know no secret or rule to cure my sickness now’)
(Robinson, 1908, p. 99)

As the passages show, the Middle English version presents Guy’s suit predominantly secularly, without appealing to religious motives. By contrast, in the Irish text, Guy asks Felice to love him and heal him from his love sickness ‘truly and faithfully in honour of the Trinity’ (Robinson, 1908, p. 99), thus clothing his secular love for the maiden with a religious dress.

(II) Preparation for Guy’s combat against Amoront:

Early Modern Irish

Roathaigh Craidhamar na dee do nertugudh le Gyi .i. Mathgamain 7 Terragont. ‘Diultaim-si doibh-sin’, ar Gyi, ‘7 iaraim furtacht aran mac dorug in ogh nemheiUnigthi, 7 rofiiiaing pais arson in cinid daena’
(Robinson, 1908, p. 80)

(Craidhamar [the king of Alexandria] prayed the gods, Mahoun and Termagant, to give Guy strength [in his imminent fight against Amoront]. 'I deny them', said Guy, 'and I pray for aid from the Son whom the immaculate Virgin bore, and who endured the passion for the race of men')
(Robinson, 1908, p. 128)

The religious exchange between the king of Alexandria and Guy, absent in the Middle English version, introduces more religious references – Christian and Islamic – In the adaptation.

The increased religiousness of *Beathadh Sir Gui o Bharbhuic*'s style is also created by the expansion of the religious invocations present in *Guy of Warwick*, as Richmond notes:

> Prayers for aid and of thanksgiving occur frequently in medieval romances and are a familiar part of Guy's legend; the Irish *Life* differs because it adds explanations and exhortations that usually appear in manuals of religious instruction.
> (Richmond, 2021, p. 250)

Such expansions can be found at different points in the narrative; building on Richmond's observation, I will discuss an example of a prayer for aid and one for thanksgiving, respectively.

(I) Prayer for aid: before fighting with Colbrond / Colbron, Guy asks for God's help:

Middle English

> When he com to be plas / Der þe batayl loked was, / Gij light with-outen delay, / & fel on knes doun in þat stede, / & to god he bad his bede, / He schuld ben his help þat day. / 'Lord', seyd Gij, 'þat rered Lazeroun, / & for man þoled passioun, / & on the rode gan blede, / that saued Sussan fram þe feloun, / & halp Daniel fram þe lyoun / To-day wisse me and rede / Astow art mighti heuen king, / To-day graunt me thi blisseing, / & help me at this need. / &, leuedi Mari ful of might, / To-day saue Inglondes / & leue me wele to spede'.
> (Zupitza, 1883, stanza 251, l. 9-12, p. 592; stanza 252, l. 1-12, p. 592)
>
> (When he came to the place of the battle, Guy immediately dismounted and kneeled to pray for God's help. 'Lord', said Guy, 'who resurrected Lazarus, endured the Passion for humankind and died on the cross, saved Susan from the false blame, and helped Daniel in his fight with the lion, illuminate and guide me today, since you are the powerful king of heaven, grant me your blessing today, and help me in this occasion. O lady Mary full of grace, today save England and help me succeed')

Early Modern Irish

> 7 Docuaidh roime co lathair in comhruicc, 7 rotuirrling ann, 7 roleig ara g[l]uinibh é, 7 roaigh Dia co duthrachtach, 7 adubairt: 'A Tigema', ar-sé, 'mata in coir agum, saer on guasacht-so me le da mirbuilibh mora fein, mur doshérais Enóg bás, 7 Isác on cloidem, 7 losebh on prisun, 7 pupul Maisi on Eigipte, 7 Duid Golias, 7 Subhsanna on cair breíge, 7 Dainial log na leogan, 7 Abacú on gorta, 7 Lasurus bas, 7 lonas a broinn in mil moir, sser misi, a Tigema, le da trocuire moir fein mur-sin'. (Robinson, 1908, p. 89)
>
> (And he proceeded to the place of the battle, and dismounted there, and fell upon his knees, and prayed God fervently, and said: 'O Lord', said he, 'if the right is on my side, save me from this danger with thy great miracles, as thou didst save Enoch from death, and Isaac from the sword, and Joseph from prison, and the people of Moses from Egypt, and David from Golias, and Susanna from the false blame, and Daniel from the lions' den, and Habakkuk from hunger, and Lazarus from death, and Jonah from the belly of the big fish, save me, O Lord, in the same way by thy great mercy, *et cetera*')
> (Robinson, 1908, p. 164)

As Robinson notes, in the Irish version, the list of Biblical episodes is considerably longer than in the Middle English version, which only refers to Lazarus, Susan, and Daniel (1908, p. 165).

(II) Thanksgiving prayer: After defeating the Saracens in Constantinople, Guy encourages his men to give thanks to God:

Middle English

> 'Lordinges', he seyd, 'God y thonked be! / Feir we, þat þe Sarrazins ben ouercome. / Wende we to be cite atte frome.'
> (Zupitza, 1883, l. 3719-3722, p. 214)
>
> ('O Lords,' said Guy, 'give thanks to God! He helped us to win the Saracens. Let us now return to the city')

Early Modern Irish

> Doraidh Sir Gyi: 'A ridiri uaisli, amhantracha, tabraidh anoir 7 uaisli don aendia docum nemh 7 talwaiw, 7 dorinde na duile do neimfni, uair is é berus buaid dibh isna cathaib 7 isna comlannaibh minca ina mithi, aningh oraib'.
> (Robinson, 1908, 49-50)
>
> (Sir Guy said: 'Noble and adventurous knights, honor and magnify the God who formed heaven and earth, and made the creatures out of nothing, for it is He who

> brings you victory in the battles and the many conflicts in which ye are, and it is good help He has given you today')
> (Robinson, 1908, p. 129)

The Irish version considerably expands the prayer: together with proposing Christian dogmas from Genesis, it reminds the warriors that they owe their success to God.

There are reasonable grounds to believe that the integration of extra or expanded religious references was operated by the Irish translator. To begin with, the consistency of this tendency suggests that it was part of Uilliam Mac an Leagha's plan. Moreover, while admitting that religious references were widespread in secular *romance* narratives (Richmond, 2021, p. 250), I would suggest that their accuracy and exhaustiveness in the adaptation make a strong case for the translator's effort. The highly religious character of Mac an Leagha's scribal experience (Byrne, 2016a, p. 292) gave him the ability and, perhaps, the predilection to compose prayers with 'explanations and exhortations that usually appear in manuals of religious instruction' (Richmond, 2021, p. 250).

It could be claimed that the reasons which led the translator to employ a religious style could be reduced to three. A first cause might have been the intent to pursue the instructions of the 'chivalric revival', which fundamentally promoted a doctrinal and instructional rewriting of secular *romance* narratives (Wiggins, 2007, p. 78); Guy's earthly love for Felice is presented as an honour to the Trinity, and his fight against the giant Amoront becomes an occasion to profess his faith. A second reason could be the influence of the monastic production context of Irish romance translations: the vital role played by monastic orders, especially the Franciscans (Byrne, 2019a, p. 7), might have created the need to give a religious, clerical look to narratives which were substantially secular in nature. Finally, the augmented religiosity of *Beathadh Sir Gui o Bharbhuic*'s style might lie in the religious character of Uilliam Mac an Leagha's translator 'signature', partially influenced by his activity in the religious domain.

One last element distinguishing the Irish narrative approach from the Middle English one is its search for realism (Richmond, 2021, pp. 251-252). This trait is primarily visible in additional specifications of time and measure absent in the English recension. Temporal details emerge in battle scenes, especially when extraordinary military feats are related (Richmond, 2021, pp. 251-252). For instance, chronological information is inserted when describing Guy's slaying of hundreds of Saracens and his fight against the Northumberland dragon:

- 'And six hundred of the Saracens fell at Guy's hands before morn of that day came, and two thousand seven hundred after mid-day' (Robinson, 1908, p. 125)

- '[…] [Sir Guy] was three hours in battle and fierce conflict with thar bold dragon' (Robinson, 1908, p. 150)'

However, time indications are given in non-military contexts as well. For instance, in contrast to the Middle English version, the adaptation specifies the time Heront and Guy took to recover from their battle wounds (Richmond, 2021, p. 252). The Middle English passage describing the recovery of Heraud does not include any temporal references but only says that the monk who assisted him realised that his wounds were not mortal and managed to heal him completely:

> A monk of þe house biheld him, / Bodi & heued & ich a lim. / Hilke monk sorgien was, / the vertu he knewe of mani a gras; / the wounde he biheld stedefastliche, / that in his body was so griseliche. / Bi the wounde he seye y-wis / that to the deth wounded he nis, / & seye þat he hym hele might; / & so he dede ful wele, y plight.
> (Zupitza, 1883, l. 1657-1666, p. 94)
>
> (An abbey monk observed his body, head, and every single limb. That monk was also a doctor; he knew the medical properties of many herbs; he looked closely at the horrible wound on his body, and he realised that he was not wounded to death, said that he could heal him, and I assure you that he managed to do so)

The Irish translation, instead, specifies that Heront was 'three months and five days […] in illness, and thereafter he was well' (Robinson, 1908, p. 110). In the same way, the duration of Guy's healing is provided only in the Irish text. The Middle English version says that Guy was cured, without including references to how much time he stayed with the monk who cured him: 'Bi the moneth ende at eue / Gij was al hole and toke his leue / From the gode ermite, he went his way / Toward Poile, also the way lay' (Zupitza, 1883, l. 1667-1668, p. 94) (Meanwhile, Guy was wholly healed as well; therefore, he took his leave from the good hermit and headed for Apulia). The Irish translation, on the contrary, specifies that he stayed '[…] twelve days with the old man for his healing, and he was whole and sound thereafter' (Robinson, 1908, p. 110).

Moreover, I would propose that the realistic nature of *Beathadh Sir Gui o Bharbhuic* is also granted by including details of measures. This tendency is most visible in battle scenes, where the death toll is always provided, frequently introduced by the sentence 'and this is the number that is remembered, namely [+ number]'. This detail is usually mixed with temporal references, creating entirely realistic accounts; two such instances can be found in Chapter 5, describing Guy's fight against the Lombard, and Chapter 19, describing his combat against the Saracens.

- '[…] and five hundred of them [knights] fell at Guy's hands before mid-day, and two hundred more fell after mid-day, and two hundred made off at full speed on their horses' (Robinson 1908, p. 106)
- 'And six hundred of the Saracens fell at Guy's hands before morn of that day came, and two thousand seven hundred after mid-day' (Robinson, 1908, p. 125)

Further, accurate measures are also specified during quasi-magical adventures, such as Roighnebron's access to the mysterious chthonic city of the king of the Sídh to rescue Aimstir Amundae. The Irish text says: '[…], and he came upon the mouth of a cave, and he went into it, and proceeded three miles under the earth; and as he left the cave a brilliant light rose in front of him, and he found a swift, strong stream, and thirty feet of depth in it […]' (Robinson, 1908, p. 102) The Middle English redaction, instead, is more generic:

> Half a mile a rod, ywisse: / the wai was therk and dim. / He rod ase faste ase a mighte: / thanne he segh more lighte / Be a water is brim. / To the water he com sone thas: / A riuer be a launde þer was; / þar he gan to lighte. / Faire hit was y growe wiþ gras: / A fairer place neuer nas / that he segh wiþ sighte (Zupitza, 1883, stanza 78, l. 8-12, p. 657; stanza 79, l. 1-6, p. 657)
>
> (He rode on a dark, obscure, and murky path for half a mile. He rode as fast as he could: then the way became a bit more illuminated, and he saw a body of water. He came close to the water, and he realised that it was a river traversing a land, which was beautiful and verdant: he had never seen such a fantastic place)

The English version just states that Reinbroun rode for half a mile in the darkness and found some water without specifying whether he was riding beneath or on the earth and without reporting the water stream's depth.

Influential factors suggest that the addition of realistic details was conducted by the Irish translator. The first clue for this lies in the reiteration of this choice throughout the narrative. Differently from the Middle English version, events are constantly placed in a chronological frame and described meticulously. The second, more substantial, indication consists in the fact that realism was an identifying aspect of Irish narrative texts (O'Connor, 2014, pp. 19-20); a case in point is represented by the description of the military encounters in *Togail Bruidne Dá Derga*, where the death count of each warrior's performance is inserted in a chronological window. [29]

[29] Such precise accounts are given in the characters' predictions throughout the description sequence. For examples, see Gantz, J. (1981) *Early Irish Myths and Sagas*, pp. 77-102. London: Penguin.

Uilliam Mac an Leagha's decision to implement the realistic tone of *Beathadh Sir Gui o Bharbhuic* was in line with the medieval Irish conception of narratives as 'historiae' (Poppe, 2007, p. 19). Through accurate descriptions, the translator gave a credible appearance to even the most extraordinary events of the tale.

Chapter VI: Content Modifications in *Beathadh Sir Gui o Bharbhuic*

Introduction

In the introduction to his edition of *Beathadh Sir Gui o Bharbhuic*, Robinson observes that the content of the Irish translation is visibly independent of the source text, to the point that '[…] there is hardly a paragraph in which there are no differences of detail' (1908, p. 6). A close study of content alterations would be particularly fruitful in that 'changes on the level of content would seem to reflect a difference in social norms and attempts to accommodate the different expectations of the new audience or the specific intentions of the redactor' (Poppe, 2005, p. 208). When trying to assess whether these modifications were introduced or merely replicated by the translator, an important *caveat* must be considered: the uncertainty around the exact source text excludes the possibility of drawing definite conclusions. However, as the present chapter hopes to show, there are substantial grounds to deem a considerable share of such variations as part of the translator's strategy. More specifically, this seems to apply to the adaptation's emphasis on piety and chivalry, and to the presence of typically Gaelic elements.

6.1 Piety in *Beathadh Sir Gui o Bharbhuic*

The content of *Beathadh Sir Gui o Bharbhuic* has been acknowledged as considerably more pious than that of *Guy of Warwick* (Robinson, 1908, p. 7; Richmond, 2021, pp. 250-252); in Robinson's words:

> Guy of Warwick was a mediaeval hero of the type of St. Alexis, and a principal feature of his story in all its forms is the desertion of his bride. All the versions, therefore, make a plea for religion and asceticism. But the Irish, as compared with the English, is particularly insistent on works of piety and charity.
> (Robinson, 1908, p. 7)

In the analysis of the source and target text, this distance surfaces at the level of characters' traits and narrative details. The enhanced piousness of the Irish protagonists is convincingly evidenced by the figures of Guy and Felice (Richmond, 2021, pp. 249-250).

(I) Introduction of Guy:

<u>Middle English</u>

> Gij of Warwike his name was, / In court non better beloued þer nas, / So he was among gret lordinges, / Litel & michel in al þinges. / Gentil he was & of michel might, / Ouer al oþer feirest bi sight: / Al þai wonderd strongliche, / For his feirhed was so miche; /

So mani godenes in him were, / Al him preysed per y-fere, / Of bordis & turnament y-wis, / Knightes to hauen & holden of pris.
(Zupitza, 1883, l. 157-168, p. 10)

(His name was Guy of Warwick: no one was more beloved at court and by noble lords. He was humble and extraordinary in everything he did, gentle and highly mighty, and so pleasing to the eye that everyone was deeply amazed by his beauty. He had many qualities, and all praised him as a valorous knight, excellent in tournaments and jousting)[30]

Early Modern Irish

Robui mac a dingmala agan sdibard-sin, Gyi a ainm-side, 7 rosháraigh na huili macu a aimsiri ar mét ar maisi ar macantacht, ar nos ar nert ar nidechus, ar uaiU ar aicnedh ar arachtus, gur ba lan na cricha co comlán 7 na cennacha comfocuiss dia clú 7 dia alludh, 7 gach inadh ina cluineadh Gyi cluithighi aonaig 7 ibhnis 7 oirechtais ar fedh 7 ar fiarlaidh crichi saeruaisli Saxan, dofreagradh iat 7 doberadh buaidh gacha buidhni co barr uil[e]. 7 Dosharuighedh lucht gacha lamaigh co lanaibeil, 7 doberedh almsa 7 othrala minca dona heglasaibh, 7 doberedh dercinna 7 dethcealta do deb[l]enaibh Dé, 7 roannlaiccedh na mairbh gan munnnr gan mainnechtnaighi, 7 doberedh fisrngudh don lucht nobidh a carcair 7 a cumgach, 7 donidh na h-uili obuir trocuire diar-mol in eglus ina aimsir, 7 robui co daingen, duthrachtach isin creidem cathoilic[d]a.
(Robinson, 1908, p. 16)

(That steward had a son worthy of himself, Guy, by name; and he surpassed all the young men of his time in size, beauty and gentleness, in courtesy, strength and prowess, in pride, spirit and courage, so that the whole country and the neighbouring provinces were full of his fame and his praise. And everywhere that Guy heard of games at fair or festival or assembly throughout the length and breadth of the free and noble English land, he entered them and won the victory of every company, surpassing all, and defeated the men utterly at every kind of feat. And he gave alms and frequent offerings to the churches, and gave gifts and clothing to God's poor, and buried the dead without murmur and without negligence, and visited the people who were in prison and in bonds, and performed all the works of mercy which the church praised in his time, and he was strong and zealous in the catholic faith)
(Robinson, 1908, p. 98)

[30] Unless otherwise stated, the translations of Middle English/Old French passages in this chapter are mine.

