Celtica 32



Edited by Barry J. Lewis and Ruairí Ó hUiginn

Celtica 32 (2020), vi + 311 pages

DOI: 10.58480/SCS-36u4r-xg5nt

DIAS
Institiúid Ard-Léinn Bhaile Átha Cliath | Dublin Institute for 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/

CELTICA

VOLUME XXXII

EDITED BY

BARRY J. LEWIS AND RUAIRÍ Ó hUIGINN

With the Assistance of
Christina Cleary, Andrea Palandri, Nike Stam
and Daniel Watson



SCHOOL OF CELTIC STUDIES
DUBLIN INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED STUDIES
2020

© Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies 2020
ISSN 0069-1399
ISBN 978-1-85500-245-6

All rights reserved

Copyright in the whole and every part of this publication belongs to the Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies (School of Celtic Studies), and it may not be used, sold, licensed, transferred, copied, rented or reproduced in whole or in part in any manner or form or in or on any medium by any person other than with the prior written consent of the publisher.

Typeset by Datapage International Ltd
Printed by eprint limited

PEER-REVIEW

The editors acknowledge with gratitude the contribution of those who provided confidential peer-reviews of the articles included in this volume.

CONTENTS

Aspects of Brittonic spirantisation under Laryngeal Realism
Joseph F. Eska 1

Constructions and polysemy of three Old Irish verbs
Elisa Roma 15

The mortal and divine histories of Mongán mac Fiachnai in *Cín Dromma Snechtai*
Daniel James Watson 27

Ríagail na Manach Líath 'The Rule of the Grey Monks': A late mediaeval fabrication
Liam Breatnach 77

Old names for the river Suck and associated sites
Máirín Ní Dhonnchadha 101

Síd Crúachan and its names
Máirín Ní Dhonnchadha 113

Connachta cid dia tá int ainm
John Carey 127

Unaccusativity and the subject pronoun in Middle and Early Modern Irish
Mícheál Hoyne 145

Addenda and corrigenda to *Celtica* XXVII (2016), 191 and XXXI (2019), 213–98
Mícheál Hoyne 183

A descriptive catalogue of TCD MS H 3. 18 (1337), vols 2–4, pp. 1–87: 'Máel Íosa's book'
Chantal Kobel 187

Maoilín Óg Mac Bruaideadha and the decline of patronage
Pádraig Ó Macháin 217

Corrach do chodlas a-réir revisited
Cathal Ó Háinle 237

 ©Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies

Pargys Caillit and John Kelly's Manx dictionary
Peadar Ó Muircheartaigh 261

Reviews
Fangzhe Qiu: *Language and Chronology: Text Dating by Machine Learning* (Toner and Han) 265
Thomas O'Loughlin: *De Origine Scoticae Linguae (O'Mulconry's Glossary): An Early Irish Linguistic Tract, with a Related Glossary, Irsan* (Moran) 272
Roan Runge: *The Case of the Abbot of Drimnagh: A Medieval Irish Story of Sex-Change* (Ó Síocháin) 274
David Callander: *Arthur in Early Welsh Poetry* (Jones) 280
Barry J. Lewis: *Medieval Wales,* c. *1050–1332: Centuries of Ambiguity* and *Medieval Powys: Kingdom, Principality and Lordships, 1132–1293* (Stephenson) 282
Barry J. Lewis: *Gerald of Wales: New Perspectives on a Medieval Writer and Critic* (Henley and McMullen) 288
Mícheál Hoyne: *Lorg na Leabhar: A* Festschrift *for Pádraig A. Breatnach* (Breatnach, Ní Úrdail and Ó Riain) 293
Mícheál Hoyne: *Súgán an Dúchais: Aistí ar Ghnéithe de Thraidisiún Liteartha Chúige Uladh i gCuimhne ar Dhiarmaid Ó Doibhlin* (Mac Cathmhaoil, Nic Cathmhaoil and Mac Seáin) 298
Mícheál Briody: *Life, Lore and Song: Essays in Irish Tradition in Honour of Ríonach uí Ógáin/'Binneas an tSiansa': Aistí in Onóir do Ríonach uí Ógaín* (Fitzgerald, Ní Fhloinn, Ní Úrdail and O'Connor) 300

Abbreviations 309

ASPECTS OF BRITTONIC SPIRANTISATION UNDER LARYNGEAL REALISM

Abstract

This paper examines the three principal environments in which spirantisation occurs in all of the Brittonic languages: (a) as fricatives which ultimately continue geminate aspirated voiceless plosives; (b) as the result of various triggering forms that cause the spirant mutation; and (c) after liquids. It is argued that these changes – long a vexed problem of Brittonic diachronic phonology – fall out naturally when one adopts a Laryngeal Realism view of Celtic phonology, under which the plosive series are not contrasted via the laryngeal feature [voice] but via the feature [spread glottis], i.e. the phonological contrast between the plosive series is /pʰ tʰ kʰ/ vs. /p t k/.[1]

Prelude

§1. Conventional wisdom is that the Celtic languages, throughout their history, contrasted their plosive series via the laryngeal feature [voice], thus /p t k/ vs. /b d g/ (e.g. Pedersen 1909: 90–140; Thurneysen 1946: 134–40; Evans 1964: 7; Ó Siadhail 1989: 82; Thorne 1993: 7; Lambert 2003: 45; Jordán Cólera 2019: 108–34).[2]

§2. This is certainly not true, however, for the modern Celtic languages. Jones (1984: 41) notes, for Welsh, that:[3]

(1) [t]he series /p, t, k/ are aspirated and voiceless, whilst the series /b, d, g/ are unaspirated, and although frequently referred to as voiced, voicing is not a constant feature of their articulation. They are regularly unvoiced in word initial and final positions: [b̥is] 'finger', [d̥ið] 'day', [kiɡ̊] 'meat', [mɑb̥] 'son', and frequently so in a medial fully voiced environment, e.g. intervocalically: [seb̥on] 'soap', [blod̥ɛ] 'flowers', [deɡ̊ɛ] 'tens'. They may be partially voiced in all these environments, but fully voiced occasionally in medial fully voiced environments only. Since aspiration/non-aspiration is the constant feature distinguishing the two series of stops, voicing may be considered redundant, and the contrast operates on the voice-onset axis, i.e. on the duration of the release stage of the plosives. The delay is consistently longer for /p, t, k/ than for /b, d, g/.

[1]I should like to thank the anonymous reviewer for helpful comments. All usual disclaimers apply.

[2]The material presented here in §§1–2 recapitulates that in Eska (2019a: 5–7; 2020: 237–9).

[3]I bring the employment of phonetic characters into compliance with the current usage of the International Phonetic Alphabet. For Modern Irish, cf. Ní Chasaide (1999: 113).

©Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies

This is verified by Voice Onset Time (VOT) values for plosives in initial position (measured in milliseconds; data cited after Ball 1984: 15):

(2)	/p/	/b/	/t/	/d/	/k/	/g/
	62	15	82	33	97	32

A VOT value of ∅ would indicate that voicing of a following segment commences precisely at the release of the occlusion. The positive values in Welsh demonstrate that voicing is not present, even in the so-called 'voiced' series. Languages that contrast their plosive series via the feature [voice] have negative VOT values in the voiced series, which indicates that voicing commences prior to the release of the occlusion, as, for example, in Spanish (data cited after Lisker and Abramson 1964: 392):

(3)	/p/	/b/	/t/	/d/	/k/	/g/
	4	–138	9	–110	29	–108

We may, furthermore, compare the VOT values for Scottish Gaelic, which is universally recognised to contrast its plosive series not via the feature [voice], but via the feature [spread glottis], i.e. via aspiration (e.g. MacAulay 1992: 231; Ladefoged, Ladefoged, Turn, Hind, and Skilton 1998: 4–12; Gillies 2010: 232). The data are cited after Nance and Stuart-Smith 2013: 137:

(4)	/p^{h}/	/p/	/t^{h}/	/t/	/k^{h}/	/k/
	71	17	73	23	89	33

A comparison of the Welsh VOT values with the Scottish Gaelic VOT values makes it clear that Modern Welsh does not contrast its plosive series via [voice] but, like Scottish Gaelic, via [spread glottis], i.e. via aspiration.

Laryngeal Realism

§3. Laryngeal Realism is an approach to phonology which 'adopts a more transparent relationship between distinctive features as phonological entities and the phonetic substance of those features' (definition as per Brown 2016: 397; the term 'Laryngeal Realism' originates with Honeybone 2005). Under Laryngeal Realism, which I adopt, the Celtic languages do not contrast their plosive series via [voice], but via the laryngeal feature [spread glottis], i.e. they contrast /p^{h} t^{h} k^{h}/ with /p t k/.[4] Under the traditional view that the contrast is /p t k/ vs. /b d g/, one is forced to believe that voiced plosives were devoiced in such a sonorous environment as intervocalic position, which is a very unnatural sound change. Instead, under Laryngeal Realism, the aspirated voiceless plosives could be – but need not necessarily be – partially voiced by perseverant passive voicing in such an environment, while unaspirated voiceless plosives, after partial passive voicing, were spirantised, presumably because their

[4]Thus orthographic ⟨p t c/k⟩ represent /p^{h} t^{h} k^{h}/ and orthographic ⟨b d g⟩ represent /p t k/.

short occlusion became incomplete (Ohala 1990: 438; see also Eska 2020: 240). Philological evidence that such a contrast also obtained in the Continental Celtic languages is provided in Eska (2017a; 2017b) and further argumentation that it should be projected back to Proto-Celtic in Eska (2018a; 2018b).

Interarticulatory timing

§4. Another factor that will come into play is that 'different outcomes of change may arise from small variations in the magnitude or coordination of consecutive segments or from adjustments operating along different dimensions all directed at achieving the same functional goal' (Solé 2012: 124).[5] For our purposes, what this means is that the relative timing of consecutive articulatory gestures may result in different segments being produced diachronically.

§5. Among the cases that Solé discusses is the treatment of fricative + nasal groups (2012: 125–9; cf. Solé 2007 for more detail). In order to generate turbulence, fricatives require a tightly closed velum, while the production of nasals requires the lowering of the velum. The diachronic development of such groups proceeds in two directions depending upon the interarticulatory timing of the adjacent segments. One result is due to the velum being lowered during the articulation of the fricative in anticipation of the production of the nasal, which reduces the oral pressure necessary to produce the fricative which, consequently, may not be perceived. This may result in gliding of the fricative, e.g. Standard Catalan *e*[s]*ma* > Majorcan Catalan *e*[j]*ma* 'judgement', or loss of the fricative altogether, e.g. Lat. *ro*[s]*marīnum* > **romarinu* > Cat. *romani*, Sp. *romero* 'rosemary'. The other result is due to the lowering of the velum being delayed relative to the occlusion of the nasal. Consequently, the initial portion of the nasal denasalises and a plosive emerges, e.g. OE *glisnian*, *hlysnan* > ME *glis*[t]*en*, *lis*[t]*en* (cf. Ohala 1981).

§6. Another example, directly relevant to the triggering of the spirant mutation, is sandhi in Vedic Sanskrit. Hale (2017) invokes the notion of 'degrees of separation'. Thus, with regard to the juncture of /s/ and /p$^{(h)}$/, he notes the following sandhi realisations (see further Allen 1962: 78):

(5)	a.	Word-internal	-⟨sp(h)⟩-	-V[sp$^{(h)}$]V-
	b.	'Close' sandhi	-⟨sp(h)⟩-	-V[s = p$^{(h)}$]V-
	c.	'Not so close' sandhi	-⟨ḫp(h)⟩-	-V[ɸ # p$^{(h)}$]V- (*upadhmānīya*)[6]
	d.	End of Intonational Phrase	-⟨ḫp(h)⟩-	-V[h ## p$^{(h)}$]V- (*visarjanīya*)

We may note that 'close' sandhi represents clisis, so the consonantal group is in internal position within the phonological word, thus [$_{\omega}$ [$_{\omega}$ -Vs] = p$^{(h)}$V-]. 'Not so close' sandhi occurs between phonological words that occur within the same phonological phrase, thus [$_{\phi}$ [$_{\omega}$ -Vɸ] [$_{\omega}$ p$^{(h)}$V-]].

[5]The material presented here in §§4–6 is substantially identical with that in Eska (2020: 242–3).

[6]Also -⟨ḫk(h)⟩- -V[x # k$^{(h)}$]V- (*jihvāmūlīya*).

Spirantisation in the Brittonic languages

§7. One of the most vexed issues in Brittonic linguistics is the matter of the origin of 'spirantisation', as evinced by the early vigorous debate on the pages of this journal between Greene (1956: 288–9) and Jackson (1960) and then, again, Greene (1966). This paper addresses the three major environments in which spirantisation – defined as the lenition of a plosive to a fricative or, in the case of segments bearing any degree of voice, a fricative or an approximant – occurs across all of the Brittonic languages. There are several other minor instances which occur in individual Brittonic languages.[7]

Geminates and spirantisation

§8. Original voiceless geminate plosives (= /pp^{h} tt^{h} kk^{h}/ under Laryngeal Realism) are ultimately realised as fricatives in the Brittonic languages, e.g.

(6) a. Lat. *cippus* ⇒ Proto-Brit. **k^{h}ipp^{h}os* > MBr *queff* 'trunk (of a tree)'
b. Proto-Brit. **k^{h}att^{h}os* > MW *cath* 'cat'
c. Proto-Brit. **prokk^{h}os* > OCo *broch* 'badger'.

§9. Jackson (1953: 565–70) states that these voiceless geminate plosives directly became fricatives, asserting that '[t]here is no need to discuss […] how this happened.' He is followed in this view by Koch (1989) and Isaac (2004; 2008).[8]

Geminate Inalterability

§10. It is well known that Geminate Inalterability blocks geminates from being affected by lenition processes prior to being reduced to singletons (Kirchner 2000; 2001: 97–135). Thus, in languages in which /p t k/ > /ɸ θ x/, /pp tt kk/ remain unaltered, i.e. they do not become /ɸɸ θθ xx/, since the occlusion of geminates may be anywhere from one and one-half to three times as long as for singletons (depending on the language), i.e. the incomplete occlusion necessary to yield a fricative is extremely unlikely. Kirchner (2001: 104–5) cites the example of Biblical Hebrew,[9] which has a rule of frication of post-vocalic labials, velars, and non-emphatic coronals:

(7)	Imperfect	Basic perfect	Causative perfect	Gloss
a.	*yix*[*p*]*or*	*kaa*[*ɸ*]*ar*	*ki*[*pp*]*eer*	'cover'
b.	*yiɸ*[*t*]*ah*	*paa*[*θ*]*ah*	*pi*[*tt*]*eeah*	'open'
c.	*yiz*[*k*]*or*	*zaa*[*x*]*ar*	*zi*[*kk*]*eer*	'remember'

[7] I intend to address these spirantisations on another occasion.

[8] It is not usually noticed that Jackson (1967: 317) later states that this change occurred 'probably via an intermediate stage of very strongly aspirate stops', though he does not pursue the matter.

[9] I cite the data in (7) after Kirchner's source, Elmedlaoui (1993: 123–4), whose presentation is clearer for present purposes. All forms are 3 singular.

Here one sees that post-consonantal radical /p t k/ are unchanged in the imperfect, but are fricated to /ɸ θ x/ post-vocalically in the basic perfect, while geminate /pp tt kk/ remain unchanged post-vocalically in the causative perfect.

§11. In view of such data, an analysis that voiceless geminate plosives directly changed into fricatives in the prehistory of the Brittonic languages is clearly untenable.

Phonetic enhancement, degemination, spirantisation

§12. A group of scholars whom we may term the 'Revisionist' camp, including Harvey (1984), Thomas (1990), Schrijver (1999), and Sims-Williams (2007 = 2008),[10] propose, with differences in the details of their respective arguments, that geminate voiceless plosives were degeminated via lenition and subsequently were subject to spirantisation – a view that goes back to Greene.

This approach is clearly on the right path, but begs the question, however, of why the new singletons were fricated rather than partially voiced, as previously happened to intervocalic singleton aspirated voiceless plosives via the earlier 'soft' lenition (see Eska 2020: 243–4), if their phonetic environments were the same.

§13. Under Laryngeal Realism, we expect medial /pʰ tʰ kʰ/ to lose some of their aspiration. Geminates of these phonemes would be contrasted with singletons primarily by the duration of their occlusion. However, depending upon the details of individual languages, listeners may experience difficulty distinguishing singleton plosives from geminate plosives, as opposed to pairs of fricatives or sonorants, which listeners can readily distinguish (Dmitrieva 2018). Phonetic enhancements may be implemented to help distinguish singleton plosives from geminate plosives such as lengthening of the preceding vowel or lengthening of post-aspiration with the geminate plosives (Ridouane 2010).[11] The latter, which is relevant to the present argument, occurs, for example, in Turkish (Lahiri and Hankamer 1988), Cypriot Greek (Arvaniti and Tserdanelis 2000), and Moroccan Arabic (Zeroual, Hoole, and Fuchs 2006).

§14. I propose that the Proto-Brittonic geminates *-/ppʰ ttʰ kkʰ/-, though their degree of aspiration may have been regularly reduced in medial position, were articulated with the phonetic enhancement of post-aspiration as *-[ppʰ ttʰ kkʰ]-. They were then degeminated via lenition, as per the 'Revisionist' camp, to *-[pʰ tʰ kʰ]-. Aspirated plosives possess a shorter occlusion than unaspirated plosives,[12] and this shorter occlusion may become incomplete and lead to spirantisation. Thus we find:

[10]Sims-Williams (2007, nn. 1 and 14), in spite of its publication date, provides references to Iosad (2005) that are not present in Sims-Williams (2008).

[11]On phonetic enhancement in general, see Avery and Idsardi (2001), Keyser and Stevens (2006), Stevens and Keyser (2010), Hall (2011), and Beckman, Jessen, and Ringen (2013).

[12]Cross-linguistically, one generally finds, within a given language, that the duration of the occlusion of an unaspirated voiceless plosive is the same as the duration of the occlusion + aspiration interval of an aspirated voiceless plosive combined (Kingston 1990: 429).

(8) a. *-/pp^h tt^h kk^h/- > *-[pp tt kk]- in medial position
b. *-[pp tt kk]- > *-[pp^h tt^h kk^h]- via phonetic enhancement
c. *-[pp^h tt^h kk^h]- > *-[p^h t^h k^h]- via degemination (lenition)
d. *-[p^h t^h k^h]- > -/ɸ θ x/- via incomplete occlusion and spirantisation.

The spirant mutation

§15. The spirant mutation affects traditional /p t k/ (= /p^h t^h k^h/ under Laryngeal Realism) after the following principal triggers:

(9) a. Middle Breton (Hemon 1984: 7–9):
1. The possessive pronouns *va* ‘my’, *he* ‘her’, and *o* ‘their’
2. The numerals *tri* ‘three’ (masc.), *teir* ‘three’ (fem.), *pevar* ‘four’ (masc.), *peder* ‘four’ (fem.), and *nav* ‘nine’;

b. Middle Cornish (Lewis 1946: 9 = 1990: 9):
1. The possessive pronouns *ow* ‘my’, *hy* ‘her’, and *aga* ‘their’
2. The numeral *try* ‘three’ (masc.);

c. Middle Welsh (Evans 1964: 21):
1. The possessive pronoun *y* ‘her’
2. The numerals *tri* ‘three’ (masc.) and *chwech, chwe* ‘six’
3. The prepositions *a* ‘with’ and *tra* ‘over, across’ and adverbial *tra* ‘very, excessive’
4. The connective *a* ‘and’
5. The negators *ny* and *na* ‘neither, nor’
6. The complementiser *o* ‘if’
7. The interrogative *cw* ‘where?’.

§16. The ‘Jacksonian’ camp requires initial singletons to become geminates prior to spirantisation, e.g. **esijās pennon* > **eiðah pennon* (Transponat)[13] > **eia ppennon* > MW *y phenn* ‘her head’. Under this analysis, the final *-/s/ of the genitive pronoun debuccalises to *-/h/, which then fully assimilates to the following voiceless plosive, thus forming a geminate, from which spirantisation ensues.

§17. As noted in §10, however, Geminate Inalterability blocks geminates from being affected by lenition processes prior to being reduced to singletons. Once again, therefore, I take the ‘Jacksonian’ approach to be untenable.

§18. The ‘Revisionist’ camp proposes that, when the triggering forms listed in (9) lost an original final consonant, spirantisation occurred, but only upon traditional */p t k/ (= */p^h t^h k^h/ under Laryngeal Realism), e.g. traditional **min pennon* > * *mi pennon* > MBr. *va fenn* ‘my head’.

[13]I.e. a phonological reconstruction that likely was not attested precisely in this form in Proto-Brittonic.

This approach begs two questions, however:

(10) a. Why did spirantisation occur here rather than partial voicing, as under 'soft' lenition, if their phonetic environments were precisely the same?
b. Why did it affect only the traditional voiceless series (= */pʰ tʰ kʰ/ under Laryngeal Realism), and not the traditional voiced series (= */p t k/ under Laryngeal Realism), as well?

§19. Harvey (1984: 97–9) presumes that voiceless fricatives arose in Proto-Brittonic, first as free variants of */p t k/ arising from */pp tt kk/ after degemination via lenition, because voiced fricatives already existed.[14] They thus filled a gap in the system. Note, to maintain clarity, that Harvey's */p t k/ = */pʰ tʰ kʰ/ under Laryngeal Realism.

But Harvey's formulation does not address why spirantisation, rather than partial voicing, occurs. If the phonetic environment was precisely the same as for the 'soft' lenition, articulatory factors demand that partial voicing should have occurred a second time.[15] One may compare the fact that palatalisation occurred in the prehistory of Old Irish three separate times with the same result (McCone 1996: 115–20).

§20. It is probable, instead, that the spirantisation result should be explained by an appeal to interarticulatory timing, as discussed in §§4–6. As posited by Iosad (2005), when traditional **min pennon* > * *mi pennon*, the possessive pronoun had not yet become a clitic, hence we have, under Laryngeal Realism, *[$_{\phi}$ [$_{\omega}$ *mi*] [$_{\omega}$ *pʰennon*]]. This leaves sufficient temporal space between the two lexemes for the initial of **pʰennon* to have retained enough aspiration to allow spirantisation to occur owing to incomplete occlusion. In contrast, a clitic would not have left sufficient temporal space and there would not have been enough aspiration for spirantisation to be possible, and thus partial voicing would have occurred instead. This is directly comparable to Hale's 'not so close' sandhi, discussed in §6.[16]

§21. But why should spirantisation affect only the traditional voiceless plosive series (= */pʰ tʰ kʰ/ under Laryngeal Realism)? Jackson's (1953: 634–5) position is that Proto-Brittonic voiced geminates were simplified to singletons

[14]I note that the two 'voiced' fricatives of Welsh, /v ð/, are very difficult to distinguish from /f θ/ in the modern language. The former may be voiced intervocalically only, but can also be completely voiceless in that environment. The principal cue that differentiates them is the longer duration of the constriction of /f θ/ (Ball 1984: 18–21; Jones 1984: 46).

[15]The only potential point of confusion would have been between the 3 singular possessive pronouns, for both masc. **eio pennon* and fem. **eia pennon* would have resulted in, for example, MW *y benn* for both genders. They could easily have been distinguished by the use of affixed pronouns, however, as became common in the Brittonic languages, even though they were not strictly needed for this purpose since the masculine and feminine pronouns actually trigger different mutations (Lewis 1946: 28 = 1990: 27; Evans 1964: 57–8; Hemon 1984: 75).

[16]This approach can also be employed to account for the differential treatment of the lenition of /pʰ tʰ kʰ/ in Insular Celtic, i.e. spirantisation in Goidelic and partial voicing in Brittonic; see Eska (2020: 242–4).

before spirantisation occurred. But we have already seen that geminate plosives do not participate in lenition processes before they are degeminated.[17]

§22. Greene's (1966: 119) explanation for why spirantisation does not occur with the traditional voiced series fares no better. He claims that, were traditional */b d g/ fricated via spirantisation to **/β ð ɣ/, the result would have been the same as the 'soft' lenition mutation, which, in his view, would be problematic. This seems hardly likely to be a problem, however. One may compare the mixed mutation of Breton, in which /d/ undergoes provection, while /b g m/ undergo spirantisation,[18] both of which occur as the result of other mutations – the provection mutation and the spirant mutation – as well.

