

The Martyrology of Donegal and *Cath Mhaighe Mochroimhe*



Helen Imhoff

Celtica 33 (2021), 324–348

DOI: 10.58480/SCS-fguwf-y7vcg

DIAS

Institiúid Ard-Léinn | Dublin Institute for
Bhaile Átha Cliath | Advanced Studies



© School of Celtic Studies, Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies.
This work is licensed under CC BY-NC 4.0. To view a copy of this
license, visit <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>

THE MARTYROLOGY OF DONEGAL AND *CATH MHAIGHE MOCHROIMHE*¹

ABSTRACT

On 1 November, the seventeenth-century Martyrology of Donegal commemorates Lonán of Treóit (Trevet, Co. Meath), who is also commemorated on this date in medieval martyrologies. Unlike these earlier sources, however, the Martyrology of Donegal includes a short episode about Art mac Cuinn and the naming of Treóit. This article examines the idea that this part of the entry is derived from the Early Modern version of the Battle of Mag Mucraime, *Cath Mhaighe Mochroimhe*, extant in a significant number of manuscripts. It also makes some preliminary suggestions regarding the relationship of the various manuscripts of *Cath Mhaighe Mochroimhe* with regard to this episode, including manuscript groupings.

THE seventeenth-century Martyrology of Donegal exists in two versions: a shorter version completed in 1628 (Brussels, Bibliothèque Royale, MS 4639) and a longer, annotated version completed by 1630 (Brussels, Bibliothèque Royale, MS 5095–5096). The shorter version was compiled by Cú Choigcríche Ó Cléirigh and Michéal Ó Cléirigh, but the annotations in the longer version are mostly the work of Michéal Ó Cléirigh, with some further additions by Hugh Ward and John Colgan after the manuscript had been sent to Louvain.² The extended, annotated version of the entry concerning Lonán of Treóit (Trevet, Co. Meath), besides dealing with the saint, also recounts how Art mac Cuinn had a vision at the site of Treóit, then known as Duma Derglúachra, and renamed the location *Treóit*. I have previously put forward a brief argument that this passage is derived from the Early Modern tale *Cath Mhaighe Mochroimhe*.³ The intention here is to examine this idea in more detail.

¹I would like to thank Prof. Máire Ní Mhaonaigh and Dr. Daniel Brielmaier for help with checking references to secondary literature, Prof. Pádraig Ó Macháin for addressing a query regarding manuscript locations, Robyn Orr at the the University of Liverpool Library for assistance with an enquiry regarding manuscript holdings, and Dr. Elliott Lash and Dr. Anna Pagé for comments at the draft stage of this article. I am also very grateful to the editor and anonymous reviewer of this article for very helpful feedback and suggestions and the copy-editor for improving consistency and clarity. Any remaining errors or oversights are, of course, my own.

²On the Martyrology of Donegal, including an outline of its development, see Pádraig Ó Riain, *Feastdays of the Saints: A History of Irish Martyrologies*, Subsidia hagiographica 86 (Brussels, 2006), chapter 13 ‘The Martyrology of Donegal (MD)’, 281–313.

³Helen Imhoff, ‘The tradition of Art mac Cuind’s burial at Treóit (Trevet, Co. Meath)’, *Ríocht na Mídhé: Records of the Meath Archaeological and Historical Society* 24 (2013), 73–11, at 86–8.

The information which the Martyrology of Donegal presents on Lonán of Treóit is clearly derived from medieval hagiological sources. Lonán mac Talmaig, in various sources the son of a British princess, Drustic, was associated with Treóit, a foundation at Trevet in Co. Meath.⁴ His feast day on 1 November and his connection with Treóit are clearly attested in medieval sources, with entries in the medieval saints' genealogies, where a 'Lonan Treoit' appears,⁵ and in *Félire Óengusso*.⁶ The Middle Irish commentary to *Félire Óengusso* in Oxford, Bodleian Library, Rawlinson B. 505 identifies Lonán as Lonán mac Talmaig 'o Threoit hi mBregaib' and the commentary in Rawlinson B. 512 also provides the alternative, 'Nó Lonán mac Telchain o Cluain fota il-Laichis', and a brief outline of Lonán mac Talmaig's parentage is then given, accompanied by two stanzas of poetry on the same topic.⁷ The parentage of Lonan mac Talmaig 'o Threoit' and a quatrain on his mother are also given in the tract on the mothers of the saints.⁸ The Martyrology of Gorman as preserved in the glossing of the *Félire Óengusso* in UCD, Franciscan A 7, fol. 39r, also contains a reference to Lonán on 1 November with a gloss providing the same information as that in Rawlinson B. 505.⁹ A saint named Lonán is also associated with Treóit in the Middle Irish text *Fástini Airt*, found in *Lebor na hUidre*,¹⁰ the language of which suggests a date in roughly the tenth century.¹¹ The association between him and Treóit appears to have been long-standing.

⁴A summary of sources associated with Lonán and details on the story regarding his parentage are found in P. Ó Riain, *A Dictionary of Irish Saints* (Dublin, 2011), 403.

⁵Pádraig Ó Riain (ed.), *Corpus Genealogiarum Sanctorum Hiberiae* (Dublin, 1985), 146 (707.452) and 180 (722.100).

⁶Whitley Stokes (ed. and trans.), *Félire Óengusso Celi De: The Martyrology of Oengus the Culdee*, Henry Bradshaw Society 29 (London, 1905). On the date, see most recently Ó Riain, 'The dates of the Tallaght Martyrologies', chapter 4 in his *Feastdays*, 75–98, and 'The Tallaght martyrologies: correlated', chapter 5 in his *Feastdays*, 99–118.

⁷Stokes, *Félire Óengusso*, 238. On the date of the commentary to *Félire Óengusso*, see Ó Riain, 'Textual history and sources of the commentary on the Martyrology of Óengus (MO)', chapter 8 in his *Feastdays*, 173–203, and previously Pádraig Ó Riain, 'Die Bibliothek des Verfassers des kommentierten *Félire Óengusso*', in Erich Poppe and Hildegard L. C. Tristram (eds), *Übersetzung, Adaptation und Akkulturation im insularen Mittelalter* (Münster, 1999), 87–104, at 102, and Pádraig Ó Riain, 'The Martyrology of Óengus: the transmission of the text', *Studia Hibernica* 31 (2000/2001), 221–42, at 235–6.

⁸Ó Riain, *Corpus*, 180 (722.100).

⁹On manuscript A 7, see in particular, Ó Riain, *Feastdays*, 275–7. On the Martyrology of Gorman as a whole, see Ó Riain, 'The Martyrology of Gorman', in *Feastdays*, in particular 147–71. The martyrology is edited in Whitley Stokes (ed. and trans.), *Félire Húi Gormain: The Martyrology of Gorman*, Henry Bradshaw Society 9 (London, 1895); the relevant passage is found on p. 208. Both manuscript A 7 and Ó Cléirigh's copy in Brussels, Bibliothèque Royal, MS 5100–4 are available on *ISOS*.

¹⁰A diplomatic edition of the text is found in Best and Bergin's *LU* II. 9821–900, and it was also edited and translated in John Mac Neill, 'Three poems in Middle-Irish, relating to the Battle of Mucrama. With English translation and notes, and a short vocabulary', *PRIA* 3, 3rd series (1895), 529–63, at 532–39.

¹¹See Helen Imhoff, 'Pre-Christian characters in medieval Irish literature: an examination of *Fástini Airt meic Cuind*, *De Suidigud Tellaig Temra*, *Aided Chonchobair* and *Aided Echach maic Maireda*', unpublished PhD thesis, University of Cambridge, 10–17. Available online at DOI <https://doi.org/10.17863/CAM.56884> (access 22 November 2020).

Turning to the Martyrology of Donegal, the earlier, shorter version contains the brief entry ‘Lonán ó threóit imbreghaibh’ (‘Lonán of Treóit in Brega’) for 1 November.¹² The longer version with the commentary contains some brief information on Lonán’s family, which tallies with the *Félire Óengusso* commentary and includes the verse found in the text on the mothers of the saints, both also being sources for the Martyrology of Donegal.¹³ Ó Cléirigh’s text is thus based on the medieval sources and old association between Lonán and Treóit. However, this information is preceded by a passage concerning Art mac Cuinn, the pre-Christian king and son of Conn Céthachaig, which does not relate to Lonán at all, but concerns the name of his church, Treóit:

Lonán, ó Threfoit, i mBreghaibh, ag Boinn. A dubairt Art, mac Cuinn ced cathaig rí Erenn, iar bfhaisin na físe an lá ria ccath muighe Mucraimhe, gurab Dumha Dergluachra ba hainm don aitsin ó thúis, agus gomadh Trefhod do bhiadh air ó sin amach óna trí fódaibh do bhenfadh sé an uair sin, .i. fód fona chenn agus fód ceachtar a dhá thaobh, agus gurab ann do hadhnaicfidhe é in ainm an athar, an mic, agus an spirat naoimh. Is ann sin do rinne, Art an laoidh darab tus, ‘Caoín do dhionnaibh déin,’ agus as follas mar sin gur chreid se, amhail tuigter, etc.

‘Lonan, of Trefoit, in Bregha, at the Boinn. Art, son of Conn of the Hundred Battles, king of Erin, after having seen the vision the day before the battle of Magh Mucraimhe, said that Dumha Dergluachra was the name of this place at first, and that Tréfót should be on it from that forth, from the three sods which he would cut at that time, viz., a sod *to be put* under his head, and a sod under each of his sides, and that it is there he should be buried in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. It was then that Art composed the poem beginning, “The fairest of mounds make;” and it is therefore evident that he believed, as is understood, &c.’¹⁴

The interest appears to be in the name Treóit, or Tréfót as it is spelt here. It is interpreted as *fót* ‘sod of earth’ with the prefix *tre-*. This makes the entry for Lonán different from the majority of entries in the martyrology in terms of structure and content. A typical entry with commentary names the most important church associated with the saint in question and may also include information on the saints themselves and their families. The focus in Lonán’s case on the place-name of his church is slightly unusual in the context of the martyrology, a point which will be discussed further below.¹⁵

¹²Brussels, Bibliothèque nationale, MS 4639, fol. 100r (accessible online via *ISOS*, accessed on 22 October 2020).