(II) Introduction of Felice:

Middle English

Felice fu la bele appellee: / pur sa beaute fu mult amee; / de totes beautez fu ele la flur, / tant bele ne ert a icel iour. / ki totes terres dunc serchast / yne tant bele n'il trouast: / qui tote sa beaute countereit / trop grant demorance i freit.
(Zupitza, 1883, l. 99-106, p. 8)

(The beautiful maiden's name was Felice and she was much loved for her beauty. All the beauties blossomed in her and there never was someone as pretty as her. If you searched all over the world, you would not find someone as beautiful; and no measure of time would ever be enough to describe her beauty)

Early Modern Irish

Robui ingen cmthach, caemhalnind a dingmala aigi i. Feilis a hainmsidhe, 7 ni roibhi ina haimsir ben dob ferr delbh 7 denum, modh 7 mnnudh, druine 7 dethbes, na'n ingin-sin. Docuiredh immorro ardmaigistir dia mnnnd annsna he [adhnaibh] sáera, 7 nir cian iarum disi co melladh a maigistir i ngach ealathain, co tucc in maigistir slat a muinti di budhein iama sharugudh di i ngach egna a cinn a secht mbliadhna dec dosinnrud. Co dos fon uili domhun a dethclú itir egna 7 ordan 7 einech, etir cradhbudh 7 ciunus 7 cunnlacht, itir gloine 7 gais 7 glicus, gur bo lin da serc 7 da sirgradh uaisli 7 ardmaithi na cruinne co comcoitcenn.
(Robinson, 1908, p. 16)

([The Earl] had a comely and beautiful daughter worthy of himself, Felice by name, and there was not in her time a woman who was better in form and figure, in handiwork and knowledge, in embroidery and noble manners, than that maiden. A great teacher was set to instruct her in the gentle arts, and it was not long afterwards that she surpassed her master in every art, so that the master gave her the rod of his instruction after being outstripped by her in every kind of knowledge even at the end of her seventeenth year. Her fair fame spread throughout all the world for knowledge, dignity and honor, for piety, gentleness and discretion, for purity, wisdom and prudence, until the princes and nobles of the whole earth were filled with love and longing for her)
(Robinson, 1908, p. 97)

The above excerpts noticeably emphasise different traits. On the one hand, the Middle English passages are more concerned with the characters' appearance: Guy is 'ouer al other feirest bi sight' and admired 'for his feirhed'; Felice is presented as 'la bele' and her prettiness is advocated as the main reason for the nobles' interest ('felice fu la bele appellee: / pur sa beaute fu mult amee') (Zupitza, 1883, l. 99-100, p. 8). On the other hand, the Irish counterparts insist on the protagonists' personality: along with being attractive and courteous, Guy is also pious,

prow, courageous, charitable, merciful, and faithful; as Richmond notes, Felice dedicates herself to handiwork, with the uniquely Irish reference to embroidery, and the reasons why she is admired are not limited to beauty, but include knowledge, dignity, honour, piety, gentleness, discretion, purity, wisdom, and prudence (2021, p. 248). More significantly, if no mention of the protagonists' piety is made in the Middle English source text, the Irish adaptation cares for explicitly attributing it to both; this augments and exposes the pious stance of the translation's content.

Guy and Felice's pious personality is reflected and confirmed by their behaviour in different narrative moments. The pious character of Guy, I believe, emerges when, in Cologne, he sends his men to find a hostelry, while he remains in a nearby forest:

Middle English

> Into a forest sir Gij is go / Neye a cite, nought fer þer-fro. / Þan seyd Gij to his meyney: / Wendeth swithe wel an heye, / Mine in to nim in þe cite; / Ich wil a while here pleye me. / For to here the foules singe. […] / Selcouthe it was for to here: / In priue stede stode Gij there; / So michel he herd þo foules sing, / þat him thought he was in gret longing. / So mani þinges he of þought, / that out of his rizt way him brought.
> (Zupitza, 1883, l. 4505-4511, l. 4517-4520, p. 258)
>
> (Sir Guy went into a forest near a close-by city. Then Guy said to his company: 'Go into the city; I will stay here for a while to rest and listen to the birds' song'; therefore, he remained there alone, in a hidden corner. The birds' song was so loud that it gave him a feeling of discomfort; Guy started thinking about so many things that he lost his way)

Early Modern Irish

> 7 Adubairt Sir Gyi: A Sir Heront', ar-se, ber na ridiri let 7 eirgidh sa cathraígh, 7 gab teg osta duinn; 7 anfa misi ann-so co foill ag radh m'esperta 7 ag eistecht re ceol na enlaithi.
> (Robinson, 1908, p. 25)
>
> (And Sir Guy said: 'Sir Heront', said he, 'take the knights with thee, and enter the city, and find a hostelry for us; and I will remain here a while to say my prayers and to listen to the song of the birds)
> (Robinson, 1908, p. 135)

In both versions, Guy isolates himself to listen to the birds' song in a forest. However, in the Middle English source text he meditates, whereas in the Irish translation he recites prayers: a moment of introspection becomes one of conversation with God. This variation almost

automatically increases the pious stance of Guy's character who, as a devoted Christian, dedicates himself to the practice of praying.

The pious nature of Felice markedly emerges in her reactions to two of the most dramatic events of her life: her husband's departure for a pilgrimage and his death (Richmond, 2021, p. 249).

(I) Felice's reaction to Guy's departure:

<u>Middle English</u>

> Now is Gij fram Warwike fare, / Vnto þe se he went ful ghare, / & passed ouer the flod. / the leuedy bileft at hom in care / Wiþ sorwe, & wo, & sikeing ghare: / Wel drery was hir mode. / 'Allas, allas!' it was hir song: / Hir here sche drough, hir hond sche wrong, / Hir fingres brast o blode. / Al þat night til it was day / Hir song it was 'wayleway': / For sorwe sche yede ner wode. / Hir lordes swerd sche drough biforn, / & þouzt haue slain hirself for sorn.
> (Zupitza, 1883, stanza 34, l. 1-12, p. 408)
>
> (Now Guy has left Warwick and set out to sea, abandoning his lady at home in sadness, sorrow, and pain. She was feeling terribly mournful: screaming 'Alas, Alas!', tearing her hair apart, and beating her hand so violently that her fingers became covered in blood. She never stopped crying 'Wayleway' for the entire night, and her pain was so strong that she did not want to live anymore: she took her lord's sword and considered killing herself out of sorrow)

<u>Early Modern Irish</u>

> Dála Feilisi ingin iarla Berbuic, iar n-imthecht do Sir Gyi uaithi, […] dorindedh mainistreacha 7 sepeil 7 dethoibrecha le ar anmain Gyi Berbuic.
> (Robinson, 1908, p. 82)
>
> (As for Felice, the daughter of the Earl of Warwick, after Sir Guy left her, she […] built monasteries and chapels and other good works for the soul of Guy of Warwick)
> (Robinson, 1908, p. 158)

In the aftermath of Guy's departure, the Middle English Felice is portrayed as highly sorrowful, desperate, and longing for her husband's return. In particular, after reporting her sadness, her father's, and that of Guy's comrades, the text relates Herhaud's vain search for Guy and Guy's experience as a pilgrim. The Irish text, instead, does not dedicate large space to Felice's pain but focuses on her active and pious reaction to this tragic event by mentioning that '[…] she built monasteries and chapels and other good works for the soul of Guy of Warwick' (Robinson, 1908, p. 158).

(II) Felice’s reaction to Guy’s death:

Middle English

a) Before Guy’s death:

Feliis þe countas was þer þan: / In þis warld was non better wiman, / In gest as-so we rede; / For þritten pouer men & ghete mo / For hir lordes loue sche loued so / Ich day sche gan fede, / Wiþ þan god & our leuedi / Schuld saue hir lord sir Gij, / & help him at his need.
(Zupitza, 1883, stanza 279, l. 1-9, p. 611)

(Countess Felice was there at that time, and the story goes that there was no kinder woman in the entire world: she began to daily feed more than thirteen poor men for the love of her lord so that God and Mary would protect him and help him at need)

b) After Guy’s death:

Ac thee leuedi left stille thare: / Sche nold neuer þennes fare; / Sche kidde þat sche was kende. / Sche liued no lenger, sothe to say, / Bot right on the fiftenday / Sche dyed that leuedi hende, / & was birid hir lord by; / & now thai er togider in compeynie / In ioie that neuer schal ende.
(Zupitza, 1883, stanza 297, l. 4-12, p. 624)

(But the lady remained there; she did not want to leave her husband. She did not feel alive anymore, and fifteen days after, she parted from this world and was buried next to her lord: now they rest together, in eternal joy)

Early Modern Irish

a) Before Guy’s death:

Dála Sir Gyi iarum dogluais roime co Berbuic, 7 fuair Feilis a ndorus an halla 7 da bocht dec aca ndil aici ar gradh Dia 7 ar anmain Sir Gyi Berbuic. 7 Roiar Sir Gyi derc fur in ríghain mur gach mbocht ele, 7 rofhech Feilis fair, 7 tug toil 7 gradh díchra, dófulaing don t-shenoir, 7 nir aithin é. 7 Adubairt ris: ‘Tarra lium don halla’, ar-si, ‘7 dogebuir betha aniugh agum-sa ann’. Docuaidh Sir Gyi don halla, 7 fuair anoir na righna, 7 fuair oirchisecht da meis budhein. Doraidh Feilís: ‘A muidh Dé’, ar-si, ‘atai-si anbann, 7 ní hinaistir tú budesta, 7 an agum-sa gud bethugudh ar gradh Dia 7 ar anmain Sir Gyi Berbuic’.
(Robinson, 1908, p. 90)

(As for Sir Guy then, he proceeded to Warwick and found Felice in the hall door, and twelve beggars supported by her for the love of God and the soul of Sir Guy of Warwick. And Sir Guy asked alms of the lady like all the other beggars; Felice looked at him and felt love and strong, irresistible affection for the older man, and she did not recognise him. And she said to him: ‘Come with me into the hall', said she, and thou shalt have thy sustenance there today with me’. Sir Guy went to the

hall, and he received honor at the lady's hands and a pittance from her own table. Felice said: ‘Servant of God’, said she, ‘thou art infirm, and now thou art not strong enough to travel; and do thou stay with me to be supported for the love of God and the sake of Sir Guy of Warwick’)
(Robinson, 1908, p. 166)

b) After Guy’s death:

7 Rohannlaicedh co hordamail annsa derthach-sin é an uair-sin. Dorindedh iar-sin sepel sidhamail, socharthanach ina timchill, 7 dorindedh mainister mór minalaind a timcill an t-seipeil, 7 docuredh ord craibtech cananach innti; 7 tug Feilis bethngudh don mainistir-sin co fnín an betha, 7 roordaigh deich sacairt fichet do beth ag serbis co siraidhi annsa mainistir-sin. Dála Feilisi iar-sin roullmuigh si hi fein, 7 fuair bás a cinn deich [la] fichet tareis na mainistreach-sin do crichnugudh, 7 rohannlaicedh a n-aentuma re Sir Gyi hi, iar mbreith buidhi doib demhun 7 domun, 7 atait a cuirp a bus isna talmannaibh coitcenna coleicc, 7 atait a n-anmanna ar nimh idir ainglibh.
(Robinson, 1908, p. 92)

(And [Guy] was buried with regular rites in the oratory at that time. Then a chapel, peaceful and lovely, was built around him, and a great, beautiful monastery around the chapel, and an order of religious canons was established in it; and Felice supported that monastery till the end of her life and commanded thirty priests to be constantly at service in that monastery. As for Felice, after that she made herself ready, and she died at the end of thirty days from the completion of the monastery; and she was buried alone beside Sir Guy, after they had won the victory of the world and the devil; and their bodies are still resting in the land of the monastery and their souls are in heaven with the angels)
(Robinson, 1908, p. 167)

Immediately before Guy’s passing, the source text and its translation paint a similar picture; both the Middle English and the Irish Felice are represented as committed to giving alms to the beggars. Right after Guy’s death, however, two radically different versions of Felice emerge. In the source text, once Guy is buried, Felice is shattered by sadness: she does not have the strength to leave Guy’s tomb, and after a fortnight, she dramatically dies of heartbreak. In the translation, instead, as soon as Guy is inhumed in the oratory, Felice actively participates in establishing commemorative structures.[31] In particular, she commissions the building of a monastery and commands thirty priests to be constantly at its service; her commitment was so

[31] I believe that the choice of conveying Felice’s piousness by picturing her as engaged in the construction of religious buildings might have been connected to the production context: indeed, as Downham underlines, ‘architectural and archaeological studies have demonstrated that a major programme of church building, remodelling and ornamentation took place across Ireland in the fifteenth century’ (2017, p. 296).

powerful that she only let herself die thirty days after its completion. These contrastive representations of Guy's wife prove that the Irish Felice is more pious than the Middle English one; she combines her earthly affection for Guy with her love for God. As a devoted wife, she prays for Guy and is loyal to him; as a zealous Christian, she contributes to the growth of her religious community by building places of worship and assisting the helpless.

As anticipated, the more pious stance distinguishing *Beathadh Sir Gui o Bharbhuic* from its source text has also been realised by significant narrative details. In particular, this aspect seems to be convincingly evidenced by the differences in the representation of Guy's dubbing ceremony and the guest list of his and Felice's wedding celebrations (Robinson, 1908, p. 6; Richmond, 2021, p. 248). To begin with, as Robinson observes, *Beathadh Sir Gui o Bharbhuic* accentuates '[…] piety and religious ceremonies at Guy's knighting' (Robinson, 1908, p. 6).