§23. A straightforward explanation, however, falls out naturally under the assumption of the Laryngeal Realism view of Celtic phonology, whereby the plosive series were /pʰ tʰ kʰ/ vs. /p t k/. The voiceless initials of MW *penn* 'head', MC *tyr* 'land', and MBr *cloch* 'bell' could be spirantised – and were – because they were aspirated, while the voiceless initials of MW *bwyt* 'food', MC *dorn* 'fist', and MBr *galar* 'sickness' were not spirantised – indeed, could not be – because they were unaspirated, hence:[19]

(11) a. *[$_{\phi}$ [$_{\omega}$ *eia*] [$_{\omega}$ *pʰennon*]] > MW *y phenn* 'her head'
b. *[$_{\phi}$ [$_{\omega}$ *eia*] [$_{\omega}$ *peːton*]] > MW *y bwyt* 'her food'
c. *[$_{\phi}$ [$_{\omega}$ *eia*] [$_{\omega}$ *tʰiːros*]] > MCo *hy thyr* 'her land'
d. *[$_{\phi}$ [$_{\omega}$ *eia*] [$_{\omega}$ *turnos*]] > MCo *hy dorn* 'her fist'
e. *[$_{\phi}$ [$_{\omega}$ *eia*] [$_{\omega}$ *kʰlokkʰos*]] > MBr *he chloch* 'her bell'
f. *[$_{\phi}$ [$_{\omega}$ *eia*] [$_{\omega}$ *kalaros*]] > MBr *he galar* 'her sickness'.

Spirantisation after liquids

§24. Spirantisation of plosives and */m/ after liquids is regular in all of the Brittonic languages, e.g.:

(12) a. Br *balcʼh* 'proud' < Proto-Brit. */palkʰ/
b. MW *cerdd* 'skill' < *[kʰerðaː] < *[kʰerɻaː] < Proto-Brit. */kʰertaː/
c. MCo *arvow* 'weapon' (pl.) < */arma/ ⇐ Lat. /arma/.[20]

§25. Jackson attributes spirantisation of the traditional voiced plosives (= /p t k/ under Laryngeal Realism) after liquids to lenition (1953: 432–3)

[17]In view of Geminate Inalterability, then, Jackson's view actually predicts that the traditional voiced plosives should undergo spirantisation, while the traditional voiceless plosives should not, precisely the opposite of what he posits.

[18]I note that most dialects of Modern Breton, unlike the other Insular Celtic languages, contrast their plosive series via the Laryngeal feature [voice], e.g. at Saint-Pol-de-Léon (Sommerfelt 1978: 48–56), surely due to prolonged contact with the [voice] language French.

[19]All syntagmata are Transponats. Before nouns commencing with vowels, sandhi /h/- is prefixed in Welsh (Evans 1964: 22–3). This is the result of resyllabification, thus **ei.ða.h ob.nus* (Transponat) > **eia hobnus* > MW *y hofuyn* 'her fear'.

[20]Note that not all combinations occur. The special treatment of Proto-Brit. *-/ltʰ/ as W -/ɬt/ is treated in Eska (2019b).

and frication of the traditional voiceless plosives (= /pʰ tʰ kʰ/ under Laryngeal Realism) to spirantisation (1953: 570–3).

§26. Russell (1985), however, combines them into a single process by positing that the feature [continuant] spreads from the liquid to both series of plosives at the same time. This seems much better. However, cross-linguistic evidence suggests that [continuant]-spreading from liquid to plosive only occurs with plosives that possess some degree of voicing, e.g.:

(13) a. Basque, Catalan, Spanish:[21] /b d g/ > [β̬ ð̬ ɣ̬] / L__ (Mascaró 1984)[22]
b. Italian: /b/ > /v/ / L__ (Rohlfs 1949: 436–7)
c. Portuguese: /b/ > /v/ / L__ (Williams 1962: 91).

§27. That this restriction is not universal, however, is demonstrated by phrasal tokens such as Br *an amzer Fask* 'Eastertime' and *Sul Fask* 'Easter Sunday', in which spirantisation of /pʰ/ occurs after a liquid. But why the differential treatment between Basque/Romance and Brittonic? The answer is that the former contrast their plosive series via the laryngeal feature [voice], i.e. /p t k/ vs. /b d g/ while in the Brittonic languages the contrast is made via the feature [spread glottis], i.e. /pʰ tʰ kʰ/ vs. /p t k/. Since the period of occlusion of plosives that bear some voicing and aspirated voiceless plosives is shorter than for unaspirated voiceless plosives (cf. n. 12), [continuant]-spreading can cause their occlusions to become incomplete and result in spirantisation. The occlusion of unaspirated voiceless plosives in Basque/Romance, however, is sufficiently long to resist [continuant]-spreading.

§28. It seems that we are obliged to posit that plosives were spirantised after liquids in two stages, though not the stages that Jackson proposes. I propose instead that, under Laryngeal Realism, /p t k/ were partially passively voiced to [p̆ t̬ k̬] in the highly sonorous environment *L_V and underwent [continuant]-spreading prior to the apocope of final syllables. Thus, in autosegmental notation:

(14) L T
[cont]

But /pʰ tʰ kʰ/ underwent spirantisation to [ɸ θ x] in final position after the apocope of final syllables.[23] That this is the case is confirmed by Br *an amzer Fask* 'Eastertime' and *Sul Fask* 'Easter Sunday', in which spirantisation of /pʰ/ can only have occurred after the apocope of the final syllables of *amzer*

[21]In Basque, voiceless plosives are sometimes voiced after /l/, but sometimes they are not. They remain voiceless after /r/ (Hualde 2003: 20–1). In Catalan and Spanish, voiceless plosives are usually preserved unchanged after liquids (Lausberg 1956: 44–5).

[22]Mascaró (1991) provides a phonetic explanation for the lack of spirantisation of /d/ after /l/ in Spanish and Catalan.

[23]Note that /pʰ tʰ kʰ/ are strongly aspirated in final position in Modern Welsh, now usually only in English loans (Jones 1984: 42).

< Proto-Brit. **amserā* and *Sul* ⇐ Lat. *solis* (Sims-Williams 2007: 45–6 = 2008: 511).

Relative chronology

§29. Sims-Williams (2007: 44–6 = 2008: 510–1) sets out a relative chronology, combined with voicing, for the sound changes considered in this paper. They are as follows:

(15) a. First spirantisation (also in Goidelic): traditional */b d g/ > */β ð ɣ/ / V_V
b. Voicing: traditional */p t k/ > */b d g/ / V_V
c. Second spirantisation: traditional */p t k/ (< */pp tt kk/) > */ɸ θ x/ / V_ prior to apocope
d. Third spirantisation: traditional */p t k b d g/ > */ɸ θ x β ð ɣ/ / L_# after apocope.[24]

§30. Under the argument set out in this paper, as well as under the view that voicing and spirantisation can both be outcomes of lenition depending upon the interarticulatory timing between segments, I would revise Sims-Williams's relative chronology to the following, under the assumptions of Laryngeal Realism:

(16) a. First lenition: Proto-Celt. */p t k kʷ/ > *[p̆ t̬ k̬ k̬ʷ] > *[β ð ɣ ɣʷ] / V_[sonant] in Proto-Celtic (Eska 2020: 239–40)
b. Second lenition: Proto-Brit. */pʰ tʰ kʰ/ > *[p t k] > *[p̆ t̬ k̬] / V_V
c. Third lenition: Proto-Brit. */pʰ tʰ kʰ/ (< */ppʰ ttʰ kkʰ/) > */ɸ θ x/ / V_ prior to apocope
d. First [continuant]-spreading: *[p̆ t̬ k̬] > */β ð ɣ/ / L_V prior to apocope
e. Second [continuant]-spreading: */pʰ tʰ kʰ/ > */ ɸ θ x/ / L_# after apocope.

Recapitulation

§31. Under the Laryngeal Realism view of Celtic phonology, whereby the plosives series were contrasted via the laryngeal feature [spread glottis] rather than the feature [voice], which is the traditional assumption, the environments that result in spirantisation across the Brittonic languages fall out naturally. The aspirated voiceless plosives /pʰ tʰ kʰ/ became fricatives because their occlusion is considerably shorter than unaspirated plosives and may become incomplete and, like fricatives, they bear the feature [spread glottis]. The unaspirated voiceless plosives possessed a longer occlusion and did not bear

[24]Sims-Williams (2007: 55–6 = 2008: 522) discusses a fourth spirantisation that occurred only in Old Welsh, */ntl/ and */ntr/ > /θl/ and /θr/ respectively. I do not consider it in this paper because it is not pan-Brittonic; cf. OW *ithr* 'between' to MBr *intre*, MCo *ynter* and MW *kathyl* 'song' to Br *kentel* 'lesson'. I intend to address this spirantisation on another occasion.

the feature [spread glottis], so did not undergo spirantisation unless they had previously undergone passive voicing, which would have resulted in a shorter occlusion.

References

Allen, W. Sidney 1962: *Sandhi: The Theoretical, Phonetic, and Historical Bases of Word-Junction in Sanskrit* ('s-Gravenhage).

Arvaniti, Amalia, and Tserdanelis, Georgios 2000: 'On the phonetics of geminates: Evidence from Cypriot Greek'. Available at https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/On-the-phonetics-of-geminates%3A-evidence-from-Greek-Arvaniti-Tserdanelis/d02e0c00fb3b9456fd78e75b080971ceddfd1704 (accessed 7 October 2019).

Avery, Peter, and Idsardi, William J. 2001: 'Laryngeal dimensions, completion and enhancement', in T. Alan Hall (ed.), *Distinctive Feature Theory* (Berlin), 41–70.

Ball, Martin J. 1984. 'Phonetics for phonology', in Martin J. Ball and Glyn E. Jones (eds), *Welsh Phonology: Selected Readings* (Cardiff), 5–39.

Beckman, Jill, Jessen, Michael, and Ringen, Catherine, 2013: 'Empirical evidence for laryngeal features: aspirating vs. true voice languages', *Journal of Linguistics* 49, 259–84.

Brown, Jason 2016: 'Laryngeal assimilation, markedness and typology', *Phonology* 33, 393–423.

Dmitrieva, Olga 2018: 'The role of perception in the typology of geminate consonants: effects of manner of articulation, segmental environment, position, and stress', *Language and Speech* 61, 43–70.

Elmedlaoui, Mohamed 1993: 'Gemination and spirantization in Hebrew, Berber, and Tigrinya: a "fortis-lenis module" analysis', *Linguistica Communicatio* 5, 121–76.

Eska, Joseph F. 2017a: 'Phonological contrasts and character reduction in the Alphabet of Lugano', *ZCP* 64, 59–80.

——, 2017b: 'The significance of **śDAń** and related matters', *International Journal of Diachronic Linguistics and Linguistic Reconstruction* 14, 51–75.

——, 2018a: 'Laryngeal Realism and the prehistory of Celtic', *Transactions of the Philological Society* 116, 320–31.

——, 2018b: 'Celto-Germanic lexis in light of Laryngeal Realism', in David M. Goldstein, Stephanie W. Jamison, and Brent Vine (eds), *Proceedings of the 29th Annual UCLA Indo-European Conference* (Bremen), 29–45.

——, 2019a: 'Laryngeal Realism and early Insular Celtic orthography', *North American Journal of Celtic Studies* 3, 1–17.

——, 2019b: 'The evolution of proto-Brit. *-/lt^{h}/ in Welsh', *ZCP* 66, 75–81.

——, 2020: 'Interarticulatory timing and Celtic mutations', *Journal of Celtic Linguistics* 21, 235–56.

Evans, D. Simon 1964: *A Grammar of Middle Welsh* (Dublin).

Gillies, William 2010: 'Scottish Gaelic', in Martin J. Ball and Nicole Müller (eds), *The Celtic Languages*, 2nd ed. (London), 230–304.

Greene, David 1956: 'Gemination', *Celtica* 3, 284–9.
——, 1966: 'The spirant mutation in Brythonic', *Celtica* 7, 116–19.
Hale, Mark 2017: 'Some notes on vowel sandhi in the Rigveda: Five degrees of separation', paper presented at the Thirty-Sixth East Coast Indo-European Conference, 2–4 June 2017, Cornell University.
Hall, Daniel Currie 2011: 'Phonological contrast and its phonetic enhancement: dispersedness without dispersion', *Phonology* 28, 1–54.
Harvey, Anthony 1984: 'Aspects of lenition and spirantization', *CMCS* 8, 87–100.
Hemon, Roparz 1984: *A Historical Morphology and Syntax of Breton* (Dublin).
Honeybone, Patrick 2005: 'Diachronic evidence in segmental phonology: the case of laryngeal specifications', in Marc van Oostendorp and Jeroen van de Weijer (eds), *The Internal Organization of Phonological Segments* (Berlin), 319–54.
Hualde, José Ignacio 2003: 'Phonology', in José Ignacio Hualde and Jon Ortiz de Urbina (eds), *A Grammar of Basque* (Berlin), 15–65.
Iosad, Pavel 2005: 'Brythonic "second lenition" revisited: theoretical and typological considerations on the rise of Brythonic voiceless spirants', paper presented at the Colloquium Societatis Celto-Slavica II (Moscow, 14–16 September 2005). Handout available at https://www.anghyflawn.net/pdf/celto-slavica.handout.pdf (accessed 27 April 2019).
Isaac, G. R. 2004: 'The chronology of the development of Brittonic stops and the spirant mutation', *Journal of Celtic Linguistics* 8, 49–85.
——, 2008: 'Brittonic voiceless spirants again', *Journal of Celtic Linguistics* 12, 17–37.
Jackson, Kenneth 1953: *Language and History in Early Britain: A Chronological Survey of the Brittonic Languages 1st to 12th c. A.D.* (Edinburgh).
——, 1960: 'Gemination and the spirant mutation', *Celtica* 5, 127–34.
——, 1967: *A Historical Phonology of Breton* (Dublin).
Jones, Glyn E. 1984: 'The distinctive vowels and consonants of Welsh', in Martin J. Ball and Glyn E. Jones (eds), *Welsh Phonology: Selected Readings* (Cardiff, 1984), 40–64.
Jordán Cólera, Carlos 2019: *Lengua y epigrafía celtibéricas* (Zaragoza).
Keyser, Samuel Jay, and Stevens, Kenneth Noble 2006: 'Enhancement and overlap in the speech chain', *Language* 82, 33–63.
Kingston, John 1990: 'Articulatory binding', in John Kingston and Mary E. Beckman (eds), *Papers in Laboratory Phonology* i: *Between the Grammar and Physics of Speech* (Cambridge), 406–34.
Kirchner, Robert 2000: 'Geminate Inalterability and lenition', *Language* 76, 509–45.
——, 2001: *An Effort Based Approach to Consonant Lenition* (London).
Koch, John T. 1989: 'Neo-Brittonic voiceless spirants from Old Celtic geminates', *Ériu* 40, 119–28.
Ladefoged, Peter, Ladefoged, Jenny, Turn, Alice, Hind, Kevin, and Skilton, St. John 1998: 'Phonetic structures of Scottish Gaelic', *Journal of the International Phonetic Association* 28, 1–41.

Lahiri, Aditi, and Hankamer, Jorge 1988: 'The timing of geminate consonants', *Journal of Phonetics* 16, 327–38.

Lambert, Pierre-Yves 2003: *La langue gauloise: description linguistique, commentaire d'inscriptions choisies*, 2nd ed. (Paris).

Lausberg, Heinrich 1956: *Romanische Sprachwissenschaft* ii: *Konsonantismus* (Berlin).

Lewis, Henry 1946: *Llawlyfr Cernyweg Canol*, 2nd ed. (Caerdydd).

——, 1990: *Handbuch des Mittlekornischen*, trans. Stefan Zimmer (Innsbruck).

Lisker, Leigh, and Abramson, Arthur S. 1964: 'A cross-language study of voicing in initial stops: acoustical measurements', *Word* 20, 384–422.

MacAulay, Donald 1992: 'The Scottish Gaelic language', in Donald MacAulay (ed.), *The Celtic Languages* (Cambridge), 137–248.

Mascaró, Joan 1984: 'Continuant spreading in Basque, Catalan, and Spanish', in Mark Aronoff and Richard T. Oehrle (eds), *Language Sound Structure: Studies in Phonology Presented to Morris Halle by his Teacher and Students* (Cambridge, MA), 287–98.

——, 1991: 'Iberian spirantization and continuant spreading', *Catalan Working Papers in Phonetics* 1, 167–79.

McCone, Kim 1996: *Towards a Relative Chronology of Ancient and Medieval Celtic Sound Change* (Maynooth).

Nance, Claire, and Stuart-Smith, Jane 2013: 'Pre-aspiration and post-aspiration in Scottish Gaelic stop consonants', *Journal of the International Phonetic Association* 43, 129–52.

Ní Chasaide, Ailbhe 1999: 'Irish', in *Handbook of the International Phonetic Association* (Cambridge), 111–16.

Ohala, John J. 1981: 'Speech timing as a tool in phonology', *Phonetica* 38, 204–12.

——, 1990: 'The generality of articulatory binding: comments on Kingston's paper', in John Kingston and Mary E. Beckman (eds), *Papers in Laboratory Phonology* i: *Between the Grammar and Physics of Speech* (Cambridge), 435–44.

Ó Siadhail, Mícheál 1989: *Modern Irish: Grammatical Structure and Dialectal Variation* (Cambridge).

Pedersen, Holger 1909: *Vergleichende Grammatik der keltischen Sprachen*, 2 vols, i: *Einleitung und Lautlehre* (Göttingen).

Ridouane, Rachid 2010: 'Geminates at the junction of phonetics and phonology', in Cécile Fougeron, Barbara Kühnert, Mariapaola D'Imperio, and Nathalie Vallée (eds), *Laboratory Phonology 10* (Berlin), 61–90.

Rohlfs, Gerhard 1949: *Historische Grammatik der italienischen Sprache und ihrer Mundarten* i: *Lautlehre* (Bern).

Russell, Paul 1985: 'A footnote to spirantization', *CMCS* 10, 53–6.

Schrijver, Peter 1999: 'Spirantization and nasalization in British', *SC* 32, 1–19.

Sims-Williams, Patrick 2007: 'The problem of spirantization and nasalization in Brittonic Celtic', in Patrick Sims-Williams, *Studies on Celtic Languages before the Year 1000* (Aberystwyth), 43–58.

——, 2008: ‘The problem of spirantization and nasalization in Brittonic Celtic’, in Alexander Lubotsky, Jos Schaeken, and Jeroen Wiedenhof (eds), *Evidence and Counter-evidence. Essays in Honour of Frederik Kortlandt* i: *Balto-Slavic and Indo-European Linguistics* (Amsterdam), 509–25.

Solé, Maria-Josep 2007: ‘The stability of phonological features within and across segments: the effect of nasalization on frication’, in Pilar Prieto, Joan Mascaró, and Maria-Josep Solé (eds), *Segmental and Prosodic Issues in Romance Linguistics* (Amsterdam), 41–65.

——, 2012: ‘Natural and unnatural patterns of sound change?’, in Maria-Josep Solé and Daniel Recasens (eds), *The Initiation of Sound Change: Perception, Production, and Social Factors* (Amsterdam), 123–45.

Sommerfelt, Alf 1978: *Le Breton Parlé à Saint-Pol-de-Léon: phonétique et morphologie*, new ed. by F. Falc’hun et Magne Oftedal (Oslo).

Stevens, Kenneth Noble, and Keyser, Samuel Jay 2010: ‘Quantal theory, enhancement and overlap’, *Journal of Phonetics* 38, 10–19.

Thomas, Peter Wynn 1990: ‘The Brythonic consonant shift and the development of consonant mutation’, *BBCS* 37, 1–42.

Thorne, David A. 1993: *A Comprehensive Welsh Grammar* / *Gramadeg Cymraeg Cynhwysfawr* (Oxford).

Thurneysen, Rudolf 1946: *A Grammar of Old Irish*, rev. and trans. D. A. Binchy and Osborn Bergin (Dublin).

Williams, Edwin B. 1962: *From Latin to Portuguese: Historical Phonology and Morphology of the Portuguese Language,* 2nd ed. (Philadelphia).

Zeroual, Chakir, Hoole, Phil, and Fuchs, Susanne 2006: ‘Étude par transillumination des consonnes occlusive simples et géminées de l’arabe marocain’. Available at https://www.researchgate.net/publication/228644849_Etude_par_transillumination_des_consonnes_occlusives_simples_et_geminees_de_l%27arabe_marocain (accessed 8 October 2019).

Joseph F. Eska

Virginia Polytechnic Institute & State University

CONSTRUCTIONS AND POLYSEMY OF THREE OLD IRISH VERBS

Abstract[1]

This brief paper examines three constructions attested in the Old Irish glosses. The relationship between flagging of arguments (case marking and adpositions) and predicate meaning is addressed for two very frequent transitive verbs used in a metalinguistic sense, *beirid fri/do* 'refer to' and *do·beir ar* 'put/say/write for', and for a third verb, *do·fich*, usually translated with 'punish' or 'avenge' but whose valency pattern differs from that of English 'punish'. The data from the glosses suggest variation in the selection of the preposition with *beirid*, consistency in the alignment of case marking with semantic roles for *do·fich*, and a possible semantic distinction between *do·beir ar* + dative 'put, say for' and *do·beir ar* + accusative 'exchange'.

Overview

In this short paper I will outline the relationship between constructions and verb meaning of three Old Irish verbs: *beirid* 'bring', *do·fich* 'punish' and *do·beir* 'give'. The constructions taken into account are grouped as valency patterns, gathered according to the general framework of the Leipzig Valency Patterns Project (Hartmann, Haspelmath and Taylor 2013). The sources are the Würzburg, Milan and St. Gall Glosses, which have been searched through the lists of occurrences in Kavanagh (2001), Griffith (2013) and Bauer (2015) respectively. The patterns of the three transitive verbs discussed here suggest the need to qualify or clarify in some ways what is reported in *DIL*, *eDIL* and in the literature (Williams 1954, Kavanagh 2001, Griffith 2013, Bauer 2015).

Before presenting the data, it is necessary to supply a working definition of the most traditional term used in grouping valency patterns, i.e. 'transitive': on a morpho-syntactic basis (flagging and indexing properties in Hartmann et al. 2013),[2] 'transitive' will be used for patterns where the verb in the active

[1]The results presented in this paper are part of the research project 'Transitivity and Argument Structure in Flux', funded by the Italian Ministry for Education and Research (MIUR) within the 2015 PRIN call, grant no. 20159M7X5P. The author thanks the reviewer for useful comments that greatly helped to emend the submitted version, and the audiences of the conference 'The shaping of transitivity and argument structure' (Pavia, 25–7 October 2018) and of the XVI International Congress of Celtic Studies (Bangor, 22–6 July 2019) for their feedback.

[2]In Hartmann et al.'s (2013) framework, flagging and indexing are coding techniques: flagging includes case and adposition marking, indexing includes agreement and cross-referencing. The third technique is word order (*Database Questionnaire Manual*, 7.1).

©Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies

form agrees with an argument in the nominative and is accompanied by (at least) an argument in the accusative. The active form may alternate with the passive, and in that case the nominal argument in the accusative with the active switches to nominative with the passive. 'Transitive verb' is shorthand for a verb which most frequently occurs in these constructions. The semantic relationship of the argument in the accusative case with the predicate is not preliminarily relevant; for an alternative working definition of the term 'transitive' for Old Irish, which relies on the semantic role of the accusative argument, see Griffith and Lash (2018).

1. METALINGUISTIC *BEIRID*

Among the constructions with the verb *beirid* 'bring', the pattern in (1) below occurs in a metalinguistic sense meaning 'refer something to' in 15 instances in the three corpora of glosses, including 7 instances in the corresponding passive construction.