¹³The entry is found on fol. 53v of the manuscript and is accessible online via *ISOS* (accessed on 22 October 2020). It is edited in James Henshaw Todd and William Reeves (eds), and John O’Donovan (trans.), *The Martyrology of Donegal: A Calendar of the Saints of Ireland* (Dublin, 1864), 290. On *Félire Óengusso* and the tract on the mothers of the saints as sources for the Martyrology of Donegal, see Ó Riain, *Feastdays*, 301 (*Félire*) and 303–4 (mothers of the saints).

¹⁴Todd, Reeves and O’Donovan, *Martyrology*, 290–1.

¹⁵See pp. 346–7 below.

THE SOURCE FOR THE ENTRY ON TREÓIT

An obvious potential source for the story given by Ó Cléirigh is the account found in *Fástini Airt* in *Lebor na hUidre*; a second text in *Lebor na hUidre*, *Senchas na Relec*, also makes reference to Art's burial at Treóit and cites the first line of the poem he is supposed to have recited.¹⁶ While the Martyrology of Donegal does explicitly refer to *Lebor na hUidre* elsewhere,¹⁷ it is not clear from the wording of the reference whether Ó Cléirigh had access to the manuscript itself.¹⁸ Moreover, a textual comparison between the Martyrology of Donegal and the two medieval texts preserved in *Lebor na hUidre* shows that they did not serve as the direct source of the passage in the martyrology even if Ó Cléirigh was familiar with them. First and foremost, neither *Fástini Airt* nor *Senchas na Relec* includes Art's explanation of Treóit's name or his description of the three sods at his burial. The fourth stanza of the poem in *Fástini Airt* does allude to this particular etymology, but the idea is not elaborated further.¹⁹ *Senchas na Relec* does not refer to the idea at all. Secondly, the first line of the poem as cited in the Martyrology of Donegal differs from the version in *Fástini Airt* ('Cáin do denna den') and *Senchas na Relec* ('Cain do Denda Den', main text; 'Cain do Denna Den', gloss). While this may not seem significant, especially as the line is difficult to translate, it is relevant when we consider that there is a text which contains both the detailed explanation of the etymology of Treóit as well as the first line as cited in the martyrology. This text is the Early Modern version of the battle of Mag Mucraime, *Cath Mhaighe Mochroimhe*.

CATH MHAIGHE MOCHROIMHE

Cath Mhaighe Mochroimhe (hereafter CMM², following O Daly) was edited by Micheál Ó Dúnlainge at the beginning of the twentieth century from four eighteenth- and nineteenth-century manuscripts in the Royal Irish Academy: 23 M 47 (973; late eighteenth century; Ó Dúnlainge's main manuscript), 23 G 10 (974; nineteenth century), 23 L 27 (556; eighteenth century) and 23 K 7 (658; early eighteenth century).²⁰ Ó Dúnlainge's edition includes

¹⁶LU 128, ll. 4089–96 and, in particular, gloss m.

¹⁷Todd, Reeves and O'Donovan, *Martyrology*, 256–7: 'Is do Adhamhnan do foillsighedh glóir flatha nimhe agus piana ifrinn, amhail atá a bfhís Adhamhnain do sgríobhadh as Leabhar na Huidhre': 'It was to Adamnan were revealed the glory of the kingdom of heaven and the pains of hell, as contained in the Vision of Adamnan, which was copied from the Leabhar-na-hUidhre'.

¹⁸Cf. the reference to a copy of *Lebor na hUidre* in the preface to *Leabhar Gabhála*: Bernadette Cunningham, *The Annals of the Four Masters: Irish History, Kingship and Society in the Early Seventeenth Century* (Dublin, 2014), 55.

¹⁹LU 296, ll. 9847–50: 'Treóit tréde fót / im thri fotu ind rí / in tan bas bec cách / and bas mór a mbríg'.

²⁰Micheál Ó Dúnlainge, 'Cath Mhuighe Mochruimhe', *Irisleabhar na Gaedhilge* 17 (1907), 385–7, 406–8, 427–31, 434–9; 18 (1908), 30–4, 75–82, 180–1. The information regarding the manuscripts used is found in a comment on p. 387. Ó Dúnlainge also states that there is 'an seanscéal i leabhar Bhaile an Mhóta' ('Cath Mhaighe Mochruimhe', 387), but I have also not been able to establish with certainty what this refers to, as the Book of Ballymote does not to my knowledge contain a copy of the tale. It may refer to the copy of *Genemuin Cormaic*, starting on fol. 142v

no discussion of the text or its history, and very little work has been done on the tale to date.²¹ Not even the number of extant manuscripts has been established with certainty, and it varies significantly between secondary sources. Henri d'Arbois de Jubainville included 21 manuscripts in his *Essai d'un Catalogue*,²² Kuno Meyer identified a further copy in NLS Adv. 72.1.38,²³ and Whitley Stokes listed five of the British Library manuscripts, as well as referring to Meyer's and Arbois de Jubainville's references.²⁴ Máirín O Daly in her edition of the medieval text *Cath Maige Mucrama* refers to 36 manuscripts at the Royal Irish Academy, without providing details.²⁵ Robin Flower gives an outline of narrative sources relating to the Battle of Mag Mucrama and, regarding CMM², lists a further six manuscripts in addition to the ones used by Ó Dúnlainge, also providing some brief notes on how the versions in the British Library manuscripts, then at the British Museum, relate to one another.²⁶ More recently, the Stichting A. G. van Hamel website has listed 11 manuscripts.²⁷ The most comprehensive list so far, however, was provided by Bruford in his *Gaelic Folk-Tales and Mediæval Romances*, where he lists 68 manuscripts.²⁸ In my own research I have so far identified 94 possible manuscript copies in catalogues from libraries in Ireland and the UK, 81 of which I have confirmed to be manuscripts of the tale either through viewing the manuscript or an image thereof or through detailed catalogue information confirming that the text in question is CMM². These manuscripts are not, of course, all independent copies,²⁹ but the overall number indicates the strong popularity of the tale. My collection of the manuscripts of the tale

of the manuscript. That tale is edited by Vernam Hull, 'Geneamuin Chormaic', *Ériu* 16 (1952), 79–85. The abbreviation CMM² is used in Máirín O Daly (ed. and trans.), *Cath Maige Mucrama: The Battle of Mag Mucrama*, ITS 50 (Dublin, 1975).

²¹O Daly, *Cath Maige Mucrama* includes occasional references to CMM² in the introductory discussion based on Ó Dúnlainge's text, and Tomás Ó Cathasaigh, *The Heroic Biography of Cormac mac Airt* (Dublin, 1977), 28–9, 114–15, briefly considers the encounter between Art and Olc Aiche's daughter and Cormac's conception in CMM².

²²H. d'Arbois de Jubainville, *Essai d'un catalogue de la littérature épique de l'Irlande, précédé d'une étude sur les manuscrits en langue irlandaise conservés dans les Îles Britanniques et sur le Continent* (Paris, 1883), 75–7. He actually includes more manuscripts, but not all are in fact of CMM² and he was not able to find the manuscript given in the list of books in Colgan's room in Louvain. This list, headed *Catalogus Manuscriptorum tam Latiné quam Hibernicé olim in Camera R.P. Colgani repertorum; quibus postea R.P. Sirinus usus fuit*, is preserved as the second item in UCD, Franciscan A 34, on which see pp. 332–6 below.

²³Kuno Meyer, 'Addenda to M. de Jubainville's catalogue de la littérature épique de L'Irlande', *RC* 6 (1883–5), 187–91, at 191.

²⁴Whitley Stokes, 'The Battle of Mag Mucrimé', *RC* 13 (1892), 426–74, at 428–9.

²⁵O Daly, *Cath Maige Mucrama*, 1.

²⁶Robin Flower, *Catalogue of Irish Manuscripts in the British Museum, Volume II* (London, 1926, repr. as *Catalogue of Irish Manuscripts in the British Library [formerly British Museum], Volume II*, Dublin, 1992), 400–1.

²⁷A. G. van Hamel Foundation for Celtic Studies's CODECS: https://www.vanhamel.nl/codecs/Cath_Mhaighe_Mochruimhe, accessed 21 October 2020.

²⁸Alan Bruford, *Gaelic Folk-Tales and Mediæval Romances: A Study of the Early Modern Irish 'Romantic Tales' and Their Oral Derivatives* (Dublin, 1969), 255.

²⁹For example, BL Egerton 106, NLI G22, Liverpool M12029, RIA 24 L 21 (816) and RIA 12 F 20 (897) all appear to be copies of the same exemplar (see the catalogue description of NLI G22).

is work in progress and I plan to compile and publish a complete list as part of a separate project. A consideration of the CMM² passage concerning Art's experience at Tréóit shows significant differences in the various manuscripts, and while I have not yet been able to view the text of all of them, the number of manuscripts consulted so far is sufficiently large for there to be a reasonable expectation that textual groupings would already be identifiable. This would thus allow some provisional suggestions regarding the relationship between the Martyrology of Donegal and CMM², although confirmation of these suggestions would have to await a fuller treatment of CMM² as a whole and its textual history.