(I) Guy's dubbing ceremony:

<u>Middle English</u>

It was at þe holy trinite, / þerl dubbed sir Gij the fre, / & wiþ him tventi god gomis, / Knightes and riche baroun sonis. / Of cloth of Tars & riche cendel / Was he[r] dobbeing euerich a del / the panis al of fow & griis, / the mantels weren of michel priis, / Wiþ riche armour & gode stedes, / the best þat wer in lond at nedis. / Alder-best was Gij y-dight, / þei he wer an emperour sone, aplight: / So richeliche dobbed was he, / Nas no swiche in this cuntre; / Wiþ riche stedes wele erninde, / Palfreys, coursours wele bereinde.
(Zupitza, 1883, l. 705-720, p. 42)

(On Trinity Sunday, the earl dubbed Sir Guy, together with twenty valorous men, sons of knights and wealthy barons. Their dubbing was celebrated by gifting them clothes made of silk from Tharsia, linen, and fur. They were given extremely precious mantles, rich armours, and the best steeds in the country. However, Guy was given the most valuable gifts, to the point that he looked like an emperor's son: his knighting was more prosperous than anyone else's in the country. Among other things, he was given outstandingly good steeds and palfreys)

<u>Early Modern Irish</u>

Is ann-sin dorindi in t-iarla ridiri do Gyi iar n-estecht nan aimfrinn domnach in spimta naeim dotsinnrud, 7 dohoirdnedh fiche an la-soin a ngradhaibh ridirechta mur anoir do Gyi. 7 Eoguidh in t-iarla cona teglach in t-sendia rocum nem 7 talmam fa buaidh ratha 7 ridirechta do beth fur Gy.
(Robinson, 1908, p. 20)

> (And then the earl made a knight of Guy after hearing mass on the Sunday of the Holy Spirit, and twenty were raised that day to the rank of knighthood as an honor to Guy. And the earl with his company prayed the one God who made heaven and earth that the choicest gift of grace and of knighthood should be upon Guy)
> (Robinson, 1908, p. 101)

As was customary (Keen, 1984, p. 69), both ceremonies occur during a religious feast (Trinity Sunday in the Middle English source text and Pentecost in the Irish translation) and involve a mass promotion, as twenty other knights were also raised to knighthood. However, they differ in their approach to the ceremony. The Auchinleck poet emphasises the martial aspect of dubbing: the new knights were given rich garments, precious armours, and good steeds. The Middle English passage resonates with John of Marmoutier's account of the knighting of Geoffrey the Fair of Anjou by Henry I: the king distributed gifts of horses and arms to the young men who were knighted with him. As such, the Middle English source text comes to represent what Keen (1984, p. 65) has defined as the 'secular strand' of this celebration, whereby the conferral of knighthood coincided with the giving of arms. By contrast, the Irish account is more concerned with the religious value of this ceremony and knighthood altogether. To begin with, the text specifies that the ceremony was held after mass; this fully respects the traditional, Christian practice whereby, prior to being dubbed, the future knight attended mass to receive God's blessing on his new, sacred role. This religious passage of the knighting ritual is described in the early fourteenth-century Roman Pontifical, which features a liturgical order for the making of a knight in St. Peter's church, and is paraphrased by Keen:

> On the eve of his knighthood the aspirant shall be bathed in rose water: after that he shall spend the night in vigil in the church. Next morning, he shall hear mass; a series of antiphons shall be sung and after that he shall come forward before the priest or prior. The priest shall give him the *collée* (or *paumée*: a light blow with the hand) and shall pray for God's blessing on his knighthood.
> (1984, p. 65)

Moreover, what symbolically marks Guy's ascension to knighthood are not the arms, which remain significantly unmentioned in the passage, but the 'choicest gift of grace and knighthood' (Robinson, 1908, p. 101). The Irish description adopts the same perspective as the *Ordene de chevalrie* and the *Libre del ordre de cavayleria*, where the Christian symbolism of the ceremony is meticulously described:[32] the bath recalled baptism and signified cleansing

[32] The author of the poem *Ordene de chevalerie*, probably composed before 1250, is anonymous. By contrast, the author of the treatise *Libre del ordre de cavayleria*, probably composed between 1274 and 1276 is the Majorcan mystic Ramon Lull (Keen, 1984, p. 6).

from sin, the white belt symbolised chastity that is girded on the new knight's loins, and the sword placed in the knight's hands reminded him of his duty to protect the weak and uphold justice (Keen, 1984, p. 64). In this way, the Irish adaptation develops what Keen (1984, p. 65) has called the 'ecclesiastical strand' of dubbing to knighthood, whereby the conferral of knighthood corresponded to the gifting of religious virtues. The sharp difference in perspective contributes to increasing the pious dimension of *Beathadh Sir Gui o Bharbhuic,* which, from the very outset, intends to represent Guy as a Christian knight instead of a mere warrior.

Furthermore, as Richmond notes, the guest list of Guy and Felice's wedding in *Beathadh Sir Gui o Bharbhuic* '[…] is longer because of an increase in the number of those in religious life, perhaps inevitable in an adaptation that stresses piety […]' (2021, p. 248).

Middle English

> When he hadde spoused that swete wight / the fest lasted a fourtennight, / that frely folk in fere / Wiþ erl, baroun, & mani a knight, / And mani a leuedy fair & bright, / the best in lond þat were.
> (Zupitza, 1883, stanza 16, l. 1-6, p. 394)
>
> (The wedding celebration between him and that sweet lady lasted a fortnight and it hosted freemen, earls, barons, knights, and the fairest and most splendid ladies in the country)

Early Modern Irish

> Docuiredh iarum techta uadhadh arcenn maithi na Saxanach itir tuaith 7 cill, 7 tanic ri Saxan 7 an rigan 7 in prinnsa cum na baindsi-sin, 7 tangadur espaic 7 airdespaic 7 abaid 7 aircinnigh 7 na huird brathar 7 eananach 7 maaach, 7 dorindedh in posad-sin co huasal.
> (Robinson, 1908, p. 74)
>
> (Then messengers were sent from him to the English nobles, both laity and clergy; and the king of the English, and the queen, and the prince came to that wedding; and there came bishops and archbishops and abbots and herenachs, and friars of the orders, and canons, and monks; and that wedding was nobly celebrated)
> (Robinson, 1908, p. 151)

The guests featured in *Guy of Warwick* all come from lay aristocracy: earls, barons, knights, and noble ladies. On the contrary, *Beathadh Sir Gui o Bharbhuic* joins lay invitees with a considerably lengthy number of clerical ones: the English king, queen, and prince participate in the celebration with bishops, archbishops, abbots, herenachs, friars, canons, and monks. The

different choice of participants changes Felice and Guy's wedding from a predominantly secular celebration to a markedly religious one, automatically enhancing the adaptation's pious orientation.

The emphasis on *Beathadh Sir Gui o Bharbhuic*'s piety seems to have been part of the translator's strategy rather than an element featured by his source. This is suggested by the consistency and effectiveness whereby defining aspects of the narrative are given a religious nature: the main characters move from being merely attractive and courteous to being pious in nature and behaviour; significant events in the tale move from being represented as primarily secular occasions to markedly religious ceremonies. The reasons why Uilliam Mac an Leagha might have been interested in increasing his adaptation's piety are multiple but, I believe, could be narrowed down to three. First, the objectives of the 'chivalric revival' (Wiggins, 2007, pp. 78-79) might have led the translator to restore the Christian and pious dimension of knighthood, primarily embodied by Guy. Second, the religious nature of the production context of medieval Irish romance adaptations (Byrne, 2019a, p. 7) might have pushed Mac an Leagha's pious intentions; particularly probative in this sense is the predominance of cloistral invitees to the wedding (abbots, herenachs, friars, canons, and monks). Third, Uilliam Mac an Leagha's professional background might have been influential as well. As anticipated in Chapter III, his central sphere of activity was religious (Byrne, 2016a, p. 292), and this is likely to have given a spiritual imprint to his translating trends.

(Fig. 2) Misericord with Felice Giving Alms to the Hermit Guy (SH-16) (c. 1330s), Wells Cathedral, Wells, England. Available at: https://sites.nd.edu/manuscript-studies/2018/03/12/guy-of-warwick-the-anglo-norman-guthlac/
(Accessed: 22 September 2022)

6.2 Chivalry in *Beathadh Sir Gui o Bharbhuic*

When presenting Irish romance translations, Byrne notes that they engage with the ideals of chivalry (Byrne, 2019b, p. 2); *Beathadh Sir Gui o Bharbhuic* is no exception. The chivalric dimension of this translation, indeed, is significantly boosted by the presentation of characters, especially the hero, Guy, and by the variation of some narrative details, namely the addition of hunting scenes and tournaments.

Guy's role in augmenting the Irish emphasis on chivalry can be witnessed from substantial variations in his introduction.

(I) Guy's introduction:

Middle English

Gentil [Gij] was & of michel might, / Ouer al oþer feirest bi sight: / Al þai wonderd strongliche, / For his feirhed was so miche; / So mani godenes in him were, / Al him preysed per y-fere, / Of bordis & turnament y-wis, / Knightes to hauen & holden of pris. (Zupitza, 1883, l. 161-168, p. 10)

(Guy was gentle and highly mighty, and he was so pleasing to the eye that everyone was deeply amazed by his beauty. He had many qualities, and all praised him as a valorous knight, excellent in tournaments and jousting)

Early Modern Irish

[Guy] rosháraigh na huili macu a aimsiri ar mét ar maisi ar macantacht, ar nos ar nert ar nidechus, ar uaiU ar aicnedh ar arachtus, gur ba lan na cricha co comlán 7 na cennacha comfocuiss dia clú 7 dia alludh, 7 gach inadh ina cluineadh Gyi cluithighi aonaig 7 ibhnis 7 oirechtais ar fedh 7 ar fiarlaidh crichi^) saeruaisli Saxan, dofreagradh iat 7 doberadh buaidh gacha buidhni co barr uil[e]. 7 Dosharuighedh lucht gacha lamaigh co lanaibeil, 7 doberedh almsa 7 othrala minca dona heglasaibh, 7 doberedh dercinna 7 dethcealta do deb[l]enaibh Dé, 7 roannlaiccedh na mairbh gan munnnr gan mainnechtnaighi, 7 doberedh fisrngudh don lucht nobidh a carcair 7 a cumgach, 7 donidh na h-uili obuir trocuire diar-mol in eglus ina aimsir, 7 robui co daingen, duthrachtach isin creidem cathoilic[d]a.
(Robinson, 1908, p. 16)

([Guy] surpassed all the young men of his time in size, beauty and gentleness, in courtesy, strength and prowess, in pride, spirit and courage, so that the whole country and the neighbouring provinces were full of his fame and his praise. And everywhere that Guy heard of games at fair or festival or assembly throughout the length and breadth of the free and noble English land, he entered them and won the victory of every company, surpassing all, and defeated the men utterly at every kind

of feat. And he gave alms and frequent offerings to the churches, and gave gifts and clothing to God's poor, and buried the dead without murmur and without negligence, and visited the people who were in prison and in bonds, and performed all the works of mercy which the church praised in his time, and he was strong and zealous in the catholic faith) (Robinson, 1908, p. 98)

The Middle English portrait is quite vague and stereotypical: just like many other romance knights, Guy is represented as beautiful, mighty, courteous, kind, and generous. The Irish description, instead, goes far more into detail by describing Guy's habits and actions. In particular, the additional examples furnished by the Irish version seem to have been carefully selected to show Guy's fulfilment of some of the canonical knightly duties, first described by Lull in his *Ordene de Chevalrie*: the defence of the faith of Christ; the protection of the weak, women, widows, and orphans; the constant exercise of his abilities by seeking tournaments and jousts; the practice of wisdom, charity, loyalty, and courage (Keen, 1984, p. 9). Furthermore, references to Guy's knightly virtues are also expressed through the other characters' words in the narrative core: for instance, in Chapter 36, the emperor addresses him by saying '"Brave and victorious knight, pious, merciful, and virtuous, I will go with thee now"' (Robinson, 1908, p. 120) and, just a couple paragraphs later, the hosts of the defeated army praise Guy by shouting '"O brave and victorious knight, and strong, valiant warrior, it is because of thy bravery and prowess, and thy wisdom and skill, that this peace has come to be made"' (Robinson, 1908, p. 122).

As anticipated, *Beathadh Sir Gui o Bharbhuic*'s emphasis on chivalry is also attained by a more intense presence of scenes of hunting and tournaments. The Irish focus on hunting is best witnessed in a scene from Chapter 20: the Greek emperor, after the vanquishing of the Sultan, organises a fifteen-day-long chase in the forest with his company.

(I) The Greek Emperor's hunting party:

7 Rachad amarach isin furais do t-sheilg 7 do fladhach, 7 bed caiddis isin furais, 7 beth senach 7 nrgairingudh againn inntifrisinre-sin'. lar tiacht an lae iarna marach docnadur san furais, 7 rogab drong dib ac fiadhach fnr muir le lintaibh fur iascach; 7 drong ele le seabchaib ac fladach fur enaib, 7 drong ele ag fiadhach le conuib 7 le líntaibh ar damaibh allta 7 ar cullcaib cuibfiaclacha 7 ar paitib primluatha 7 ar na huili fhiadhach archena.
(Robinson, 1908, p. 46)

(And tomorrow I will go into the forest to the hunt and the chase, and I will stay fifteen days in the forest, and we will have sport and diversion there for that time'. When the next day came they went into the forest; and some of them set to hunting

on the sea with nets to catch fish, and others with hawks to catch birds, and others with dogs and nets to catch stags and tusked boars and swift hares and all the other wild creatures besides)
(Robinson, 1908, p. 126)

The addition of supplementary hunting scenes is reiterated in the Irish version; four such instances are found in chapters 23, 30, 33, and 34. In chapter 23, the Greek emperor is once again said to have gone on a hunt with his retinue before seeing the fight between the dragon and the lion, which Guy would eventually save:

> Dála an imperi iarna mharach, docuaidh se cum fiadhaigh cona teghlach, 7 robui sé na suidhi ar inn tulca, 7 Sir Gyi ina farrudh ann, 7 nír cian doibh ann in tan dochunncadur leoghan limfhiaclach […].
> (Robinson, 1908, p. 53)
>
> (As for the emperor, on the next day he went to the hunt with his retinue, and he was sitting on the top of a hill, and Sir Guy in his company there; and they were not there long before they saw a lion […])
> (Robinson, 1908, p. 132)

In the corresponding Middle English passage, the emperor is just said to have been riding through the country:

> Þemperour aros amorwe tho, / To sen the cuntre þai ben y-go; […] A lyoun thai seye cominde þo.
> (Zupitza, 1883, l. 4109-4117)
>
> (In the morning, the emperor went riding into the country [with his retinue and, in the evening,] they saw a lion approaching them)

(Fig. 3) *Guy of Warwick Slays the Dragon, Saving the Lion. The Taymouth Hours, London, British Library, MS Yates Thompson 13, f. 14r (c. 1331)*. Available at: https://sites.nd.edu/manuscript-studies/2018/03/12/guy-of-warwick-the-anglo-norman-guthlac/

(Accessed: 22 September 2022)

In chapter 30, the duke of Lombardy postpones his wedding with Uisin by one day and goes on a hunt:

> Dála in diuice dochuaidh roime fan furais firalaind fasaigh do marbadh muc 7 agh 7 ainmindti a n-oircill na bainnsi iarna marach.
> (Robinson, 1908, p. 67)
>
> (As for the duke, he went forth into the beautiful, wild forest to kill boars and deer and [other] creatures in preparation for the wedding on the morrow)
> (Robinson, 1908, p. 145)

In the Middle English source text, instead, the duke does not delay the celebration and, accordingly, immediately goes to the church hosting it:

> And [þe duke] seyd, / 'leman, glad make þe; / Today thou schalt y-spoused be' […] Toward a chirche went hye; / Wiþ ioie he wend hir to spousi'.
> (Zupitza, 1883, l. 6395-6396, 6405-6406, p. 342)
>
> (And the duke said: 'o lady, today you shall marry me and make me glad' […] He cheerfully headed to the church hosting the wedding)

In chapter 33, before Guy and Felice's wedding, the hero is said to have gone hunting with Felice's father in the week preceding the wedding:

> 7 Dotheighedh in t-iarla 7 Sir Gy cuin fiadhaigh gach lé frisin ré-sin a n-oircill na baindsi.
> (Robinson, 1908, p. 74)
>
> (The earl went to Guy and set the time for the marriage on the seventh day from that day. And the earl and Sir Guy went to the hunt every day during that time in preparation for the wedding')
> (Robinson, 1908, p. 145)

In the Middle English version, there is no mention of these hunting parties in the period between Guy's proposal and the wedding:

> When þe time was comen to thende / To chirche wel feir gun þai wende.
> (Zupitza, 1883, stanza 15, l. 5-6, p. 394)
>
> (When the time [for the wedding] had come / [Guy and his men] went joyfully to the church)

In chapter 34, Guy starts to feel remorseful about his violent life while he is on a hunt:

> A cinn na haimsirí-sin docuaid Gyi la chum f[i]adaigh, 7 romarbadh ilimud fiaigh lais an la-sin. 7 Ger bhi binn sin ni hann robui menma Sir Gyi acht ina duailchib budhein, uair robui egla in duileman fair.
> (Robinson, 1908, p. 75)
>
> (At the end of that time Guy went one day to hunt, and many wild creatures were killed by him that day. And though that was pleasant, it was not there that his mind was, but upon his own sins, for the fear of the Lord was upon him)
> (Robinson, 1908, p. 152)

In the Middle English narrative, instead, this moment of deep remorse occurs while Guy is on a turret, looking at the firmament:

> To a turet sir Gij is went, / & biheld þat firmament, that thicke wiß steres stode. / On Iesu omnipotent, / Dat alle his honour hadde him lent, / He thought wiþ dreri mode.
> (Zupitza, 1883, stanza 21, l. 1-6, p. 398)
>
> (Sir Guy went on a turret and looked at the starry firmament: he was overwhelmed by the daunting thought that he had been a strong warrior, but he had never done anything good for the love of Jesus our Saviour, the Almighty, who had given him so much honour and success)

The other narrative detail conducive to an increase in the chivalric dimension of *Beathadh Sir Gui o Bharbhuic* is the presence of more tournaments. Robinson notes in his introduction that the Irish version describes a three-day tourney in Brittany (Chapter 5) and a game in Normandy (Chapter 7). In contrast, the Middle English source text only has general statements that Guy fought in Brittany and Normandy (Robinson, 1908, p. 6). The addition of these military events considerably contributed to augmenting the presence of the chivalric theme in *Beathadh Sir Gui o Bharbhuic*; indeed, as Keen observes, tourneys were an element associated explicitly with a knight's life:

> All the great heroes of Arthurian stories were masters of the tourney – even, in spite of the church's disapproval, the spotless Galahad. […] Because of their popularity, and because knights came together from far and wide to attend great tournaments, they were a powerful force towards generalising both the standards and the rituals of European chivalry.
> (Keen, 1984, p. 83)

The visible effort in improving *Beathadh Sir Gui o Bharbhuic*'s representation of chivalry is likely to have been part of the translator's strategy. Along with the consistency of

this inclination throughout the translation, this possibility is supported by the fact that Uilliam Mac an Leagha would have had valid reasons for intervening.