> (1) argument 1-nominative [bringer/sayer] > argument 2-accusative [brought thing/referring expression] > preposition + argument 3-accusative/dative [referred entity]

This meaning is not reported in *DIL* and *eDIL* s.v. *beirid*, where only the abstract sense of 'adduces, infers' is given (sense I(b)). Nevertheless, the entry for the verbal noun *breth* records the meaning 'act of referring to' with *do, fri* (*DIL* D, col. 181, l. 44; *eDIL* sense (e)), and Griffith (2013) and Bauer (2015) clearly acknowledge a submeaning or meaning 'applies, refers' for *beirid*. The collection of verb-frames reveals variation in the selection of the preposition. While in *Wb.* (and *Sg.*, which however only offers one example) only *fri* occurs in this construction, *Ml.* mostly features *do*, although *fri* occurs twice, once with an active form and once with a passive form. The relevant loci are listed in (2)–(16) below.[3]

> (2) *Ml.* 16a17 indí nodberat **du**duaid 'those who refer it to David'.
>
> (3) *Ml.* 16a18 indí no berat [leg. nod berat] **do**sorbabel 'those who refer it to Zorobabel'.
>
> (4) *Ml.* 37a9 cia beraid **doib** aremepthe [leg. remeperthe] 'although he may refer the aforementioned to them'.
>
> (5) *Ml.* 42b7 is **do**soscelu beridi[nt]apstal insalmso 'the apostle refers this psalm to the Gospel'.

[3]All examples henceforth are cited from *Thes.* (for *Wb.*), Griffith (2013, for *Ml.*) and Bauer (2015, for *Sg.*). Manuscript abbreviations are silently expanded.

(6) *Ml.* 42b7 an ·eorum is **do** apstalaib beirthi ‘the *eorum*: it is to the apostles that he refers it’.

(7) *Ml.* 43a2 mad**fri**frecur cheill de nosbera ‘if it be to the worship of God that he should apply them’.

(8) *Ml.* 45a1 **do**dia ráuc ‘[it is] to God that he applied it’.

(9) *Ml.* 86d16 archuit nimmaircidetad· namber **du**chesad ‘in respect of appropriateness, apply it to the Passion!’

(10) *Wb.* 23c11 (passive) is **fri**pol berir amal sodin ‘it is to Paul that it is referred in that case’.

(11) *Wb.* 29a28 (passive) berir dano **fri**laa brátha ‘it is then referred to Doomsday’.

(12) *Ml.* 35b10 (passive) ruucthar **fri**cachrét ‘it can be applied to every thing’.

(13) *Ml.* 37a8 (passive) air**doib** danau ⟨airdoib⟩ berthair ⟨thir⟩ anisiu sís ‘for it is to them, then, that this below would be referred’.

(14) *Ml.* 37a8 (passive) ba**doib** berthir sanctis .i. iudeis ‘or [it is] to them that *sanctis*, i.e. *Iudeis*, would be referred’.[4]

(15) *Ml.* 37a10 (passive) nad fetammar ni im **du** iudaib fagentib berthair a sanctis fil sunt ‘that we do not know whether it is to Jews or to Gentiles that the *sanctis* here is referred’.

(16) *Sg.* 28b8 (passive) benair [leg. berair] **fri** cach nae a ndédese ‘these two are referred to each of them’.

This variation is confirmed by the occurrences of the two prepositions with the verbal noun *breth*, reported in (17)–(24) below (6 instances with *do* in *Ml.*, 2 with *fri* in *Wb.*).

[4]This is the translation in Griffith’s database, where it is assumed that *ba* (= *fa*) introduces the second of two alternatives; *Thes.* emends *badoib* to *bad doib* and translates ‘let it be to them that is referred *sanctis*, i.e. *Iudeis*’, where *bad* is a copular form in a cleft sentence. I would suggest that here *ba* is a modal form of the copula and *doib* is cataphoric to *iudeis*, which is the focus of a pseudo-cleft sentence (see Mac Coisdealbha 1998: 18–19) and represents one of the frequent instances of a Latin dative corresponding to an Irish prepositional phrase with *do*. Therefore, an appropriate translation would be ‘it would be to them, *Iudeis* (to Jews), that *sanctis* is referred’, or ‘to whom *sanctis* is referred would be *Iudeis* (to Jews)’.

(17) *Wb.* 13d4 niréid ambrith **fri**corpu peccatorum sed iustorum ‘it is not easy to refer them to the bodies *peccatorum* rather than *iustorum*’.

(18) *Wb.* 23c11 abrith **frisan**dliged remeperthe ‘its reference to the aforementioned principle’.

(19) *Ml.* 36c20 abrith **do**israheldaib ‘its reference to the Israelites’.

(20) *Ml.* 36c21 abreth **do**israheldaib ‘its reference to the Israelites’.

(21) *Ml.* 37a10 acht is **do**gentib is coir a breth ‘but it is to Gentiles that it is right to refer it’.

(22) *Ml.* 16b05 friabrith **do**duaid ⁊ sorbabel ‘against referring it to David and Zorobabel’.

(23) *Ml.* 37a10 abrith **do**iudaib ‘its reference to Jews’.

(24) *Ml.* 37a06b á brithe **do**iudaib ‘of its reference to Jews’.

To sum up, the use of *fri* is possibly semantically restricted in *Ml.* (‘apply’), and looks like a relic as opposed to *beirid do* ‘refer to’. Anyhow, although the alternation of the two prepositions in the construction points to variation, it would be hard to conclude that this alternation reflects a diachronic development without being circular. In this connection, it might be worth noting that a similar hypothesis has been put forward for variation concerning an unrelated feature, nasalisation after inflected nominals, in *Wb.* and *Ml.* (Roma 2018 and forthcoming).

2. THE TWO TRANSITIVE PATTERNS OF *DO·FICH*

The collection of argument frames may uncover some restrictions which do not surface immediately. The patterns attested with the verb *do·fich* (occurring only in *Wb.* and *Ml.*; 23 instances) show that the accusative argument with active forms and the nominative argument with passive forms can either be the punished deed (inanimate direct object, 7 instances),[5] as in (25), or the beneficiary, the person on behalf of whom the punishment is inflicted (animate direct object, 6 instances), as in (26).[6]

(25) *Wb.* 6a16 hore dofeich cach nolc et mórid cachmaith ‘because he punishes every evil and magnifies every good’.

[5] *Wb.* 6a16, 15a16; *Ml.* 24b17, 24b19, 38d8, 115b13, 129b4.
[6] *Ml.* 29c7, 38c21, 43d11, 43d19, 98d9, 101c16.

> (26) *Ml.* 38c21 nimdichimse formnaimtea ‘I do not avenge myself upon my enemies’.

In the first case the verb can be translated with both ‘punish’ and ‘avenge’, in the second only with ‘avenge’, if a transitive construction with the same direct object is preserved in translation. The beneficiary can also be flagged by *tar cenn* + genitive (*Ml.* 27c4, 72d11), while the punished deed can be flagged by *tar ési* + genitive (*Ml.* 123d8). The punished person is always flagged by the preposition *for* + accusative (*Wb.* 15a16, *Ml.* 38d8, 38c21, 115b13, 129b4).

The two meanings ‘punish’ and ‘avenge’ are simply listed in *DIL* and *eDIL*, without any reference to particular constructions. Nevertheless, in no case is the animate direct object of *do·fich* the punished person. In *Ml.* 24b17 *nísndíg focetoir* ‘he does not punish them at once’ the plural infixed pronoun refers to *peccata* ‘sins’ in the Latin text, in *Ml.* 24b19 *ardufesatar asennad* ‘for they will be punished at last’ the subject of the plural passive form *dufesatar* is *(impunita) uitia* ‘unpunished vices’ in the Latin text.[7] This pattern excludes a correlation between the English translations and the argument frame, as is suggested for example by Griffith (2013):

> The meanings ‘punishes’ and ‘avenges’ are distinguished by the nature of the object (when present). The object of ‘punishes’ is personal and represents the person receiving the punishment, while in ‘avenges’, the object is either personal or impersonal and represents rather the person or thing on behalf of which or because of which the vengeance is being carried out.

This distinction rather applies to English, but not to Old Irish, since the direct object of *do·fich* is never the person receiving the punishment.

The permitted frames are confirmed by the patterns attested with the verbal noun *dígal*: out of 138 instances, 77 are followed by a prepositional argument with *for* (always expressing the punished person), while 21 are accompanied by a genitive referring to either the punished deed (11 instances),[8]

[7]In *Tur.* 79 *is forrae fadisin doroacht* ‘it is on itself that vengeance has been taken’, glossing Latin *mentita est iniquitas sibi, ut regina aduersus Ioseph, et sacerdotes aduersus Sussannam* (‘iniquity has lied to itself, as the queen against Joseph, and the priests against Susanna’), the feminine noun *iniquitas*, resumed in *forrae*, metonymically refers to persons, and a non-promotional passive, with no nominative subject, occurs, translating a Latin deponent form. I cannot dwell on this issue here, but I use ‘non-promotional passive’ for what is usually termed ‘impersonal passive’ or ‘arbitrary-subject passive’ (‘active subject impersonal’ in Graver 2011) because I think there are reasons to believe that some Old Irish passive constructions with no nominative argument may represent strategies to promote adpositional arguments pragmatically, without promoting them syntactically, while downplaying the nominative argument by suppressing it. This example is a case in point.

[8]A single occurrence also in *Sg.*, where the finite form does not occur: *Wb.* 9c21, 17a10; *Ml.* 23b5, 27c1, 51c21, 55d4, 74b5, 74b7, 77c6, 138b6; *Sg.* 181a6.

the beneficiary (3 instances),[9] or else the punisher (7 instances),[10] but never to the punished person.

The two possible exceptions are *Ml.* 32c20, with a finite form, reported in (27), and *Wb.* 26b21, with the verbal noun, reported in (28).

> (27) *Ml.* 32c20 codufessar 'that he be punished' (translation as in *Thes.*)

> (28) *Wb.* 26b21 conammadarsa andígail forru .i. bot[h] cen biad man[id]irgn[at][11] 'I have adjudged their punishment on them, to remain without food if they do not supply it'.

Ml. 32c20 is a single word gloss on Latin *rogat ut sine furore* […] *in se* […] *seueritas uindicetur* 'he asks that severity might avenge upon him without rage'. Single-word glosses are not good sources to establish valency patterns and, notwithstanding the translation in *Thes.*, there is no need to interpret *codufessar* as a promotional passive with a (zero anaphora) nominative subject (see fn. 7); it could rather be translated as 'that punishment be inflicted'.

In *Wb.* 26b21 *andígail forru* the argument expressing the punished person is clearly in the inflected preposition *forru*, so that, if one claims that the plural possessive refers to the punished person, that would be coreferential with, and cataphoric to, the object of the preposition, ruling this out as a neat counterexample. Alternatively, the possessive refers to the punisher (reflexive, 'their punishment on themselves'), an alignment which, as stated above, occurs in 7 instances in the glosses and of course would not testify to an accusative argument expressing the punished person. This gloss on the right margin of the page starts over the Latin *si quis non uult operari, nec manducet* ('if someone does not want to work, neither should he eat'), and is in fact followed by the preceding gloss in *Thes.*, *Wb.* 26b20 *issí apennit dé* 'that is their penance for it', which is written over *nec manducet*.

In conclusion, the Old Irish verb's polysemy relies on the hierarchy and animacy of participants: if the accusative direct object is inanimate it represents a punished/avenged deed, if it is animate, it is a beneficiary, not the punished person. This does not align with the English opposition between 'punish' and 'avenge', because, as noted above, both can have either animate or inanimate direct objects. Rather, the relationship between argument structure and semantic roles of *do·fich* is similar to that of English 'avenge'.

[9] *Wb.* 5d35, 5d37; *Ml.* 57c6.

[10] *Wb.* 27c11; *Ml.* 31d1, 32d27, 40a6, 77d16, 105d7, 128d3. These instances are not crucial to the point here, but I have discussed them in two conference presentations (Roma 2018b and 2019) and will deal with them in a forthcoming paper.

[11] This is the restoration of the missing letters I suggest. *Thes.*, followed by Kavanagh (2001), reads *bot*[*h doib*] *cen biad ma*[*ni*]*... irgn...*

3. TRANSITIVE *DO·BEIR* WITH *AR*

The verb *do·beir* is one of the most frequent in the glosses (403 occurrences in finite form). It occurs in a variety of transitive constructions, in particular also as a light (aka support) verb governing nouns or verbal nouns such as *fortacht* 'help', *dígal* 'punishment', *frithorcun* 'offence', usually accompanied by a prepositional argument whose phrasal head (mainly *do* or *for*) appears to be selected by the verbal noun. I will not report all the argument frames here, but focus on those transitive constructions with a third argument flagged by the preposition *ar*, in order to try to match the meaning of the predicate, or rather of the whole construction, with the case governed by *ar*. This preposition can in fact govern either the dative or the accusative, without a clear semantic distinction between the two. *DIL* (A, col. 365, ll. 35–60) and *eDIL*, s.v. 1 *ar*, are at pains to draw a distinction and, referring to Zeuss (1853: 622) and *VGK* (74),[12] state:

> The presumed distinction between ar with *accus*. when motion is implied and with *dat*. when no motion is implied [...] appears most clearly in the stereotyped phrases ar chenn *towards*, ar chiunn *ahead of, before* [...]. The *dat*. is usual in ar cach láu *daily* [...] and in ar thosuch [...]. Usage is less clear outside fixed phrases, and that of the various collections of O. Ir. glosses differs (the available material is also much reduced by the frequent identity of form of *as*. and *ds*. of nouns). The *accus*. is regular in *Wb*. in senses of taking away *from* and counting *as*, and also in glosses on Lat. *ob*, the *dat*. where the meaning is *with regard to, instead of* and in glosses on Lat. *super*. Both cases are found where the meaning is *for the sake of, because of*. In *Ml*. *accus*. is constant only in set phrases. The *dat*. is usual in meaning counts *as*, do-beir ar (for?) *calls* and in glosses on Lat. *dat*. without preposition (ar gentib gl. *gentibus*, 78a12, 89c2) and where a Lat. compd. noun is treated as two words (arintinmlegun gl. *promulgatione*, 71c18). In general use the meanings saving *from, instead of, in meaning of, in return for, on account of, because of, for the sake of, for the purpose of* are all found both with *accus*. and *dat*. In *Sg*. the meanings *instead of* and *on account of* are found with both cases.

Besides the use of *do·beir ar* 'calls' found in the excerpt above (presumably corresponding to the metalinguistic meaning outlined in (i) below,

[12] 'Die Grenze zwischen den dativischen und den akkusativischen Verwendungen ist nicht immer leicht zu ziehen; namentlich ist die Unterscheidung zwischen Grund, vorhandenen Umständen, die etwas bewirken, und [zu erreichendem] Zweck nicht immer selbstverständlich.' ('The boundary between dativa l and accusatival usages is not always easy to draw; the distinction between cause, existing circumstances that cause something, and goal (to be reached) is in particular not always self-evident.')

examples 29–32), the frequent occurrence in the glosses of *ar* with the verbs *do·beir* and *as·beir* in the meaning 'instead of, in place of, as substitute for, in meaning of' is also clearly recorded in *DIL* (A, col. 367, l. 42) and *eDIL* (s.v. 1 *ar* sense II(d)); in that sense, again, the dative is given as the usual case, and it is stated that the accusative is used occasionally. No case is specified for *do·beir (ní) ar* 'gives in exchange for, pays for' (*eDIL* s.v. *do-beir*, sense I(c)). Williams (1954: 311), also referred to by *DIL*, notes that *ar* meaning 'in place of, instead of, representing, as representative of' may govern either the dative or the accusative.

I shall try here to draw a distinction between (i) a metalinguistic meaning 'put/say/write a word for x' and (ii) a physical or abstract meaning not implying any metalinguistic sense, 'give something (in exchange) for x', 'exchange'. The valency patterns in the glosses for (i) and (ii) are reported below:

> (i) *do·beir* argument 2-acc [said, put word] > *ar*+argument 3-dat [substituted, referred thing/person]
>
> (ii) *do·beir* argument 2-acc [given thing] > *ar*+argument 3-acc [exchanged thing].

The construction in (ii) is synonymous with a similar one where the third argument is flagged by *tar ési* + genitive (e.g. *Wb.* 6a11, 14b15, 22b7, *Ml.* 106c1). Moreover, the metalinguistic meaning of *do·beir* 'say/write/put down a word, an expression' can also be found without *ar* (e.g. *Ml.* 118b6 *airmad panem namma duberadsom ⁊ ní taibred meum* 'for if it were only *panem* which he had put, and had he not put *meum*'). Nevertheless, while the meaning of the preposition *ar* is similar in the two constructions, so that it could be semantically classified independently from the predicate, the meaning of the predicate differs ('say/write in replacement of' vs. 'give in replacement of'), so that it seems better to look at construction meaning. The two valency patterns in fact imply two different further semantic roles: a locative in (i)[13] and a recipient in (ii) (explicitly expressed by *do* + dative in *Wb.* 3c1 quoted in (33) below).

The clear cases are listed in (29)–(32) for (i) and (33)–(35) for (ii):

(i) Metalinguistic meaning with *ar* + dative:

> (29) *Wb.* 21a13 dobeir inso **arnab uilib cumactib** dichoissin inim et talam 'he puts this for all the powers which exist in heaven and earth'.

[13]Cp. *Ml.* 35c26a *mani taibred domine ant* 'if he had not put *Domine* there', *Ml.* 51d5 *nitaib* [leg. nitaibir] *ebraide dobrethir hisuidib* 'the Hebrew does not put an adverb in them.'

(30) *Ml.* 18c5 douic nadegnimu **arnaib foraiccib** [leg. fochraiccib] ⁊ inna dualchi **arnaib pianaib** 'he has put the good deeds for the rewards and the vices for the punishments'.

(31) *Ml.* 109a1 is **ar neurt** dubeir som dugræs am brachium amal as ar gním dubeir am manum 'it is for strength that he always puts *brachium*, as it is for deed that he puts *manum*'.

(32) *Ml.* 51c2 **aircech ceneliu** ciuil honid techtae molad dǽ do ber som ani as chithara as beir 'for every kind of musical instrument with which the praise of God is fitting he puts the *cithara* which he mentions'.

The same construction is calqued in *Wb.* 21d1 *tuicsom inda nainmso tantum pro omnibus gradibus caelestibus* 'he puts these two names only for all heaven's grades', and *Ml.* 50b8 ⁊ *pro sustinui da* [leg. *dano*] *dauic dauid an· dixi·* 'and so for *sustinui* David has put *dixi*', with Latin *pro* (+ ablative) corresponding to *ar* + dative.

(ii) Exchange meaning with *ar* + accusative:

(33) *Wb.* 3c1 stipendium didiu ainm indlóge doberr domíledaib **armílte** '*stipendium* then is the name of the pay which is given to soldiers for military service'.

(34) *Ml.* 90c14 intan dobera dia fochraicci **ar degnimu** 'when God will give rewards for good works'.

(35) *Ml.* 130d15 amal bid log mór dubertha **erru** 'as though it were a great price that you had given for them'.

However, in the case of the two constructions in (i) and (ii), it should be noted that the situation is more skewed, in comparison with the previous two cases discussed in this paper. The counterexamples are reported in (36) and (37):

(36) *Ml.* 81c4–6 is **ar forngartaidi** dubertar 'it is for imperatives that they are put'.

(37) *Sg.* 140a4 ní·comṡuidigther acht is **ar in ṁbrethir ṅdiuit** doberr 'it is not compounded, but it is put for the simple verb'.

Example (36) seems to attest to a metalinguistic meaning with the accusative (note that Griffith 2013 tentatively suggests 'check this: forngartaid?', i.e. a singular form which can be a dative). Example (37) again shows an accusative case in a construction with metalinguistic meaning; case is unambiguous.

It could be argued that the instances (29–33) listed under (i) above are slightly different from the two counterexamples (36) and (37), since rather than a *designans* (accusative) for a *designatum* (*ar* + dative) we have here reference to a morphological form used instead of another (a perfect instead of an imperative, an analytic verb form for a synthetic one). However, I am inclined to group the instances together.

Ambiguous cases, i.e. where there is no morphological distinction between dative and accusative (singular), are reported in (38–40). In *Ml.* 109a1 (31 above), although *gním* in *ar gním* could either be a dative or an accusative form, the parallelism with *(ar) neurt* suggests that it is a dative form (metalinguistic meaning).

> (38) *Wb.* 10d20 honorum dobertar **ar precept soscéli** 'of the honours which are given for teaching the Gospel' – exchange meaning.
>
> (39) *Ml.* 73d12 cia duberat argat dait siu **arasoirad** 'though they give you silver for their deliverance' (Griffith 2013 'probably acc.') – exchange meaning.
>
> (40) *Ml.* 118b6 huare immurgu dunuic meum is**arcechsasad** dauic som amal sodin 'because, however, he has put *meum*, it is for every food that he has put it then' – metalinguistic meaning.

The following two examples from *Sg.* should probably be classified differently (Williams 1954: 314, n. 8, 'To denote purpose: "with a view to, with the object or purpose of, as preparatory to, in order to"'), although *do·beir* shows here the same metalinguistic meaning 'put a word, an expression', which, as noted above, can occur without any prepositional argument (explicit locative *híc* in (41), implicit locative in (42)).

> (41) *Sg.* 76b2 ardesimrecht dobeirsem indaarticul híc 'for an example he puts here the two demonstratives'.
>
> (42) *Sg.* 213a7 isaremsuidigud dobertar indadesmerecht ⁊ itaremsuidigthib indí greic amal ṡodain[14] 'it is for prepositive use that the two examples are given and for prepositions are the two Greek words then'.

It is hard to tell whether dative and accusative case really match with these two meanings, in particular because occurrences of the first construction outside

[14]I wonder whether the ms. text really needs to be emended here supplying the preposition *ar* in *itaremsuidigthib*, as suggested by *Thes.* and Bauer (2015): it could be read as *a* plural possessive + dative (see *GOI* § 251.2 for the construction). The translation given above could accordingly dispense with the second 'for'.

the glosses are hard to find.[15] However, the account of occurrences given here can be a starting point for further investigation.

4. Summary and conclusion

This paper has shown that the transitive construction *beirid fri* 'refer to' in *Wb.* is scarcely attested with the same preposition in *Ml.*, where *do* is mostly used; that the transitive Old Irish verb *do·fich* in the Old Irish glosses can only govern a direct object expressing the punished deed or the beneficiary (the person on behalf of whom punishment is inflicted), not the punished person; that the two constructions attested in the glosses *do·beir ar* + dative and *do·beir ar* + accusative may belong to two different semantic fields.

Bibliography

Bauer, Bernhard 2015: *The Online Database of the Old Irish Priscian Glosses.* (downloaded from http://www.univie.ac.at/indogermanistik/priscian/, 30 June 2016).

Graver, Jenny 2011: 'The syntax and development of the Old Irish autonomous verb', in Andrew Carnie (ed.), *Formal Approaches to Celtic Linguistics* (Newcastle upon Tyne), 41–63.

Griffith, Aaron 2013: *Dictionary and database of the Old Irish Glosses in the Milan MS Ambr. C301 inf.* (downloaded from http://www.univie.ac.at/indogermanistick/milan_glosses.htm 3 November 2013).

Griffith, Aaron and Lash, Elliott 2018: 'Coordinate subjects, expletives and the EPP in Early Irish', *Journal of Celtic Linguistics* 19, 87–156.

Hartmann, Iren, Haspelmath, Martin and Taylor, Bradley (eds.) 2013: *Valency Patterns Leipzig* (Leipzig). http://valpal.info (accessed 7 May 2018).

Kavanagh, Séamus 2001: *A Lexicon of the Old Irish Glosses in the Würzburg Manuscript of the Epistles of St. Paul.* Ed. by D. S. Wodtko (Vienna).

Lash, Elliott 2018: *The Old Irish Minor Glosses Database*, in D. Stifter, S. Barrett, B. Bauer, E. Ganly, A. Griffith, T. Ji, T. Ha Nguyen, E. Lash, G. Osaboro, F. Qiu, N. White, Corpus Palaeohibernicum [The Old Irish corpus] (Maynooth: Maynooth University, 2015–present). https://chronhib.maynoothuniversity.ie.

Mac Coisdealbha, Pádraig 1998: *The Syntax of the Sentence in Old Irish: Selected studies from a descriptive, historical and comparative point of view.* Ed. by G. R. Isaac (Tübingen).

Roma, Elisa 2018a: 'Nasalisation after inflected nominals in the Old Irish glosses: A reassessment', *Journal of Celtic Linguistics* 19, 1–30.

——, 2018b: 'Valency patterns of Old Irish verbs: finite vs. non-finite syntax', Paper presented at the conference *The shaping of transitivity and argument structure* (Pavia, 25–27 October 2018).

[15] No instances of both constructions can be found in the glosses reckoned in the *Minor Glosses Database* (Lash 2018).