A footnote in the edition of the Martyrology of Donegal references O'Donovan's *Annals of the Four Masters* and Petrie's essay on the round towers of Ireland to point out the similarities between the entry for Lonán and *Senchas na Relec* as well as CMM²:

The substance of the following notice of Tréfoit is borrowed from the *Leabhar-na-hUidhri*, and the tale *Cath Maighe Mucraimhe*. See Petrie, *Round Towers*, pp. 99, 101, and O'Donovan's note on the *Four Masters*, An. 734, vol. i., p. 336.³⁰

This note does not specify whether this is the medieval or Early Modern version, but the relevant note in O'Donovan's edition of the *Annals of the Four Masters* allows us to surmise that the reference is to a version of CMM²: it is a summary of information on the monastery of Tréóit, referring amongst other sources to 'the historical story called *Cath Maighe Mucraimhe*'.³¹ This cannot be a reference to the medieval tale, which does not contain any reference to Tréóit, and O'Donovan thus appears to be referring to the Early Modern account. He also includes a direct quotation which is similar to the words spoken by Art in CMM² but not identical. O'Donovan may have had access to a manuscript I have not yet been able to consult; alternatively, one might perhaps assume that he was paraphrasing the text.

As far as I have been able to ascertain, there is no other discussion of the connection between the entry in the Martyrology of Donegal and material relating to Art and the battle of Mag Mucrama. Ó Riain does not refer to CMM² as a possible source, referencing only Best and Bergin's edition of *Lebor na hUidre (Fástini Airt)* in relation to the entry for Lonán.³² Ó Cléirigh himself does not reference the text CMM²; nevertheless, a comparison between the Early Modern text and the martyrology indicates the great likelihood that a version of the tale lies behind the entry for Lonán in the longer version of the martyrology, as the following comparison will show.

³⁰Todd, Reeves and O'Donovan, *Martyrology*, 290 n. 1. The page reference for Petrie makes it clear that the text in *Lebor na hUidre* that is referred to here is *Senchas na Relec*. It is found in George Petrie, *The Ecclesiastical Architecture of Ireland, Anterior to the Anglo-Norman Invasion; Comprising an Essay on the Origin and Uses of the Round Towers of Ireland, which Obtained the Gold Medal and Prize of the Royal Irish Academy*, 2nd ed. (Dublin, 1845), 97–101.

³¹AFM s.a. 735, vol. i, 336, n. a.

³²Ó Riain, *Feastdays*, 307 n. 119.

In *Cath Mhaighe Mochroimhe*, Art goes hunting on the day before the battle. Following the hunt, all his companions leave him except for one by the name of Lughna. Art lies down to sleep, and when Lughna wakes him, Art tells him of a dream he had in which he saw angels going up and down in the place in which he and Lughna are. He tells Lughna that this place will at some point be of great importance. In the passage which then follows and which corresponds to the entry in the martyrology, Art provides an etymology of the placename Treóit. Ó Dúnlainge's edition reads as follows at this point:

[...] ‘Dumha Dearg-Luachra a ainm gus indiu, agus ba Treafóid a ainm ó so amach do na trí fódaibh bhainfead-sa do chois na sleighe so im’ láimh ann, .i. fód fám’ cheann, fód fám’ thaobh, agus fód fám’ chosaibh, gurb ann adhlaicfear mé i n-onóir an Athar agus an Mhic agus an Spioraid Naoimh, agus mairbhfiór mé i gCath Mhuighe Mochruimhe le mac mo dhearbhsheathrach, agus tuitfidh Eoghan Mór le Beinne Briot, mac righ Breataine; agus is truagh liom-sa gan oirdhearcas Éireann ag Eoghan Mór, ó nach bhfuil mac mo dhíongmhála agam féin,’ agus do chan an laoi mar leanas:

“Caoin do dhéanamh is do ghean [...]”.³³

[...] “Duma Dearg-Luachra [was] its [the place’s] name up until today, and from now on its name will be Treafóid because of the three sods of earth that I will cut there with the point of this spear in my hand, that is, a sod under my head, a sod under my side and a sod under my feet, so that I will be buried there in the glory of the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost, and I will be killed in the Battle of Mag Mucrama by the son of my sister, and Eogan Mór will fall by Beinne Briot, the son of the king of Britain, and I pity the fact that Eogan Mór will not have the renown of Ireland, since I myself do not have a son who is my equal” and he recited the poem as follows: *Caoin do dhéanamh is do ghean* [...].’

The explanation for the name Treóit, i.e. ‘three sods’, is the same in both CMM² and the martyrology, with both giving the detail that these are the sods of earth with which Art will be buried. Furthermore, the way the information is structured is very similar as the bold passages in the following side-by-side comparison of the full passage show:

³³Ó Dúnlainge, ‘Cath Mhuighe Mochruimhe’, vol. xvii, 427; my translation.

CMM²

Martyrology of Donegal

‘Do toirbheadh fíis domh,’ ar an rígh,
 ‘óir gidh beag brígh agus cádhas
 an ionaid-so a bhfuilim anois, beidh
 amsear ann i ndeireadh an domhain
 bhéas mór a chion agus dobhéarthar
 uinge d’ór ar áit aoine-tighe ann,
Dumha Dearg-Luachra a ainm gus
indiu, agus ba Treadóid a ainm ó so
amach do na trí fódaibh bhainfead-
sa do chois na sleighe so im’ láimh
ann, .i. fód fám’ cheann, fód fám’
thaobh, agus fód fám’ chosaibh,
gurb ann adhlacfead mé i n-onóir
an Athar agus an Mhic agus an Spi-
oraid Naoimh, agus mairbhfead mé i
 gCath Mhuighe Mochruimhe le mac
 mo dhearbhsheathrach, agus tuitfidh
 Eoghan Mór le Beinne Briot, mac rígh
 Breataine; agus is truagh liom-sa gan
 oirdhearcas Éireann ag Eoghan Mór,
 ó nach bhfuil mac mo dhíongmhála
 agam féin,’ agus do chan an laoi mar
 leanas:
‘Caoín do dhéanamh is do ghean
 [...].’³⁴

A dubairt Art, mac Cuinn ced
 cathaig rí Erenn, iar bhfaicsin na físe
 an lá ria ccath muighe Mucraimhe,
 gurab **Dumha Dergluachra ba**
hainm don aitsin ó thús, agus go-
madh Trefhod do bhíadh air ó sin
amach óna trí fódaibh do bhenfadh
sé an uair sin, .i. fód fona chenn
agus fód ceachtar a dhá thaobh,
agus gurab ann do hadhnaicfidhe é
in ainm an athar, an mic, agus an
spirat naoimh.

Is ann sin do rinne, Art an laoidh
 darab tus, **‘Caoín do dhionnaibh**
dén,’ agus as follas mar sin gur chreid
 se, amhail tuigter, etc.³⁵

There are a few differences in detail, some of which will be discussed below, but the overall similarity between the two texts is striking. They agree significantly more closely with each other than either of them do with any of the medieval sources on this episode. In *Cath Mhaighe Mochruimhe*, of course, the episode is part of an extended narrative, including a detailed explanation of the dream vision and, in many of the manuscripts, the text contains more than just the first line of the poem recited by Art, providing us instead with a poem of between 1 and 25 stanzas. Although the vast majority of CMM² manuscripts post-date the Martyrology of Donegal, the detail in the narrative and the length of the poem make it clear that the martyrology cannot have been the source of the Early Modern saga. Instead, it seems likely that Ó Cléirigh was familiar either with CMM² or with a text that served as a direct source for CMM². The large number of surviving CMM² manuscripts, including one from the seventeenth century, and another, now non-extant one that is attested in Louvain in the seventeenth century, discussed below, make it very likely that Ó Cléirigh could have been

³⁴Ó Dúnlainne, ‘Cath Mhaighe Mochruimhe’, 427.

³⁵Todd, Reeves and O’Donovan, *Martyrology*, 290.

acquainted with a written version of CMM². The tale did also have an oral existence,³⁶ and it should be noted that the textual differences between CMM², in particular Art's poem, and *Fástini Airt* preclude a direct line of transmission from the medieval to the Early Modern text, instead indicating that there was further related material in circulation that has been lost. However, the nature of this additional material is entirely unclear and, consequently, we cannot speculate on whether such a source may have been available to Ó Cléirigh. A written version of CMM² remains the strongest and most convincing candidate as a source for this passage in the Martyrology of Donegal and would be quite different in nature from the sources for Lonán outlined at the beginning of this contribution.

Notwithstanding the similarities between the two passages, it must, however, be noted that there are also differences. These are the wording of the first line of the poem and the wording with regard to the placement of the sods of earth. The next section of this article will consider first the evidence that a copy of CMM² was available in Louvain; this will be followed by a discussion, with reference to the manuscript transmission of CMM², of the two differences just noted.

CMM² at Louvain

While NLS 72.1.38, which dates to the seventeenth century,³⁷ indicates that CMM² was in existence in written form by around the time the Martyrology of Donegal was being compiled, there also survives a reference to the presence in Louvain of a manuscript that is very likely to have contained a copy of CMM². While this does not necessarily mean that Michéal Ó Cléirigh had access to the latter copy, a number of manuscripts of the Donegal friary in which the martyrology was compiled were transferred to Louvain, so the reference is tantalising.³⁸ The presence of a copy of CMM², and other vernacular 'secular' literature, certainly indicates that this type of source was of interest in Louvain. UCD, Franciscan A 34, contains lists of texts available in Louvain,³⁹

³⁶Bruford, *Gaelic Folk-Tales*, 153 and 255, also provides information on oral accounts collected in Scotland (Western Isles), at least one of which was derived from a manuscript version.

³⁷See Donald Mackinnon, *A Descriptive Catalogue of Gaelic Manuscripts in the Advocates' Library Edinburgh and Elsewhere in Scotland* (Edinburgh, 1912), 118, for a late sixteenth-/early seventeenth-century date. The description by Ronald Black, 'Catalogue of Gaelic manuscripts in the National Library of Scotland', published online as part of *ISOS*, 2011, references seventeenth-century watermarks; see the *ISOS* page for NLS Adv. 72.1.38 (accessed 22 November 2020).