To begin with, the emphasis on chivalry and chivalric activities *par excellence* like hunting and tournaments would have been conducive to meeting the reading tastes of the Burgundian Renaissance (Byrne, 2016a, p. 298). Particularly probative of a Burgundian influence is the detailed and expanded description of hunting; I would posit that, in this respect, Mac an Leagha could have been inspired by the *Livre de Chasse* (*c.* 1387 – 1389), a treatise on the chase written by Gaston III Phoebus, Count of Foix and dedicated to Philip the Bold, Duke of Burgundy. Although there is no direct evidence of Mac an Leagha's access to a copy of this book, I believe that the possibility of an influence could be conceded in light of the significant popularity and diffusion of Gaston Phoebus's work on a European level; in Couderc's words:

> 'De toutes les productions de la littérature cynégétique du moyen âge, le Livre de la chasse de Gaston Phébus, comte de Foix, est incontestablement l'une de celles dont le succès a été le plus grand. Ce succès est attesté non seulement par le nombre et la qualité des manuscrits qui en restent – près de 40 – mais encore par les études et les imitations dont il a été l'objet'.[33]
> (1910, p. 1-2)

Furthermore, I would speculate that if Mac an Leagha *did* in fact access Gaston Phoebus's work, he did so indirectly. More specifically, considering that the presence of settlers from England and English territorial incursions facilitated the importation of English texts (Byrne, 2019b, p. 21), it is possible that he consulted an English translation of it: *The Master of Game* (*c.* 1406-1413). This treatise, the oldest and most important medieval work on the chase in the English language, has been defined as '[…] a careful and almost literal translation from […] [the] *Livre de Chasse*' (Baillie-Grohman, 1909, pp. 11-12). The popularity of this translation, preserved in no fewer than nineteen manuscripts (Baillie-Grohman, 1909, p. 13), and the fact that it was written before the realisation of *Beathadh Sir Gui o Bharbhuic* allows us to hypothesise that Mac an Leagha read it and indirectly imitated the contents and accuracy of Gaston's manual in his adaptation. Surely, in order to reach more definite and reliable conclusions, a concerted study of the transmission and tradition of both the *Livre de Chasse* and *The Master of Game* is demanded.

Moreover, a further reason leading to Mac an Leagha's interest in the chivalric dimension could lie in his intent to bring the text closer to Irish literary tastes. This intention

[33] (Of all the medieval cynegetic literary works, the *Livre de la chasse* by Gaston Phébus, count of Foix, is undeniably one of the most successful. Its success is attested not only by the number and quality of the extant manuscript witnesses – around 40 – but also by the studies and the imitations it underwent).

could justify the integration of additional tournaments and hunting parties. Fierce fighting and military action were a conventional character of the Irish literary tradition (Richmond, 2021, p. 256); indeed, medieval Irish narratives typically featured extraordinary battles, with heroes capable of killing hundreds of men in one blow. In a similar way, venatorial activities were also well-evidenced in native texts; I would suggest that the saga *Acallam na Senórach* (*c.* early 13th century), centred on the adventures of Fionn Mac Cumaill and his *fían* (warband), is particularly probative in this respect. Indeed, the tale features several references to the hunt, the most elaborate one being: [34]

> Then they heard the concert of three packs of hounds hunting round the head of Sliab Lugda with Taiglech, son of Ailill, king of the Connaught Luigni. 'What is this chase, Cailte?' says Blathmec. 'A chase by three packs of hounds, with three quarries ahead of them.' 'What are those quarries?' asks Blathmec. 'The chief chase which the packs achieve is the chase of fierce wild stags and bulky hinds.' 'And this pack after them?' asks the warrior. '*That* is the melodious chase by beagles after swift and gentle hares.' 'And this third pack?' says Blathmec. '*That* is the furious and urgent chase after heavy boars, killing them vehemently.' 'What is this fourth chase, Cailte,' asked Blathmec. 'The chase of heavy-sided, low-bellied badgers'.
> (Stokes, 1900, p. 260)

Therefore, by dedicating a conspicuous narrative space of *Beathadh Sir Gui o Bharbhuic* to military encounters and hunting scenes, Uilliam Mac an Leagha ensured that his text met both Burgundian and native literary expectations.

[34] Other examples can be found at pp. 224-226, 234-236, 251-252, 260 in Stokes, W. [ed. and tr.] (1900) 'Acallam na senórach', in Windisch, E. and Stokes, W. [eds] *Irische Texte mit Wörterbuch 4*, pp. 1-438. Leipzig: S. Hirzel.

Source gallica.bnf.fr / Bibliothèque nationale de France. Département des Manuscrits. Français 616

(Fig. 4) Detail from *Gaston Phébus, Livre de la chasse, f. 40v*

Available at: https://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/btv1b52505055c

(Accessed: 22 September 2022)

6.3 Gaelicisation in *Beathadh Sir Gui o Bharbhuic*

A closer analysis of *Beathadh Sir Gui o Bharbhuic* suggests that the Gaelicisation effort noted by Robinson in his study of the adaptation's style (1908, p. 5, 11) also emerges on the content level. This factor can be witnessed in geographical, cultural, and social divergences.

The Gaelicisation of geographical details is suggested by a double tendency of omitting specifically English references on the one hand and adding specifically Irish ones on the other.

(I) Omission of specifically English references - the search for Guy:

After Guy departs for his pilgrimage, Herhaud and other barons decide to send messengers all over England to try and find him. The corresponding stanza fundamentally reads as a map of medieval English topography:

> Menssangers anon þai sende / Ouer al this lond fer & hende / Fram Londen in-to Louthe, / Ouer al bighonde Humber & Trent, / & est & west þurch-out al Kent / To the hauen of Portesmouthe. / ai sought him ouer al vp & doun, / Ouer alle the lona in euerich toun / Bi costes þat wer couthe, & seþþen to Warwike þai gan wende, / & seyd þai might him no-whar fende / Bi norþ no bi southe.
> (Zupitza, 1883, stanza 40, l. 1-12, p. 412)
>
> (They [the earl of Warwick and his barons] sent messengers all over this free and noble country: they went from London to Louth, they rode over the close-by Humber and Trent, and they proceeded eastwards and westwards throughout Kent, until they reached Portsmouth haven. After seeking Guy in every single town and on foreign shores, they returned to Warwick and they said that they could not find him anywhere, neither in the North nor in the South)

By contrast, the Irish version omits the messengers' search for Guy and only relates to Heront's search for Guy:

> 7 Docuir iarum arcenn Sir Heront, 7 roindis na scela-sin dó. Doraidh Sir Heront co cuairtheochadh sé in domun no co faghadh é. Eoimigh roime arisí, 7 nír fagaib tir dar shittbail ríam fare Gyi gan cuartugudh; 7 docuartaigh an Eoim dó, 7 ni fuair a scela, 7 tarrla da ceile iat a cathraigh ele, […] anic Sir Heront tarais a Sasanaib, 7 roinnis nach fuair enfocal do scelaib Gyi.
> (Robinson, 1908, p. 77)
>
> (And afterwards he sent to Sir Heront and related the news to him. Sir Heront said that he would explore the world until he found Sir Guy. He set out again, and he did not leave unexplored a land of those he had traversed before with Guy; and he searched in Rome for him, and got no news of him, and they came together in another city […] Sir Heront returned to England, and reported that

he had not found a word of news about Guy)
(Robinson, 1908, p. 154)

I would hypothesise that this modification was introduced by Mac an Leagha to naturalise the source text: if the medieval English audience would have probably particularly appreciated these references to local geography, the Irish audience might have felt these toponyms superfluous as they were not immediately relatable to their experience.

(II) Addition of specifically Irish references - the power of the Sultan's army:

During the war between the Sultan and the Greek emperor, Herhaud/Heront has a vision: he sees Guy surrounded by wild beasts (bears and wolves in the English, lions in the Irish) and, fearing for his friend, he resolves to join the fight against the Saracens. Now, the two versions of the tale have different ways of representing the power of the Sultan's army:

Middle English

Of Sarrazins þai herd gret bost; / Of hem was wrin al þe feld, / On hors thai were wiþ spere & scheld, / þat euerichon þai þretten Gij.
(Zupitza, 1883, l. 4048-4051, p. 232)

(They heard a lot about the power of the Saracens, who were all over the battlefield and, armed with spears and shields, they rode on their steeds to attack Guy)

Early Modern Irish

7 Ni roibhi on muir ngainmigh anes gnsin muir tinntíghi a tuaigh Eirristinech incumannta nach roibhi aran aensluagh-sin.
(Robinson, 1908, p. 53)

(And from the sea of sand in the south to the fiery sea in the north, there was not a Saracen capable of fighting who was not in that one army)
(Robinson, 1908, p. 131)

It might be argued further that the indication 'from the sea of sand in the South to the fiery sea in the North' was another instance of Gaelicisation. The expression 'sea of sand', absent from all the Middle English redactions of *Guy of Warwick*, appears in two other Irish translated works (Robinson, 1908, pp. 131, 132): *Eachtra Sheóin Mandavil* (*The adventure of John Mandeville*) and *Leabhar Ser Marco Polo* (*The book of Sir Marco Polo*, translation of the Latin version of Marco Polo's *Travels*). Considering that these texts were produced at roughly the

same time as *Beathadh Sir Gui o Bharbhuic*, it seems likely that the insertion of the 'sea of sand' detail derived from an interest to place the text within the established Gaelic geographical system of references.

Furthermore, I believe that the movement of *Beathadh Sir Gui o Bharbhuic* towards the Gaelic sphere is also evidenced by the surfacing of typically Irish cultural features. An instance of this is found in the description of the welcome received by Guy in Constantinople. The Middle English text limits itself to describe the joy of the emperor:

> Ac when þemperour wist atte frome, / that Gij of Warwike was y-come, / Tvay erls he dede after him go, / & loueliche he bad hem com him to. / & sir Gij him goth to bemperour fre: / 'Welcome, sir Gij', þan seyd he, 'Of thine help gret nede haue we. / Michel ich haue herd speke of thee.
> (Zupitza, 1883, l. 2869-2876, p. 166)
>
> (When the emperor was informed that Guy had arrived in Constantinople, he sent two earls to warmly welcome him. When the emperor met the knight, he said: 'Welcome, Sir Guy. I heard a lot of praise about you. My people and I need your help')

The Irish version, instead, accompanies the emperor's delight with a procession in honour of Guy:

> 7 Adubairt an t-imper re lucht na cathrach dul a prosesiam a n-arrthaisc Sir Gyi. Is ann-sin tángadur lucht gacha heglusa don cathraigh co tapraibh 7 co priceduibh 7 co lampaíb lansoillsi, co cloguibh, co mbachlaibh, co minnuib; 7 sluaigh na cathrach co n-ethaigib somaisecha sidha 7 orshnaith, 7 an ri co coroin cengailti, clochbuadhaigh cumdaigh fura cenn, 7 ses ciuil na cathrach a comseinm itir orgán 7 gitart 7 galltrumpa 7 tabur 7 fhedan 7 cruiti 7 clairsigh 7 na huili ceol archena.
> (Robinson, 1908, p. 44)
>
> (And the emperor bade the people of the city go in procession to meet Sir Guy. Then came the men of every church in the city with tapers and with […] bright lamps, with bells and with staves and with relics; and the people of the city with splendid garments of silk and of gold thread, and the king with his crown on his head, tightly bound, set with jewels and adorned, and the musicians of the city playing the organ, and the guitar and the trumpet, and the tabor and the pipes and the fiddle and the harp, and all the other instruments besides)
> (Robinson, 1908, p. 124)

This passage enriches the adaptation with two fundamental components of late-medieval Irish culture and literature: garments and music. As far as dresses are concerned, the city's people are said to wear 'splendid garments of silk and gold thread', and the king's crown is 'tightly bound, set with jewels and adorned'. The attention to clothes and ornaments pervades *Beathadh*

Sir Gui o Bharbhuic: even when the character's look is limitedly mentioned in the Middle English source text, the Irish distinguishes itself for adding many details. This difference is most visible in one of the first scenes in the narrative, where Guy waits on Felice and her maids. The Middle English text reads:

> In a kirtel of silk he gan him schrede, / Into chaumber wel sone he yede. / þe kirtel bicom him swiþe wel, / To Amenden þer on was neuer a del.
> (Zupitza, 1883, l. 211-214, p. 14)
>
> (He wore a tunic of silk, and he immediately reached for her chamber: the tunic suited him perfectly and did not need any adjustments)

The only piece of clothing mentioned is the 'kirtel of silk' ('silk tunic') that 'bicom him swiþe wel' ('fitted him very well'); yet, neither the colour nor the decorations of the tunic are mentioned. By contrast, the Irish adaptation portrays Guy's appearance as such:

> Docuir sé léine sremnaighi sroill re grian a geilchnis, 7 inar ingnathach orsnaith 7 gúdna sgiamach sgarloide air amuigh anechtair. 7 Docuaidh roime fon maisi-sin co gríanan na h-ingine.
> (Robinson, 1908, p. 17)
>
> (He put a shirt of thin satin next to the brightness of his white skin and a wonderful tunic of gold thread and a fine, scarlet gown outside of it; and in that splendour, he went to the maiden's bower)
> (Robinson, 1901, p. 121)

This passage is visibly more detailed than its English correspondent: not only does it mention more items of clothing (shirt, tunic, gown), but it also specifies their colour and ornaments, with some judgment of value as well ('wonderful', 'fine'). The addition or expansion of the descriptions of the characters' outfits, which pervades the translation, is engrained in Gaelic culture. Garments and jewellery were a vital element of medieval Irish society, as testified by narrative texts and legal documents. As far as narratives are concerned, a good case in point would be the description of the high king Conare in *Togail Bruidne Dá Derga*, who is portrayed by two other characters, Ingcél and Fer Rogain.[35]

> I see the diadem of a fair prince, proper to the dignity of a ruling lord. […] I see a crown encircling his head, the colour of beautiful gold over his yellow, curly hair. I see his cloak red, multihued, of excellent braided silk. I see a huge brooch, ornamented with

[35] *Togail Bruidne Dá Derga* (The Destruction of Dá Derga's Hostel) was written in the earlier part of the Middle Irish period, in either the tenth or eleventh century and it largely draws on Old Irish material. The saga is centred on the over-king Conare Mór of the Érainn dynasty and tells the story of his ascension to kingship and tragic fall (O'Connor, 2014, p. 2).