——, 2019: 'Valency patterns of Old Irish verbs', Paper presented at the *XVI International Congress of Celtic Studies*, Bangor 22–26 July 2019.

——, forthcoming: 'Nasalisation after inflected nominals in the Old Irish glosses: evidence for variation and change', in Elliott Lash, Fangzhe Qiu, and David Stifter (eds), *Morphosyntactic Variation in Medieval Celtic Languages: Corpus-Based Approaches* (Berlin).

WILLIAMS, J. E. CAERWYN 1954: 'The preposition *ar* in Irish', *Celtica* 2(2), 305–24.

ZEUSS, JOHANN KASPAR 1853: *Grammatica celtica. E monumentis vetustis tam hibernicae linguae quam britannicarum dialectorum, cambricae, cornicae, armoricae comparatis gallicae priscae reliquiis* (Leipzig).

ELISA ROMA

University of Pavia

THE MORTAL AND DIVINE HISTORIES OF MONGÁN MAC FIACHNAI IN *CÍN DROMMA SNECHTAI*

Abstract

It has long been claimed that Early Irish literature portrays a form of reembodiment which is the equivalent of Pythagorean metempsychosis. But this is not what we find in most examples. Where a human is said to have traversed multiple embodiments, the process of reembodiment generally comes to an end once the person in question has been restored to their proper form and bequeathed their memories of ancient history to the Church. However, some of the earliest stories about Mongán mac Fiachnai do not fit this pattern. *Immacaldam Choluim Chille* and *Scél asa mberar combad hé Find mac Cumaill Mongán* offer no indication that Mongán's sequence of embodiments is drawing to an end, or which of his bodies may properly be his. This study will interpret the open-endedness of Mongán's rebirths in these two instances in light of related stories which have also been attributed to the lost manuscript known as *Cín Dromma Snechtai*. Doing so will allow us to determine the degree to which Mongán's rebirths show parallels with Pythagorean metempsychosis, and the meaning these rebirths had for their medieval Christian context. Moreover, it will demonstrate further links between the tales that the current consensus places in *Cín Dromma Snechtai*.[1]

Among the many fascinating features of Early Irish literature are its stories of souls traversing from body to body. Such stories are, of course, not confined to medieval Ireland. Many such are found in Classical poetry and philosophy, for example. This point of comparison has not been lost on scholarship. There has

[1]An earlier version of this paper was presented at the seventh annual colloquium on 'Thinking about Mythology in the 21st Century' at the University of Edinburgh on 19 October 2019. My thanks to John Carey (Cork) and Jonathan Wooding (Sydney) for offering such useful criticisms of that earlier version. These did much to help guide the trajectory of its development into its present form. My thanks also to Elizabeth Boyle (Maynooth), to Evan King (UCD), and especially to Liam Breatnach (DIAS), for their patient and clarifying advice at various stages of that development. Likewise, I owe a debt of gratitude to the anonymous reader, whose comments and criticisms pointed the way forward on multiple fronts, and to the editors of *Celtica*, who saved me from incomprehensibility more often than I would like to admit. Any faults found here are, of course, to be blamed squarely on myself alone. At the outset, it should also be noted that this paper includes an appendix. In it are found the text and translation of quotations that, on account of their length, could not be included into the body of the relevant footnotes. Reference shall be made to the appropriate section of this appendix wherever a footnote cites one of the quotations in question.

©Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies

long been a tendency to equate the way that reembodiment is portrayed in Early Irish accounts with the Pythagorean doctrine of metempyschosis that Classical authors sometimes attributed to ancient Celtic-speaking peoples.[2] Some have gone on to claim that this ostensible correspondence demonstrates a continuity of belief between ancient Gallic druids and the medieval Irish learned classes, at least on this one issue.[3] But the conclusion that the kind of reembodiment portrayed in Early Irish narratives is more or less the same as Pythagorean metempsychosis – and so also as the doctrine attributed to Gallic druids in antiquity – has tended to be based only on the most tangential references to the ancient Pythagorean evidence.[4] Whatever continuities these medieval sources may have with pre-Christian belief in Ireland, a closer comparison will reveal that they portray reembodiment in a way that has important, even fundamental, points of contrast with metempsychosis as ancient Pythagoreans understood it.

However, the early stories about Mongán are found here to be a special case, perhaps even an exception, having a much higher degree of similarity to the ancient Pythagorean material, and displaying none of the concern for

[2]Diodorus Siculus straightforwardly attributed the Pythagorean doctrine of metempsychosis to the Gallic peoples as a whole; Diodorus Siculus, *Bibliotheca historica* V.xxviii.6; Oldfather, ed. and trans. (1939–67, vol. iii: ed. 170 and trans. 171). Valerius Maximus said that the Gallic peoples had the same beliefs about the immortality of the soul as the Pythagoreans; *Factorum et dictorum memorabilium* II.x.6; Kempf, ed. (1854: 205). Ammianus Marcellinus said that Gallic druids had the same beliefs about the immortality of the soul as the Pythagoreans; *Rerum Gestarum Libri XXXI* XV.ix.4; Rolfe, ed. and trans. (1950, vol. i: ed. 180 and trans. 181). Julius Caesar seems to have attributed a doctrine of metempsychosis to Gallic druids, but did not compare this to Pythagoreanism; Caesar, *Commentarii de Bello Gallico* I.vi.14.5; Edwards, ed. and trans. (1917: ed. 338 and trans. 399). Ps. Hippolytus portrayed Gallic druids as Pythagoreans, but did not mention the doctrine of metempsychosis as one of his examples of this; *Refutatio Omnium Haeresium* [a.k.a. *Philosophumena*] I.xxv.1; Litwa, ed. and trans., (2016: ed. 80 and trans. 81). Strabo attributes the doctrine of the immortality of the soul to Gallic druids, but does not compare this to Pythagoreanism; *Geographica* IV.iv.4; Jones, ed. and trans. (1917–32, vol. ii: ed. 244 and trans. 245); St. Clement of Alexandria, argues for the influence of Gallic druids [among other 'barbarian' philosophers] on Pythagoras and Greek philosophy in general; *Stromata* I.xv.70.1, 71.4; Stählin, ed. (1906–9, vol. i: 44–5); Ferguson, trans. (2005: 75–6). For translations of all these passages as a single collection of excerpts, see Koch and Carey et al, trans. (2003: 12–23, 30–6).

[3]Here d'Arbois de Jubainville (1884: 344ff) is seminal. More recent examples include Carey's description of the relevant evidence in *De mirabilibus sacrae scripturae* in Carey (2000: 58 n. 7): 'This remarkable statement appears to indicate that, in the middle of the seventh century, there were still in Ireland druids [...] preaching some form of the doctrine of transmigration ascribed to their continental counterparts by Greek and Roman authors.' He has since modified his stance on this specific text in an encyclopaedia entry (2006a: 1484–6), where he continues to draw parallels to the Pythagorean tradition relative to other forms of early Irish evidence, but without explicitly claiming their continuity with the ideas attributed to druids by Greek and Roman authors; a similar statement has since been made in Carey (2009: 221). However, in the same volume, other scholars stay closer to the earlier form of his argument; see Freeman (2006: 850): 'Pagan Celtic views about an afterlife as found in later Irish and Welsh literature are often a mixture of reincarnation and an otherworldly land of the dead [...] It is likely that some ancient Celts viewed an afterlife in an otherworld as a temporary state before reincarnation, similar to Plato's Pythagorean myth of Er (*Republic* 10).'

[4]Nutt (1895–7a) being the most notable exception.

the implications of Christian eschatology which is otherwise typical of the Irish material. The task of working out how far this similarity goes, and of determining the meaning that such a singular process of reembodiment as Mongán's could have within a medieval Christian understanding of reality, will require that we read the relevant accounts in light of each other. The many parallels (and occasional overlaps) in the content of these stories would be reason enough for this interpretive approach, especially since four out of the five principal texts in question are often transmitted in the same manuscripts,[5] and all have been dated to the eighth century, or somewhat earlier.[6] Yet such an approach is made all the more necessary by the fact that the current scholarly consensus traces them to the same lost manuscript, namely *Cín Dromma Snechtai*,[7] the earliest known collection of narratives written in the Irish vernacular, or for that matter, in any Western European vernacular.[8] The crucial aspect of this consensus opinion, for the concerns at hand, is the conclusion that these specific texts appear not simply to have been collected and compiled by the northern scriptorium which produced *Cín Dromma Snechtai*, but to variously reflect its creative and editorial activity.[9] The process of clarifying the significance of Mongán's reembodiments by comparison with Pythagorean metempsychosis will thus have the additional significance of providing further confirmation of the accepted list of *Cín Dromma Snechtai* texts. For through this process it will be demonstrated that, beyond the textual

[5]These five texts are: 1) *Compert Mongáin*, 2) *Scél asa mberar combad hé Find mac Cumaill Mongán ocus aní día fil aidid Fothaid Airgtig*, 3) *Echtrae Chonnlai*, 4) *Immram Brain*, and 5) *Immacaldam Choluim Chille ⁊ ind Óclaig oc Carraic Eolairg*. There is a chart displaying these patterns of transmission in White (2006: 11). Texts 1 and 2 here are the first two in the sequence of four early Mongán tales that are generally transmitted as a group and in the same order. The outlier in this list is *Immacaldam Choluim Chille ⁊ ind Óclaig oc Carraic Eolairg* (*Immacaldam*, hereafter). It is grouped with *Compert Mongáin* and *Scél Mongáin* in TCD MS H 3. 18 (1337) part 2, pp. 555–6, but none of these other texts are found in TCD H 2. 17 (1319), where it appears on p. 178. For further bibliographical information on the *Immacaldam,* see Carey (2002: 54).

[6]As recently as Mac Mathúna (1985: 421–89), it has been argued that the constituent texts of *Cín Dromma Snechtai* were no older than the tenth century. However, this conclusion has not stood up very well to subsequent scrutiny. See Breatnach (1988: *passim*, but esp. 191); Carey (1995a: 72 n. 10); McCone (2000a: 43–7, 66–8). McCone (2000a: 67–8) has suggested that the name '*Cín Dromma Snechtai*' could as easily belong to a tenth-century mediation of the original eighth-century archetype as to the archetype itself. This possibility has subsequently been raised by White (2006: 36–7) and Stifter (2017: 24). The dating of these texts will be discussed on an individual basis as the argument makes reference to them.

[7]For a list of the texts currently attributed to *Cín Dromma Snechtai*, see Carey (1995a: 71–2; 2007: 27–41); Stifter (2019b). For an overview of the history of scholarship on *Cín Dromma Snechtai* and its hypothesised contents, see Stifter (2017: 23 n. 2).

[8]'Western' because I would not be confident in claiming that it necessarily predates any such development in the vernacular literatures of Armenia or Georgia.

[9]The most important discussion of the textual and thematic evidence is Carey (1995a: 73–5, 77–86, 91). His discussion here is subsequently summarised in Carey (2007: 28–9). White (2006: 37–70) expands on Carey's findings, and works out some of their implications for the interpretation of the relevant texts. In a recent article, Stifter (2017: 28–31) has since identified further thematic evidence which supports Carey's conclusions about their interrleationships, and in a subsequent lecture (2019a), further linguistic evidence.

and thematic links which have previously been noted, these texts share a theologically and cosmologically coherent vision of Mongán and of the earthly paradise to which he belongs.

PYTHAGOREAN METEMPSYCHOSIS AND EARLY IRISH REEMBODIMENT

In Classical antiquity, metempsychosis, where it is held as a doctrine, is invariably presented as an essential feature of the soul's metaphysical character, and as an argument for the justice of divine providence.[10] The sufferings which a rational being endures in a given embodiment are not unjust if they are they are neither more nor less than the education necessary to correct the vices that it acquired in its previous embodiments. However, in Early Irish literature, reembodiment does not occur as part of the general order of things (at least, not where humans are concerned),[11] but rather as an atypical interruption of the normal operation of natural processes.[12]

Where it is clearly humans that are portrayed as undergoing serial embodiments, it seems to occur only in exceptional cases, and then only to notable people.[13] This may, at first, make these Early Irish examples appear difficult to distinguish from their Pythagorean counterparts, seeing as the ancient Pythagorean sources also tend to base their exploration of these matters on exceptional cases and notable people: namely, on those few that are able to

[10]As slight as our knowledge of Pythagoreanism earlier than Plato is, the fragments of Empedocles's suggest that this characterisation may also be consistent with pre-Platonic forms of Pythagoreanism. For a systematic account of Empedocles' understanding of metempsychosis in the context of his overall theology, see Rangos (2012). However, any distinction between pre- and post-Platonic Pythagoreanism is of little relevance to the case at hand. By the time of the earliest Classical authors which compare the Pythagorean metempsychosis to Gallic beliefs about the fate of the soul, Pythagoreanism had already become inseparable from its various post-Platonic interpretations.

[11]It does indeed seem as if it might be seen as natural occurrence for certain other kinds of beings. This possibility will be discussed on pp. 51 and 60.

[12]On this issue, it seems to be only Diogenes Laertius's *Vitae Philosophorum* (*c*. 3rd century AD) that presents Pythagorean metempsychosis in a form that is comparable to the relevant medieval Irish material. According to him, 'the revolution' or 'wandering of the soul' (τὴν τῆς ψυχῆς περιπόλησιν / tēn tēs psukēs peripolēsin) undergone by Pythagoras is a special 'gift' (δῶρον / dōron) given him by the god Hermes, rather than the universal fate of all souls; see *Vitae Philosophorum* VIII.4; Dorandi, ed. (2013: 602); translations here are mine. However, it appears not to be relevant to the case at hand. It does not agree with the Classical sources that compared the beliefs of Gallic druids about the post-mortem fate of souls to Pythagorean metempsychosis. Moreover, it is unlikely to have been available in Latin translation early enough to be have been an influence on the seventh- and eighth-century sources we have been considering here, the earliest recorded attempt being the partial translation attributed to Henricus Aristippus († 1162), now surviving only in fragments; Dorandi (2013: 9–10).

[13]Nutt (1895–7a: 120–1) went as far as this, but for the sake of trying to argue for strong parallels with more arachaic forms of Greek thought instead. See also Mac Cana (1983: 122): 'Far from implying that a process of serial reincarnation affected all animate beings, the legends restrict it to a relatively small number of instances concerning either deities or mythical personages.' See also Guyonvarc'h and Le Roux (1986: 271–3, esp. 273): 'Il importe aussi de souligner que la métempsycose celtique n'est pas Générale, comme celle qui a cours dans plusieurs religions de l'Inde.'

remember their past embodiments.[14] In either instance, the matter of central importance is the authoritative knowledge that a clear memory of past embodiments is thought to grant to the person in question.[15] But past this, significant differences begin to appear. In the Pythagorean accounts,[16] whatever historical information is made available through the experiences of past embodiments functions as little more than supporting evidence that such a person possesses authoritative knowledge concerning the rebirths that all souls are understood to undergo, and thus, concerning the soul itself.[17] For the soul's rebirths, according to these ancient authors, are not accidental adventures into which it has somehow fallen, but a process that belongs to its very nature as soul.[18] However, in the Early Irish accounts, the authoritative knowledge taken to be possessed by such a person is precisely that of a reliable witness to ancient history,[19] a historical knowledge which – however evocative it may be of other matters – is not claimed to reveal anything at all regarding

[14]Noted by Carey (2006a: 1485; 2015: 65).

[15]Although, in Classical literature, the idea of Pythagorean metempsychosis is sometimes turned to as a way as of establishing (or making sense of) the significance of a person who does not necessarily remember their past embodiments. For Ennius's claim that a dream revealed to him that he was a reincarnation of Homer, see discussion and references in Skutsch (1985: 147–67); Newman (1988: 434–6); Aicher (1989). For Antipater's claim that Stesichorus was a reincarnation of Homer, see *Anthologia Graeca* LXXIV; Gow and Page, eds and trans. (1968, vol. i: ed. 58 and trans. 59), with discussion in Newman (1988: 436) and Rawles (2018: 28ff.).

[16]The classic example here is the Myth of Er in Book X of Plato's *Republic*; Slings, ed. (2003: 369–409); Grube and Reeve, trans. (1997: 1199–23). But see also the following. Iamblichus, *De vita Pythagorica* XIV; Deubner and Klein, eds (1975: 34–5); Clark, trans. (1989: 25–6). Porphyry, *De vita Pythagorae* XXVI; des Places, ed. and trans. (1982: 163–97, at 48); Guthrie, trans. (1987–8: 123–35, at 128).

[17]i.e. Ovid's *Metamorphoses* XV, ll. 479–879 appears to be innovative in presenting historical knowledge as a fundamental aspect of Pythagoras's wisdom, and thus also, not to be representative of what the Classical authors, cited in note 2, would have had in mind when attributing belief in Pythagorean metempsychosis to Celtic-speaking peoples; Miller, ed. and trans. (1984: ed. 398–426 and trans. 399–427). For discussion of this as an innovation, see Hardie (1995: 210–12); Segal (2001: 81, incl. n. 42). It is also unlikely to have directly influenced the medieval Irish texts we are considering here, since the earliest earliest extant example of extended commentary on Ovid's *Metamorphoses* in the Latin West is that of Manegold of Lautenbach, and belongs to the last quarter of the eleventh century; Dronke (2008: 90–5); Dronke (2009: 21).

[18]For Platonic forms of Pythagoreanism, this characteristic of the rational soul is something that it has in distinction it from other kinds of beings that are inferior (animals) and superior (divinities) to it, even if the reembodiments of rational souls can include animal reemobiment according to some manner that is particular to their rational nature. On this, see Smith (1984). However, according to more materialist interpretations of Pythagoreanism – such as we find summarised by Sextus Empiricus – metempsychosis demonstrates that divinity, humanity and animality are different modes of existence which the soul undergoes, rather than essentially different kinds of being, life and thought. Sextus Empiricus, *Adversus Mathematicos* IX [a.k.a. *Adversus Physicos*] i.127; Bury, ed. (1933–49, vol. iii: 2–381, at 68); Bett, trans. (2012: 28).

[19]See a similar statement in Carey (2006: 1486): 'In most of the insular examples, memory of former existences is invoked to provide authority for accounts of the distant past.' The reason I make a somewhat stronger claim is that I am characterising a smaller group of examples than Carey is here: i.e. those which include (or seem to include) actual rebirth, rather than all transitions from one embodiment to another.

the processes that are intrinsic to the soul as such.[20] For in medieval Irish literature, it is not so much their memory of past embodiments that makes such people exceptional, as the fact that they were reembodied at all, this evidently being due to otherworldly involvement[21] or some more explicitly divine miracle.[22]

Moreover, every such account ends, to my knowledge, with the protagonist regaining their own natural human form, after which they meet one of the saints, and subsequently die a death that is absolute and final.[23] In this way they avoid any of the awkward dilemmas about the resurrection body which would necessarily follow were all of a soul's embodiments to be on equal footing, to say nothing of the additional complications that would result if some of these equally legitimate embodiments were non-human. If it is the unity of the body and soul together that is thought to make up a complete human identity (rather

[20]Accepting Bondarenko's argument that the significance of the *senchas* preserved by Fintan mac Bóchra extends to the interpretation of contemporary institutions perceived to be ancient, in the broadest sense, but rejecting his contention that this somehow makes it distinct from the medieval discipline of *historia*; Bondarenko (2012: 142).

[21]With the proviso that the relevant examples tend more towards *metamorphosis* than rebirth. See Watson (forthcoming)**.** One might easily suppose that Mongán mac Fiachnai is the prime example of rebirth that is due to otherworldly involvement. See, for instance, *Immram Brain* §53–4 [McCone (2005) / White (2006) §4–5] in note 53. However, we shall find that it is by no means certain that he is understood to have an essentially human identity. On this, see pages 48ff. below.

[22]In the case of Tuán mac Cairill, divine agency is first explicitly referenced relative to his last two reembodiments: a salmon, and then a human again; *Scél Tuáin meic Chairill*, ll. 63–4, 67; Carey, ed. and trans. (1984: ed. 102 and trans. 106): 'Domchuirethar Dia isin n-abaind [...] in tan romba mithig la Dia mo chobair sea' (= 'God puts me into the river [...] When God decided that it was time to help me'). This seems to imply the decisive role of divine agency from the beginning of the process of reembodiment. It is, in any event, how it was later understood in material belonging to R^2 and R^3 [esp. The Book of Ballymote and The Book of Lecan, second text] of the *Lebor Gabála Érenn*; see *Lebor Gabála Érenn* §222, 236 [prose] and XXXIX.1 [poetry]; Macalister, ed. and trans. (1938–56, vol. iii: ed. 22, 41, 80 and trans. 23, 42, 81). Albeit, the matter is likely worthy of a more detailed consideration than is possible here. The case of Fintan mac Bóchra, however, is less ambiguous; divine agency is explicitly manifest from the beginning; *Suidigud Tellaig Temra* §9; Best, ed. and trans. (1910: ed. 130 and trans. 131): 'Mad misi romanacht / mac Dé' (= 'As for me I was saved / by the Son of God').

[23]In *Scél Tuáin meic Chairill*, ll. 7–12, 75ff. Tuán's final reembodiment does not end before St. Patrick catechises and baptizes him, Sts Finnia and Colum Cille also speak to him, and he has become a hermit; see Carey, ed. and trans. (1984: ed. 101–2 and trans. 105–7). For Carey's linguistic dating of *Scél Tuáin* to the second half of the ninth century, and its connexions with other texts, see (1984: 93–100). In the Middle Irish text, *Suidigud Tellaig Temra*, Fintan mac Bóchra's final reembodiment ends only after he receives the sacrament from the hand of bishop Erc, and the spirits of Sts. Patrick and Brigid are present at his death; *Suidigud Tellaig Temra* §36; Best, ed. and trans. (1910: ed. 160 and trans. 161). Lí Ban, in *Aided Echach maic Maireda*, is a somewhat different case, since it is clear that her initial body is not exchanged for another at any point, but is, rather, transformed; O'Grady, ed. and trans. (1892, ed. vol. i: 233–7 and trans. II: 265–9); de Vries, ed. and trans. (2012: ed. 200–18 and trans. 201–19). This story has been most recently dated to the twelfth century by de Vries (2012: 23). Her alternation of form, as described by *Aided Echach*, is also recounted in detail by the Middle Irish commentary on *Félire Óengusso* §27; Stokes, ed. and trans. (1905: ed. 52 and trans. 53). It is further alluded to in the Cottonian Annals. See Freeman, ed. and trans. (1924–7, ed. vol. i: 321 and trans. vol. iii: 362). In the *Annals of Tigernach*, however, it is Lí Ban's sister, Airiu, who changes form; Stokes, ed. and trans. (1895–7, vol. ii: 147). For further discussion and notes, see Imhoff (2008).

than the soul alone), and the body in which a soul is born is thought to be the one that is necessarily proper to it, then the identity of the body in which a soul will rise at the Last Judgement becomes a far from indifferent matter.[24] And were that soul not, at some point, to undergo a bodily death which is followed by no rebirth, there could be no such thing as a Last Judgement so far as that soul is concerned. For the effect of any post-mortem judgement undergone by a soul which is always yet to be reembodied again will necessarily be provisional, extending only through the next cycle of embodiment to whatever judgement will, in turn, come after.[25] Or such, at least, was St. Augustine's influential conclusion on the subject.

Of the relevant examples, Tuán mac Cairill comes as close as any to a Pythagorean doctrine of metempsychosis insofar as at least one of his reembodiments (i.e. his transition from a salmon to a human) seems to clearly involve death as a feature of the transition from one bodily form to another, even if there is still physical continuity between his soon-to-be mother's digestion of his fish-flesh and her subsequent conception of him in her womb.[26]

[24]On the reunification of soul and body at the Resurrection, and the reconstitution, preservation and perfection of the particulars that are unique to one's own body in that state, see St. Augustine's *De civitate Dei* (*DCD*, hereafter) XXII.4–5 and 11ff; Dombart and Kalb, eds (1955, vol. ii: 557–61 and 584ff.); Bettenson, trans. (1972: 1026–7 and 1049ff.). In the context of medieval Irish literature, the most transparent engagement with Augustine's thought on this issue is likely the eleventh- or twelfth-century text, *Scéla na Esérgi*. For its distinction of resurrection (*esérgi*) from such things as metamorphosis (*metaformatio*) and metempsychosis (*revolutio*), see *Scéla na Esérgi* §33; Stokes, ed. and trans. (1904: ed. 250 and trans. 251). Carey notes (2015: 64) that this passage shows the influence of Augustine. For further discussion of this aspect of *Scéla na Esérgi*, see Boyle (2014: 249–51). However, the date of this text means that the light it sheds on Early Irish engagement with this aspect of *DCD* is more relevant to the Middle Irish evidence than it is to the Old Irish Mongán narratives which are the principal concern of this article. For references to salient examples of the Middle Irish evidence, see notes 23, 46 and 110.