³⁸For specific manuscripts, see Myles Dillon, Canice Mooney, and Pádraig de Brún, *Catalogue of Irish Manuscripts in the Franciscan Library Killiney* (Dublin, 1969), xiv–xv. For an outline of Franciscan manuscripts, see Canice Mooney, 'Irish Franciscan libraries of the past', *Irish Ecclesiastical Record* 60 (1942), 215–28, esp. at 220–1, and on the Killiney collection specifically, Canice Mooney, 'Franciscan Library Killiney. A short guide for the student of Irish church history', *Archivum Hibernicum* 18 (1955), 150–6. Additional manuscripts that entered the Killiney collection at a later date are described in Pádraig de Brún, 'Two additions to the Franciscan collection', *Éigse* 13 (1978), 379–84, and Pádraig de Brún, 'Further additions to the Franciscan collection', *Éigse* 20 (1984), 157–63.

³⁹A very brief overview of the lists in A 34 is given in Dillon, Mooney and de Brún, *Catalogue*, xix–xx.

and the second of these lists, which consists of manuscripts previously kept in Colgan's room and later used by Thomas Sheeran, includes a reference to a paper manuscript that contained *Cath Mhaighe Mochroimhe* and *Nuallghubha Oileall Oloim*, amongst other texts:

Liber in 4^o continens *Cath muighe mucroimhe / Nuallghubha Oileall oloim / Do righe Chormaic maic Airt / Do na trí Cairbribh / Betha Ronáin ⁊ buile Shuibhne / Cath Ros na Ríogh ós boinn / Betha Padraic / Betha Bhrighide / Indeall an ghaoi bulga / Chronicon breve apocryphum / Imtheachta Nuadha nechtmhair*.⁴⁰

This manuscript is very likely to be identical with a manuscript found in the first and third list in A 34, also described as being paper and in quarto. The contents of this manuscript are mostly identical, but some additional texts are mentioned:

Liber in 4^o,⁴¹ continens *cath muige muchroimhe; nuallgubha oileall oloim; do ríge corbmaic maic airt énfir; dona tri cairbribh; betha \Ronaín/ ⁊ buile suibne; cath ros na riogh ós bóinn; beatha Padraig; beatha bhrighde*;⁴² *Indeall an gáoí bulga; cath leatreach ruidhe; iomthus taidhg mac ceín, mac oilill oluim; foclóir; cronicon breue apochryphum; imtheachta nuadha neachtmair*.⁴³

As the manuscript is listed among the paper manuscripts, if it was copied in Ireland (as seems likely), the use of paper would suggest that it would most likely have dated to the sixteenth century at the earliest and more probably the seventeenth.⁴⁴ It would thus have been contemporary with Ó Cléirigh and Colgan. Given that it also contained *Nuallghubha Oileall Oloim*, a text which frequently appears together with CMM² in the manuscripts, it is extremely likely that its *Cath Mhaighe Mochroimhe* was the Early Modern version of the story rather than the medieval text.⁴⁵

⁴⁰Item 2, p. 3, available on *ISOS* (accessed 8 November 2020). The list was published in Charles Mac Donnell, 'On the MSS. of John Colgan, preserved at St. Isidore's, Rome', *PRIA* 6 (1853–7), 95–103, and in J. T. Gilbert, 'Manuscripts of the former College of Irish Franciscans, Louvain', *Fourth Report of the Royal Commission on Historical Manuscripts*, Part I, Report and Appendix (London, 1874), 599–613, at 611–12. On the printed material in this second list, see Ignatius Fennessy, 'Printed books in St Anthony's College, Louvain, 1673 (F. L. K., MS A 34)', *Collectanea Hibernica* 38 (1996), 82–117. Note also that the entry includes a reference to *Buile Shuibne*, a text which also served as a source for the martyrology (see Ó Riain, *Feastdays*, 307).

⁴¹Corrected from 'folio'.

⁴²'beatha Padraig' and 'beatha bhrighde' added in margin and inserted via insertion mark.

⁴³The text is cited from Item 1, p. 2 of the manuscript, but the entry in Item 3, p. 2 is identical.

⁴⁴On the relative numbers of parchment to paper manuscripts in the different centuries and on the transition to paper, see Pádraig Ó Macháin, 'The emergence of the Gaelic paper manuscript: a preliminary investigation', in Pádraig Ó Macháin (ed.), *Paper and the Paper Manuscript: A Context for the Transmission of Gaelic Literature* (Cork, 2019), 21–43.

⁴⁵A version of *Nuallghubha* is edited from NLS Adv. 72.1.28 in Myles Dillon, 'The lamentation of Oilill Olom', *SGS* 6:1 (1947–9), 1–10. Ó Dúnlainne, 'Cath Mhuighe Mochruimhe', 75–180, also includes a version of the text.

In his survey of Louvain manuscripts in the Franciscan friary, Killiney, Gilbert transcribed the list of manuscripts in the possession of Colgan, including the reference to this quarto volume.⁴⁶ In his overall inventory of the Louvain manuscripts he also listed an item which he described as follows: 'Battle of Mag Macruimhe; death of Cuchullain. Irish. Small 4to.'⁴⁷ Gilbert numbered this manuscript as 30, and it is tempting to identify Gilbert's manuscript 30 with the manuscript listed in items 1–3 in A 34. However, while the size is the same and *Cath Mhaighe Mochroimhe* is listed in both cases, the manuscript in A 34 does not, according to any of the descriptions, contain an account of the death of Cú Chulainn.

Both Arbois de Jubainville and Flower refer to Gilbert's mention of his manuscript no. 30,⁴⁸ and Arbois de Jubainville identified it with what is now manuscript A 25.⁴⁹ The same identification was made by Hyde⁵⁰ and in the *Catalogue of Irish manuscripts in the Franciscan Library Killiney*.⁵¹ This is, however, problematic: while A 25 does contain a version of *Brisleach Maige Muirtheimne*, it does not contain *Cath Mhaighe Mochroimhe* in its present form.⁵² The problem is illustrated by the fact that while Arbois de Jubainville is able to identify Gilbert's manuscript 30 in his introduction, he is unable to reconcile this with the reference to *Cath Mhaighe Mochroimhe* in his list of manuscripts of the tale.⁵³ The catalogue description of A 25 states that it is damaged and difficult to read in places and, moreover, that pages have been removed, either deliberately or through loss,⁵⁴ and so it is not impossible that CMM² was originally contained in the manuscript but later lost. However, even if this were the case and Gilbert's manuscript no. 30 was A 25, the manuscript listed in A 34 cannot be identical with A 25 in its present form as the contents according to the passages cited above differ entirely from what is found in A 25. In fact, none of the texts listed in the manuscript in A 34 appear in the index to the 1969 *Catalogue*. Furthermore, A 25 contains a significant amount of poetry, a fact that does not tally at all with the manuscript described as containing *Cath Mhaighe Mochroimhe* in the A 34 lists. Instead, it seems more likely that the

⁴⁶Gilbert, 'Manuscripts', 611.

⁴⁷Gilbert, 'Manuscripts', 605.

⁴⁸Arbois de Jubainville, *Essai*, lxxxiv and 75; Flower, *Catalogue*, 401. Flower provides page references both to Gilbert's description of his manuscript no. 30 and to his transcription of A 34, thus probably indicating that he considered them to be the same manuscript.

⁴⁹Arbois de Jubainville, *Essai*, lxxxiv. Arbois de Jubainville did not, of course, use the number A 25, but his description of the manuscript, including folio numbers, make it clear that he is referring to manuscript now catalogued as A 25.

⁵⁰Douglas Hyde (ed. and trans.), *Giolla an Fhiughá; or, The Lad of the Ferule. Eachtra Cloinne Rígh na h-Ioruaide; or, Adventures of the Children of the King of Norway*, ITS 1 (London, 1899), xiii. For other references regarding A 25, see the Dillon, Mooney and de Brún, *Catalogue*, 51.

⁵¹Dillon, Mooney, and de Brún, *Catalogue*, Table 1, xxi, and n. 57.

⁵²The tales do in fact appear together in UCD A 59, but this manuscript was not added to the collection until 1977 (de Brún, 'Two additions').

⁵³Arbois de Jubainville, *Essai*, 75: 'un manuscrit de ce morceau appartenait à Colgan quand il mourut à Louvain en 1658: Gilbert, *Fourth Report of the Royal Commission on Historical Mss.*, p. 611, col. 2. M. Gilbert, p. 605, col. 1 a classé ce manuscrit sous le n° XXX de la collection de Franciscains de Dublin, Je n'ai pas eu le talent de le retrouver'.

⁵⁴See the description of the manuscript in Dillon, Mooney and de Brún, *Catalogue*, 50–1.

current manuscript A 25 is the manuscript described as follows in the A 34 list: 'Liber in 4^o continens varia Poemata Hibernica / *Stair triar* mac rí na Hioru-aidhe / comhrac fhirde 7 choncculuinn'.⁵⁵ For ease of reference, I will refer to the manuscript description in A 34 that refers to *Cath Mhaighe Mochroimhe* as A 34(a) and the description just cited, which is likely to be the surviving manuscript A 25, as A 34(b).