> gold, that shines with the vigour of the full moon. I see a circle of crimson gems in a bowl-like cluster. […] I see a tunic of splendid linen, silken its sheen, refracted and many-coloured its hue. […] I see his sword, its hilt ornamented with gold, in its scabbard of white silver; the latter, with its five concentric circles, retains its excellence. I see his bright, lime-whitened shield overhead; it scorns throngs of enemies. His spear of sparkling gold would illumine a feast, and his shaft is of ornamented gold. […] There is no flaw in him as to form or shape, or clothing.
> (Gantz, 1981, p. 90-91)

The abundance of details featured in this example is exceptionally close to that found in the passages above from *Beathadh Sir Gui o Bharbhuic*; all the pieces of clothing and equipment are given a colour, a material, and an evaluation of their prestige. Moreover, if the focus is narrowed down to the representation of the king's diadem/crown, the similarity with that of the Greek emperor's is almost undeniable, as both centre on its being adorned with jewels. As far as legal documents are considered, the importance of clothing in medieval Ireland is testified by an entry in the *Annals of the Four Masters*, expressing the correlation between a person's look and their rank already suggested by the previous narrative passage ('[…] the diadem of a fair prince, proper to the dignity of a ruling lord'):

> Regulations for the wearing of colours by the different ranks of people were made by King Tigernmas and by his successor, Eochaid Edguthach, many years before the Christian era: a slave was to be dressed in clothes of one colour; a peasant or farmer in two; and so on up to a king and queen and an ollave of any sort; all of whom were privileged to wear six.
> (Joyce, 1903, p. 192)

To be sure, as Mulligan underlined (2005, p. 8), this prescription is not necessarily ancient, as it is found in an entry (3664) of the *Annals of the Four Masters*, dating back to the seventeenth century. However, she notes that:

> Given detailed medieval sumptuary codes found elsewhere both in Ireland and Europe, the attention that Irish texts pay to dress and status, as well as the fact that multi-coloured clothing was more expensive to produce and thus attainable only by those of moderate wealth, I think it is almost certain that a hierarchy of clothing and its colours was in place early on.
> (Mulligan, 2005, p.8)

Furthermore, as Downham underlines, late-medieval Irish economy was characterised by an intensification of textile production:

> Cloth and leather production was also essential in serving the basic needs of the population. […] The wearing of fine linen was a symbol of status, while wool was the staple fibre of cloth production. […] According to Ramón de Perilhos who visited

> Ireland in 1397, coarse woollen cloaks were the main attire of the Gaelic Irish, even if little else was worn. In the thirteenth century there is evidence that cloth production was increasing, aided by the introduction of new breeds of sheep and water-powered fulling mills in the east of Ireland. Weavers, dyers, tailors and mercers were among the most common professions listed in the 'Dublin Guild Merchant Roll' that covers the years from around 1190–1265.
> (2017, p. 195)

When the attention is turned to music, the procession in Constantinople features '[…] the musicians of the city playing the organ, and the guitar, and the trumpet, and the tabor and the pipes and the fiddle and the harp, and all the other instruments besides' (Robinson, 1908, p. 124). The Gaelicising intervention of the translator is suggested by the fact that some of these musical instruments (the pipes, the fiddle, and the harp) present a connection with Irish culture. These instruments are indeed mentioned as specifically Irish by Downham:

> Ireland had an acclaimed musical tradition in the twelfth century. It was distinctive from much of Britain. but shared strong similarities with Scotland. Gerald of Wales described the main instruments of the Irish as the harp (*citharia*) and the lyre (*tympanum*) in which the Irish were 'more skilled than any nation'. Ireland's proficiency in 'intricate polyphony' was singled out for praise, as were the quickness and liveliness of Irish music. In addition to the string instruments mentioned by Gerald, wind instruments are also mentioned in early sources as a standard accompaniment to the harp. Harpists were among the most prestigious of Irish musicians. The *cláirseach*, or 'modern' triangular framed harp became popular in Ireland from the fourteenth century. The 'Brian Boru' harp on display in Trinity College Dublin may be the most famous example, and it dates from the fifteenth century.
> (2017, pp. 326-327)

It seems that music was a vital part of various strands of late-medieval Irish society, as it was employed in both religious and secular events (Downham, 2017, p. 327). As a result, there is a solid understanding of the figures of musicians, who '[…] might pursue their hobby for its own sake, gain casual employment or become renowned professionals […] [and they] were often employed in the retinues of great lords and were valued members of their household' (Downham, 2017, p. 327). Despite the fact that the majority of the extant manuscript sources for music are liturgical, the importance of music in medieval Ireland is suggested by literary sources (Downham, 2017, p. 327). I believe that a valid case in point is provided by *Togail Bruidne Dá Derga*:

> There were nine pipes, all four-toned and ornamented; and the light from the ornamentation was sufficient for the royal house. […] They are the nine pipers that came to Conare from Sid Breg because of the famous tales about him; their names are

> Bind, Robind, Rianbind, Nibe, Dibe, Dechrind, Umal, Cumal, and Cialgrind. They are the best pipers in the world. They will match the performance of anyone in the hostel; each of them will boast of victories over kings and royal heirs and plundering chieftains, and they will escape afterwards, for combat with them is combat with a shadow. They will slay and will not be slain, for they are of the Side.
> (Gantz, 1981, p. 82)

Just like *Beathadh Sir Gui o Bharbhuic*, this passage attributes particular attention to the musical factor: it provides technical and aesthetic details ('four-toned and ornamented') and goes even beyond by presenting the musicians as members of the godly people (Sid) and as invincible warriors.

Finally, another aspect suggesting an intent to Gaelicize the adaptation is the presence of the social institution of fosterage.[36] This aspect emerges in the Reinbroun / Roighnebron section of the narratives, when Guy's son meets a knight who has been killing all the men unable to help him in his search for some of his family members. The Middle English and Irish accounts exhibit a minor yet significant difference. In the source text, the knight is looking for his father alone, whereas in the Irish adaptation, he is also looking for his foster brother. The mention of the foster brother is, I believe, a convincing cue to Gaelicisation efforts: fosterage was a pillar of Irish society from the earliest times, as the term for foster-brother is first attested in Old Irish and kept being practised in the late Middle Ages (Downham, 2017, pp. 78-80). Details on the modes and effects of the practice of fosterage in late-medieval Ireland are provided by Downham:

> Foster parents were expected to raise, educate, and maintain children in a manner appropriate to the social standing of the child's father, and children's experience in fosterage would be important for the future roles they would play in society. Fosterage was practiced in both Gaelic and Anglo-Irish communities. The bonds of fosterage aroused concern in the royal government, which sought to outlaw cross-cultural fosterage in the fourteenth century. However, these laws had limited effect and exemptions to the rule were granted. According to 'The State of Ireland and Plan for its Reformation' written for Henry VIII in 1515, one of the reasons that royal power was so diminished in Ireland was that 'the Englyshe noble folke useith to deluyver therre children to the Kynges Irysshe enymes to foster'.
> (2017, pp. 234-235)

[36] For a detailed discussion on fosterage in medieval Ireland see O'Donnell, T. (2020) *Fosterage in Medieval Ireland: An Emotional History*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

Owing to its vital role in Irish society, this institution soon came to be an expected component of literary texts; for instance, fosterage ties will be partially responsible for the fall of the over-king Conare in *Togail Bruidne Dá Derga* (O'Connor, 2013, p. 79):

> [Conare's mother] requested of the king that the boy have three fosterages: the men who had fostered her and the two men called Mane Milscothach and she herself. And she said to the men of Ériu "Those of you who wish anything from the boy should contribute to the three households". Thus Conare was reared. The men of Ériu knew him from the day he was born, and three other boys were reared with him: Fer Lé and Fer Gar and Fer Rogain, all sons of the fían-champion Dond Désa, a man of supporters for the support of the boy. Conare possessed three gifts – the gift of hearing and the gift of seeing and the gift of judgment – and he taught a gift to each of his foster-brothers. Whenever a meal was prepared for him, the four would go to it together; and even if three meals were prepared for him, every one of them would go to his meal. And all four had the same garments and weapons and colour of horses.
> (Gantz, 1981, p. 64-65)

Hence, the reference to fosterage in the Roighnebron material, rooted as it was the Irish literary and social system, confers to the text a visible Irish dimension.

The geographical, cultural, and social differences separating *Beathadh Sir Gui o Bharbhuic* from its source text have been shown to be interpolations targeted to the naturalisation of *Guy of Warwick*. When the nature of medieval translation as literary acculturation is considered (Poppe, 2004, p. 75), the reasons for Uilliam Mac an Leagha's Gaelicisation effort become pretty intuitive. By inserting his adaptation into the receiving audience's geographical, cultural, and social system, he would have ensured the full integration of his work into a considerably different context.

Chapter VII: *Speculum Gy de Warewyke* and *Beathadh Sir Gui o Bharbhuic*

Introduction

One of the most substantial content differences between *Guy of Warwick* and *Beathadh Sir Gui o Bharbhuic* lies in their divergent realisation of a pivotal moment in Guy's narrative: the hero's decision to abandon his spouse and embark on a redemption pilgrimage (Robinson, 1908, pp. 6-7). In the Middle English romance, Guy receives a sort of divine revelation; as he ascends on a turret, he is suddenly struck by the thought that, while God granted him much honour and success, he never did anything to please Him. Hence, after a long inner reflection, he reveals to Felice his choice to forsake the world's ephemeral bliss and seek God. In the Irish translation, instead, the remorseful Guy actively seeks the guidance of a holy father, John de Alcino. This clerical figure exhorts the knight to atone for his sins by emulating the sufferings of the saints, ultimately motivating Guy to begin his pilgrimage.

<u>Middle English</u>

> To a turet sir Gij is went, / & biheld þat firmament, / that thicke wiß steres stode. / On Iesu omnipotent, / That alle his honour hadde him lent, / He thought wiþ dreri mode; / Hou he hadde euer ben strong werrorir, / For Iesu loue, our saueour, / Neuer no dede he gode. / Mani man he hadde slayn wiþ wrong. / 'Allas, allas!' it was his song: / For sorwe he ghede ner wode. / [He said to Felice] 'For his loue ichil now wende / Barfot to mi liues ende, / Mine sinnes for to bete.
> (Zupitza, 1883, stanza 21, l. 1-12, p. 398; stanza 24, l. 4-6, p. 400, 402)
>
> (Sir Guy went on a turret and looked at the starry firmament: he was overwhelmed by the daunting thought that he had been a strong warrior, but he had never done anything good for the love of Jesus our Saviour, the Almighty, who had given him so much honour and success. When he was struck by the thought that he had wickedly killed many men, he started crying, 'Alas, Alas!'. He was so sorrowful that he wanted to die. […] He said to Felice: 'For His love, I will now live as a pilgrim until the end of my life to atone for my sins)[37]

<u>Early Modern Irish</u>

> Dála Sir Gyi iar-sin, robni se da fichit la 7 aidhci ag loighi le hingin iarla Berbuic. A cinn na haimsirí-sin docuaid Gyi la chum f[i]adaigh, 7 romarbadh ilimud fiaigh lais an la-sin. 7 Ger bhi binn sin ni hann robui menma Sir Gyi acht ina duailchib budhein, uair robui egla in duileman fair. 7 Boba menmarc lais a lesugudh asa oige. Docuir Sir Gyi

[37] Unless otherwise stated, the translations of Middle English/Old French passages in this chapter are mine.

techta nadha in tan-sin arcenn Iohannes de Alcino .i. athair naemtha ei-side, 7 tanicc cuigi co prap. Doraid Gyi: ‘A athar naemtha’, ar-sé, ‘cuirim cumairci m'anma ort’; […] Doraidh Iohannes: ‘Fechar let, a Gyi’, ar-sé, ‘mur fuaradur na nseim ata ar nim flaithemnus .i. drong dibh co n-aine, co n-eirnuigthi, co n-oili[th]ri, co flghlib, co coibhsinaibh minca, co n-almsanaib imdha. […] [Adubairt Sir Gyi] ‘Rachud do shiubal na talman rosiubail mo tigerna .i. Ísa’.
(Robinson, 1908, p. 75)

(‘Guy went one day to hunt, and many wild creatures were killed by him that day. And though that was pleasant, it was not there that his mind was, but upon his own sins, for the fear of the Lord was upon him, and it was his desire to make amends for his youth. Sir Guy sent messengers at that time to Johannes de Alcino, a holy father, and he came to him at once. Guy said: ‘Holy father’, said he, ‘I put the charge of my soul upon thee’; […] Observe, Guy’, said [de Alcino], ‘how the saints who are in heaven attained the kingdom: part of them by fasting and prayer, by pilgrimages and vigils, by frequent confession and many alms […]. [Guy said to Felice] ‘I will go to traverse the land that my Lord Jesus traversed’)
(Robinson, 1908, p. 153)

Robinson observes that this moment of religious instruction (henceforth: *Speculum* material), which is absent in the English version of the romance, is a condensation of part of the material found in the Middle English poem *Speculum Gy de Warewyke* (henceforth: *Speculum*) (1908, pp. 7-8). This poem is preserved in a number of copies: MS Auchinleck, Advocates’ Library, Edinburgh (*c*. 1327-1240); MS Bibl. Reg. 17 B XVII (*c*. 1370-1400) (*ff*. 19a-36a), Library of the British Museum; Harleian 1731, Library of the British Museum (*c*. 1440-1460) (*ff*. 134a-148b); MS Arundel 140, Library of the British Museum (*c*. 1420-1430) (*ff*. 147a-151d); MS Dd 11.89, University Library, Cambridge (*c*. 1440-1450) (*ff*. 162b-179b); MS Harleian 525, Library of the British Museum (*c*. 1440-1450) (*ff*. 44a-53a) (Morrill, 1898, p. 27-40). The earliest copy of the *Speculum*, transmitted by the Auchinleck manuscript (*ff*. 39ra-?48rb stub), is based on various sources; principally based on the *De Virtutibus et De Vitiis Liber* by Alcuin, it also employs passages by Augustine, St. Alexis, Gregory, the Bible, and *The Prymer: Or, Lay Folks’ Prayer Book* (Richmond, 2021, p. 109). Like the Irish adaptation, the *Speculum* features Guy as he receives spiritual counsel from a friar, Alcuin (or Alquin): still, the *Speculum* and its Irish elaboration present significant differences.

Robinson notes that the Irish version ‘[…] is much shorter than the *Speculum* and does not agree with that closely in the arrangement of material’ (1908, pp. 7-8). In this regard, he remarked that the overall distance in the texts’ outline could be ascribed to either the Irish redactor himself or to his source, claiming that ‘[…] a number of lost versions may intervene

between the Irish *Guy* and the known Middle English texts, and the *Speculum* may have been several times abridged in the course of transmission' (1908, p. 8). However, as the following section hopes to show, a closer study and contextualisation of the differences between the two versions bring to light alterations which seem to have been introduced in the translation process rather than replicated from the source. In order to pursue this analysis, the *Speculum* material will be compared with the critical edition (Morrill, 1898) of the Auchinleck recension of the *Speculum*, as it is approximately complete and transmits relatively the most correct text (Morrill, 1898, p. 30). Before proceeding, however, it is necessary to specify that the results of this comparison must be intended as speculative: in order to legitimately draw definite conclusions, a thorough study of the *Speculum* manuscript tradition would be necessary.

7.1 Structural differences: the place of the *Speculum* in Guy's narrative

The *Speculum* and the *Speculum* material are placed in radically different positions. The Middle English poem travelled separately from the romance proper: in the Auchinleck manuscript, the former is preserved between *ff.* 39ra-?48rb stub and the latter appears between *ff.* 108ra-146vb ('Couplet Guy') and *ff.* 145vb-167rb ('Stanzaic Guy'). The Irish version is instead featured in the narrative core, occupying Chapter 34; Robinson attributed this difference to the alleged Middle English intermediary used by the translator, hypothesising that he had before him 'a romance into which the substance of the *Speculum* had been woven [as] […] the combination in question would have been more naturally made by an Englishman than by a foreigner (Robinson, 1908, p. 8). However, it seems that, when framed in the manuscript context of TCD MS 1298, the insertion of the *Speculum* material at the heart of the narrative is more likely to have been part of the translator's plan.

As it stands, both TCD MS 1298b and 1298c, which, as specified in Chapter III, should be studied as a unicum (Byrne, 2016a, p. 290), present the genre of the *speculum principis*: 1298b inserts a *speculum* centred on a foreign prince, Sir Guy; 1298c features the *specula* of two native noble figures, Morann (*Audacht Morainn*, *The Testament of Morann*, *pp. 418-420a*) and Cormac (*Tecosca Cormaic, The Instructions of Cormac*, *pp. 420a-422a*). This connection between these manuscript sections leads us to two fairly solid conclusions. First, considering that the Fitzgeralds of Allen commissioned both manuscripts (Byrne, 2016a, pp. 290, 293-294), it is likely that the patrons explicitly requested works of this genre. Second, given that both manuscripts were produced roughly in the same period and bound together from an early stage (Byrne, 2016a, p. 290; Byrne, 2019b, p. 8), it is reasonable to think that the three *specula* were

viewed as part of a single, composite manuscript. These factors augment the likelihood of the translator's responsibility for this modification. By inserting the *Speculum* material in his adaptation, Uilliam Mac an Leagha would have respected their patron's instructions and reached an effect of internal harmony within the miscellaneous TCD MS 1298b/c.