[25]Augustine's primary criticism of metempsychosis, as he understands it, is that, if the soul is always being reembodied, even the most beatific life in heaven cannot be truly happy. For the happiness of a beatified soul would necessarily be blighted by the fearful anticipation of the unavoidable fall that is yet to come, in which it will be plunged back again into the suffering which characterises inferior embodiments; *DCD* X.30, XXI.17; Dombart and Kalb, eds (1955, vol. i: 307–8; vol. ii: 783); Bettenson, trans. (1972: 418–9, 995).

[26]*Scél Tuáin meic Chairill*, ll. 69–71; Carey, ed. and trans. (1984: ed. 102 and trans. 106): 'Cuman lim dano co ndombeir in fer ⁊ fomnoí, ⁊ nom ithend in ben a oenur co mbá in a broind. Cuman lim dano ind airet ro mbá ina broind ⁊ rl.' (= 'I remember then how the man takes me and cooks me, and the woman also eats me so that I was in her womb. I remember then the interval when I was in her womb, etc.'). While it seems unlikely to have been an influence on medieval Irish developments, the central role that ingestion was thought to play in the transition from one form of embodiment to another (or, indeed, in being freed from the cycle of reembodiment) in Manichaeanism is worth noting; e.g. Augustine, *De haeresibus* XLVI.13; *PL* 42, col.37; Gardner and Lieu, trans. (2004: 190): 'Sic quippe in omnem carnem, id est, per escas et potus venire animas credunt.' (= 'For this is the way, indeed, they [the Manichees] believe that souls come into all flesh, that is, through food and drink'). Comparable examples of inception by ingestion may be found in the following. *Tochmarc Étaine* I.21; Bergin and Best, eds and trans. (1938: ed. 156 and trans. 157). *De Chopur in Dá Muccida*; Best, Bergin and O'Sullivan, eds (1954–83, vol. v: 1121–4, at 1122, ll. 32989–92); Kinsella, trans. (1969: 46–50, at 49–50). *Compert Con Culainn* §6-8; van Hamel, ed. (1933: 5.1–6.8); Gantz, trans. (1981a: 132–3). However, the first two of these examples concern the rebirths of otherworld immortals rather than humans, and if Cú Chulainn's birth is a reembodiment, it is not self-evident. He is at any rate, not a reembodiment

However, his sequence of reembodiments comes to a definitive end once he, with his human body restored to him, has met the saints of Ireland, and bequeathed to them his knowledge of the past ages.[27] His recovered humanity is the *dúnad* which signals the end of his life.[28] As such, there is, in the end, no ambiguity as to which body is truly his; it is the human form in which he was twice born and once baptised.[29]

THE AMBIGUITY OF MONGÁN

But very little of this seems to apply to the Old Irish accounts of Mongán mac Fiachnai. One of the most important of these for our concerns is the cumbersomely named *Scél asa mberar combad hé Find mac Cumaill Mongán ocus aní día fil aidid Fothaid Airgtig* (the *Scél*, hereafter).[30] In the *Scél*, then, it is not at all clear which bodily form is intrinsic to Mongán. As the title of the story suggests, Mongán is discovered to be Find, such that an ancient friend of Find's, upon meeting Mongán, does not say that he *was* Find, but greets him *as* Find.[31] The situation it describes is not, of course, without certain parallels to the later developments we have been discussing. Like Tuán mac Cairill,[32] Mongán seems to enjoy a continuity of memory between past and present embodiments.[33] The story tells us: 'Mongán was Find except that he did not

of his immortal father, Lug, as Bondarenko (2013: 140–2) has claimed, since Lug is consistently portrayed as being a distinct being whose existence overlaps with that of Cú Chulainn.

[27]*Scél Tuáin meic Chairill*, ll. 78–81; Carey, ed. and trans. (1984: ed. 102 and trans. 107): 'Anait sechtmain i ssuidiu oc imaccallaim. Nach senchas ⁊ nach genelach fil i nHére is ó Thuán nac Cairill a bunadus. Attraglastar Pátraic ri sin ⁊ atcuaid dó ⁊ atraglastar Colum Cille ⁊ atcuaid Finnia dó i fiadnaisi lochta in tíre' (= 'They [Finnia and his followers] remain there for a week conversing [with Túan]. Whatever history and genealogy there is in Ireland, its origin is from Tuán son of Cairell. Patrick had spoken with him before that, and he related it to him; and Colum Cille had spoken with him; and Finnia related it to him in the presence of the folk of the land.').

[28]Murphy (1961: 43): 'In Irish syllabic verse, and also often in the older poetry, the last word or syllable of the *íarcomarc* (final stanza) echoes the first word or syllable of the first line of the poem.'

[29]It is worth noting that this would not answer every early Christian theologian's concerns about the idea that a rational soul could be reembodied. For those who had a Stoic materialist understanding of the soul (as opposed to a Platonic understanding of it as incorporeal), the notion of a soul preserving what is distinct to it in a body other than the one that is proper to it would likely have been deemed impossible. This is, at any rate, certainly what we find in Lactantius, *Institutiones Divinae* III.18–19; Brandt and Laubmann, eds (1890–93, vol. i: 236–45); Bowen and Garnsey, trans. (2003: 202–7). On Lactantius's debts to Stoicism in his understanding of the soul, and for further references, see (Colish 1990: 43). My thanks to the anonymous reader for drawing my attention to this reference.

[30]i.e. 'A story from which it is inferred that Mongán was Find mac Cumaill and the cause of the death of Fothad Airgtech'.

[31]*Scél* §12; White, ed. and trans. (2006, ed. 73–4, at 74 and trans. 79–81, at 81): 'Bámar-ni lat su, la Find.' (= 'We were with you, with Find.').

[32]See nn. 26–7.

[33]Cf. *Tochmarc Étaíne* II.8, where Étaín does not remember her identity prior to her embodiment as the daughter of Étar's wife; Bergin and Best, eds (1938: 170); Koch and Carey et al, trans. (2003: 146–65, at 155–6). This has been previously noted by Carey (2006a: 1485).

allow it to be told',[34] thus implying that Mongán was fully conscious of his preceding life as Find. Moreover, Mongán and Find are certainly exceptional individuals: as recurring figures in Early Irish literature, as uniquely gifted persons at the upper reaches of the political hierarchies to which they belong, and as humans who are, furthermore, associated with the divinities of the otherworld of the sagas.[35] We have seen that a focus on the reembodiments of similarly exceptional individuals is also typical of the Pythagorean sources.[36] But in distinction from them, the fact of Mongán's traversal from one embodiment to the next seems to be part of what makes him exceptional, rather than a process which, in being remembered, he is found to undergo in common with all other souls. The concern is, again, not what such a process of reembodiment may have revealed to the one who has undergone it regarding the nature of the soul itself, but the unique knowledge of ancient history that the memory of these reembodiments made possible for them: in this case, the knowledge of the place and cause of Fothad Airgtech's death.[37] Therefore, like the examples we have been considering to this point, the *Scél* seems to be a long way from making Find's rebirth as Mongán exemplary of any cosmic process thought to apply to all souls generally.

In this respect, the parallels with the stories of Tuán mac Cairill, Fintan mac Bóchra, and the like are fairly strong. However, the *Scél* still differs from them radically in providing no way of knowing which embodiment – whether that of Find, Mongán, or someone else entirely – is the protagonist's proper bodily form, or if (from its perspective) there is indeed such a thing as a proper bodily form for Mongán. It remains at least hypothetically possible that Find is understood to be the 'true' bodily form of the person temporarily embodied in the form of Mongán, or that this Mongán could be a restoration of a true form that preexisted his embodiment as Find, or, perhaps, that both are identical in form, seeing as his old friend, Caílte, is apparently able to recognize him immediately, without any sign on Mongán's part.[38] If so, the *Scél*'s presentation of Mongán would still be at least potentially conciliable with more standard Christian ideas about the resurrection body, seeing as this would remove any confusion regarding which body would be properly resurrected as his when the time came. However, if the author does in fact assume that the protagonist has a body that is proper to him, they seem to show no particular interest in making it clear.

Nevertheless, not every early story about Mongán's reembodiments offers so little information of relevance to a more standard medieval understanding of the doctrine of the Resurrection. Manannán mac Lir's prophecy

[34]*Scél* §15; White, ed. and trans. (2006: ed. 73–4, at 74 and trans. 79–81, at 81): 'Ba hé Find […] intí Mongán acht nand:léic a forndissiu.'

[35]For discussion of what is signified by 'divinity' is such cases, see pp. 56–9.

[36]Above, pp. 30–1.

[37]*Scél* §1–4, 11–15; White, ed. and trans. (2006: ed. 73–4 and trans. 79–81).

[38]See note 31.

concerning Mongán in *Immram Brain*[39] seems to envisage him as being born a human, and then, despite many alternations of bodily form, dying in that same human form at the age of fifty, all without any indication of further embodiments preceding this birth or succeeding this death.[40] Granted, it provides no indication of his baptism, or that he meets Christian saints, such as the tales of Tuán or Fintan might lead us to expect.[41] However, his theological significance is made intelligible in another way, namely, through the typological connexion that the *Immram* traces between his identity as both god and man (the divinity, Manannán mac Lir, being his father) and that of Christ, as both God and man in the most absolute sense.[42] This is not to insist that the idea of Mongán's divine parentage was necessarily derived from the Gospel story. But whatever its ultimate origins might be, the author of the *Immram* requires the we interpret Mongán's birth in light of Christ's, indeed, as a lesser likeness of it, by making a prophecy of Christ's birth the context from which the prophecy of Mongán's emerges.[43] As for his baptism, it is likely to have simply been assumed, seeing as the annals have his life as a prince of Dál nAraide ending in 625 A.D.[44] Thus far, the *Immram* remains

[39]On the dating of this text, see note 68. On its contemporaneity with the four early Mongán tales, see pp. 38 and 48–9 below.

[40]*Immram Brain* §49–59 [McCone (2005) / White (2006) §1–10]; Meyer, ed. and trans. (1895–7: ed. 25–9 and trans. 24–8); McCone, ed. (2005: 145–6); White, ed. and trans. (2006: ed. 38–40 and trans. 39–41).

[41][Tuán mac Cairill]: *Scél Tuáin meic Chairill*, ll. 75–6; Carey, ed. and trans. (1984: ed. 102 and trans. 106): 'Co tánic iarom Pátraic co creitem. Aes már dam i ssuidiu ⁊ rom báisted ⁊ ro creites im oenur Ríg na n-uili cona dúilib.' (= 'Then Patrick came with the Faith. I was very old then, and I was baptised, and of my own accord I accepted belief in the King of All, with His creatures.'). [Fintan mac Bóchra]: *Suidigud Tellaig Temra* §36; Best, ed. and trans. (1910: ed. 160 and trans. 161): 'Roforbastair tra Fintan a beathaid ⁊ ṡáegul fon indus sin, ⁊ dofarraid aithrighi ⁊ rochaith comaind ⁊ sacarbaigg do láim eps*cuip* Erc m*eic* Ochomoin meic Fidhaich, ⁊ dodechaid spirat Pátraic ⁊ Brigde co rabatar a fíadnaisi a éitsechta.' (= 'So Fintan ended his life and his age in this manner, and he came to repentance, and he partook of communion and sacrifice from the hand of bishop Erc son of Ochomon son of Fidach, and the spirits of Patrick and Brigit came and were present at his death.').

[42]Carney's (1955: 280) identification of this typological connexion is seminal. While the correct interpretation of this typological connexion remains controversial, its identification as such has not ever, to my knowledge, been seriously disputed. For discussion, see Mac Cana (1975: 51); Carney (1976: 89); McCone (2000a: 18, 157); White (2006: 45); Wooding (2009: 70); Stifter (2017: 29). Here the recent discussion in Williams (2016: 66–8) is notable. While Williams takes the typological connexion between Mongán and Christ to be 'clearly deliberate' he, nevertheless, remains skeptical that Manannán could succeed in the role he was given as 'a "type" of God himself'. His reservations appear to arise from a sense that Manannán's sexual role in the procreation of Mongán undermines, even as it suggests, this typological connexion. However, Augustine's ideas on Edenic sexuality seem to provide the basis for beginning to resolve these apparent dissonances; see note 93.

[43]Note also that, like Christ, Mongán will be accepted by the mortal husband of his mother. See Matt. 1:18ff. and *Immram Brain* §48–51; Meyer, ed. and trans. (1895–7: ed. 23–5 and trans. 22–4). Compare to the Cú Chulainn of *Brislech Mór Maige Muirthemni* [*BMMM*, hereafter]; Kimpton, ed. and trans. (2009). On the Christ-typology of Cú Chulainn in *BMMM*, see Kelleher (1971: 121–2); McCone (2000a: 197); Kimpton (2009: 4–5).

[44]Mongán is often portrayed as a ruler in the saga literature. However, according to the Annals, he never succeeded his father, Fiachna, in the kingship of Ulster (or, according to some sources, the high-kingship of Tara), given that they have his death preceding Fiachna's.

relatively uncontroversial in its expression, at least insofar as the doctrine of the Resurrection is concerned.

The nameless youth of *Immacaldam Choluim Chille ⁊ ind Óclaig oc Carraic Eolairg* (the *Immacaldam*, hereafter) is another matter.[45] It is, to my knowledge, the one early instance where we have a saint (i.e. Colum Cille) speaking with someone whom at least some early Irish readers identified as Mongán.[46] As in the *Immram*, insofar as he is identified with Mongán, and Mongán is thought to be an early seventh-century ruler, it is not really very significant that the saint neither baptizes him, nor offers baptism.[47] What *is* significant is that there is no sign of his encounter with the saint bringing about (or else heralding) the final end of his life (a life which apparently goes farther back than the initial formation of Loch Febail), or even the final end of his sequence of reembodiments. Mongán (for those who identified him as such) simply disappears following his conversation with Colum Cille, leaving no clues regarding the character of his future. Nor does the narrator offer any indication of his true form, or any hint besides, that an end to the rebirths he has been speaking of is in sight.[48] But the *Scél* seems to push the aporia represented by Mongán even farther than this, so that not only the identity of his true body, but even the identity of the person that is undergoing the reembodiments, has become unclear. Is Find a prior embodiment of Mongán, Mongán a subsequent embodiment of Find, or are they both subsequent embodiments of an identity which is fundamentally prior to, and distinct from, both of them? Is Mongán the last incarnation of this identity, or are there many more to come? The text seems to provide no answer.

For discussion and references, see White (2006: 62–9). Thus, as the Annals portray him, he is high in the hierarchy of rulers, but not supreme. This makes the question of why the sagas tend to portray him as a representative of ideal kingship all the more interesting (cf. the unambiguously lofty status of Conaire Mór, Cormac mac Airt, Conchobar, etc.).

[45]Carey, ed. and trans. (2002: ed. 60 and trans. 61). Initially, Carey (1995a: 77–80, 91) dated this text to the seventh century. However, in his subsequent edition of the text (2002: 53) he found it 'difficult to be confident' that it was any earlier than the eighth century. For a recent treatment, see Johnston (2015).

[46]This is with reference to its subtitle; *Immacaldam*, ll. 1–2; Carey, ed. and trans. (2002: ed. 60 and trans. 61): 'as-berat alaili bad é Mongán mac Fiachnai' (= some say that he was Mongán mac Fiachnai). Note that while his identification as Mongán is put forward as one interpretation among others here, it is assumed in a later poem attributed to him in Oxford, Bodley MS Laud 615 (Meyer, ed. and trans., 1895–7: ed. 88–9 and trans. 89–90), and in Magnus Ó Domhnaill's Early Modern Irish *vita* of Colum Cille; *Beatha Colaim Chille* §87, 159; O'Kelleher and Schoepperle, eds and trans. (1918: ed. 78–82, 166–70 and trans. 79–83, 167–71).

[47]Cf. Carey (2011: 10), where Tuán's baptism is used as a means of distinguishing between the meaning of his encounter with the saint, and that of the nameless youth with Colum Cille. Cf. also Mac Cana (1975: 41–2).

[48]*Immacaldam*, ll. 24–7; Carey, ed. and trans. (2002: ed. 60 and trans. 61): 'Óro bátar isin chobrunn, leth lai nó ó oentráth co 'raile, muinter Choluim Chille oca ndéicsi di etarchéin. Óro glé, co n-accatar talmaidiu do-celar erru ind óclach. Ní fetatar cia luid nó can to-luid.' (= 'They were conversing [?] for half the day, or from one day to the next, as Colum Cille's followers watched them from a distance. When [the conversation] ended, they suddenly saw that the youth was hidden from them. They did not know whither he went nor whence he came.').

The question, then, is what we are to make of these apparently contrasting portrayals. The simplest approach would be to interpret the portrayal of Mongán in *Immram Brain* as in fundamental contrast with these latter examples, were it not that the current consensus traces the extant versions of these stories back to the same manuscript, the lost *Cín Dromma Snechtai*.[49]

This would not necessarily be of any great relevance for our interpretation if it amounted to no more than an argument that they were once present together in a single volume. However, this is not the case. As it stands, the scholarship indicates that *Immram Brain* and the four early stories about Mongán, including the *Scél*, were all produced in the same northern scriptorium[50] (either that of Druimm Snechtai or that of Bangor),[51] and that their collective production was based, in part, on the *Immacaldam*, if the *Immacaldam* was not in fact produced together with them.[52] This raises the possibility that the decisive limits to Mongán's process of reembodiment, which *Immram Brain* seemed to establish, should be interpreted in light of the relevant elements of the *Immacaldam* and the *Scél*. If so, the absolute birth and death of Mongán, which we seem to find in *Immram Brain* when considered on its own, would threaten to become no more than the birth and death of the Mongán-centric embodiment which has most recently

[49]Carey (1995a: *passim*, but esp. 71–2; 2007: 27–41, esp. 35ff.); White (2006: 35–7, 41, 46–7); Stifter (2007: 27–31).

[50]Mac Cana (1972; 1978: 85, 88); Carey (1995a: *passim*, but esp. 83 and 91; 2007: 28–9); White (2006: 45–6, 54); Murray (2017: 87); Stifter (2017).

[51]For the argument that the *Cín Dromma Snechtai* was composed at Druimm Snechtai, see Carey (2007: 29, 35–40). For the argument it was composed at Bangor, and only later became associated with Druimm Snechtai, see Mac Cana (1972: 103–6); Byrne (2005: 678); Stifter (2017: 24–6). For the history of the dating of *Cín Dromma Snechtai* and the conclusion that it was assembled in the eighth century, see Carey (1995a: 27 n. 10; 2007: 27, incl. n. 3). Further arguments in support of an eighth-century date for *Cín Dromma Snechtai* are made in White (2006: 35–7). McCone argues that while these texts do indeed have an eighth-century archetype, it is still at least possible that *Cín Dromma Snechtai* may have been a tenth-century mediation of that archetype; McCone (2000a: 67–8).

[52]Carey (1995a: *passim*, but esp. 91) has argued that *Echtrae Chonnlai* and the *Immacaldam*, are among the texts which formed the basis for composition of *Immram Brain* and the Mongán tales. In a later paper (2002: 53) he amends this somewhat. Given that he is no longer confident that the *Immacaldam* is earlier than the eighth century, he then concludes that this may turn out to have implications for his earlier characterisation of these texts' relationships, but does not discuss what these implications may be. White (2006: 41, 46, 56–7) cautiously noted that this might imply that the *Immacaldam* was produced together with *Immram Brain* and the Old Irish Mongán tales, rather than preexisting them as one of their sources, while also noting the plausibility of Carey's construction of their relationships. More recently Carey (2007: 27–40) has placed the *Immacaldam* in the 'Northern Group' of texts, which, together with the 'Midland Group', are drawn upon by the later 'Mixed Group' of texts to which *Immram Brain* and the Mongán stories belong. This treatment seems to amount to a refinement of his previous theory rather than a new direction. His conclusion has since been adopted by Stifter (2017: 29; 2019a; 2019b).

been undergone by a being of uncertain identity, age, intrinsic character, and end.[53]

The Deathless Earthly Paradise

But before we go farther with this interpretation, we should consider the fate of Fintan mac Bóchra – as recounted in the Middle Irish text, *Suidigud Tellaig Temra* (the *Suidigud*, hereafter) – to determine if it is relevant for the case at hand. This tale suggests that Fintan, following his many different reembodiments, may not actually be dead, but that, if alive, he is waiting in paradise (*pardus*) with Enoch and Elijah for the resurrection of the last day.[54] We must take care here not to confuse this paradise with the state that is said to await the righteous *following* the Resurrection (*eiséirgi*). As in Irenaeus's *Adversus Haereses*,[55] among many other places,[56] this is a paradise of a preliminary

[53]Mongán-centric, because it is said that he will be embodied as many different things between his birth and death as Mongán. *Immram Brain* §53–4 and 58 [McCone (2005) / White (2006) §4–5 and 9]; McCone, ed. (2005: 145–6); White, trans. (2006: 39–41): '4. Bieid i fethol cech míl / Etir glasmuir ocus tír; / Bid drauc re mbuidnib i froiss, / Bid cú allaid cech indroiss. / 5. Bid dam co mbennaib arcait / I mruig i:n-agtar carpait. / Bid écne brecc i llind lán / Bid rón, bid elae findbán […] 9. Bieid bes ngairit a ré, / Coícait mblédne i mbith ché, / Oircthi ail' (= '4. He will be in the shape of every animal / Between blue-grey sea and land; / He will be a dragon before bands in a shower, / He will be a wolf of every great forest. / 5. He will be an ox with horns of silver / In a land in(to) which chariots are driven. / He will be a speckled salmon in a full lake / He will be a seal, he will be a pure white swan […] 9. It shall be that his time will be short, / Fifty years in this world, / A rock slays him').

[54]*Suidigud* §36; Best, ed. (1910: 160–1); Nagy, trans. (1997: 6): 'Is indemin im*morro* cía baile in rohadhnocht, acht is dóig leo is ina chorp chollaigi rucad i nnach ndíamair ndíada amail rucad Ele ⁊ Enócc i pard*us* condafil ic ernaidi eiséirgi in sruthseanóir sáeg*h*lach sin .i. Fintan m*ac* Bóchra' (= 'It is uncertain, moreover, where he was buried, but they suppose that he was taken up in his fleshly body, by some divine mystery, just as Elijah and Enoch were taken, into paradise, where that long-lived ancient, Fintan mac Bochra awaits the Resurrection.' [edited]). The first 'eis' of 'eiseiséirgi' in YBL 109a [col. 749], ll. 16–7, is not present in the Book of Lismore 134rb, l. 31. Moreover, the first 'eis' occurs at the end of a line, with 'eiséirgi' following on the next, suggesting a mistaken scribal doubling of 'eis'. Furthermore, if accepted, the doubled 'eis' would result in a word that is not otherwise attested. Therefore, I have replaced Best's reading of 'eiseiséirgi' with 'eiséirgi'. I have also replaced Nagy's translation of this term (i.e. 'rising'), with 'resurrection' for the sake of theological clarity. Additionally, by amending the translation of 'i nnach ndíamair ndíada' from 'in a divine secret place' to 'by some divine mystery', the meaning of the text in YBL is at once clarified and brought into accord with the text of the Book of Lismore 134rb, ll. 29-31, where he is clearly understood to be in paradise: 'co fil i p*arr*̇*us*' (= 'so that he is in paradise'). My thanks to Liam Breatnach for his decisive advice on how to resolve the ambiguities represented by Best's text.

[55]Irenaeus, *Adversus Haereses* V.v.1; see Appendix 1 for text and translation. Augustine, *De peccatorum meritis et remissione*, I.iii is another important example; see Appendix 2 for text and translation. See also Augustine, *De gratia Christi et de peccato originali* II.xxvii; *PL* 44, col. 397–8; Holmes, trans. (1886–9b: 246).