Gilbert's manuscript no. 30 may have been lost after he carried out his inventory; indeed, the 1969 catalogue of the Irish manuscripts at Killiney contains no reference to any account of the Battle of Mag Mucrama, medieval or modern. I have been unable to consult the lists made by O'Reilly at the end of the nineteenth and beginning of the twentieth century to ascertain whether he includes any reference to the manuscript.⁵⁶ However, as seen above, the surviving manuscripts do include a copy of Cú Chulainn's death tale. Thus, there are the following three possible ways of explaining the joint appearance of *Cath Mhaighe Mochroimhe* and the death of Cú Chulainn in Gilbert's manuscript no. 30:

- There may have been two copies of *Cath Mhaighe Mochroimhe* at Louvain; one as described in A 34(a) and one contained in A 25, from which it was lost or removed; however, in this case, one might still reasonably expect CMM² to feature in the contents of A 25 as described in A 34(b) given that it is mentioned in A 34(a).
- Alternatively, Gilbert's manuscript no. 30 may be completely separate from either A 34(a) or A 34(b) and could in fact be a second copy of both *Cath Mhaighe Mochroimhe* and the death of Cú Chulainn. However, A 34 does not explicitly refer to a second copy of either text, though it should be taken into account that not all manuscript descriptions in the A 34 lists provide all names of individual texts. It would also mean that both copies of *Cath Mhaighe Mochroimhe* and one copy of the death of Cú Chulainn had gone missing from the library since Gilbert's survey.
- Finally, A 25 and the manuscript containing *Cath Mhaighe Mochroimhe* may have been bound together after the lists in A 34 were compiled and presented to Gilbert as one volume, subsequently recorded by him as manuscript no. 30; this would also mean that these manuscripts were separated again at some point after Gilbert's survey had been completed and the *Cath Mhaighe Mochroimhe* part of the manuscript, perhaps identical with A 34(a), had then been lost.

None of these solutions is entirely satisfactory, but the third is perhaps more feasible than the first two. In this case, the statement that Gilbert's manuscript

⁵⁵Item 2, p. 4. The manuscript is also listed in Item 1, p. 2 ('Liber in 4^o. continens varia poemata Hibernica: Acta conficta filiorum Regis No/r/wegia; pugnam firdia 7 conchulain etc.') and Item 3, p. 2 (text identical to Item 1). No manuscript corresponding to this description can be identified in Gilbert's inventory list.

⁵⁶On these lists and for a concordance of manuscript numbers, see Dillon, Mooney and de Brún, *Catalogue*, xix–xxii.

no. 30 is identical with A 25 would be at least partially correct. Ultimately, however, the copy of *Cath Mhaighe Mochroimhe* listed in A 34(a) does not survive today, and the discussion above has shown that it is unlikely that even parts of the manuscript in which it was contained survive. Thus very little can be said regarding its date or the exact nature of its text of the tale. Furthermore, it is not possible to say whether the manuscript in Colgan's possession at the time of his death was available to Ó Cléirigh when he was working on the annotated version of the martyrology. Nonetheless, the reference in A 34(a) is significant, as it indicates that such a text may have been considered a source of interest in Louvain and may well have been regarded as an acceptable source for Mícheál Ó Cléirigh's work on the martyrology.

The text of CMM²

To return to the text of CMM² itself, in the short passage on Art and Treóit alone, the manuscript copies I have consulted show significant differences, as will be seen below. As my interest in this context is on this episode's relationship with the martyrology, I have focused on the episode of Art's experience at Treóit and have not analysed the tale in its entirety or examined such questions as the episode's position within it. Given the divergence and manuscript groupings that can be established for this short passage alone, Ó Dúnlain's text is unlikely to be representative of the textual tradition as a whole and likely reflects one version of the tale.

The first line of the poem

Most of the manuscripts I have identified so far date to the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, and, as mentioned, only NLS Adv. 72.1.38 can be dated to roughly the same time as the Martyrology of Donegal. Thus, while I have not been able to find any other surviving manuscripts from this period, this manuscript and the copy of the tale probably present in Louvain indicate that the text was known in the first half to middle of the seventeenth century.

The various manuscripts of the tale that contain Art's poem differ both in the number of stanzas transmitted, ranging from 1 to 25, and in the wording of the first line of the poem. Moreover, some manuscripts omit the poem entirely. Of those for which I have sufficient detail of the text, 62 copies of the tale contain the poem and 19 do not. Of these, only those manuscripts I have been able to consult either in person or as images, 53 in total, have been included in the discussion here. In one of these, NLS Adv. 72.2.8, the script is so badly faded that the poem is only very partially legible, and it is impossible to determine the wording of the first line or the length of the poem. This manuscript has therefore been omitted from the following considerations.

On the basis of the variation amongst this group of manuscripts, I have divided the ones that contain the poem into five groups, which I have labelled A to E. Groups A and C are further subdivided into A1 and A2 and C1 and C2 as the quality in the final consonant of the last word varies, reflected in the spellings 'dein', 'den' and 'dean'. My working hypothesis is that these groups arise from different lines of transmission and may be linked to different versions

of CMM², although only a full examination of the text and manuscript tradition of the tale would bring certainty on this. The following list gives the form of the first line in each group and, indented, the manuscripts that belong to this group.

- A1** *Caoín do dionnaibh de(i)n* (nine manuscripts)
Maynooth R70; NLS Adv. 72.1.38; RIA 24 L 8 (121); RIA 24 C 8 (288); RIA 23 E 4 (524); RIA 23 H 12 (705); RIA 24 I 9 (930); TCD H 1. 13 (1287); TCD H 2. 5 (1296)
- A2** *Caoín do dionnaibh dean* (two manuscripts)
NLI G18; RIA 24 L 26 (776)
- B** *Caoín do dheanamh is do ghean* (four manuscripts)
BL Add. 29614; Cambridge, University Library, Add. 3095; TCD H 6. 7 (1411); RIA 23 H 18 (707)
- C1** *Caoidhin do dheanamh a dhein* (thirteen manuscripts)
BL Eg. 150; Coláiste Cholmáin, Mainistir Fhear Maí 34, Liverpool, University Library, M12029; Maynooth M20; Maynooth M67; NLI G22; RIA F iv 1 (267); RIA 23 I 47 (431); RIA 23 D 46 (521); RIA 24 L 21 (816); RIA 12 F 20 (897); RIA 23 E 15 (1029); to this group can be added BL, Eg. 114, which is a nineteenth-century transcript by John O'Donovan of Eg. 150
- C2** *Caoín do dheanamh a dhean* (seventeen manuscripts)
BL Eg. 106; Maynooth C37(a); Maynooth C37(b); Maynooth M51; Maynooth M55; NUI Galway Hyde 51; RIA 23 D 22 (33); RIA 24 P 6 (94) (second version); RIA 24 P 10 (96); RIA 23 H 16 (115); RIA 23 K 37 (152); RIA 23 O 37 (197); RIA 3 B 12 (212); RIA 23 L 27 (556); RIA 23 M 47 (973); RIA 23 G 10 (974); RIA 23 N 19 (1030)
- D** *Caoíne do dheanam a dhe(a)n* (three manuscripts)
RIA D iii 2 (619); TCD H 1. 15 (1289); UCC 96.

A further manuscript, MS Ir 12 at Houghton Library, Harvard University, contains the first stanza of the poem, with the first line reading '[C]aoín do deanamh do dhean'. This cannot be clearly assigned to the groups outlined.

It is clear that the first line of the poem quoted in the Martyrology of Donegal corresponds to the line as found in the Group A1 manuscripts. While a comparison of a single line of poetry may seem a slim basis for such an association, there are a few points that justify it. From a purely practical point of view, the martyrology only preserves the first line of the poem and so that is what must be compared. More importantly, however, if as is argued here, a written version of CMM² formed the source of the martyrology text, one would imagine that that source contained the line of verse as preserved in the martyrology. While Ó Cléirigh may have intervened in the text, as suggested below

with regard to the prose, the verse line tallies with this group of manuscript witnesses and an association thus seems a reasonable inference.⁵⁷

When taking groups A1 and A2 together, it becomes clear that they also share another feature not found in the other manuscripts, namely the length of the poem. The number of stanzas in the poem varies across the manuscripts of CMM², with some citing only the first stanza and others giving fuller versions of the poem consisting of 20, 21, 22, 23.5, 24.5 or 25 stanzas.⁵⁸ While the most common length is 22 stanzas, the 25-stanza version of the poem appears to be exclusive to groups A1 and A2.⁵⁹ It should be noted that some of the manuscripts in the other groups only cite the first stanza and we cannot, therefore, tell how long a fuller version would have been.⁶⁰ Nevertheless, this distribution is striking, suggesting that Group A is indeed a distinct group and that it may reflect a particular phase in the text's history or a separate line of transmission.

Four other manuscripts, Cashel 4729 (now University of Limerick, Bolton Library MS 22), NLI G161, UCD A 59 and BL Add. 18947 contain lines which may be corrupted forms of Group A. The Cashel manuscript has the first line 'Caoín do *dhionnaibh*', G161 reads 'Caoín do *dionad dein*', UCD A 59 gives 'Caoín do *dhiona déan*' and BL Add. 18947 has '[C]aon do *dhenábha ccéin*'. Of these, G161 and A 59 also contain 25 stanzas. The Cashel manuscript contains 24 stanzas plus an extra line. Taken together with the anomalous first line, it is possible that this manuscript contains a corrupted version of the 25-stanza poem beginning 'Caoín do *dionnaibh de(i)n*' or 'Caoín do *dionnaibh dean*'. The British Library manuscript only contains the first stanza of the poem. While the first line is clearly problematic, nothing can be said beyond that.

Interestingly, Group A also contains the oldest manuscript identified so far, NLS Adv. 72.1.38. Furthermore, while the precise relationship between the episode in CMM² and *Fástini Airt* is unclear, the 25-stanza version of the poem is closer to the medieval text than the other shorter versions of the poem, as the three additional stanzas contained in the 25-stanza version have equivalents in *Fástini Airt*. Finally, of the various first lines, the version in Group A is closest to *Fástini Airt*'s 'Cain do *denna den*'. There may be grounds, then, for arguing that this group of manuscripts reflects the oldest strand in the extant Early Modern transmission of the poem, and this is a possibility that should be investigated further in any future, more detailed examination of the overall textual variation in the manuscripts of CMM².