The relationship between the *Speculum* or *Speculum* material and Guy's narrative significantly differs in the two versions. In the Middle English poem, Guy's story plays a marginal role (Richmond, 2021, p. 108), whereas, in the Irish adaptation, it represents an actual application of the precepts illustrated in the *Speculum*.

The *Speculum* employs Guy's story as a mere narrative device to make Alcuin's speech commence (Richmond, 2021, p. 108). In the opening section of the poem, after providing a synopsis of Guy's tale, the minstrel pictures him asking for Alcuin's help in his redemption endeavour; the knight recognises that his attraction for the world's bliss led him to suffer and, accordingly, he wishes to know how to forsake the world.

> Herof I wole a while dwelle, / And a tale I wole ȝou telle / Off an eorl of gode fame / Gy of Warwyk was his name / Hou on a time he stod in þouht: / Þe worldes blisse him þouhte noht. / Þe world anon he þer forsok / And to Ihesu Crist him tok, / And louede God and his lore / And in his seruise was euere more. / […] On a day, I vnderstonde, / Sire Gy þe eorl sente his sonde / To þe holi man Alquin / And seide '[I] grete þe wel, fader myn, / And preie þe for Godes loue / Þat us alle sit aboue, / Þat þu wole, par charite / And in amendement of me, / Make me a god sarmoun / And don hit write in lescȝoun; /Þat were my ioye and my delit / And to my soule a gret profyt; / For þe world þurw his foule gile / Haþ me lad to longe while. / Þerof I wole consail take, / Hu I mihte þe world forsake.
> (Morrill, 1898, l. 27-36, l. 49-64)
>
> (Now, I will take some time to tell you the story of a famous earl, Guy of Warwick, who, one day, resolved to stop seeking earthly bliss. He immediately forsook the world and started to seek Jesus Christ: he loved God and his teachings, and he decided to eternally serve him. Once, I understand, Sir Guy the earl sent a messenger to the holy friar Alcuin and said: 'I salute you, o father, and I pray, for the love of God who is in heaven, that you will be so merciful to redeem me by making me a good speech and then put it into writing. Your sermon would bring me immense joy and heal my soul, which has been far too long subject to the world's devilish lies: I am ready to follow your advice on how to dismiss the world)

In response, Alcuin begins a sermon that poorly corresponds with Guy's narrative. This sermon could be divided into halves (Richmond, 2021, pp. 109-110). The first (l. 69 – 509) is focused on the idea that a penitent should pray and read the holy scriptures, as praying is a way to speak to God, and reading is a way of letting God speak to us:

> Man, if þu wolt þe world forsake, / And Ihesu Crist to þe take, / Þu most ben ofte in orisoun /And in reding of lescȝoun. / Wid us God spekeþ whan we rede / Off him and of his goddede, / And we wid him, ful iwis, / Whan we him bisekeþ þat riht is.
> (Morrill, 1898, l. 497-504)
>
> (Man, if you want to forsake the world and if you want Jesus Christ to guide you, you must pray often and you must read the Scriptures frequently, for God speaks to us when we read about Him and His good deeds, and we talk to God when we pray to Him)

More specifically, after making a clear distinction between virtues (wisdom, love, charity, hope, meekness, peace, mercy, forgiveness, patience, humility) and vices (pride, wrath, envy, false judgment, treason, false witnessing, avarice, gluttony, sloth, lechery, acedia), it dedicates vast space for discussion to the virtues of wisdom, faith, authentic charity, and hope. The second half (l. 510-1030) affirms the necessity of seeking peace with an assurance that grace will come:

> And, if þu wolt haue þe loue / Off God þat is in heuen aboue, / Þu most ben euere in god acord, / In pes and loue and hate descord, / And ben aboute wid al þi miht, / To make pes bi day and niht; // For Ihesu Crist hit seiþ ful wel, / As we hit finden in godspel / *Beati pacifici, quoniam filii Dei uocabuntur*.
> (Morrill, 1898, l. 515-518)
>
> (And if you want to receive the love of God, who is in heaven, you must seek peace and hate discord: day and night, you have to put all your strengths in spreading peace. As the Gospels read, Jesus Christ said ‘Blessed are the peacemakers, for they will be called children of God’)

Alongside peace, in the subsequent lines, Alcuin addresses the importance of mercy, indulgence, penitence, lowliness before God, confession, fear of sin, and almsgiving. Differently from the latter section, whose emphasis on repentance and fear of sin creates a connection with Guy’s story, the former is utterly extraneous to it: nowhere in the Middle English tale does Guy read the Scriptures, and he is only seen praying once, during his *moniage* (Richmond, 2021, pp. 108-109). The separation between the content of the *Speculum* and Guy’s experience seems to have been an inherent trait of the Middle English version of this example of wisdom literature: as Robinson notes, there is no English copy of the *Speculum* where this moment of spiritual growth is integrated into the narrative’s core (Robinson, 1908, p. 8).

By contrast, it might be posited that the Irish *Speculum* material uses Guy’s story as the pivot around which the religious discourse is structured. Indeed, de Alcino’s sermon is centred around themes vital to Guy’s formation as a Christian knight: the peril of deadly sins and the

value of the primary virtues, the exemplarity of the sufferings of the saints, and the importance of faith in the Church's dogmas.

> 'A Sir Gyi', ar-se, 'dena mo comurle-si festa .i. (I) coiméd na deich n-aithnighi rofagaib Grist a talam itir claruibh ag Maisi .i. tabur gradh dod Dia os cinn gach uili gradha a nim 7 a talam, 7 cetera 7 sechain na pecaíeía marbtha .i dimus 7 ferg 7 leisgi 7 tnuth, druis 7 craes 7 saint 7 athimradh; 7 bi co cennsa, umal, urnaightech, dercach, trocurech, buidh[ech], bennachtach. […] (II) Fechar let ar-sé, 'mur fuaradur na nseim ata ar nim flaithemnus .i. drong dibh co n-aine, co n-eirnuigthi, co n-oiIi[th]ri, co flghlib, co coibhsinaibh minca, co n-almsanaib imdha; 7 drong ele co pais, co pianad, co purgadoir saeghalta, co loscadh, co crochud, co n-aingcis gacha galair 7 gacha peine do gradh ísa […] (III) tabur do choibhsena co glan, 7 bi umal do Dia, 7 bí tarcuísnech imud fein […] (IV) creid mur adubradar na hespail in cre […]'.
> (Robinson, 1908, pp. 75-76)
>
> ('Sir Guy', said he, do thou now take my advice: (I) 'keep the ten commandments which Christ left on earth with Moses in the tablets; love God beyond every love in heaven and earth, et cetera; avoid the mortal sins, pride, anger, sloth, envy, lust, gluttony, avarice, and backbiting; and be merciful, humble, prayerful, pitiful, compassionate, grateful and full of benediction. […] (II) Observe how the saints who are in heaven attained the kingdom: part of them by fasting and prayer, by pilgrimages and vigils, by frequent confession and many alms; others by suffering, by pain, by purgatory in this life, by burning, by crucifixion, by the distress of every disease and every pain, for the love of Jesus […] (III) Make thy confession clean, and be humble before God, and be ashamed of thyself […] (IV) Believe what the apostles say in the creed […]') (Robinson, 1908, p. 153)

To begin with, deadly sins stained the first phase of Guy's life: as he acknowledges before resolving to confer with de Alcino, he repeatedly acted out of anger and pride in searching for vain earthly glory. By contrast, the virtues listed by the holy father are what characterised the pious Irish Guy up until this narrative moment and will define his new self even more in the following sections. Furthermore, de Alcino's exposition of the ways to sanctity is crucial for developing the second phase of Guy's life. Among others, the father mentions pilgrimage as a road to God, and this will inspire Guy to make one himself. Last, adherence to the Christian faith is what will guide Guy to his final ascendance to heaven as he dies. As such, it appears that the themes elaborated by the Irish *Speculum* material and Guy's story are functionally connected, as the presence of de Alcino's sermon is justified by previous narrative events and, in turn, explains the following developments: just like Guy asks for de Alcino's advice because he is overcome by remorse, he chooses to go on a pilgrimage because the holy father instructed him to do so.

It might be posited that the different relationship between Guy's story and the *Speculum* or the *Speculum* material is also suggested by a difference in the addressee. In particular, if the Middle English poem seems destined for each Christian, the Irish version explicitly targets Guy's character. In the *Speculum*, Alcuin indicates the addressee of each argument by using either the general term 'man', as opposed to Guy, or, more significantly, by referring to 'alle' ('all [Christians]'). There are plenty of these instances throughout the poem: for instance, we could mention 'Herkne nu alle to me, / For I wole speken of charite' (Morrill, 1898, l. 323-324) and 'Man, if þu wolt to me herkny, / Nu I wole speken of merci' (Morrill, 1898, l. 523-524) ('Ye all listen to me, for I will talk about mercy', 'Man, if you will listen to me, I will now speak of mercy') The Irish de Alcino, instead, delivers each piece of advice specifically to Guy by apostrophising him through a vocative construction 'A Sir Gyi' ('O Guy'). Seemingly a tiny detail, this divergence in the addressee is a cue to the position of the *Speculum* concerning Guy's story, which is external in the Middle English source text and internal in the Irish version.

The tight connection between the *Speculum* material and the Irish version of Guy's story reinforces the hypothesis that the translator decided to insert this spiritual section into the narrative core. This choice probably derived from the translator's conception of the *Speculum* and his translation strategy. First, unlike the Middle English conception of Alcuin's sermon as a spiritual excursus isolated from Guy's life (Richmond, 2021, pp. 109-110), Uilliam Mac an Leagha viewed de Alcino's teachings as a vital part of the narrative development, guiding a significant shift in Guy's life. Second, Mac an Leagha's religious motive as a translator (Byrne, 2015, p. 191) and the intention to enhance his adaptation's piety discussed in Chapter V and VI might have led him to dedicate considerable textual space to this moment imbued with Christian doctrine and advice on how to live a holy life.

7.2 Stylistic differences: Uilliam Mac an Leagha's trends

The *Speculum* material presents a profoundly different stylistic façade from the Middle English poem; more specifically, the *Speculum* underwent alterations in the narrative medium and the narrative approach that strongly recall previous stylistic choices of the translator.

The Irish treatment of the narrative medium distinguishes itself for both large- and small-scale variations. On a macroscopic level, Alcuin's / de Alcino's sermon has been remediated from verse to prose. This variation is vital in that it testifies to the Irish translator's rewriting effort and his conception of the *Speculum* material. First, as discussed in Chapter II

and V, prose was the typical medium of medieval Irish narratives (Poppe, 2004, p. 76; O'Connor, 2014, pp. 17-18): the remediation of the *Speculum*, then, was, in all likelihood, operated by Mac an Leagha to respect this native convention. Second, even though medieval Irish prose texts contemplated the presence of verse sections to suspend the narrative development temporarily (O'Connor, 2013, p. 10), the translator opted for remediation: this seems to reinforce the hypothesis of his view of the *Speculum* material as integral to Guy's narrative, as opposed to a spiritual excursus.

On a microscopic level, the Irish *Speculum* material re-elaborates the principal motifemes of the *discours* of the Middle English poem: the 'exhortation' motifeme, the 'now-we-leave-and-turn-to' motifeme, and the motifemic group constituted by personal comments on the narrative (Wittig, 1978, pp. 61-62). To begin with, the *Speculum* immediately establishes a relation between the minstrel and his audience with an 'exhortation' motifeme which comprises both the obligatory exhortation nucleus and the optional synopsis of the narrative.

(I) Opening of the *Speculum*:

> Herkneþ alle to my speche, / And hele of soule I may ou teche. / Þat I wole speke, it is no fable, Ac hit is swiþe profitable. / Man, if þu wolt heuene winne, / Þurw loue to God þu most biginne. Þus shal ben þi biginning: / Þu loue God ouer alle þing // And þin emcristene loue also, / Riht as þiself þu most do. / If þu wolt þus biginne and ende, / Þu miht be seker to heuene wende; / Ac, if þu louest more worldes god / Þan God him self in þi mod, / Þu shalt hit finde an yuel plawe; /To deþ of soule it wole þe drawe. // For, whan þe world þe haþ ikauht / And in his paunter þurw his drauht, / Al at his wille he wole þe lede. / Ne shaltu spare for no drede, / Ne for loue to God, ne for his eiȝe, / To gon out of þe rihte weye; // For swiche beþ þat loueþ more / Þe world and his foule lore, / Þan þeih don God þat hem wrouhte / And on þe rode dere bouhte. / Herof I wole a while dwelle, / And a tale I wole ȝou telle / Off an eorl of gode fame / Gy of Warwyk was his name / Hou on a time he stod in þouht: / Þe worldes blisse him þouhte noht. / Þe world anon he þer forsok / And to Ihesu Crist him tok, / And louede God and his lore / And in his seruise was euere more.
> (Morrill, 1898, l. 1-36)
>
> (All of ye, listen to my speech, and I may teach you how to heal your souls: what I am going to say is entirely accurate and highly beneficial. Man, if you want to reach heaven, you must begin to love God. First and foremost, you must love God over anything else, and you must love every fellow Christian as yourself. If you behave like this until the end of your life, you can be sure that you will ascend to heaven. However, if, in your heart, you love the world's bliss more than God, you will be committing a sin and drawn to the soul's death. Your soul will die because, when the world has caught and trapped you, it will take complete control of your actions.

You will not stop going out of the right way, not even for the love or fear of God: this is what happens to he who loves the shallow teachings of the world more than those of God, who died on the cross to deliver them. Now I will take some time and tell you a tale about a famous earl, called Guy of Warwick, who resolved to stop seeking the world's bliss. He immediately forsook the world and started to seek Jesus Christ: he loved God and his teaching, and he eternally served him)

By contrast, the Irish rewriting does not present any such introductory formula to de Alcino's intervention; instead, this section is introduced by a simple narrative sentence.

(II) Opening of the *Speculum* material:

'Docuir Sir Gyi techta nadha in tan-sin arcenn Iohannes de Alcino .i. athair naemtha ei-side, 7 tanicc cuigi co prap'.
(Robinson, 1908, p. 75)

(Sir Guy sent messengers at that time to Johannes de Alcino, a holy father, and he came to him at once)
(Robinson, 1908, p. 75)

Furthermore, the *Speculum* marks internal passages in Alcuin's speech with 'now-we-leave-and-turn-to' motifemes: on a fictional level, these are pronounced by Alcuin to Guy; on a metatextual level, these motifemes function as *ruhepunkte* given by the minstrel to his audience. These structures occur in an impressively regular way.

Middle English	Translation
Herkne nouþe to me, / And I hem wole nempne þe / Pride, wraþþe, and enuie, / Fals iugement and tricherie. (Morrill, 1898, l. 107-110)	Listen now to me and I will speak of pride, wrath, envy, false judgment, and treachery.
Herkne now to my sarmoun, /What I wole telle in my lescȝoun. (Morrill, 1898, l. 137-138)	Listen now to my sermon, what I will tell in my lesson.
Herkne nu alle to me, / For I wole speken of charite / Herkne and I wole telle þe (Morrill, 1898, l. 323-324)	All of ye, pay attention to me now, as I will talk about charity. Listen, and I will tell you about it
Þis seiþ sein Powel and bereþ witnesse, / As he may wel in soþnesse. / Abraham him sauh,	Abraham saw God, but you do not know how. Listen, I will tell you about it now.

ac þu nost hou. / Herkne, I wole þe telle nowh. (Morrill, 1898, l. 345-348)	
And if þu wolt witen hou, / Herkne, I wole þe telle now; /For so heih a þing is þe godhede, / Þerof to speke it is drede. (Morrill, 1898, l. 378-380)	And if you want to know how, listen, I will tell you about it now. The nature of God is such an elevate issue that it is daunting even to talk about.
Herkne what I wole seie nouþe, / For hit com out of Godes mouþe: / Vbi te invenio, ibi te iudicabo (Morrill, 1898, l. 479-481)	Listen to what I will say now, for it comes from God's words: Wherever I find you, there I shall judge you.
Man, if þu wolt to me herkny, / Nu I wole speken of merci. (Morrill, 1898, l. 523-524)	Man, if you listen to me, I will now speak of mercy.
Herkne, and I ȝou telle wole: / Þat man þat lyþ in dedli sinne, / And to singy wole noht blinne / Gostli wit he haþ ilore. (Morrill, 1898, l. 712-715)	Listen, and I will tell you: the man who lies in deadly sin and will not stop sinning has lost his soul.
Listneþ nouþe to my speche, /And of nedful þing I wole ȝou teche. (Morrill, 1898, l. 753-755)	Listen now to my speech, and I will teach you a necessary thing.
Tweye manere shame men fint in boke, / Whoso wole þerafter loke: /Þat on goþ to dampnacioun; / Þat oþer to sauuacioun. // ȝif ȝe wole wite hou hit be, / Sitteþ stille and herkneþ me. (Morrill, 1898, l. 785-790)	The Bible describes two types of shame: one leads to damnation, the other to salvation. If ye want to know why this is, sit still and listen to me.
Leue frend, herkne to me, / And more I wole speke to þe; / For in þe godspel I wole rede / Off þe uertu of almesdede. (Morrill, 1898, l. 919-922)	Dear friend, listen to me, and I will say something more to you: I will read what the Gospels say on the virtue of almsgiving.