[56]For further ancient and medieval sources on the idea of a pre-resurrection paradise as an interim state for the disembodied souls of the righteous, sometimes for Enoch and Elijah, and occasionally others besides, see Delumeau (2000); Kabir (2004). Dumville (1976: 79, incl. notes) draws attention to the significance of apocryphal texts generally, and the *Visio Sancti Pauli* specifically, for early Irish portrayals of a pre-ressurection paradise. Even so, the *Visio*'s influence on the development of this idea in medieval Ireland is far from uncomplicated, something which deserves detailed consideration on another occasion. The *Navigatio Sancti Brendani* is

sort. In the *Suidigud* this is demonstrated by the fact that it is the sort of place in which one anticipates, rather than enjoys, the consummation of all things taken to follow upon the Resurrection. Thus its inhabitants are, to use Irenaeus's words, everliving *coauspicantes incorruptelam* (that is, 'presages' or 'tokens of imperishableness'), rather than immortals in the strictest sense of the word.[57] The same doctrine is given a much more expansive articulation in *Dá Brón Flatha Nime* 'The Two Sorrows of Heaven',[58] a Middle Irish text which has been dated to the late tenth or early eleventh century.[59] Perhaps, then, something similar is thought to be the case with Mongán: the open-endedness surrounding his absolute death (if not his absolute bodily form) is portrayed as unresolved because, like the openendedness of the lives of Biblical prophets who have escaped death in their own way,[60] it will only be brought to a close at the end of the world.

just one significant example of this. The *Navigatio* is the first of many medieval Irish texts to use the *Visio*'s term 'terra repromissionis' [i.e. the Land of Promise] to describe such a paradise; Dumville (1976: 79ff.); Carey (2015: 55). However, at the same time as the *Navigatio*'s depiction of the *terra repromissionis* clearly owes much to the *Visio*, it also diverges from it on the relatively fundamental issue of the character of its inhabitants: i.e. it includes at least one person [a nameless youth] who is physically embodied. See *Visio Sancti Pauli* [St. Gall] §19–30; Silvertstein and Hilhorst, eds (1997: 135–41); Elliott, trans. (1993: 616–44, at 627–33). Compare *Navigatio Sancti Brendani* §28; Orlandi and Guglielmetti, eds (2014: 109–11); O'Meara, trans. (1978: 67–9). For further discussion of the *Visio*'s influence on the *Navigatio*, see McNamara (2006) and Carey (2017; 2020: 167).

[57]Given that the sojourn of such beings involves awaiting and then successively experiencing certain temporal events (i.e. martyrdom at the hands of the Antichrist, the Resurrection and the Day of Judgement), they cannot be said to be eternal (transcendent of time itself), or even to enjoy whatever state of second-order timelessness (intermediate between temporality and eternity) might be said to characterise the experience of the angels and resurrected saints in heaven.

[58]Carey, ed. and trans. (2019a). See also parallel material in *Fís Adamnáin* §60–62; Carey, ed. and trans. (2019b: ed. 111–13 and trans. 110–112). Carey (2019b: 35–44) has upheld the dating of *Fís Adamnáin* to *c*. 1000 on linguistic grounds, and promsises to provide further non-linguistic evidence in support of this conclusion in a forthcoming article. The penitential response of the righteous souls in Paradise to Elijah's preaching of the Last Judgement demonstrates that the Paradise in which these works place Enoch and Elijah is a somewhat more imperfect state than the Third Heaven, where the *Visio* places them, and is thus distinct from it. And even apart from their display of penitence, the very presence of such souls in this Paradise shows that it is the equivalent of what the *Visio* calls the *terra repromissionis* (the Land of Promise), rather than the equivalent of the Third Heaven, which is what the *Visio* itself opts to identify as Paradise. On the *Visio* and the *terra repromissionis*, see note 56.

[59]Carey (2019a: 179–82).

[60]In the case of Enoch, this idea is based, in the first place, on Genesis 5:21–4, which is in turn expanded upon by Hebrews 11:5: 'fide Enoch translatus est ne videret mortem et non inveniebatur quia transtulit illum Deus ante translationem enim testimonium habebat placuisse Deo' (= 'By faith Enoch was translated that he should not see death; and was not found because God took him: for before his translation he had this testimony, that he pleased God.'); in the case of Elijah, on 2 Kings 2:1–15. On such basis, they came to be associated with the 'two witnesses' of Rev. 3:2–13. The germ of this association and subsequent elaboration of the theory may found in Ecclesiasticus 44:16: 'Enoch placuit Deo et translatus est in paradiso ut det gentibus paenitentiam' (= 'Enoch pleased God, and was translated into paradise, that he might give repentance to the nations' [translation here follows Douay-Rheims]), and 48:9–10 [concerning Elijah]: 'qui receptus es in turbine ignis in curru equorum igneorum / qui inscriptus es indiciis temporum et lenis iracundiam Domini conciliare cor patris ad filium et restituere tribus Iacob' (= 'Who was

Of course, the *Suidigud*, in itself, can only be of limited relevance to the issue at hand, given that it was composed centuries later than the *Immacaldam* and the *Scél*. But then, it is not the earliest text in which we find such ideas.[61] The verse version of the voyage-tale *Immram Snédgusa ocus Maic Riagla* – dated by Thomas Clancy to the rule of Máel Brigte mac Tornáin from Kells as the abbot of both the Armagh and Columban churches (891–927),[62] but by Kevin Murray to *c.* 1000[63] – describes a voyage made by two clergymen associated with Colum Cille. The penultimate island they discover is a place *cen pecadh n-o*m *cen chol cen cesadh cen gaile* 'without crude sin, without transgression, without suffering, without blemish',[64] which is inhabited by people who had been banished from Ireland, as well as Enoch and Elijah, all of whom await their martyrdom in the battle against the Antichrist at the end of the world.[65] Many of the Early Irish tales which speak of sea-voyages to a sinless earthly paradise are hagiographical.[66] Thus it is of no surprise here that our voyagers are clergy. But more significant for our purposes – given that Mongán is consistently understood to be a ruler of some kind, rather than a cleric – is that the greater part of the people they find living in this sinless place, awaiting the end of the world, are Irish lay-people, namely sixty couples of the Fir Rois. This is also, however, still a good deal later than the texts we are considering.

taken up in a whirlwind of fire, and in a chariot of fiery horses: Who wast ordained for reproofs in their times, to pacify the wrath of the Lord's judgment, before it brake forth into fury, and to turn the heart of the father unto the son, and to restore the tribes of Jacob.').

[61]For a helpful overview of this and other theories of the interim state of the soul relative to an early Irish context, see Wright (2014).

[62]Clancy (2000: 222), with a full account of the various versions of the text running from pages 212 to 225.

[63]Murray (2014: 764–5). This is solely on linguistic grounds. He leaves Clancy's arguments regarding intellectual and political context unanswered.

[64]*Immram Snédgusa ocus Maic Riagla* §53; Murray, ed. and trans. (2014: ed. 794 and trans. 795). Noting that 'om' seems to describe sin as a whole here, rather than designate a particular form of it. I have substituted Ó hAodha's translation (1997: 426) of 'om' as 'crude' here, since it, like Thurnysen's 'roh' (1904: 24), seems somewhat less figurative. My thanks to Christina Cleary (DIAS) and Andrea Palandri (DIAS) for their advice regarding the semantic range of this word.

[65]*Immram Snédgusa ocus Maic Riagla* §48–66; Murray, ed. and trans. (2014: ed. 792–6 and trans. 793–7).

[66]For instance, *The Litany of Irish Pilgrim Saints* [a.k.a. *The Litany of Irish Saints II*]; Plummer, ed. and trans., (1925: ed. 68–76 and trans. 69–77). It includes, in Dumville's (1976: 79) words, 'allusions to voyages and the Land of Promise in connexion with SS. Ailbe, Ibar, Munnu mac Tulchain, and Patrick', and has most recently been dated by Clancy (2000: 195) to *c.* 900. In this, Clancy affirms Mac Cana's (1980: 43, 76–7) and Sanderlin's (1975) earlier position. Carey argues (1982) that the very idea of a paradise over the sea is ecclesiastical in origin [repr. in Wooding, ed. (2000: 113–9)]. In this he confirms Carney's (1963: 40 n. 9) earlier comment [repr. in Wooding, ed. (2000: 42–51, at 46 n. 9)]. See also the gloss of §251 in the version of the *Immacaldam* found in Dublin, TCD H. 2. 17 (1319), which says that the communities of Brendan, Cainnech and Munnu will settle the Land of Promise following the Apocalypse; found in Carey, ed. and trans. (2014: 641), with further sources listed on 631, n. 11.

CONTEMPORARY EXAMPLES

Most relevant to this aspect of our Mongán texts are two early Old Irish tales: *Echtrae Connlai*[67] and *Immram Brain*.[68] And it is significant that it is these two accounts in particular that are the most relevant. We are already familiar with *Immram Brain* as a narrative that is understood to have been composed, together with the four early Mongán tales, in the scriptorium which produced *Cín Dromma Snechtai*. *Echtrae Chonnlai* is likewise understood to be a *Cín Dromma Snechtai* narrative, and indeed, to form a group within *Cín Dromma Snechtai* with *Immram Brain*.[69] Among the various forms of evidence which have suggested this are the many parallels they share, both textually and thematically.[70] These tend to be interpreted as signs of *Echtrae Chonnlai*'s direct influence on *Immram Brain* rather than the reverse.[71] Moreover, the strength of these parallels is such that it has given rise to the further argument that *Immram Brain* was composed as a companion piece to *Echtrae Chonnlai*,[72] or more precisely, to *Echtrae Chonnlai* as, to some extent, refashioned by the author(s) of *Immram Brain*.[73] As a text, then, that appears to be closely related to *Immram Brain*, and is likely to have exercised direct influence on it, any relevant features we find in *Echtrae Chonnlai* will necessarily have the highest order of significance for our interpretation of the way that Mongán appears

[67]McCone, ed. and trans. (2000a). Its editor (2000a: 29) argues for an early eighth-century date: '*Echtrae Chonnlai* belongs at least as far back as the Old Irish period of the eighth and ninth centuries […] The text conforms so faithfully to Old Irish usage along with the odd possible hint of archaism that the former century seems rather more likely than the latter and, indeed, there is no apparent linguistic objection to a date as early as the first half of the eighth century.' Carey (1995a: 83–9, esp. 89) suggests that its composition took place in the late seventh century, along with the other texts of the 'Midland Group': 'I propose accordingly that the midland group dates from the reign of Fínnechta Fledach mac Dúnchada, perhaps specifically from the years 688–9.' He has since reiterated this argument (2007: 28).

[68]McCone (2000a: 47) concluded that *Immram Brain* was, like *Echtrae Chonnlai*, composed in the eighth century, but that *Echtrae Chonnlai* was likely composed a little before it. Carey (1995a: 83–6) has argued that *Echtrae Chonnlai* not only preceded the eighth-century composition of *Immram Brain*, but directly influenced it. Stifter (2017: 30) has raised the possibility that *Echtrae Chonnlai* may have been composed in tandem with *Immram Brain*, or that the influence may run the other way, but does not advance any arguments against Carey or McCone in the process. Cf. Carney (1955: 292–3), where *Immram Brain* is taken to precede and influence *Echtrae Chonnlai*. Cf. also Carney (1976: 193) and Nutt (1895–7b: 148–9), where it is suggested that they were both composed by the same author or school.

[69]This conclusion is due, in part, to their frequently overlaping manuscript transmissions, on which see Mac Mathúna (1985: 1–12); McCone (2000a: 1–9; 29, 43–7, 108); White (2006: 11).

[70]These parallels are described in Carey (1996: 83–7); McCone (2000a: 106–19, esp. 115); White (2006: 56–7); Stifter (2017: 30; 2019a).

[71]See notes 68 and 73.

[72]McCone (2000a: 74, 106, 109); Williams (2016: 56); Stifter (2017: 30).

[73]Bearing in mind that Carey (1995a: 86), who makes the strongest case for *Echtrae Chonnlai*'s influence on *Immram Brain*, has suggested that the author of *Immram Brain* derived *Echtrae Chonnlai* and *Baile Chuinn Chétchathaig* from a single source. However, he seems to see this editorial process as preceding the actual composition of *Immram Brain* and the four Mongán tales (1995a: 91), and thus, as not being influenced by it in turn. McCone (2000a: 114–6) concurs with the general outline of Carey's argument, but takes *Echtrae Chonnlai* to have been composed with a draft form of *Immram Brain* in mind, and perhaps to have been retouched in light of a completed version.

in *Immram Brain*, and in the four Mongán stories which were evidently composed together with it.

Like the Fir Rois in *Immram Snédgusa ocus Maic Riagla*, the eponymous heroes of these tales both travel to a sinless paradise, never to return to mortal lands.[74] Enoch and Elijah do not appear in either instance[75] – the description of Eden in Genesis 1–3 replaces them as the dominant biblical reference point[76]– but Connlae's and Bran's avoidance of the normal human experience of death is also manifested as inseparable from answering a summons to live in such a place.[77] The inhabitants of this paradise are less explicitly awaiting the Resurrection and the Day of Judgement than they are in the *Suidigud* or *Immram Snédgusa*. Nevertheless, the Day of Judgement remains the limit of the undiminishing youth and beauty promised to Connlae,[78] and the repeated

[74]*Echtrae Chonnlai* §3, 9 [= Carey (2011) §1, 9]; see Appendix 3 for text and translation. On the double-meaning of *síd* as both 'peace' and 'hollow hill' [i.e. otherworld-dwelling], see Ó Cathasaigh (1978) [repr. in Boyd, ed. (2014: 19–34)]; Carey (2011: 29). *Immram Brain* §9–10, 44–5; see Appendix 4 for text and translation. See also the similar idea in *Tochmarc Étaíne* III.10; Bergin and Best, ed. and trans. (1938: ed. 180 and trans. 181); Koch and Carey et al, trans. (2003: 146–65, at 160): 'daine delgnaide cen ón. / combart cen pecadh cen chol. / Atchiam cach for cach leath. / ⁊ nícon aice nech. / teimel imorb*uis* Adaim / dodonarcheil ar araim.' (= 'splendid folk there without flaw, / conception without sin or fault. / We see everyone on every side, / and no one sees us; / it is the darkness of Adam's sin / which prevents our being counted.').

[75]This is interesting in itself. One might be tempted to argue that this reflects the influence of a text like *Visio Sancti Pauli*, which does not place Enoch and Elijah in the earthly paradise. However, the idea that a person can inhabit such a place while in their pre-resurrection body seems as if it would most likely have emerged with reference to the early idea that Enoch and Elijah inhabit the earthly paradise bodily; see notes 54–6. If so, the secondary idea would then seem to be appearing in the absence of the primary idea which serves (or served) as its basis: a remarkable situation. This matter merits further study on another occasion.

[76]As Carney (1969: 162–5) and McCone (2000a: 80–82) have noted, the giving of the apple in *Echtrae Chonnlai* is an inversion of the eating from the fruit of the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil in Genesis 3:16ff. *Echtrae Chonnlai* §7–8; McCone, ed. and trans. (2000a: ed. 122 and trans. 159–63); see Appendix 5 for text and translation. *Immram Brain*'s comments on the Fall suggest that the sinless paradise it describes may be Eden itself; see *Immram Brain* §45; Meyer, ed. and trans. (1895–7: ed. 23 and trans. 22), in Appendix 4.

[77]*Echtrae Chonnlai* §3, 9 [= Carey (2011) §1, 9]; McCone, ed. and trans. (2000a: ed. 121, 122 and trans. 132–6, 169–72); Carey, ed. and trans. (2011: 28 and 32). *Immram Brain* §9–10, 44–5; Meyer, ed. and trans. (1895–7: ed. 7, 23 and trans. 6, 22).

[78]*Echtrae Chonnlai* §5; McCone, ed. and trans. (2000a: ed. 121 and trans. 144): 'Ma cho-tum:éitis, ní:crínfa do delbae oítiu áilde / co bráth mbrindach.' (= 'If you come with me the youth (and) beauty of your appearance (/form) will not perish until the Judgement Day which is foretold.'). Note that for the sake of theological clarity I have exchanged McCone's translation of 'co bráth mbrindach' (i.e. until dream-laden judgement) for Carey's (1995b: 49) 'until the Judgement Day which is foretold'. This remains close to the sense of Carney's (1969: 163) [repr. in Bourke and Kilfeather et al, eds (2002: 268)] 'until the Day of Doom', but is preferable to it, since it makes sense of the way that 'brindach' modifies the meaning of 'bráth'. See Carey (1995b: 49 n. 32) for further discussion of the sense of 'brindach' here, see (1995: 49 n. 32). Note that Carey's translation is very close to that of Pokorny (1928: 202), who had 'until the vision-laden Last Judgement'. In his discussion of the grammar of this sentence, McCone cites Pokorny's and Carey's respective translations of this sentence in full. Nevertheless, he does not provide any reasons for preferring his own translation of 'co bráth mbrindach' to theirs (McCone 2000a: 21–2, 144).

prophecies of Christ by inhabitants of this paradise in *Immram Brain*,[79] together with their observation of the canonical hours,[80] involve them in a gesture toward future realities that are far beyond the innocent enjoyment of corporeal perfections which currently characterises their existence. That is to say, the earthly paradise found in these texts is consistent with the later examples we considered above in not being confounded with the heaven of Christian expectation.[81] In its 'ever-living' (*bithbéo*) quality, its 'permanence' (*búaine*),[82] it is a typological anticipation of eternity rather than eternity itself.[83]

Of course, in a pre-scholastic context, what one is to understand by 'eternity' (*aeternitas*), 'eternal' (*aeternus*) and their calques[84] will be somewhat ambiguous, since they can signify eternity in the sense of an infinite duration of time,[85] but also – when they are used in reference to the eternity in which God dwells – in the sense of a transcendent simultaneity that is wholly beyond the before and after of temporal process.[86] A good example of this semantic

[79]*Immram Brain* §26–8, 48; see Appendix 6 for text and translation. Theological prophecy is an aspect of *Echtrae Chonnlai* as well; see *Echtrae Chonnlai* §11; McCone, ed. and trans. (2000a: ed. 122 and trans. 181): 'Mo-tub:ticfa a recht. / Con:scéra brichtu druad tárdechto / ar bélaib demuin duib dolbthig' (= 'His law will soon come to you. He will destroy the spells of the druids of base teaching in front of the black, bewitching Devil.').

[80]*Immram Brain* §7: Meyer, ed. and trans. (1895–7: ed. 7 and trans. 6): '7. Fil and bile co m-bláthaib / forsṅgairet eóin do thráthaib: / is tré cocetul is gnáth / congairet uili cech tráth.' (= 'An ancient tree there is with blossoms, / On which birds call to the Hours. / 'Tis in harmony it is their wont / To call together every Hour.'). The chanting of the canonical hours here is noted by Carney (1955: 283 n.1), Mac Cana (1972: 122–3) and Carey (1989a: 7).

[81]*Pace* Carey (2011: 33–6; 2015: 64–5); Siewers (2014).

[82]*Echtrae Chonnlai* §3, 9; McCone, ed. and trans. (2000a: ed. 121, 122 and trans. 132, 170): 'Mulier respondit: "Do:dechad-sa a tírib béo […] 9. […] To-t:chuiretar bí bithbí."' (= 'The woman replied, "I have come from [the] lands of [the] living […] The everliving living invite you."'). *Immram Brain* §21; Meyer, ed. and trans. (1895–7: ed. 13 and trans. 12): 'is i nImchiúin cach ági / dofeith búaine la háni' (= 'Into Imchiuin at every season / Will come everlasting joy'). See also the corresponding features of Carey's text and translation in Appendix 3.

[83]*Pace* Carey (1987: 8; 2011: 33–6). He was right in claiming that otherworld temporality is qualitatively different from mortal time. This is everywhere evident, and beyond any serious dispute. However, he was wrong in seeing it as absolutely transcending temporality. For instance, the prophecies that residents of the earthly paradise make about future events, *as* future events, would not make sense from the perspective of a state in which 'all time exists simultaneously in an eternal present'. See *Echtrae Chonnlai* §11; McCone, ed. and trans. (2000a: ed. 122 and trans. 178–81); *Immram Brain* §16–21, 26–8, 48–57; Meyer, ed. and trans. (1895–7: ed. 11–15, 23–7 and trans. 10–14, 24–6). It remains the case that prophecy – whether by otherworldly beings, or by mortal humans – was likely understood to have its ultimate basis in an eternal perspective to which all times are simultaneously present (i.e. God's). But as the ultimate basis of a knowledge which the prophet only sometimes has (however easily or frequently it might come to them), this higher perspective would necessarily be distinct from, and superior to, the temporal perspective that belongs to the prophet themself on their own level. And this will be no less true of prophecies that, unlike those here, are given in the present tense. Ní Dhonnnchadha (2007: 104) followed Carey in this, as did Siewers (2014: 335–8) and Williams (2016: 58–9).

[84]In the Old Irish glosses, the prefix 'bith-' and the adjective 'suth[a]in' stand out.

[85]This is what would come to be known as 'aeviternity' in scholastic philosophy. For what would become its classic expression, see St. Thomas Aquinas, *Summa theologiae* Ia, Q.10, A.5–6; Gilby, ed. and trans. (1964–81, vol. ii: ed. 146–54 and trans. 147–55).

[86]Boethius, *Consolatio Philosophiae* V.vi.4–8 [prosa]; see Appendix 7 for text and translation. Augustine, *Confessiones*, I.vi (10), VII.xv (2), XI, esp. VII.xv (2); O' Donnell, ed. (1992: 6,

ambivalence is Bede's use of the terms in *De temporum ratione*.[87] He primarily uses versions of *aeternitas* and *aeternus* with reference to the state of human souls following the Last Judgement, but sometimes with reference to God. By describing God as the *auctorem lucis aeternae* 'Creator of eternal light',[88] for instance, he seems to imply that he follows Augustine here, as in so much else,[89] in understanding God's eternity to transcend eternity in the sense of unlimited time. However, it is unclear if a medieval reader who was unfamiliar with with the pertinent aspects of Augustine's thought would necessarily conclude this based on Bede's text alone.

The prefix '*bith-*' has a similar ambiguity in the Old Irish Glosses, where its single application to God himself seems also to imply his transcendence of time, though not so clearly as to put the matter beyond doubt: *acht is* est *na*m*má robói and* .i. *fír* .i. *biddixnugud fírinne* 'but it is *Est* only that was in Him, that is the True, even eternal existence of truth'.[90] Yet despite the fact that it sometimes directly translates '*aeternus*',[91] the potential ambiguity of '*bith-*' goes further than it, in that it can also refer to a long but finite duration of time,[92] in this regard seeming closer to the range of meanings evoked by '*saeculum*'.

To speak more precisely then, just as the innocent pleasures[93] of this earthly paradise act as a foretaste of the enjoyment of God himself by the

83–4, 148–64, esp. 83–4); Chadwick, trans. (1991: 8, 126, 221–45, esp. 126): 'et vidi [...] qui solus aeternus es, non post innumerabilia spatia temporum coepisti operari, quia omnia spatia temporum, et quae praeterierunt et quae praeteribunt, nec abirent nec venirent nisi te operante et manente.' (= 'And I saw that [...] you alone are eternal and did not first begin to work after innumerable periods of time. For all periods of time both past and future neither pass away nor come except because you bring that about, and you yourself permanently abide.'). See also Augustine, *DCD* XI.5–6, 21, XII.16–18; Dombart and Kalb, eds (1955, vol. ii: 325–6, 339–40, 370–5); Bettenson, trans. (1984: 434–6, 451–3, 490–6). Augustine, *De Genesi contra Manichaeos* I.iv; Weber, ed. (1998: 70); Hill, trans. (2002: 41). Augustine, *De Genesi ad litteram liber unus imperfectus* XIII; Zycha, ed. (1894: 487); Hill, trans. (2002: 137–8). Augustine, *De Genesi ad litteram* VIII.20, 25–6; Zycha, ed. (1894: 258–9, 263–5); Hill, trans. (2002: 368–9, 372–4).

[87]*De temporum ratione*, preface, VI, XXX, XL, XLIII, LXVI, LXVII, LXIX, LXX, LXXI; Jones, ed. (1975–80, vol. ii: 263, 292, 374, 405, 413, 456, 478, 499, 529, 537, 539, 541, 542–4); Wallis, trans. (1999: 3, 25, 87, 110, 116, 151, 175, 200, 233, 240, 243, 245, 247–9).

[88]*De temporum ratione* XXX; Jones, ed. (1975–80, vol. ii: 374); Wallis, trans. (1999: 88).