As a provisional conclusion, it may be suggested that the Martyrology of Donegal appears to be related to this strand in the textual development of *Cath*

⁵⁷The citation of the first line of a poem is also in itself not an unusual practice and one might therefore assume the first line to carry a degree of authority.

⁵⁸Problems with the legibility of NUI Galway, Hyde 51, make it difficult to determine the exact length of the poem, but it appears to contain 23 stanzas or 23 stanzas plus an extra half-stanza.

⁵⁹There are two manuscripts containing the 25-stanza version of the poem that I omit from my grouping as I have not been able to double-check their readings due to library closures. These are NLI MS G296 and TCD MS H 3. 10 (1329), both from the eighteenth century.

⁶⁰These are in Group C2: Maynooth M51, RIA 23 O 37 (197), RIA 23 G 10, RIA 23 M 47, RIA 23 G 10 (974).

Mhaighe Mochroimhe and, if one accepts that it is directly dependent on the tale, is likely to have been based on a version of the tale that contained 25 stanzas of the poem.

The sods of earth

Turning to the other difference mentioned above, i.e. the placement of the sods of earth, this concerns the number of sods actually mentioned in CMM² as compared to the Martyrology of Donegal. Given that the first line of the poem in the martyrology appears to be related to a particular group of CMM² manuscripts, namely those in Group A above, in the following I will compare the text of those manuscripts, including the four doubtful manuscripts Cashel 4729 (University of Limerick, Bolton Library MS 22), NLI G161, UCD A 59 and BL Add. 18947. The focus on this group assumes that the association between the martyrology of the Group A version of the text is secure, and while further research may revise this assumption, the reasons justifying it have been outlined above.

Of these manuscripts, i.e. Group A and the four doubtful copies, BL Add. 18947 does not contain the detailed etymology given in the text as cited above from Ó Dúnlainge's edition and the martyrology in that the placement of the three sods is not described to the same extent as in the other manuscripts. BL Add. 18947 is also the only manuscript in this group to cite just the first stanza and it may be that this version is generally less detailed.

The other manuscripts are more detailed and can be divided into two groups as follows (insignificant variations in spelling or wording have not been taken into account and are ignored in the following headings):

Group 1 — *fód fám chenn 7 fód fám chosaibh 7 fód ceachtar mo dhá thaoibh* (alt. *fód ceachtar dom dhá thaobh*) ('a sod beneath my head, and a sod under my legs/feet, and a sod for each of my two sides'):

Cashel 4729/Limerick Bolton 22; NLI G18; NLI G161; NLS Adv. 72.1.38; RIA 24 L 8 (121); RIA 24 C 8 (288); RIA 23 E 4 (524); RIA 24 L 26 (776); TCD H 1. 13 (1287); TCD H 2. 5 (1296), UCD A 59;

Group 2 — *fód fám cheann, fód fám chosaibh 7 fód fám dhá tháobh* ('a sod under my head, a sod under my legs/feet, and a sod under my two sides'):
Maynooth R70; RIA 23 H 12 (705); RIA 24 I 9 (930).

It is noticeable that, although the supposed etymology of Treóit is 'three sods', the wording in Group 1 is ambiguous. The possible distributive use of *ceachtar* to reference a sod beneath each of Art's two sides may be read as indicating two distinct sods, which would bring the total count up to four. In Group 2, the ambiguity is less obvious as the text leaves more room for the reference to be to one large sod that is big enough to accommodate the width of Art's body. Moreover, although there are three manuscripts in Group 2 as given here, they are related to each other, and all are linked to 'Leabhar Muimhneach'. The Maynooth manuscript and RIA 24 I 9 (930) were copied by the same scribe,

Mícheál Ó Raghallaigh, and a note in the third manuscript, RIA 23 H 12 (705), states that it was also copied from a manuscript by Mícheál Ó Raghallaigh.⁶¹

The martyrology diverges from Groups 1 and 2 at this point and only mentions a sod beneath Art's head and beneath each of his sides. The feet/legs are ignored entirely, but the distributive pronoun *ceachtar* is also used. However, unlike in Group 1, there is no ambiguity about the number of sods. The question arises as to whether Mícheál Ó Cléirigh's version derived from his source, was an oversight on his part or is the result of a deliberate intervention of his to regularise the text by highlighting the perceived etymology of Treóit more clearly.⁶² As Pádraig A. Breatnach has remarked, Ó Cléirigh, in comments from 1629, complains about having to copy his sources exactly, including any errors he identified in them, but according to Breatnach, such comments do not recur in the later period of his work.⁶³ If one accepts that the Martyrology of Donegal was drawing on a version of *Cath Mhaighe Mochroimhe*, the martyrology's peculiarity regarding the sods of earth *may* reflect Ó Cléirigh's desire to correct his sources, although his annotations presumably date to around the time of the complaints noted by Breatnach.

A comparison with The Annals of the Four Masters and Genealogiae Regum et Sanctorum Hiberniae

It has been argued above that the first line cited in the Martyrology of Donegal may be an indication of which version of CMM² underlies the account. It may further be of interest to take into consideration references to Art in three other works produced by Mícheál Ó Cléirigh and his associates in order to see whether this potential influence of CMM² can also be detected there. These are the *Genealogiae Regum et Sanctorum Hiberniae*, the Annals of the Four Masters and *Leabhar Gabhála*.⁶⁴ The *Genealogiae* existed in draft form at the time the annotated version of the martyrology was being compiled and the Annals

⁶¹ It may be of interest to note that the version of the etymology involving the word *ceachtar* is by far the most common, including in manuscripts outside Group A. The other variants found outside Group A are a version including the word *dhá* and variants that do not: (1) *fód fám chosaibh, fód dom dá tháobh* γ *fód fám cheann*; (2) *fód fám chosaibh, fód fám cheann* γ *fód fám tháobh*; and (3) *fód fám cheann, fód fám chosaibh* γ *fód fám tháobh* (spellings normalised). Ó Dúnlainge's edition, which is based on RIA manuscripts 23 M 47, 23 G 10, 23 L 27 and 23 K 7, presents yet another version, reading *fód fám' cheann, fód fám tadhbh, agus fód fám' chosaibh*. As the anonymous reviewer has pointed out to me, this last variant is less ambiguous than the two variants presented here from the Group A manuscripts. However, 23 M 47, 23 G 10, and 23 K 7 all include the word *ceachtar*, so Ó Dúnlainge's version must derive from 23 L 27, for which I have not been able to double-check the prose section.

⁶² As stated in the previous note, three of Ó Dúnlainge's four manuscripts actually contain the version of the etymology including *ceachtar*. At the very least, then, Ó Dúnlainge also appears to have felt the need to choose a more logical reading than that presented by the *ceachtar* manuscripts.

⁶³ Pádraig A. Breatnach, 'An Irish Bollandus: Fr Hugh Ward OFM and the Louvain hagiographical enterprise', *Éigse* 31 (1999), 1–30, at 15–16.

⁶⁴ For an overview of these texts as a group, see Pádraig A. Breatnach, *The Four Masters and their Manuscripts: Studies in Palaeography and Text* (Dublin, 2013), 1–10.

may also have been partially available in draft form.⁶⁵ To date, there is no full edition of the Four Masters' recension of *Leabhar Gabhála*, so I refer to two manuscripts: Royal Irish Academy 23 M 70, written by Michéal Ó Cléirigh and probably closest to the version of the text completed in 1631, and Royal Irish Academy 23 K 32 (617), written by Cú Choigríche O Cléirigh and likely representing his own expansion of the material prepared by 1631.⁶⁶

The *Genealogiae* contain the following reference to Art and his death:

Art m Cuinn cétcathaig deich mbliadhna fichet go ttorcair la Lucchaid mac Maic Niadha a ccath Moighe Mucroimhe do laimh Lioghairne laighnigh A. M. 5394, A. D. 195.⁶⁷

'Art mac Cuinn cétcathaig, 30 years until he fell due to Lucchad mac Maic Niadha in the Battle of Mag Mucraime by the hand of Liogharne laighnigh.'

In the Annals of the Four Masters, the description of the battle reads as follows:

Iar mbeith triocho bliadhain hi righe hEreann dArt, mac Cuinn Cédcathaigh, torcair hi ccath Moighe Mucraime la Mac Con go na allmarchoibh. Torcratar beos isin cath cedna maraon re hArt, meic a Sethar Saidbe ingine Cuind .i. seacht maca Oiliolla Oluim, tangatur lais i naghaidh Mic Con a nderbrathar, Eoghan Mór Dubhmerchon, Mughcorb, Lughaidh, Eochaidh, Dichorb, 7 Tadcc a nanmanna, 7 Béinne Briot, ri Bretan ro imir lamha forra. Torchair Beinde la Lughaidh Lagha a ccionaidh a bhráithrech. Liogairne Leacanhoda, mac Aengusa Bailbh, mic Eathach Finn-fuathnairt, ro imbir lamha for Art isin cath sin Moighe Muccroimhe, iar tocht do hi sochraide Mic Con.

'After Art, the son of Conn of the Hundred Battles, had been thirty years in the sovereignty of Ireland, he fell in the battle of Magh-Mucruime, by Maccon and his foreigners. In the same battle, along with Art, fell also the sons of his sister, Sadhbh, daughter of Conn, namely, the seven sons of Oilioll Olum, who had come with him against Maccon, their brother. Eoghan Mor, Dubhmerchon, Mughcorb, Lughaidh, Eochaidh, Diochorb, and Tadhg, were their names; and Beinne Brit, King of Britain, was he who laid [violent] hands upon them. Beinne was slain by Lighaidh Lagha, in revenge of his relatives. Lioghairne of the Long Cheeks, son of Aenghus Balbh, son of Eochaidh Finn Fuathairt, was he who laid

⁶⁵ Ó Riain, *Feastdays*, 291 (on the *Genealogiae*) and 290 (on the Annals). Moreover, Cunningham has noted a close connection between *AFM* and the Martyrology of Donegal in terms of the saints whose obits are mentioned in *AFM* (Cunningham, *The Annals*, 226).