These internal markers are absent in the Irish version, where declarative sentences are introduced by 'adubairt / doraidh / ar-se' ('said (he)') to separate de Alcino's points.

Irish	Translation
Adubairt Iohannes de Alcino; 'A Sir Gyi', ar-se, 'dena mo comurle-si festa .i. coiméd na deich […]'(Robinson, 1908, p. 75)	Johannes said: 'Sir Guy' said he, 'do thou now take my advice: keep the ten commandments […]' (Robinson, 1908, p. 152)
Doraidh Iohannes: 'Fechar let, a Gyi', ar-sé, 'mur fuaradur na nseim ata ar nim flaithemnus' (Robinson, 1908, p. 75)	'Observe, Guy', said he, 'how the saints who are in heaven attained the kingdom […]' (Robinson, 1908, p. 152)
7 Adubairt Iohannes: 'A Gyi', ar-se, 'tabur do choibhsena co glan, 7 bi umal do Dia […]' (Robinson, 1908, p. 75)	'Guy', said he, 'make thy confession clean, and be humble before God […]' (Robinson, 1908, p. 152)
A Gyi, ar-se, 'creid mur adubradar na hespail in cre […]' (Robinson, 1908, p. 76)	'Guy', said he, 'believe what the apostles say in the creed […]' (Robinson, 1908, p. 153)

Last, the Middle English poem presents the motifemes consisting of a series of personal comments by the minstrel, which he expresses directly, through his voice, or indirectly, through Alcuin's words. Particularly prominent is the presence of the observation 'I vnderstonde' (I understand): 'On a day, I vnderstonde, / Sire Gy þe eorl sente his sonde', 'Hit fareþ bi swiche, I vnderstonde / As hit doþ here bi þe bonde', 'Enes I it vnderstod, / Þat in almesdede is double god' (Morrill, 1898, l. 49-50, l. 889-890, l. 939-940). The Irish version does not present any such comments: this can be vividly seen in the comparison between the manner of relating how Guy sent a messenger to Alcuin or de Alcino.

(I) Guy sends messengers to Alcuin / de Alcino:

<u>Middle English</u>

> 'On a day, I vnderstonde, / Sire Gy þe eorl sente his sonde / To þe holi man Alquin'. (Morrill, 1898, l. 49-51)
>
> (One day, I understand, Sir Guy the Earl sent his messenger to the holy man Alcuin)

<u>Early Modern Irish</u>

> Docuir Sir Gyi techta nadha in tan-sin arcenn Johannes de Alcino .i. athair naemtha ei-side, 7 tanicc cuigi co prap'.
> (Robinson, 1908, p. 75)

('Sir Guy sent messengers at that time to Johannes de Alcino, a holy father, and he came to him at once')
(Robinson, 1908, p. 152)

As it has become apparent, there is strong linearity in the treatment of the motifemes of the *discours* in the *Speculum* material and the rest of *Beathadh Sir Gui o Bharbhuic*. More specifically, the translator substituted these structures, which problematically exposed the narrator's presence and gave a subjective tone to the narration, with others aimed at meeting a significant convention: the preference for an external and chronicle-like storytelling style (Poppe, 2004, pp. 80-81; O'Connor, 2014, pp. 19-20). Therefore, there is a high probability that such modifications of the narrative medium were introduced by the translator rather than reproduced from an already modified Middle English exemplar.

The Irish treatment of the narrative approach also resonates with Mac an Leagha's previously evidenced translating trends. In particular, while Alcuin's preaching attitude is strongly empathic, de Alcino's stance is more detached and starker. In the *Speculum*, Alcuin frequently apostrophises Guy to make sure he understands his directions and that he will listen to them; to do so, he alternates the more neutral 'telle' with the stronger 'warne' or 'preye':

Middle English	Translation
Vnderstond nu what I mene / Þu most ben of herte clene, /In word, in dede, and in þouht, / Þat þu ne be ifiled noht. (Morrill, 1898, l. 407-410)	For the love of God, who is so bright, understand now what I mean: your heart must be always pure, in word, action, and in thought, so that you are never made impure.
Beati mundo corde, quoniam ipsi deum uidebunt / Þis is to seie, I telle þe, /Þe clene of herte blessed þeih be. (Morrill, 1898, l. 412-414)	'Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God': this is to say, I tell you, that the pure of heart are blessed.
The fourme of þre children he mette; / Þre he sauh, and as on he hem grette. / In tokne it was, I telle þe, / Off þe holi trinite. (Morrill, 1898, l. 349-352)	[Abraham] once saw the shape of three children: he saw three of them, but he greeted them as one. This was done, I tell you, to symbolise the Holy Trinity.
For sikerliche I telle þe, /Man ne sauh neuere his deite. (Morrill, 1898, l. 373-374)	I am absolutely sure, as I tell you, that no man ever saw His divinity.

Þerfore, man, I warne þe: / Loke þat þu þe bise. (Morrill, 1898, l. 863-864)	Therefore, o man, I warn you: make sure you are always diligent.
And ȝif a man þurw his power / Doþ þe wrong on eorþe her, / Þenk in þin herte, I preie þe, / Off þe wrong and þe vilte, / Þat men to Ihesu Crist dede / Here on eorþe in many stede. (Morrill, 1898, l. 599-604)	And if a man, through his power, does you wrong on this earth, think in your heart, I pray you, of the wrong and the vileness that men caused to Jesus Christ from every part of the world and think of how He endured it gracefully, all for His love for you, certainly.

In the Irish version, de Alcino does not express heartfelt exhortations to Guy but limits himself to developing his discourse. John de Alcino's neatly different attitude aligns with the Irish preference for self-contained characters, who do not let themselves be overwhelmed by excessive emotions, and for event-targeted accounts, which prioritise facts over feelings (Poppe, 2004, pp. 80-81). Hence, it seems reasonable to believe that this visible move towards an objective storytelling approach originated within the Irish translator rather than in his source.

In conclusion, Robinson's attribution of the differences exhibited by the Irish *Speculum* material to a Middle English rewriting becomes quite feeble; the consistency of the significant discrepancies with Mac an Leagha's translating strategy allows us to speculate that these were introduced by the translator himself rather than replicated from his source.

Conclusions

The comparison between *Guy of Warwick* and *Beathadh Sir Gui o Bharbhuic* has attempted to describe the most significant differences separating the adaptation from its source. More specifically, this study has evidenced the translator's preference for Irish narrative norms, his effort to Gaelicise the source text, and his emphasis on piety and chivalry.

The respect for native literary conventions can be witnessed on both a structural and stylistic level. The structural accommodation concerned the motifemes of the *discours* marking the episodic configuration of *Guy of Warwick* (Poppe, 2005, p. 217). On the one hand, the unfamiliar phraseology identifying each motifeme was substituted with a familiar one, directly borrowed from native narrative texts. On the other, the motifemic components contravening the Irish preference for a hidden, non-omniscient, and emotionally detached narrator or threatening the tale's veracity have been excised.

The stylistic adaptation affected both the narrative medium and approach. As for the narrative medium, *Guy of Warwick* has been remediated from verse to ornate prose, enriched with typically Irish sequences of synonyms (Robinson, 1908, p. 11; Poppe, 2005, p. 209). Moreover, it appears that the Middle English *formulae* pervading *Guy of Warwick* have been substituted with native alternatives composed of synonymic groups. Last, the technique of the 'watchman device', featured in the source text, has been reproduced with its conventional Irish structure, where a 'riddling' perception is followed by a realistic explanation (O'Connor, 2014, pp. 173-177).

As to the narrative approach, *Beathadh Sir Gui o Bharbhuic* shifted from an empathic storytelling technique, focused on representing emotions, to a typically Irish stark one, primarily concerned with reporting events (Poppe, 2004, p. 87; Poppe, 2005, p. 217). Furthermore, the narrator's omniscience has been drastically reduced, favouring the Irish habit of delegating narrative disclosure to the characters' actions and words (Poppe, 2005, pp. 213; Poppe, 2004, pp. 83-87). Eventually, the tale has been filled with details on time and measures, meeting both the Irish taste for realism and the Irish conception of narratives as 'historiae' (Richmond, 2021, p. 252; Poppe, 2007, p. 19).

The Gaelicisation of the source text is visible in stylistic and content features. The naturalisation of style principally affected names: personal names have been substituted with their Gaelic counterparts (Robinson, 1908, p. 5), common names have been replaced with others echoing aspects of Irish culture, and additional toponyms echoing the native literary imagery have been supplied. The Gaelicisation of content seems to have been achieved through

a double tendency of omitting English contents on the one hand and extending or adding traditional Irish ones on the other. This entailed the deletion of lengthy descriptions of the geography of England, the expansion or insertion of scenes featuring clothing or musical details, and the mention of the social institution of fosterage.

The adherence to native literary conventions and the Gaelicisation of the foreign material were most likely guided by the same reason: the necessity to secure the audience's recognition and acceptance of the text and its consequent integration into the native corpus of translation literature. This conclusion holds a relevant scholarly value in that it strengthens the idea that medieval translation was primarily a process of literary, social, and cultural acculturation (Djordjević, 2000, p. 9). Moreover, it also confirms Poppe's claim that the Irish adaptation of *Guy of Warwick* is '[…] fascinating evidence for the period's literary *mentalité*' (Poppe, 2005, pp. 207-208).

Another divergence between the source and target text lies in the latter's more pious style and content (Robinson, 1908, p. 7; Richmond, 2021, p. 245). The religious tone of *Beathadh Sir Gui o Bharbhuic*'s style has been created by supplementing or extending religious expressions and interjections. Significantly, these are inserted in secular situations of the Middle English version to give them a religious stance (Richmond, 2021, p. 250). The pious stature of the content has been built by various factors.

To start with, the characters of Guy and Felice are represented as more pious, not only in their personality but also in their behaviour (Robinson, 1908, p. 7; Richmond, 2021, pp. 249-250). Moreover, the adaptation features several prayers containing additional explanations and exhortations usually found in manuals of religious instruction (Richmond, 2021, p. 250). Last, the guest list of Felice and Guy's wedding is predominantly constituted by ecclesiastical figures, primarily monastic. However, the major contribution to increasing the pious stance of *Beathadh Sir Gui o Bharbhuic* has been given by the presence of material from the *Speculum Gy de Warewyke* in the narrative core (Robinson, 1908, p. 8).

Implementing the pious dimension of the adaptation seems connected to three factors. First is the monastic nature of the production context of Irish romance adaptations (Byrne, 2019a, p. 7). Second is the influence of Uilliam Mac an Leagha's professional background: the predominantly religious nature of his scribal activity might have left some traces in his translating trends (Byrne, 2015, p. 191). Third is the translator's intent to follow the reading tastes characterising the Burgundian Renaissance, which included the *speculum principis* genre and, more generally, instructional works (Byrne, 2016a, pp. 298-299).

One last feature distinguishing *Beathadh Sir Gui o Bharbhuic* from its source is the higher importance it attributes to chivalry (Richmond, 2021, p. 254). This effect is principally obtained through content modifications, by inserting additional scenes of hunting and tournaments, both crucial moments of a knight's life. However, the adaptation specifically emphasises the pious, Christian side of chivalry; this is evident from the Irish description of Guy's dubbing ceremony, where Guy's passage to his new status is marked by the receiving of the gift of grace and knighthood, as opposed to the gift of arms.

The choice of devoting attention to chivalry was probably meant to meet the reading tastes established by the Burgundian Renaissance, which was particularly interested in the ideals of chivalry (Byrne, 2019b, p. 2). The inclination to represent the Christian side of knighthood might have been due to the influence of the Burgundian phenomenon of the chivalric revival (Wiggins, 2007, p. 78), aimed at restoring the figure of the Christian knight.

Significantly, the impact of the Burgundian Renaissance on the Irish adaptation, visible in its increased attention to piety and chivalry, could lead to a more accurate understanding of Ireland's position in late-medieval Europe. Contrary to popular isolationist views, Ireland was not isolated from the rest of the Continent: instead, it was involved in cultural movements shaping the European Renaissance.

Last, the final section of this study has addressed the most substantial difference between *Beathadh Sir Gui o Bharbhuic* and its Middle English version: the integration of some material from the *Speculum Gy de Warewyke* in the narrative core (Robinson, 1908, pp. 7-8). I would suggest that, contrary to Robinson's hypothesis, this insertion might have been an authentic innovation by the Irish translator instead of a mere replication from an English intermediary.

To begin with, following a general trend of the adaptation, unfamiliar Middle English structural and stylistic features were omitted or replaced with typically Irish ones. Furthermore, content modifications demonstrate how Uilliam Mac an Leagha functionally connected the *Speculum* material to the rest of his version of the narrative. In particular, he seems to have employed this conversation between Guy and father de Alcino to further enhance Guy's pious nature.

Moreover, the possibility of the translator's intervention appears to be strengthened by the broader manuscript context of *Beathadh Sir Gui o Bharbhuic*. TCD MS 1298c, which should be studied as one with TCD MS 1298b (Byrne, 2019b, p. 8), presents two *specula principis* (*Audacht Morainn* and *Tecosca Cormaic*). Hence, Uilliam Mac an Leagha might have inserted the *Speculum* material in TCD MS 1298b to harmonise the two sections.

Last, the insertion of material from an advice text in *Beathadh Sir Gui o Bharbhuic* would have been consistent with the translator's tendency to follow the reading tastes of the Burgundian Renaissance, which particularly appreciated these kinds of instructional texts (Byrne, 2016a, p. 298).

The discussion on the divergences between the *Guy of Warwick* and *Beathadh Sir Gui o Bharbhuic* has led to a potential reconstruction of Uilliam Mac an Leagha's strategy. As it seems, this highly conscious translator attempted to integrate his text into a specifically Irish context while ensuring Ireland's participation in the broader European intellectual conversation. However, further insight into his activity can be obtained when some research *desiderata* are pursued. First, a deeper study of the intertextual connections harmonising TCD MS 1298 could shed new light on the compositional plan behind this composite codex and verify whether it influenced Uilliam Mac an Leagha's decisions. Second, an explanation must be given to the apparent exceptions to the translator's trends evidenced by this study: the presence of a typically English comment on the narrative in Chapter 38 and the absence of a *coda* at the end of the tale. Finally, to confirm or dismiss the speculations on the presence of the *Speculum* material in the Irish adaptation, a comprehensive study of the manuscript tradition of the *Speculum Gy de Warewyke* is needed.

Reference List

Abbott, T.K. and Gwynn, E. J. (1921) *Catalogue of the Irish Manuscripts in the Library of Trinity College Dublin*. Dublin: Hodges, Figgis & Co.

Bampi, M. (2008) 'Translating Courtly Literature and Ideology in Medieval Sweden: Flores och Blanzeflor', in *Viking and Medieval Scandinavia 4*, pp. 1-14. Available at: http://www.jstor.org/stable/45093193 (Accessed: 15 September 2022).

Barber R. (1993) 'Malory's Le Morte Darthur and Court Culture under Edward IV', in Carley J.P. and Riddy F. [eds] *Arthurian Literature XII*, pp. 133-156. Cambridge: Brewer.