[89]For a list of Bede's many citations of Augustine, see Lapidge (2005: 196–204).

[90]*Wb* 14c 31; Stokes and Strachan, eds and trans. (1901–1910, vol. i: 595). Note here that '*dixnugud*' (existence) is also a calque on Latin theological/philosophical terminology. See Exod. 3:14: 'dixit Deus ad Mosen ego sum qui sum ait sic dices filiis Israhel qui est misit me ad vos' (= 'And God said unto Moses, I AM THAT I AM: and he said, Thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, I AM hath sent me unto you.').

[91]E.g. *Wb* 4a 13; Stokes and Strachan, eds and trans. (1901–1910, vol. i: 517).

[92]See, for example, the first quotation in note 118.

[93]Including romantic pleasures. Byrne's suggestion that Augustine's understanding of the sinless sexuality of Eden is operative here is undoubtedly correct; Byrne (2014: 101, incl. n. 9). Thus, Mac Cana (1976: 101) was right to conclude that Carney's unsuccessful attempt (1955: 287 n.1; 1969: 165; 1976: 84) to downplay the erotic dimension of the otherworld in *Immram Brain* (or elsewhere) was a result of his understanding that such texts are products of Christian scholarship. However, he was wrong in his assumption that Carney's characterisation of medieval Christian theology was correct. The stark dichotomy of sexless Christian paradise vs. sexual pagan paradise, to which Carney and Mac Cana both subscribed, falls apart in the light of

immortal righteous, so the relative (if limited) freedom from the demands of temporality which the inhabitants of the earthly paradise seem to enjoy foreshadows the absolutely unlimited perpetuity of that more perfect bliss which belongs to the beatific vision.[94] As such, the temporality of the earthly paradise – boundless as it appears by comparison with the narrow limitations of merely mortal time[95] – remains distinct from heaven's (so to speak) eternal temporality, and beyond that, from the atemporal eternity of God himself, which, when clearly distinguished from eternal temporality,[96] is understood to utterly transcend all temporal sequence.

Beyond what these tales have to say regarding the character of the earthly paradise itself, in its likeness to but distinction from heaven, it is of further significance that they also involve non-clerical mortals from Ireland coming to live a deathless life. Although we have also seen this in the *Suidigud* and *Immram Snédgusa*, the proximity of *Echtrae Chonnlai* and *Immram Brain* in both time and context to the *Immacaldam* and the *Scél* make this a notable feature. For Mongán himself, as we have noted, is some kind of ruler, rather than a clerical figure. Yet the most important detail in these stories, relative to the matter at hand, is their identification of the otherworld of the sagas with the sinless earthly paradise of Christian theology.[97] Fundamentally at issue here is the kind of beings whom they understand to be the natural inhabitants of such a paradise. It is clear that such beings cannot, in any event, be conflated with

Augustine's comments on the subject. See *DCD* XIV.xxi-xx, esp.xxiii; Dombart and Kalb, eds (1955, vol. ii: 443–50); Bettenson, trans. (1972: 583–92, esp. 585): 'Quisquis autem dicit non fuisse coituros nec generaturos, nisi peccassent, quid dicit, nisi propter numerositatem sanctorum necessarium hominis fuisse peccatum' (= 'If anyone says that there would have been no intercourse or procreation if the first human beings had not sinned, he is asserting, in effect, that man's sin was necessary to complete the number of the saints.').

[94]Among other things this means that something along the lines of the allegorical reading of Song of Songs, as suggested by McCone (2000b: 81–2), is still on the table. Because the consummation of erotic desire, in either instance, appears to occur without sin in this paradise, it will be a more adequate image of the union of the soul and God, or Christ and the Church/Resurrected Cosmos than that which is found in fallen human marriages. The wellspring of subsequent allegorical interpretation of the Song of Songs is Origen; *Commentarium in Canticum Canticorum*, esp. prologue, ii; *PG* 13, esp. col.71–2; Lawson, trans. (1957: esp. 36–9). For this theme in medieval exegesis more generally, see Matter (1990) and Turner (1995). For a good general characterisation of Origen's interpretation, see King (2005).

[95]The seminal study of this contrast remains Carey (1987: 7ff.).

[96]One cannot necessarily assume of a given medieval writer that their concept of God's eternity will be qualitatively distinct from the limitless time which is taken to characterise the existence of the angels and resurrected saints. For example, Eriugena understood his disagreement with Gottschalk about predestination to be due, in part, to Gottschalk's failure to properly distinguish between limitless time and God's complete transcendence of time itself. See Eriugena, *De divina praedestinatione* IX.5ff.; Mainoldi, ed. (2003: 94–8); Brennan, trans. (1998: 62–3). See discussion in Moran (2002: 494–5).

[97]Among other patristic and apocryphal sources, some form of the Book of Enoch is likely to have been significant for early Irish thinking about the earthly paradise. On the Book of Enoch in early medieval Ireland, see McNamara (1975: 24–7; 2003: 78 –9). Relevant passages of the extant Amharic version include 1 Enoch 23–5, 32, 60.8, 65.1–3, 70, 77.3, 106.8; Knibb, ed. and trans. (1978, ed. vol. i: 84–91, 100–103, 162–3, 187, 208–9, 250–51, 410 and trans. vol. ii: 112–4, 120–23, 143–4, 153–4, 165, 180–81, 245). For some of the other relevant patristic and apocryphal sources, see notes 55–6.

the exceptional people who leave the lands of mortality behind to come and reside there. Those who arrive in this sinless paradise from elsewhere are, by definition, not indigenous to it.

The question of what sort of beings might belong there originally (and continue to belong there) is not an issue that is addressed in the *Suidigud*, *Immram Snédgusa* or, to my knowledge, in the patristic and apocryphal speculation which informs them. The concerns of ancient Christian thought in this area tend to be more apocalyptic than cosmological. However, according to *Echtrae Chonnlai* and *Immram Brain*,[98] the native inhabitants of this earthly paradise are evidently the deathless people of the *síde*,[99] the same as are always getting mixed up elsewhere with the likes of Cú Chulainn, Conaire Mór and Finn mac Cumaill in stories of the pre-Christian past.[100] In such a view, the earthly paradise is not simply a remote place where the disembodied righteous await their resurrection – or a blissful embodied few await the glory of martyrdom at the end of the world – but an ever-present reality whose inhabitants are somehow aware of, interested in and, moreover, involved in, the secular hierarchies to which these notables belong, and were so long before Christian penitents began to seek the company of Enoch or Elijah there.[101]

For our purposes, one of the most interesting examples of this awareness, interest and involvement is that, in *Immram Brain*, the paradisal inhabitant who prophesies to Bran and his companions concerning the advent of Christ, as of Mongán after him, is himself the soon-to-be father of Mongán. Our hypothetical solution to the ambiguity of whether Mongán is the sort of person who dies or not is now not looking like so much of a stab in the dark. However, it now requires reformulation. It is no longer a question of whether Mongán is thought to be an exemplary, but mortal, human who, by some special grace, has gone away, like Enoch and Elijah, like Fintan and the Fir Rois, or even

[98]See Appendix 3. *Immram Brain* does not actually use the term *áes síde*. However, among other things, its identification of one of their number as Manannán mac Lir leaves no doubt regarding what kind of people they are supposed to be; §32ff.; Meyer, ed. and trans. (1895–7: ed. 16ff. and trans. 17ff.). See further discussion just below on pp. 47–8 and on pp. 56–7 further on.

[99]Ó Cathasaigh (1978: 149) [repr. in Boyd, ed. (2014: 19–34, at 29)]: '*síd* enjoys a special status as a term for the Otherworld: it is the normal generic term which can be used without further definition to denote the Otherworld […] It is true that, when used of a particular localization of the Otherworld, *síd* seems almost invariably to refer to a mound or a tumulus […] But when used less specifically in collocations such as *ben síde* it must mean simply "(the) Otherworld": thus, *ben síde* (or *ben a sídib*) "goddess, woman of the Otherworld," *fer síde* "god, man of the Otherworld," *áes síde* "Otherworld folk, gods".'

[100]See, for example, *De Gabáil in t-Shída*, in Hull, ed. and trans. (1933: ed. 55–6; Koch and Carey et al, trans. (2003: 145). *Tochmarc Étaíne* I.23, III.15–20; Bergin and Best, ed. and trans. (1938: ed. 158–9 and trans. 184–9); Koch and Carey et al, trans. (2003: 146–65, at 153, 161–3). *Togail Bruidne Dá Derga* §3, 35; Knott, ed. (1936: 2, 10); Koch and Carey et al, [partial] trans. (2003: 166–84, at 167, 173). *Echtra Chorbmaic Uí Chuinn*; Hull, ed. and trans. (1949); Koch and Carey et al, trans. (2003: 184–7). *Macgnímartha Find* §21–8; Meyer, ed. (1882: 202–4); Koch and Carey et al, trans. (2003: 194–201, at 198–201). Cf. *Tirechani collectanea de sancto Patricio* XXVI.1–3; Bieler, ed. and trans. (1979: 122–65, ed. at 142 and trans. 143), where two daughters of king Loíguire briefly mistake Patrick and his companions for 'uiros side aut deorum terrenorum aut fantassiam' (= 'men of the other world or earth-gods, or a phantom').

[101]Carey (2011: 35).

like Connlae and Bran, to live in everlasting youth in the earthly paradise until the end of the world. It is a question of whether he is, in his very nature, thought to be one of the proper inhabitants of such a place, or at least more so than he is a proper inhabitant of mortal lands. According to the perspective of *Immram Brain*, Mongán's father is just such a natural inhabitant of this sinless paradise.[102] This being so, is it possible that, like all its native inhabitants, he is inherently deathless in a way that mere visitors to it, such as the hapless Nechtán, are not?[103] Which is to say, might the openendedness concerning Mongán's ultimate death – exhibited by the *Scél*, and one of the early interpretations of the *Immacaldam* – emerge as no more than the simple result of *Immram Brain*'s understanding of his lineage? There is, at any rate, nothing intrinsic to the portrayal of the Mongán of the *Immacaldam* or the *Scél* which would be in tension with such an interpretation. Given the textual and thematic connexions that are shared by these accounts of Mongán,[104] it certainly seems to be best way of accounting for all the relevant details without then involving them in direct contradiction of each other. However, the *Immacaldam* allows us to confirm this with a much higher order of certainty.

INTERTEXTUAL CONSIDERATIONS: *CÍN DROMMA SNECHTAI*

The significance of the *Immacaldam* will be best appreciated if we first review what has been said to this point regarding the interrelations of all these texts, according to the current consensus. It is understood that *Immram Brain* and the four early Mongán stories (including the *Scél*) were all composed in an eighth-century east-Ulster scriptorium by the scholar(s) responsible for the production of *Cín Dromma Snechtai* as a whole.[105] *Echtrae Chonnlai* and the *Immacaldam* seem to have preceded these texts, and to have served as a partial basis for their composition.[106] However, the influence appears not to flow in strictly one direction. And among the potential examples of this, one in particular is of undeniable significance for the matters at hand. Carey has convincingly argued that the identification of the youth of the *Immacaldam* as Mongán was subsequently introduced into the text by the same creative activity responsible for *Immram Brain* and the four early Mongán texts.[107]

[102]*Immram Brain* §44; Meyer, ed. and trans. (1895–7: ed. 23 and trans. 22). For the text and translation, see Appendix 4.

[103]For Nechtán's fate, see *Immram Brain* §63–5, esp. 65; Meyer, ed. and trans. (1895–7: ed. 33–5, esp. 33 and trans. 32–4, esp. 32): 'Dochurethar úadib in fer assin churuch. Amal conránic side fri talmain inna Hérenn, bá lúaithred fochétóir amal bíd i talmain nobeth tríasna hilchéta blíedne.' (= 'The man leaps from them out of the coracle. As soon as he touched the earth of Ireland, forthwith he was a heap of ashes, as though he had been in the earth for many hundred years.').

[104]See note 70.

[105]See pp. 38–9.

[106]See pp. 42–3.

[107]Carey (1995a: 82–3; 2002: 62; 2007: 33), following Carney (1976: 192). White largely confirms Carey's position in his earlier paper (1995a), but maintains the possibility that the *Immacaldam* may perhaps have been created together with *Immram Brain* and the Mongán texts, rather than being a preexisting source that they drew upon; White (2006: 46, 56–7).

This understanding of their textual interrelationships suggests, in the first place, that those responsible for the composition of *Immram Brain* and the four early Mongán tales were in a position to make use of any aspects of *Echtrae Chonnlai* and the *Immacaldam* that they may have seen as relevant to the ambiguities that make Mongán hard to place in the order of reality. In addition, since *Immram Brain* and the four Mongán stories seem to have been produced together, one should, until it is proven otherwise, expect that their respective portrayals of Mongán will mutually inform each other. Cumulatively, then, this leads us to expect a unified vision of Mongán between these five texts, which also involves a harmonisation of the relevant materials in *Echtrae Chonnlai* and the *Immacaldam*. It remains possible that this harmonisation may, in turn, have led to the further revision of one, or both, of these source texts, and perhaps (insofar as such a harmonisation may have been anticipated before it was realised) even have guided their initial composition, to some extent or another. But the question of which way this ambiguity falls is not especially important for the current argument. For insofar as we are investigating what these texts meant in the context of *Cín Dromma Snechtai*, any one of these possibilities requires that we read all the relevant texts in light of each other. Finally, one must also bear in mind that the physical proximity of all these texts to each other in *Cín Dromma Snechtai* would have encouraged subsequent readers to interpret them as interpreting each other.[108] Thus, reading them as mutually illuminating promises to reveal, not only the way that the composers of *Immram Brain* and the four Mongán tales understood what they wrote (and two of the texts on which they based that writing) but also how they were likely to have been understood thereafter.

Much of this has been said already in discussing the claim that *Immram Brain*'s portrayal of Mongán should be interpreted as being consonant with the portrayals of Mongán in the four early Mongán texts, and with the identification of the otherworldly youth in the *Immacaldam* as Mongán. In an earlier part of this article, this led to the conclusion that the short life prophesied for Mongán in *Immram Brain* should be placed in the context of the long and possibly unlimited process of rebirths attributed to him by the *Immacaldam* and the *Scél*.[109] Subsequently, the further conclusion has been drawn that the process of rebirths described by these latter texts should be placed in the context of *Immram Brain*'s claim that his father is a native – and thus deathless – inhabitant of the sinless earthly paradise. We shall see now how the *Immacaldam* allows the necessity of both arguments to be demonstrated with greater precision.

However, were this to be so, it would only strengthen Carey's case concerning the context in which the indentification of the youth of the *Immacaldam* as Mongán took place.

[108]Bearing in mind that part of the evidence for these texts having once been together in the lost *Cín Dromma Snechtai* is that they regularily appear in the same extant manuscripts. On this, see notes 5 and 69. What is said here regarding the interpretation of these texts implicit in *Cín Dromma Snechtai* itself applies, in varying degrees, to many of the existing manuscripts as well. Here LU, YBL, TCD MS H 4.22 (1363), RIA MS 23 N 10 (the Book of Ballycumin), TCD MS H.3.18 (1337) and BL Egerton MS 88 are notable.

[109]See pp. 38–9 above.

The youth which some, the *Immacaldam* says, identify as Mongán, has evidently come from the same sinless paradise as the mysterious woman who first appears to Bran, summoning him to travel there. We cannot conclude this based on any direct statements in the *Immacaldam* regarding the place he has come from,[110] but such a conclusion seems to be inescapable when we consider its linguistic and structural parallels with *Immram Brain*. Both texts use exactly the same phrase to describe the place from which the otherworld visitor has come. They come *a tírib ingnad* 'from lands of strange things'.[111] Both protagonists, moreover, subsequently disappear in such a way that those present do not know where they went,[112] the latter being something which they also have in common with the otherworldly woman of *Echtrae Chonnlai*.[113]

This disappearance from sight is the key to understanding the significance of the parallels at issue here. For in *Immram*, *Echtrae* and *Immacaldam* alike, it is only the natural inhabitants of the earthly paradise that are capable of doing this. Moreover, the one mortal visitor who manages to return to mortal lands – Nechtán, in the *Immram* – does so by means of moving through space in the manner of a normal physical body, and, having done so, immediately withers into ash upon arrival.[114] Mongán, however, prior to disappearing back where he came from, seems no worse for his experience of mortal lands. There are certainly reasons besides these for supposing that Mongán is understood to be more like the inhabitants of the earthly paradise than those of the mortal world. Among them, there is the fact that Mongán is seen by Colum Cille as an authoritative and fitting interlocutor for speech of *rún nemdae* ⁊ *talmandae* 'heavenly and earthly mysteries' that are best kept from mortals.[115] But given what we know about the interrelationships shared by this text with *Echtrae Chonnlai* and *Immram Brain*, it is his disappearance which is the

[110]See, however, the Middle Irish poem beginning 'Coinne Mongain is Coluim caim', where Mongán is quoted as saying that he has come to Colum Cille from the 'Land of Promise' (*Tír Taingire*); Meyer, ed. and trans. (1895–7: 87).

[111]*Immacaldam*, ll. 4–5; Carey, ed. and trans. (2002: ed. 60 and trans. 61): '"Do-dechad-sa," ol inde óclach, "a tírib ingnad, a tírib gnáth"' (= '"I come," said the youth, "from lands of strange things, from lands of familiar things"'). *Immram Brain* §1; Meyer, ed. and trans. (1895–7: ed. 3 and trans. 2): 'Cóica rand rogab in ben a tírib ingnath for láur in tige do Bran mac Febail' (= 'Twas fifty quatrains the woman from lands of strange things sang on the floor of the house to Bran son of Febal' [translation lightly modified to bring out its mirroring of the *Immacaldam*'s phrasing, as translated by Carey]). For discussion of the correspondences listed here, and more besides, see Carey (1995: 79).

[112]*Immacaldam*, ll. 26–7; Carey, ed. and trans. (2002: ed. 60 and trans. 61): 'Óro glé, co n-accatar talmaidiu do-celar erru ind óclach. Ní fetatar cia luid nó can to-luid.' (= 'When [the conversation] ended, they suddenly saw that the youth was hidden from them. They did not know whither he went nor whence he came.'). *Immram Brain* §31; Meyer, ed. and trans. (1895–7: ed. 17 and trans. 16): 'Luid in ben úadib íarom annadfetatar cia luid, ocus birt a cróib lee.' (= 'Thereupon the woman went from them, while they knew not whither she went. And she took her branch with her.').

[113]Although, in her case, this occurs in the context of the king's *magus* attempting to drive her away, at the king's request. Moreover, it also differs in that she was invisible to all but Connlae beforehand; *Echtrae Chonnlai* §4, 7; see Appendix 5 for text and translation.

[114]See note 103.

[115]*Immacaldam*, ll. 22–30; see Appendix 8 for text and translation.

most decisive signal that, whatever ambiguities remain, he is fundamentally one of the *áes síde* from its perspective.

That said, it seems likely enough that the identification of the otherworld youth with Mongán in *Immacaldam Choluim Chille* did not belong to it originally. We have already noted Carey's argument that this identification reflects the influence of the creative process that produced *Immram Brain* and the four early Mongán stories.[116] But if so, it would indicate that their authors were already thinking of Mongán beforehand as a person who was more fundamentally a native of the earthly paradise, where the undying people of his father lived, than the human world, where he was a prince of Dál nAraide. Were this not the case, it would have been impossible for them to recognize Mongán in the story of a youth who clearly belongs to that other world. As such, the reason that Mongán's beginning and end are unclear in the *Scél* is simply that the inhabitants of the earthly paradise have been present from the creation, and will remain unaging until the end of the world. This also means that the '*bithu síru, / Cét mblédne i findríg*' which the Mannanán mac Lir of the *Immram* prophesies that Mongán will have following the death of his coming embodiment is not, as Carney would have it, an eternity in heaven,[117] but a long yet finite interval in the earthly paradise to which he most truly belongs on this side of the Judgement.[118]

This makes the ambiguity regarding his true embodiment a bit of a non-issue. If he is not going to die in any final way before the end of the world, any questions regarding the nature of his resurrected body are suspended almost indefinitely. But then it remains unlikely that these concerns would even apply to the, in some sense, 'divine' inhabitants of the earthly paradise. The patristic critiques of the possibility of serial rebirths are concerned with the fate of mortal humans and immortal angels and devils. Insofar as such ever-living beings appear to be none of these things – as beings that can die, but not (before the end of the world itself) with any finality – it is at least possible that a process of ongoing reembodiment is conceived as natural for them, especially given how frequently they are portrayed as undergoing such a process. An earlier form of the extant *Tochmarc Étaíne*, one of the texts which would best seem to support such a conclusion,[119] is, after all, thought to have been included in *Cín Dromma Snechtai*, together with these stories of Mongán.[120]

[116]See p. 48 above, incl. note 107.

[117]Carney's interpretation of this passage (1976: 193) is embedded in his argument: 'Manannán also foresees that Mongán's life will be short. But the *drong find*, the fair host (of angels), will take him away and he will be "through eternities of / centuries" in a fair kingdom.'

[118]*Immram Brain* §55 [McCone (2005) / White (2006) §6]; McCone ed. (2005: 145); White, trans. (2006: 40): 'Bieid tre bithu síru / Cét mblédne i findrígu' (= 'He will be through long ages / A hundred years in bright kingship'). This likely means (*pace* Carney) that the 'drong find' (fair host) which will take him there is just as likely to be composed of other indigenous inhabitants of the earthly paradise as angels; *Immram Brain* §59 [McCone (2005) / White (2006) §10]; McCone, ed. (2005: 145); White, trans. (2006: 41): 'Gébthai in drong find' (= 'The fair host will take him').

[119]See other references to *Tochmarc Étaíne* in notes 26, 33, 74 and 100.

[120]Carey (1995: 89–91); Stifter (2019b).

But while it seems clear that the authors of *Immram Brain* and the four early Mongán tales (and the editors, if not the authors, of the *Immacaldam*) understand him to be one of the ever-living people of the sinless earthly paradise rather than a properly mortal inhabitant of this world, it was certainly not a priority for them to state this unambiguously. We have seen that it is everywhere implied, and sometimes shown, but nowhere directly claimed. In this, these texts are in stark contrast to the later accounts of Tuán mac Cairill and Fintan mac Bóchra, where great pains are taken to define their reembodiments in a way that anticipates any theological objections. What then is preoccupying about Mongán for these texts if the definition of his place in Christian eschatology and cosmology is not?

MONGÁN AS AN APOLOGY FOR NATURAL LAW

The answer begins to become evident when we observe the ideological disparity between these Mongán texts and those which describe the reembodiments of Tuán and Fintan. In the latter, the restoration of the ancient person's human form in the Christian Era, as a prelude to a final death which breaks the cycle of embodiment, serves to do more than simply satisfy any eschatological concerns about the resurrection body. It also confines the body of extra-ecclesiastical knowledge that they exhibit and represent to the past. They have passed on the knowledge which has been enabled by their miraculously enabled longevity to the saints who, in turn, have passed it on to ecclesiastical scholarship.[121] This is, on the one hand, a powerful affirmation of the body of extra-ecclesiastical knowledge which is attributed to them, one of the relevant texts even going so far as to claim that all subsequent historical and genealogical scholarship in Ireland is based on this saintly mediation of their knowledge.[122] However, on the other hand, it would appear to undermine any perceived need for further extra-ecclesiastical knowledge in the present, especially insofar as it pertains to the recovery of lost history. If all subsequent historical and genealogical knowledge depends on the saintly mediation of this knowledge, this does not, for instance, seem to leave much room for the recovery of lost history through the inspiration of poets, such as we find attested in *Sanas Cormaic* and other subsequent texts.[123] In short, such accounts seem to

[121]Carey (2011: 10).

[122]e.g. *Scél Tuáin meic Chairill*, ll. 78–81; Carey, ed. and trans. (1984: ed. 102 and trans. 107). However, the translation provided in this instance is that of Koch and Carey et al, trans. (2003: 223–5, at 225), since it seems to give a clearer interpretation of the passage in question: 'Anait sechtmain i ssuidiu oc imaccallaim. Nach senchas ⁊ nach genelach fil i nHére is ó Thuán mac Cairill a bunadus. Attraglastar Pátraic ri sin ⁊ atcuaid dó ⁊ atraglastar Colum Cille ⁊ atcuaid Finnia dó i fiadnaisi lochta in tíre (= 'They remained there conversing for a week; every history and genealogy in Ireland derives from Tuán son of Cairell. Patrick had spoken with him before that, and he had told [these things] to him; and Colum Cille had spoken with him. And Finnia spoke with him in the presence of the people of the region.').