⁶⁶ A detailed discussion of these manuscripts is found in Pádraig A. Breatnach, 'On the Ó Cléirigh recension of *Leabhar gabhála*', *Éigse* 37 (2010), 1–57. Both are available on *ISOS*.

⁶⁷ Walsh, Paul (ed.), *Genealogiae Regum et Sanctorum Hiberniae by the Four Masters* (Maynooth and Dublin, 1918), 27.

[violent] hands upon Art in this battle of Magh-Mucruimhe, after he had joined the forces of Maccon.’⁶⁸

The two manuscripts of *Leabhar Gabhála* considered here present an interesting contrast, with 23 K 32 presenting a much fuller entry on Art’s reign than 23 M 70, in keeping with their relationship as a whole. I cite only the sentence relevant to Art’s death and note that neither manuscript refers to Art’s experience at Treóit.

23 M 70, fols. 94v⁶⁹

Gabois tra Art mac Cuinn cet cathach an righe deich mbliadna fichet go ttorcair a cath mucramha la lughaid mac con & lioghairne loigneach ro imbir lamh fair.

‘Art mac mac Cuinn cécathaig took the kingship for 30 years until he fell in the battle of Mag Mucramha by Lugaid Mac Con and it was Liogairne Loigneach who carried out violence against him.’

23 K 32, p. 148

Lioghairne leaconfoda mac aenghusa bailb maic eachaid finn fuathairt baoi for dibeirg iffarradh meic con ro imbir lamha for an righ Art. Deich mbliadhna ficheat do Art ina Righ gó sin.

‘Lioghairne Leacanfoda mac Aengussa bailb maic Eochaid was engaged in vengeance in the company of Mac Con. He carried out violence against the king, Art. Art had been king for 30 years up until then.’

The use of the *ro imbir* in both manuscripts and the fuller genealogy of Liogairne in 23 K 32 align both versions more closely with the text in *AFM* than that in the *Genealogiae*. All of these texts diverge from the medieval account of the battle, *Cath Maige Mucrama*, in attributing Art’s death to Ligairne rather than Lugaid Lága. In the case of the *Genealogiae*, Lugaid mac Macnia is also mentioned, though he is not referenced as being associated with Art’s death in the other sources discussed here.⁷⁰ Dobbs and O Daly drew attention to the discrepancy regarding the identity of Art’s killer in various medieval and Early Modern sources,⁷¹ including two poems in *Iomarbhágh na bhFileadh* as well as O’Flaherty’s *Ogygia*.⁷² The first of the two poems is ‘A Thaidhg ná tathaoir Torna’,⁷³ in which stanza 61 reads

⁶⁸*AFM* 108–11.

⁶⁹This passage comes at the end of fol. 94. The beginning of 95r is damaged; as a result text has been lost and what remains is fragmentary. As far as can be seen, however, the text on fol. 95r does not concern Art.

⁷⁰Several characters appear to have been known by the name Mac Nia (and variants thereof) as well well as Lugaid, leading to some problems of identification. See Margaret Dobbs, ‘Who was Lugaid Mac Con?’, *JRSAI* 20 (1930), 165–87, at 175.

⁷¹Dobbs, ‘Who was Lugaid Mac Con?’, 179; O Daly, *Cath Maige Mucrama*, 8.

⁷²The Early Modern poems are found in Lambert McKenna (ed. and trans.), *Iomarbhágh na bhFileadh: The Contention of the Bards*, 2 vols, ITS 20, 21 (London, 1918). The passage in O’Flaherty’s *Ogygia: Seu, Rerum Hibernicarum Chronologia* (London, 1685) is found on p. 328 (not 228 as stated by O Daly).

⁷³McKenna, *Iomarbhágh*, 18–27.

Guin Airt do Lughaidh Lágha
 níor mhaoidhte dhuit go dána
 ní hé Lughaidh do mharbh Art
 acht Lioghairne go laochdacht.

‘You should not have attributed so boldly the death of Art
 to Lughaidh Lágha. It was not Lughaidh who killed Art but
 Lioghairne in brave combat.’⁷⁴

The second poem is ‘Ro chuala ar thagrais a Thaidhg’,⁷⁵ in which stanzas 255–268 are wholly or in part concerned with the question and which appear to contain references to other sources, though these are not identified by McKenna. O Daly specifically refers to stanza 257:

Tar a bhfuair do ghonaibh arm
 is é Lioghairne ros mharbh
 iar dtuitim Airt ar an maigh
 is ann ros dhícheann Lughaidh.

‘After all the sword-wounds Art received, Lioghairne killed him.
 When he was dead on the field Lugh[aidh] beheaded him.’⁷⁶

Both of these poems are attributed to Lughaidh Ó Cléirigh, an acknowledged influence on Michéal Ó Cléirigh’s work.⁷⁷

In the late seventeenth century, O’Flaherty’s *Ogygia* also suggests competing traditions. He also involves both Lugaid and Ligairne and concludes *Uter eorum vero lethale vulnus inflixit, uter caput scidit? disquisitione, aut controversia dignum non judico* ‘I do not consider [the question of] which of the two actually inflicted the lethal wound and which severed the head worthy of investigation or debate’.⁷⁸ In the edited version of CMM², however, it is also Lugaid Lága who kills Art, and Ligairne does not come into play; the manuscripts which I have so far consulted on this point agree, including the oldest manuscript, NLS, Adv. 72.1.38, with which the martyrology shares a first line. Thus, provisionally, it appears that Ligairne does not have a role in Art’s death in CMM², and Ó Cléirigh’s information on this point may have been derived from a different source. The textual examples cited above serve to show that, while CMM² appears to have influenced Ó Cléirigh’s addition to the martyrology regarding the naming of Treóit, the other texts in which he was involved show influence from a different tradition to the one underlying CMM². It appears that CMM² was valuable for the information it could give on Treóit but it did not serve as a source for other information on Art.

Another point can be added to the examination of the passages quoted above. The Annals of the Four Masters list the sons of Ailill Ólomm that

⁷⁴McKenna, *Iomarbhágh*, 26–7.

⁷⁵McKenna, *Iomarbhágh*, 54–91.

⁷⁶McKenna, *Iomarbhágh*, 88–9.

⁷⁷For details of this, see Cunningham, *The Annals*, 268–70 and passim.

⁷⁸O’Flaherty, *Ogygia*, 329; my translation.

are killed in the battle, and the order in which they are listed corresponds, with one exception, to the order in which Ailill is given news of his sons' death in *Nuallghubha Oiliolla Oluim*. *Nuallghubha* is a text which frequently accompanies CMM² in manuscripts of all the groupings above and thus the similarities with *AFM* could potentially indicate a connection. The one exception to the order given in *AFM* and *Nuallghubha* is Eoghan Mór, whom *AFM* mentions first, but who is mentioned last in *Nuallghubha* as printed in the edited version of CMM². Ailill's reaction in that text to the *giolla* who conveys the news of Eoghan's death is more extreme than when he is told about his other sons' deaths:

Ad! Ad! Ad! Uch! Uch! Uch! is faobhrach ro bheanais riom, óir do dhallais mo rosg, do bhodhrais mo chluas, do lagais mo lámh, do ghearraais mo réim, do chiorrais mo ré, go bhfuilid caoba fola flannruadha i gcompar mo chléibh, agus d'ionnarbais mo chroidhe as mo chlé-thaobh, go bhfuil 'san taobh ar aill.⁷⁹

'Oh! Oh! Oh! Alas! Alas! Alas! It is sharply you have struck at me, since you have blinded my eye, you have deafened my ear, you have weakened my arm, you have cut short my course, you have destroyed my life, so that they are tears of very red blood in my chest, and you have banished my heart from my left side, so that it is in the other side.'

Ailill then recites a verse, as he also does regarding each of his other sons, but like the prose reaction, the verse is lengthier in Eoghan's case. Whether this is because it is the final piece of bad news in a series of blows or whether it is because he considered Eoghan the greatest of his sons is not clear. In the latter case, this might explain his different position as the first of the sons in the annal entry, but as last in the narrative text where the account builds up to the news of his death.

The medieval account *Cath Maige Mucrama* does, of course, include references to Ailill's seven sons dying, but they are not named.⁸⁰ Their names are, however, given in the poems 'Beir mo scíath' and 'A maccáin na cī', both preserved in the Book of Leinster.⁸¹ These poems were edited and translated by Mac Neill together with *Fáistine Airt*, and their connection to *Cath Maige Mucrama* and CMM² has been noted on a number of occasions.⁸² In 'Beir mo scíath', the order in which Ailill's sons are named is essentially the same as in *AFM* and CMM², but Eoghan's name is found in yet another position:

⁷⁹Ó Dúnlainge, 'Cath Mhuighe Mochruimhe', 78; my translation.

⁸⁰O Daly, *Cath Maige Mucrama*, 56 (text) and 57 (translation): *Atá a n-otharlaige frisin n-áth atáuid .i. secht meic Aillela Óluim* 'The grave of the seven sons of Ailill Ólom is to the north of the ford'.

⁸¹Mac Neill, 'Three poems', 540–45.

⁸²See Mac Neill, 'Three poems', 556 n. 22–4 and 28; O Daly, *Cath Maige Mucrama*, 1; Flower, *Catalogue*, 400.

Mo shecht maicc ro-s-marb Macc Con
 issē a nglo nglechrach ngarg
 Dubmercon Mug Corp Eogan
 Lugaid Echaid Dichorp Tadc.