Barber, R. (1996) 'Chivalry and the Morte Darthur', in Archibald E. and Edwards A. S. G. [eds] *A Companion to Malory*, pp. 19-35. Cambridge: Brewer.

Bassnett, S. (2002) *Translation Studies*. London: Routledge.

Binchy, D.A. [ed.] (1978) *Corpus Iuris Hibernici: ad Fidem Codicum Manuscriptorum / Recognovit*. Baile Átha Cliath: Institiúid Ard-Léinn Bhaile Átha Cliath.

Breatnach, L. (1987) *Uraicecht na ríar: the Poetic Grades in Early Irish Law*. Early Irish Law Series, 2. Baile Átha Cliath: Institiúid Ard-Léinn Bhaile Átha Cliath.

Bruford, A. (1969) *Gaelic folk-tales and mediaeval romances: a study of the Early Modern Irish 'Romantic tales' and their oral derivatives*. Dublin: Folklore of Ireland Society.

Burnley, J.D. (1989) 'Late Medieval English Translation: Types and Reflections', in Ellis R. et al. [eds] *The Medieval Translator: The Theory and Practice of Translation in the Middle Ages*. Cambridge: D.S. Brewer.

Busby, K. (2002) *Codex and Context: Reading Old French Verse Narrative in Manuscript*. Amsterdam-New York: Rodopi B.V.

Byrne, A. (2014) 'A lost insular version of the romance of Octavian', in *Medium Ævum 83* (2), pp. 288-302.

Byrne, A. (2015) 'The circulation of romances from England in late-medieval Ireland' in Perkins, N. [ed.] *Medieval Romance and Material Culture*, pp. 183-198. Cambridge: D. S. Brewer.

Byrne, A. (2016a) 'Cultural Intersections in Trinity College Dublin MS 1298' in Harlos, A. and Harlos, N. [eds] *Adapting texts and styles in a Celtic context: interdisciplinary perspectives on processes of literary transfer in the Middle Ages*, pp. 289-304. Studien und Texte zur Keltologie 13. Münster: Nodus Publikationen.

Byrne, A. (2016b) ‘Writing westwards: medieval English romances and their Early Modern Irish audiences’ in King, A. and Woodcock, M. [eds] *Medieval into Renaissance: essays for Helen Cooper*, pp. 73-90. Cambridge, MA: Boydell & Brewer.

Byrne, A. (2019a) ‘From Hólar to Lisbon: Middle English Literature in Medieval Translation, c.1286–c.1550’, in *The Review of English Studies*, *New Series*, pp. 1-27. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Byrne, A. (2019b) *Translating Europe: Imported Narratives and Irish Readers at the End of the Middle Ages*. Maynooth: School of Celtic Studies, Maynooth University.

Calder, G. [ed. and tr.] (1907*) Imtheachta Æniasa; or, The Irish Æneid*. London: Irish Texts Society.

Christiansen, R. Th. (1931) *The Vikings and the Viking Wars in Irish and Gaelic Tradition*. Oslo: I Kommisjon hos J. Dybwad.

Clunies Ross, M. (1998) *Prolonged Echoes: Old Norse Myths in Medieval Northern Society* (*Volume 2: The Reception of Norse Myths in Medieval Iceland*). Viking Collection 10. Odense: Odense University Press.

Copeland, R. (1991) *Rhetoric Hermeneutics and Translation in the Middle Ages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Couderc, C. [ed.] (1910) *Livre de la chasse par Gaston Phébus, Comte de Foix*. Paris: Bibliothèque Nationale Département des Manuscrits, Imprimerie Berthaud Frères.

Cronin, M. (1996) *Translating Ireland: Translation, Languages, Cultures*. Cork: Cork University Press.

Djordjević, I. (2000) ‘Mapping Medieval Translation’, in Weiss, J. et al. [eds] *Medieval Insular Romance: Translation and Innovation*, pp. 7-23. Cambridge: Boydell and Brewer.

Djordjević, I. (2007) ‘Guy of Warwick as a Translation’, in Field, R. and Wiggins, A. [eds] *Guy of Warwick: Icon and Ancestor*, pp. 27-43. Cambridge: Boydell & Brewer.

Downham, C. (2011) ‘Viking identities in Ireland: it’s not all black and white’, in Duffy, S. [ed.] *Medieval Dublin 11: Proceedings of the Friends of Medieval Dublin Symposium 2009*, pp. 185-201. Dublin: Four Courts.

Downham, C. (2017) *Medieval Ireland*. Cambridge Medieval Textbooks. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1017/9781139381598 (Accessed: 15 September 2022).

Drake, G., Herzman R.B., Salisbury, E. [eds] (1997) ‘King Horn’, in *Four Romances of England: King Horn, Havelok the Dane, Bevis of Hampton, Athelston*, pp 17-56. Kalamazoo, Michigan: Medieval Institute Publications.

Ewert, A. [ed.] (1932) *Gui de Warewic: roman du XIIIe siècle, Volume II*. Paris: Honoré Champion.

Flower, R. (1947) *The Irish Tradition*. Oxford: Oxford Clarendon Press.

Fulton, H. (2014), ‘History and historia: uses of the Troy story in medieval Ireland and Wales’, in O’Connor, R. [ed.] *Classical literature and learning in medieval Irish narrative*, pp. 40-57. Studies in Celtic History 34. Cambridge: D. S. Brewer.

Gantz, J. (1981) *Early Irish Myths and Sagas*. London: Penguin Books.

Gillespie, R. (2014) ‘Scribes and manuscripts in Gaelic Ireland, 1400-1700’, in *Studia Hibernica 40*, pp. 9–34.

Hanna, R. (2005) *London Literature, 1300–1380*. Cambridge Studies in Medieval Literature. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hudson, H. [ed.] (2006) ‘Octavian’, in *Four Middle English Romances: Sir Isumbras, Octavian, Sir Eglamour of Artois, Sir Tryamour*, pp. 45-89. Kalamazoo, Michigan: Medieval Institute Publications.

Hunt, T. (1975) ‘Herr Ivan Lejonriddaren’, in *Mediaeval Scandinavia 8*, pp. 168-186.

Hyde, D. [ed. and tr.] (1899) *Giolla an ḟiuġa; or, The lad of the ferule. Eaċtra cloinne riġ na n-Ioruaiḋe; or, Adventures of the children of the king of Norway*. London: Irish Texts Society.

Joyce, P. W. (1903) *A Social History of Ireland*. London: Longmans, Green.

Joyce, P.W. (1903) *A Social History of Ireland*. London: Longmans, Green.

Keen, M. (1984) *Chivalry*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Kline, A.S. (2014) [tr.] *The Aeneid*. CreateSpace Independent Publishing Platform. Available at: https://www.poetryintranslation.com/PITBR/Latin/VirgilAeneidI.php (Accessed: 20 September 2022).

Kölbing, E. [ed.] (1885) *The romance of Sir Beues of Hamtoun*. London: Early English Text Society.

Lefevere, A. (1992) *Translation, Rewriting, and the Manipulation of Literary Fame*. New York: Routledge.

Luft, D. (2006) ‘Translation Theory and Medieval Translation’, in Murray, K. [ed.] *Translations from classical literature: Imtheachta Æniasa and Stair Ercuil ocus a Bás*. London: Irish Texts Society.

Macalister, R.A. [ed.] (1939) *Lebor Gabála Érenn: The Book of the Taking of Ireland*. Dublin: Irish Texts Society.

MacCana, P. (1962) ‘The influence of the Vikings on Gaelic Literature’, in O Cuív B. [ed.] *Proceedings of the International Congress of Celtic Studies*, *Dublin 6-10 July 1959*, pp. 78-118. Baile Átha Cliath: Institiúid Ard-Léinn Bhaile Átha Cliath.

MacSweeney, P. [ed. and tr.] (1904) *Caithreim Conghail Clairinghnigh. Martial career of Conghal Cláiringhneach*. London: Irish Texts Society.

Morrill, G.L. (1898) *Speculum Gy de Warewyke: an English poem, with introduction, notes, and glossary*. London: Early English Text Society.

Mulligan, A. (2005) ‘Togail Bruidne Dá Derga and the Politics of Anatomy’, in *Cambrian Medieval Celtic Studies 49*, pp. 1-19.

Ní Mhaonaigh, M. (2006) ‘Literary Lochlann’, in McLeod W. et al. [eds] *Cànan & Cuitar/ Language and Culture*, in *Rannsachadhna Gàidhlig 3*, pp. 25-37. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Ní Shéaghdha, N. (1984) ‘Translations and adaptations into Irish’, in *Celtica 16*, pp. 107–124.

O’Connor, R. (2013) *The destruction of Da Derga's hostel: kingship and narrative artistry in a mediaeval Irish saga*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

O’Connor, R. [ed.] (2014) *Classical literature and learning in medieval Irish narrative*. Studies in Celtic History 34. Cambridge: D. S. Brewer.

O’Curry, E. (1878) *Lectures on the Manuscript Materials of Ancient Irish History*. Dublin: W.A. Hinch, P. Traynor.

O’Donnell, T. (2020) *Fosterage in Medieval Ireland: An Emotional History*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

O’Donovan, J. (1836-1840) *Catalogue of manuscripts in the Irish language in the library of Trinity College, Dublin*. Unpublished.

O’Donovan, J. (1843) *The tribes and customs of Hy-Many, commonly called O'Kelly's Country*. Dublin: Irish Archaeological Society.

O’Rahilly, C. [ed. and tr.] (1967) *Táin bó Cúalnge: from the Book of Leinster*, in *Irish Texts Society 49*. Baile Átha Cliath: Institiúid Ard-Léinn Bhaile Átha Cliath.

Ólason, V. (2005) ‘Family Sagas’, in McTurk, R. [ed.] *A Companion to Old Norse-Icelandic Literature and Culture*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Pearsall, D. and Cunningham I.C. [eds] (1977) *The Auchinleck Manuscript: National Library of Scotland Advocates’ MS 19.2.1* London: Scolar Press.

Poppe, E. (1992) ‘The early modern Irish version of Beves of Hamtoun’, in *Cambrian Medieval Celtic Studies 23*, pp. 77–98.

Poppe, E. (1996) ‘Favourite expressions, repetition, and variation: observations on *Beatha Mhuire eigiptacdha* in Add. 30512’, in Poppe E. and Ross, B. [eds] *The legend of Mary of Egypt in medieval insular hagiography*. Dublin: Four Courts.

Poppe, E. (2004) ‘*Imtheachta Æniasa*: Virgil's “Aeneid” in Medieval Ireland’, in *Classics Ireland Vol. 11*, pp. 74-94. Dublin: Classical Association of Ireland.

Poppe, E. (2005) ‘Narrative structure of medieval Irish adaptations: the case of Guy and Beues’ in Fulton, H. [ed.], *Medieval Celtic Literature and Society*, pp. 205–229. Dublin: Four Courts.

Poppe, E. (2006) ‘Stair Ercuil ocus a bás: rewriting Hercules in Ireland’, in Murray, K. [ed.] *Translations from classical literature: Imtheachta Æniasa and Stair Ercuil ocus a bás*, pp. 37-68. London: Irish Texts Society.

Poppe, E. (2007) ‘Literature as History / History as Literature: A View from Medieval Ireland’, in Keller, W. R. and Fielitz, S. [eds] *Literature as history/history as literature: fact and fiction in medieval to eighteenth-century British literature*, pp. 13-27. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

Poppe, E. (2017) ‘Cultural transfer and textual migration: Sir Bevis comes to Ireland’, in Keller, W.R. and Schlüter, D. [eds] *Hiberno-Continental cultural and literary interactions in the Middle Ages*, pp. 205–220. Münster: Nodus Publikationen.

Pratt, K. et al. (2017) *The Dynamics of the Medieval Manuscript: Text Collections from a European Perspective*. Göttingen: Göttingen University Press.

Quin, G. [ed. and tr.] (1939) *Stair Ercuil ocus a bás: The life and death of Hercules*. London: Irish Texts Society.

Richmond, V.B. (2021) *The Legend of Guy of Warwick*. London: Routledge [eBook edition].

Robinson, F.N. [ed. and tr.] (1908) ‘The Irish Lives of Guy of Warwick and Bevis of Hampton’, in *Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie 6*, pp. 9–180, 273–338.

Rouse, R.A. (2007) ‘An Exemplary Life: Guy of Warwick as Medieval Culture-Hero’, in Wiggins, A. and Field, R. [eds] *Guy of Warwick: Icon and Ancestor*, pp. 94-109. Cambridge: Boydell & Brewer.

Sims-Williams (Patrick): ‘Riddling treatment of the ‘watchman device’, in *Branwen* and *Togail Bruidne Dá Derga*, in *Studia Celtica 12-13*, pp. 83-117.

Sørensen, P. M. (1992), ‘Historical Reality and Literary form’, in Faulkes, A. and Perkins, R. M. [publ.] *Viking Revaluations: Viking Society Centenary Symposium*, pp. 172-181. London: Viking Society for Northern Research.

Stokes, W. [ed. and tr.] (1881) *Togail Troí: the destruction of Troy*. Calcutta Private Print.

Stokes, W. [ed. and tr.] (1900) 'Acallam na senórach', in Windisch, E. and Stokes, W. [eds] *Irische Texte mit Wörterbuch 4*, pp. 1-438. Leipzig: S. Hirzel.

Toury, G. (1995) *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing.

Tristam, H.L.C. (1989) 'Early modes of Insular expression', in Ó Corráin, D. et al. [eds], *Sages, saints, and storytellers: Celtic Studies in honour of Professor James Carney*, pp. 427-448. Maynooth Monographs 2. Maynooth: Maynooth University.

W.A., Baillie-Grohman and F., Baillie-Grohman [eds] (1909) *The Master of Game by Edward, second duke of York: the oldest English book on hunting*. New York: Duffield and Company.

Walsh, P. [ed.] (1947) *Irish men of learning: Studies*. Dublin: Three Candles.

Wiggins, A. (2007) 'The Manuscripts and Texts of the Middle English Guy of Warwick' in Wiggins, A. and Field, R. [eds] *Guy of Warwick: Icon and Ancestor*, pp. 61-80. Cambridge: Boydell & Brewer.

Wiggins, A. [ed.] (2004) *Stanzaic Guy of Warwick*. Kalamazoo, Michigan: Medieval Institute Publications.

Wittig, S. (1978) *Stylistic and narrative structures in the Middle English romances*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Würth, S. (1998) *Der 'Antikenroman' in der isländischen Literatur des Mittelalters: eine Untersuchung zur Übersetzung und Rezeption lateinischer Literatur im Norden*. Basel: Helbing & Lichtenhahn.

Ziolkowski, J.M. (2007) 'Middle Ages', in Kallendorf, C.W. [ed.] *A Companion to the Classical Tradition*, pp. 17-29. Hoboken: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Zupitza, J. [ed.] (1883) *The romance of Guy of Warwick, the 1st or 14th-century version, ed. from the Auchinleck ms. and from ms. 107 in Caius College, Cambridge*. London: Early English Text Society.

List of Illustrations

(Fig. 1) *Guy of Warwick as a Knight. Introductory illustration to a copy of Le Rommant de Guy de Warwik et de Herolt d'Ardenne (an abridged continental French prose version). London, British Library, MS Royal 15. E. VI, ff. 227r-272r (15th Century)*. Available at: https://sites.nd.edu/manuscript-studies/2018/03/12/guy-of-warwick-the-anglo-norman-guthlac/ (Accessed: 22 September 2022)

(Fig. 2) Misericord with Felice Giving Alms to the Hermit Guy (SH-16) (c. 1330s), Wells Cathedral, Wells, England. Available at: https://sites.nd.edu/manuscript-studies/2018/03/12/guy-of-warwick-the-anglo-norman-guthlac/ (Accessed: 22 September 2022)

(Fig. 3) *Guy of Warwick Slays the Dragon, Saving the Lion. The Taymouth Hours, London, British Library, MS Yates Thompson 13, f. 14r (c. 1331)*. Available at: https://sites.nd.edu/manuscript-studies/2018/03/12/guy-of-warwick-the-anglo-norman-guthlac/ (Accessed: 22 September 2022)

(Fig. 4) Detail from *Gaston Phébus, Livre de la chasse, f. 40v*. Available at: https://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/btv1b52505055c (Accessed: 22 September 2022)