‘My seven sons, Mac Con slew them, he is (the cause of) their
 vehement wild bewailing, Dubmercon, Mug Corp, Eogan, Lugaid,
 Echaid, Dichorp, Tadc.’⁸³

‘A maccáin na cī’ gives a different order overall, but it emphasises Eogan’s
 special importance to Ailill:

Ro-marbad mo macc 7 mo shé meicc.
 diliu lim mo macc andát mo shecht meicc.

Mug Corb. is Dubmercon. Dichorb. Eocho ard.
 ropdar crōda cruaid Lugaid 7 Tadc.

Diliu lim-sa Eogan andat ciarbat ile
 rop é smir mo chnāma rop hí in chuslend cride.

Rop é con mo shlúaigh rop é mo choll ciúin
 rop é cuit mo bél rop hí mo chruit ciúil.

Am cumthach dia éis nidam tualnge dúis
 am aneoil dia ēis is todiúir mo gnúis.

‘My son was slain and my six sons; dearer to me my son than my
 seven sons.

Mug Corb and Dubmercon, Dichorb, tall Eocho, they were brave
 and hardy, Lugaid and Tadc.

Dearer to me Eogan than they, though they were many; he was the
 marrow of my bones, he was the heart’s vein.

He was the head of my host, he was my gentle hazel, he was the
 food of my lips, he was the harp of music.

I am sorrowful after him, I am incapable of joy (?), I am senseless
 after him, my aspect is miserable.’⁸⁴

While the constraints of verse must be taken into account with these two poems, the second citation shows that the order of the names was not fixed enough to prevent variation and this may give more weight to the similarities between *AFM* and *CMM*² in this regard. However, the citation from ‘Beir mo sciath’ also shows that *CMM*²/*Nuallghubha* was not alone in employing the basic order found in these texts. As with the identity of who killed Art,⁸⁵ the examination of

⁸³Mac Neill, ‘Three poems’, 542–3.

⁸⁴Mac Neill, ‘Three poems’, 546–53 at 548–9.

⁸⁵Moreover, any order may also have been influenced by factors such as the perceived age of the sons. I thank the anonymous reviewer for this suggestion.

the names of Ailill's sons provides no clear indication that CMM² and by association *Nuallghubha* played a role in the work of Ó Cléirigh and his associates beyond providing the passage on the renaming of Treóit.

WHY INCLUDE ART IN THE MARTYROLOGY?

Compared to the other texts that refer to Art's burial at Treóit, i.e. the medieval texts *Fástini Airt* and *Senchas na Relec* and the Early Modern text CMM², the martyrology stands out because it is the only one that brings together hagiographical information on Lonán with the story of Art's experience at Treóit and the resultant change in name from Duma Derglúachra to Treóit. As the two components of the martyrology's entry are not linked internally by their narrative and only through their association with Treóit, the fact that they are not found together elsewhere is not necessarily surprising.⁸⁶ However, it does raise the question of why the story of Art's conversion is included in the martyrology. While the account is religious in nature, it is not hagiological. The sources of the martyrology underline the relevance of the question: while the sources listed by Ó Riain of the annotated version of the martyrology include a number of poems, the majority of source texts is hagiographical in nature.

It is clear that the martyrology was not intended for use in a liturgical context,⁸⁷ and it could be argued that the Treóit entry illustrates this well: in this small section, the vision experienced by a pre-Christian king precedes the genealogy of the saint with whom the entry is concerned. The relevance of Art's vision to the entry seems to lie not in any connection to Lonán but in the name of the place itself, providing an etymology for the name Treóit. An interest in placenames does occasionally surface elsewhere in the Martyrology of Donegal, although it is not an overriding theme. The locations of churches are sometimes identified on the basis of personal geographical knowledge,⁸⁸ and at times, the names of the places are elucidated, as in the long 9 June entry on Colum Cille, where the name 'Ath-an-Carpaid' is explained as deriving from a broken chariot.⁸⁹ On 8 September, the entry for Colum of Ros Glanda is probably the closest in nature to the entry on Lonán and the story of Art, including both an etymology of the placename as well the reference to a change in name:

Coluim, Rois glanda, .i. glan ainm tioprat boí ann ria bPátraicc, acus Domhnach mór Maighe Iomchclair a ainm aniu ó do bheannaigh Pátraicc ann, a Tír Eoghan atásidhe.

'Colum, of Ros Glanda: i.e. Glan is the name of a well which was there before Patrick; and Domhnach-mór Maighe Imchclair is

⁸⁶It might be argued that *Fástini Airt*'s interest in the foundation and *Senchas na Relec*'s focus on burial sites rather than individual biographies could have offered a space to provide information on the saint associated with the church in question, but this may not have made sense within the narrative focus and structure of the texts.

⁸⁷Cf. Ó Riain, *Feastdays*, 312–13.

⁸⁸For other examples, see Ó Riain, *Feastdays*, 290 and 309–10.

⁸⁹Todd, Reeves and O'Donovan, *Martyrology*, 154.

its name at this day, since Patrick blessed it. In Tir-Eoghain it is situated.'⁹⁰

It is tempting to associate this interest in the name of the church with the fragmentary lists of placenames preserved in UCD, Franciscan A 31, which are connected to Louvain.⁹¹ By the nature of these lists, the name Treóit does not appear in them: none covers those sections of the alphabet or the regions of Ireland in which Treóit would be expected to appear. However, it cannot be argued that the Martyrology of Donegal reflects a particular interest in such matters; the ancestry of the various saints, for example, is referenced much more frequently. Thus, while there does appear to have been an interest in collecting placenames in Louvain, it is possible that this occasional interest in placenames in the martyrology has its origins elsewhere. Etymology is a common feature of medieval Irish literature and the martyrology may reflect a continuation of this interest. The commentary on *Félire Óengusso*, for example, also includes numerous etymologies. While most of these are of saints' names, some provide short placename etymologies that are unconnected with the saint in question.⁹² Thus, the inclusion of the episode of Art's conversion and the recourse to a non-hagiographical source is in keeping with medieval practice, which would have been evident in the sources available to Ó Cléirigh and his collaborators.

CONCLUSION

A detailed consideration of the 1 November entry for Lonán suggests that *Cath Mhaighe Mochroimhe* is likely to have been a source for information in the Martyrology of Donegal. While the sources of the martyrology are of course manifold, this argument has potential implications for the textual history of

⁹⁰Todd, Reeves and O'Donovan, *Martyrology*, 238 (text), 239 (translation). The words 'ó do bheannaigh Pátraicc ann' are added above the line.

⁹¹Digital images available on *ISOS* (accessed 24 November 2020). On the lists preserved in the manuscripts, see Canice Mooney, 'Topographical fragments from the Franciscan library', *Celtica* 1 (1950), 64–85. Pádraig Breatnach has suggested that Item 8, which Mooney describes as possibly being 'intended as an index of placenames occurring in the Martyrology' of Donegal ('Topographical fragments', 81), might be linked to *De Nomenclatura Hiberniae*, a title attested for a text available in Louvain in the seventeenth century but no longer extant: Breatnach, 'An Irish Bollandus', 24.

⁹²Two examples of such brief accounts, chosen at random to illustrate the point, are the etymological notes on Dún Blésc (3 January, saint: Findlug) and on Cenn Etig (7 April, saint: Finán). The 3 January entry reads 'Dun-bléisci .i. Fleisc nomen amnis qui est iuxta urbem, et ab eo nominatur (L). Blesc ainm muccida rig Húa Cuanach. is e ro bui isin dunad sin artus, unde nominatur (LL)' ('of Dún-bléisce, that is, Fleisc is the name of the river which is next to the settlement, and from that it is named (L). Blesc was the name of the swineherd of the king of Uí Cuanach. It is he who was originally in that fort, from which it is named (LL)'). The text is taken from Stokes, *Félire*, 40. The letters in brackets indicate the manuscripts as given by Stokes. L: Oxford, Bodleian Library, Laud Misc. 610; LL: the Book of Leinster. As Stokes does not translate the Latin passage, the translation is my own. The 7 April entry reads as follows: 'Cennetig .i. Etèch muime na Fian ro hort ann. Nó Cell eti o eti in prechain ro faid Brenaind roime a tuaid o Clúain ferta Brenaint. (R2)' ('of Cenn-etig, i.e. Etech, the nurse of the Fians, was slain there. Or Cell eti (is the right reading) from the flying of the (pet) scallcrow that Brénainn sent out of the north from Clúain ferta Brénainn'; Stokes, *Félire*, 112–13. R2: Oxford, Bodleian Library, Rawlinson B. 512).

CMM² and adds a further small piece to the picture of the sources used by Ó Cléirigh and his associates. In the absence of a full discussion of CMM²'s textual history, many of the arguments made here must be considered provisional, but they and the evidence of NLS MS 72.1.38 indicate that a version of *Cath Mhaighe Mochroimhe* was circulating in the early seventeenth century, predating the bulk of the surviving manuscripts. The first line of Art's poem as given in the Martyrology of Donegal aligns it with those manuscripts of CMM² that include the 25-stanza version of the poem and may reflect the oldest strand of transmission in the context of CMM². Moreover, comparison with the Annals of the Four Masters, the *Genealogiae* and *Leabhar Gabhála* indicates that Ó Cléirigh was also familiar with details concerning Art's death that differ from *Cath Maige Mucrama* and the surviving manuscripts of CMM².

It is impossible to say with certainty whether Ó Cléirigh had access to a version of CMM² or whether his account was based on an independently circulating episode of Art at Treóit, but there is no doubt that there is a close connection between the Martyrology of Donegal and the Early Modern saga text, and the balance of the evidence points towards CMM² being a source for the martyrology.

ABBREVIATION

CMM² *Cath Mhaighe Mochroimhe* (with reference to the text itself and not the critical edition, for which see n. 20)

HELEN IMHOFF

Hann. Münden, Germany