[123]*Sanas Cormaic* is notable for such stories. For the story of how Lugaid comes to know the lost history of a lap-dog by putting his poet's staff on its head, see *Sanas Cormaic* Y 323; Russell, Arbuthnot and Moran, eds (2006–); Russell, trans. (2008: 33–4). For other similar examples, see *Sanas Cormaic* Y 883, 1018; Russell, Arbuthnot and Moran, eds (2006–). See

sit better with attempts to minimise the ongoing importance of the inspired knowledge often associated with the secular hierarchies of poets and rulers than with attempts to emphasize it. It remains that there is, in principle, no reason why the idea that lost history may be retrieved through some form of inspiration could not be brought into agreement with the idea that it may be retrieved through chance encounters with miraculously long-lived ancients, a possibility which is variously realised in *Airne Fíngein*,[124] *Suidigud Tellaig Temra*[125] and *Acallam na Senórach*,[126] among other places. But where a conciliation of this kind occurs, such inspiration as aids or enables the recovery of historical knowledge seems to be among the potentialities that perished long ago, with the age-old survivors of past times in whom they were last manifest.

Our Mongán texts are another matter.[127] The representative of extra-ecclesiastical knowledge that they describe persists in living and will likely live until the end of the world. Moreover, in all instances, Mongán's knowledge is not limited to that of an observer, however long-lived and multiformed, but includes an understanding of things that are not available to the normal operation of human thought in any embodiment. In the *Immacaldam*, his knowledge extends, as we have seen, to 'heavenly and earthly mysteries' that are beyond what it is generally advisable for mortals even to hear about.[128]

also *UB* II [*CIH* 552.3]; Carey, ed. and trans. (1997: 41–58, at 54): 'Dícedal do cennaib .i. adhbalcantain do cennaib na tulach go tabraid a n-infoilghi airgid dó nó co roinnisidh a n-indsencas' (= '*Díchetal di chennaib*, i.e., great chanting to the tops of the hills so that they give their silver treasures to him, or so that he may relate their *dindshenchas*'). For discussion of these examples, see Carey (1997: 47–8, 54ff.). See also *Do Faillsigud Tána Bó Cúailnge*; Murray, ed. and trans. (2001). On the portrayal, in *Togail Bruidne Dá Derga* [*TBDD*], of the knowledge which is received from the otherworld and expressed in *rosc* as 'trapping past, present and future within a timeless realm', see O'Connor (2008: 65). We have already established that the otherworld itself is not itself timeless, but this remains an apt description of the inspiration which it mediates. O'Connor develops the temporal ambivalence of poetic inspiration described here only in the direction of the prophetic revelation of the future, but the possibility of a prophetic recovery of the past is also implicit in his characterisation of its role in *TBDD*.

[124]In this account of Fintan mac Bóchra, he is unable to tell the things he has seen since the Flood because of his muteness until a 'spirit of prophecy' (*spirut faitsine*) decends on him; *Airne Fíngein* §4; Vendryes (1953: 5–7); Cross and Brown, trans. (1918: 36–37) [translation based on text of older edition found in Scarre (1907–13: 3)].

[125]Fintan's historical knowledge does not only come from all the things he has witnessed through his many transformations but also from a divine source: namely, Trefuilngid; *Suidigud Tellaig Temra* §31; Best, ed. and trans. (1910: ed. 152 and trans. 153): 'ba haingel Dé hés*ide*, nó fa Día féisin' (= 'he was an angel of God, or he was God himself').

[126]Most often, in the *Acallam*, poetic inspiration involves prophecies of the future, rather than revelations regarding what has already occurred in the past, but there is at least one instance of the latter. Finn, by his tooth of wisdom, is able to discern the identity of the thief of some dogs, who has otherwise left no trace; Stokes, ed. (1880–1909: 7); Dooley and Roe, trans. (1999: 9).

[127]Cf. Carey (2011: 7), where he characterises *Scél Tuáin meic Chairill* as a 'warmer treatement of the theme' than the *Immacaldam*.

[128]See p. 50. Mac Cana (1975: 43–5) rightly compared the necessity of not repeating these mysteries to the to the similar necessity that St. Paul not repeat what he heard when he has been caught up to the Paradise of the Third Heaven. 2 Cor. 12:2–4: 'scio hominem in Christo ante annos quattuordecim sive in corpore nescio sive extra corpus nescio Deus scit raptum eiusmodi usque ad tertium caelum / et scio huiusmodi hominem sive in corpore sive extra corpus nescio Deus scit / quoniam raptus est in paradisum et audivit arcana verba quae non licet homini loqui'

Immram Brain likewise has him relating 'mysteries' (*rúna*).[129] The *Scél* does not claim so much, but nevertheless portrays him as having confident and accurate foreknowledge of the approach of Caílte's assistance.[130] In short, he is portrayed as exhibiting the knowledge and prophetic power that many of the Early Irish law-tracts and sagas would lead us to expect of those who preside at the pinnacle of the secular hierarchies, that is, those whom the Holy Spirit is thought to have inspired with the knowledge of the law of nature (*recht aicnid / lex naturae*) to a superlative degree.[131]

Insofar as his human embodiment is concerned, he is certainly the right sort of person to be enjoying such inspiration, seeing as he is, like Cormac mac Airt[132] (and Cú Chulainnn, in some manner of speaking),[133] taken to be a ruler who is also a master of poetry.[134] As such, his correction of his

(= 'I knew a man in Christ above fourteen years ago, [whether in the body, I cannot tell; or whether out of the body, I cannot tell: God knoweth;] such an one caught up to the third heaven. / And I knew such a man, [whether in the body, or out of the body, I cannot tell: God knoweth;] / How that he was caught up into paradise, and heard unspeakable words, which it is not lawful for a man to utter.'). His ultimate dismissal of this evidence leaves him without one of the best ways of accounting for how the pre-Chrisitian continuities he wants to see here would have been rendered intelligible in a medieval Christian context. As Johnston (2015: 426) notes, the idea that Mongán's knowledge has continuity with a pre-Christian past, and the idea that it has a likeness to the knowledge that was revealed to St. Paul in Paradise, are not mutually exclusive possibilities here.

[129]Carey (1995: 79). *Immram Brain* §52; Meyer, ed. and trans. (1895–7: ed. 25 and trans. 24): 'adfíi rúna, rith ecni' (= 'He will make known mysteries—a course of wisdom'); 'mysteries' replaces Meyer's 'secrets' here to match Carey's translation of 'rúna' in the *Immacaldam*.

[130]*Scél* §7; White, ed. and trans. (2006: ed. 73 and trans. 80).

[131]The *locus classicus* for this theme is the Prologue to *Senchas Már*; Carey, ed. and trans. (1994a). See discussion in McLeod (1982); McCone (1986); Ó Corráin (1987); Carey (1990); Watson (2018a). However, to date, the only detailed treatment of this theme in early Irish literature as a whole is Watson (2018b, vol. i: 73–173).

[132]According to the Cormac of *Tecosca Cormaic*, a king is not only required to be proficient in poetic *roscada*, but every art; *Tecosca Cormaic* §3, ll. 40–4; Fomin, ed. and trans. (2013: ed. 150–60, at 154 and trans. 149–61, at 155: 'Foglaimm cach dána, / Eólas cech bérlai, / Druine m(b)rechtrad, / Tacra co fásaigib, / Brithemnas co roscadaib' (= 'Learning every art, / Knowledge of every specialist language, / Craftsmanship of variegated works, / Law-suit based on legal precedents, / judgement with *roscada*.' [trans. lightly edited]).

[133]According to *Mesca Ulad*, Cú Chulainn was king over a third of Ulster for a year's time; *Mesca Ulad* §3–4; Watson, ed. (1941: 2); Koch and Carey et al, trans. (2003: 106–27, at 106–7). My thanks to Elizabeth Boyle for this reference. See also *Brislech Mór Maige Muirthemni* [*BMMM*], where he is felled by a spear which has been prophesied to kill a king; *BMMM* §20, ll. 353–5; Kimpton, ed. and trans. (2009: ed. 23 and trans. 42): 'Íar sin dano ro:gab Lugaid in tres gai indlithi ra:boí oc maccaib Calatín. "Cid bias din gai-seo, a maccu Calatín?" "Tuitfid rí dé," ar meic Calatín.' (= 'After that Lugaid grasped one the three prepared spears of the sons of Calatín. "What will come of this spear, sons of Calatín?" "A king will fall by it," said the sons of Calatín.'). For his poetic and legal training by Sencha mac Ailela, Amairgen and Morann, see *Compert Con Culainn* §7.14ff.; van Hamel, ed. (1933: 7–8); Duvau, trans. (1888: 8–9). For Cú Chulainn prophesying in poetic *rosc*[*ad*], see *BMMM* §10, 31; Kimpton, ed. and trans. (2009: ed. 16–18, 28–9 and trans. 38, 46–7).

[134]See White's discussion and presentation of the evidence (in these early Mongán-tales and elsewhere) that illustrates Mongán's association with *filid*, and yet his superiority to them; White (2006: 1–3). However, her tentative conclusion that this may reflect an anti-*filid* perspective seems not to follow from this, especially as Mongán seems to be idealised precisely for his superlative possession of the qualities associated with them.

poet, Forgoll, about a point of history, and his subsequent neutralisation of the threat posed by him, do not seem as if they should be read as anti-poetic polemic.[135] For instance, Mongán seems to take Forgoll's threat of satire, and of making the land barren through his chanting, quite seriously.[136] If anything, the *Scél* seems to be an example of the contention, familiar to us from *Tecosca Cormaic*, that it is the kingly rather than the poetic role which preeminently possesses the arts and, therefore, the natural revelation by which they operate.[137] This would mean that the poet is not wrong in being poetic so much as in not showing due deference the preeminence of royal judgment over his and every art.[138]

The identification of the youth of the *Immacaldam* as Mongán is particularly significant for our consideration of these differences. For of all the early Mongán texts, it is this text alone that includes the familiar trope of the saint who is interested in hearing, and does hear, the extra-ecclesiastical knowledge of the long-lived person who has been undergoing reembodiments, in this case, extra-ecclesiastical knowledge of a seemingly inspired character. However, here, the saint has by no means been exhaustive in his mediation of extra-ecclesiatical knowledge to the ecclesiastical hierarchies. In the first place, the saint does not and will not convey this knowledge to his monks because he deems such knowledge unfitting for mortals; in the second, there is no indication that Mongán will not meet again, either with him, or with some other saint, in the future. Thus the identification of the youth of the *Immacaldam* with Mongán highlights, among other things, the ongoing need in the Christian Era for the particular way that the Holy Spirit was understood to be revealed to and through the secular hierarchies in distinction from the ecclesiastical. Just as Mongán himself shows no sign of dying, or that his knowledge will ever be fully grasped by the ecclesiastical hierarchy, so those who have a comparable proficiency in these modes of inspiration will always be necessary. For apart from the saints, they are the only ones who may fully partake of its results without risk of harm.

[135]Toner (2005: 76); Stifter (2017: 31–2). Cf. Mac Cana (1972: 134); McCone (2000b: 201).

[136]*Scél* §4; White, ed. and trans. (2006: ed. 73 and trans. 79–80): 'Do:arcaid Mongán a réir ndó di sétaib co:tici secht cumala no da secht cumal no tri secht cumal. Tarcaid asennad trian no leth a ferainn no a ferann n-óg asennad acht a soíri a óenur cona mnaí Bréothigirn mani:forsulcad co cenn treisse.' (= 'Mongán offered him what he desired of treasures up to seven cumals or twice seven cumals or t[h]rice seven cumals. Finally he offered a third or half of his land or his entire land at last, save only his only freedom with [that of] his wife Bréothigern unless he redeem [himself] by the end of three days.').

[137]See notes 131–2. For discussion, references and further examples, see Watson (2018b, vol. i: 152ff.). It is worth noting here in what follows that *Tecosca Cormaic* is found immediately after the *Immacaldam* in TCD MS H 2. 17 (1319), on p. 178; see Abbott and Gwynn (1921: 112).

[138]This agrees in every respect with the following statement by White, but not the conclusions she derived from it following Mac Cana and McCone; White (2006: 53): 'What all this would seem to suggest is that Mongán (much like Tuán and Fergus) is a central player in the validation of the earliest Irish narrative writing. While represented as superior in knowledge and wisdom to the greatest poet(s) in Ireland he is, at the same time, portrayed as being connected with the church in his associations with Colum Cille and in the parallels drawn between his birth and Christ.'

This does not, then, signify that these texts are no more than an allegory of political theology. It would seem closer to the mark to interpret this as an example of the tendency of Early Irish literature to use the figures of historiography, rather than the categories of dialectic, as the means of working out abstract concepts.[139] The history must be what it is because reality as experienced in the present – personally and institutionally – must be an intelligible result of it. But beyond history, part of what is so fascinating here is the cosmology that evidently becomes necessary to accommodate the extra-ecclesiastical revelation that is proper to the secular hierarchies. Insofar as Mongán may be taken to be emblematic of this secular form of prophecy, the earthly paradise described by certain patristic and apocryphal writings seems, in some fashion, to be the proximate origin of the knowledge that is specific to it, and is so due to the awareness, interest and at least periodic involvement that its everliving inhabitants, the gods of the sagas, have in the mortal world.

THE GODS OF THE SAGAS

Now it may seem somewhat odd to be using terms like 'gods' and 'divinities' here, and likewise to have done so at various points in the preceeding discussion.[140] But the apparent incongruity will persist only so long as we assume that 'gods' is always shorthand for 'pagan gods', and, as such, descriptive only of intrinsic rivals to the God of Christian theology,[141] except, perhaps, in its most figurative senses.[142] Granted, in the stories we have been most concerned with here, neither '*día*', nor '*dé*', nor or any other word that could be straightforwardly translated as 'god', is used to describe the everliving inhabitants of the earthly paradise.[143] In *Echtrae Chonnlai*, they are described as the 'people of the hollow hills' (*áes síde*).[144] In *Immram Brain*, Manannán mac Lír is said to be a 'man' (*fer*) of some sort,[145] or at least, 'in the shape of a man' (*cruth ind ḟir).*[146] But given that he is the sort of man who drives about in a chariot pulled

[139]Watson (2018a: 200).

[140]See pp. 35–6, 47 nn. 99–100, 51.

[141]Cf. Borsje (2009: 65). Cf. also Carey (2012: 40), where he asssumes that the plural, 'gods', is 'by definition non-Christian'.

[142]Williams's general tendency is to bypass the theological complications introduced by the existence of such gods, as they appear in *Echtrae Chonnlai* and *Immram Brain*, through an exploration of what they might represent allegorically (2016: 54–65, 69). However, he also points to aspects of *Immram Brain* which seem to demand that such gods are understood literally as gods, in addition to whatever allegorical meanings may be at play (2016: 66–8). Nevertheless, he does not attempt to solve the difficulties that seem to be posed by the idea of their literal existence.

[143]As noted by Williams (2016: 63). For the historical development of these terms, see Carey (2012).

[144]See Appendix 3. On *áes síde* as the equivalent of *Tuath*(*a*) *Dé* (*Donann*), see Carey (2006b: 1694).

[145]*Immram Brain* §32; Meyer, ed. and trans. (1895–7: ed. 17 and trans. 16): 'Ó robói dá lá ocus dí aidchi forsin muir, conacci a dochum in fer isin charput íarsin muir.' (= 'When he had been at sea two days and two nights, he saw a man in a chariot coming towards him over the sea.'). This is noted by Williams (2016: 63)

[146]*Immram Brain* §50; Meyer, ed. and trans. (1895–7: ed. 25 and trans. 24): 'Sech is Moninnán mac Lir / asin charput cruth ind ḟir' (= 'For it is Moninnan, son of Ler / From the chariot in the

by invisible horses over sea waves that are, for him, a plain, blooming with flowers,[147] he is clearly not a 'man' in any reductive sense of the term, such as would later be argued in *Sanas Cormaic*.[148] The same may be said of the 'woman' (*ben*) who appears in the midst of Bran's fortress at the beginning of the *Immram*, and then disappears again, bearing her silver branch with her.[149] Rather, she is a 'woman' and Manannán is a 'man' in the same way as the otherworld visitor of *Echtrae Chonnlai* is said to be a 'woman' (*ben*)[150] and that of the *Immacaldam* is a 'youth' (*óclaig* / *iuuenis*).[151]

One way that some medieval Irish authors made sense of beings of this kind – as beings that are in many ways like humans, but in others superior to them – is by interpreting everything that seems wonderous about their persons, their behaviour and their knowledge as just so many diabolical phantasms.[152] In this view they would either be devils themselves,[153] or else mortal humans who harnessed the power of devils through sorcery.[154] But while the possibility of such an interpretation should always be borne in mind, it is manifestly not commensurable with the perspective of the *Cín Dromma Snechtai* narratives we have been considering. We have seen that they consistently portay these beings as the natural inhabitants and representatives of a paradisal reality that remains untouched by the stain of sin which has since troubled the

shape of a man').

[147]*Immram Brain* §33–43; Meyer, ed. and trans. (1895–7: ed. 17–21 and trans. 16–20).

[148]*Sanas Cormaic* Y 896; Russell, Arbuthnot and Moran, eds (2006–); Russell, trans. (2008: 37). Other versions of this passage are found in *Sanas Cormaic* B 519, La 82; Russell, Arbuthnot and Moran, eds (2006–).

[149]*Immram Brain* §1–2, 31; Meyer, ed. and trans. (1895–7: ed. 3–5, 17 and trans. 2–4, 16).

[150]See Appendix 3.

[151]*Immacaldam*, ll. 1, 3–4, 9, 16, 18, 26; Carey, ed. and trans. (2002: ed. 60 and trans. 61).

[152]The classic examples of this interpretation are the Latin colophon which follows the Leinster recension of the *Táin* and version A of *Serglige Con Culainn* respectively. Bergin, Best and O'Sullivan, eds and trans. (1954–83, vol. ii: 399, ll. 12416–20); O'Rahilly (1967: ed. 136 and trans. 172). *Serglige Con Culainn* §41; Carey, ed. and trans. (2011: ed. 36–7 and trans. 37), following Dillon, ed. (1953: 29). While these passages are both significantly later than the texts here in question, ideas which invite such application may be found in the seventh-century Hiberno-Latin text, *De ordine creaturarum*; *De ordine creaturarum* VIII.16; Díaz y Díaz, ed. (1972: 142–4); Smyth, trans. (2011: 186). The reasons for its seventh-century attribution are found in Smyth (2011: 138). For further discussion, see Carey (1994b: 78–9, 83–4; 2006b: 1694; 2011: 16–20; 2015: 51–2); Ó Néill (1999: 272); Borsje (2009: 63–4); Clarke (2014); Williams (2016: 79, 147–8, 150).

[153]For an example of the interpretation of such gods as devils, in addition to the passage in *Serglige Con Culainn* A referenced immediately above, see *Scél Tuáin Meic Chairill*, ll. 57–8; Carey (1984: ed. 102 and trans. 106): 'Tuatha Dé ⁊ Andé dona fes bunadus lasin n-oes n-eólais. Acht ba dóich leo bith din longis dodeochaid de nim dóib' (= 'the Tuatha Dé and Andé, whose origin the mean of learning do not know; but they thought it likely that they are some of the exiles who came to them from Heaven'). See also the third recension of the *Lebor Gabála Érenn*, as found in the Yellow Book of Lecan; *Lebor Gabála Érenn* V §268; Macalister, ed. and trans. (1938–56, vol. iii: ed. 154 and trans. 155); Carey, ed. and trans. (2011: ed. 18–19 and trans. 19).

[154]For an early example of interpretation of the gods as mortal sorcerers, see the first recension of *Lebor Gabála Érenn* in the Book of Leinster, ll. 1049–55; Best, Bergin and O'Sullivan, eds (1954–83, vol. i: 33); Koch and Carey et al, trans. (2003: 252–3). This corresponds to *Lebor Gabála Érenn* VII §304–6 [= Carey §64–5]; Macalister, ed. and trans. (1938–56, vol. iv: ed. 106–8 and trans. 107–9).

descendants of Adam.[155] One might perhaps be tempted to argue, by analogy with the Middle Irish version of *Serglige Con Culainn*, that this happy state of affairs is only apparent, that it is implicitly understood to be just such an deceitful and diabolical phantasm.[156] But the accompanying details rule out the possibility that such an interpretation of these texts could be intristic to them. Manannán's prophecy of the advent of Christ would be especially hard to explain as part of a diabolical deception, as would his theologically orthodox descripton of the Fall and its effects on humanity.[157] The same can be said of the *síd*-woman's prophecy in *Echtrae Chonnlai*, in which she foretells the coming of the Faith to Ireland and the Devil's inability to prevent its future destruction of *brichtu druad tárdechto*, the 'spells of the druids of base learning'.[158] And whatever the dangers posed by the mysteries known to Mongán, they remain of sufficient interest to Colum Cille that he spends *leth lai nó ó oentráth co 'raile* 'half the day, or from one day to the next' enquiring after them.[159]

Of course, since these beings are evidently at home in a place that is either the equivalent of Eden, or Eden itself,[160] it may well be that they are unfallen humans,[161] rather than belonging to an order of being that is innately superior to human existence in its very essence. But if so, we have seen that Manannán is nevertheless divine enough, in some manner of speaking, that his corporeal fathering of Mongán can be presented as a lesser analogy of the incoporeal fathering of Christ.[162] Moreover, his son Mongán remains the mediator of mysteries that are far beyond what is available to mortals only by means

[155]See pp. 42–8.

[156]i.e. that they should be read in the same way which the end of *Serglige Con Culainn* A says that its own descripton of such things should be read. See reference in note 152 above. Note that it has Lóeg describe the *áes síde* as the descendants of a pre-Fall Adam (*síl n-Ádaim cen imarbos*) before subsequently placing Lóeg's whole experience of them, including their apparently *marthanach* 'everlasting' character, in the category of diabolical phantasm; Dillon, ed. (1953: 19); Gantz, trans. (1981b: 170). Here the apparent influence of *Immram Brain* on its description of the world in which the *áes síde* live is also worth noting; Carey (1994b: 83). Such parallels introduce the possibility that it may have *Immram Brain* in mind as a specific target of its polemic. My thanks to the members of the weekly online meeting of the junior scholars at DIAS during the Covid 19 pandemic for their advice on this point.

[157]*Immram Brain* §46–8; Meyer, ed. and trans. (1895–7: ed. 23 and trans. 22). For the otherworldy woman's prophecy of the Incarnation and the institution of the sacrament of baptism earlier in the same work, see Appendix 6.

[158]*Echtrae Chonnlai* §11; McCone, ed. and trans. (2000a: ed. 122 and trans. 181). See also Carey, ed and trans. (1995b: ed. 56 and trans. 57).

[159]*Immacaldam*, l. 24; Carey, ed. and trans. (2002: ed. 60 and trans. 61).

[160]See pp. 43–4 above.

[161]See Carney (1969: 165); Carey (1987; 2006b: 1694; 2011: 29–36; 2015: 52; 2018: 15); Williams (2016: 79, 87). But while it seems clear that this was an important theory, the demonstrable examples of it seem to be somewhat fewer than has been claimed. The idea that the gods, together with the paradise in which they live, have not been touched by Adam's sin, and generally cannot be seen by those who have, may indicate that they are unfallen humans, but it does not require this conclusion. For discussion of some of the ambiguities here, see Watson (2018b, vol.ii: 403, n. 132).

[162]See p. 36.

of their own capacities.[163] The question of whether the everliving beings met by Connlae, Bran and Colum Cille are understood to be superior to human beings only by virtue of being unaffected by the Fall and its consequences, or to be superior to human beings by nature (and yet more like humans than angels), is a difficult ambiguity which we will not have occasion to resolve here. However, it is not ultimately of great significance to the question of their relative divinity or godhood. What *is* important is the cosmological position that they are found to occupy, whatever the underlying reasons may be for the superiority of their mode of existence by comparison with that of mortal humans.

The composite picture which has emerged from our analysis of these accounts is that they are holy beings who suffer few of the constraints from their experience of corporeality and temporality that mortals do in theirs, so that they appear to occupy an intermediate station between the limitation of mortal corporeal humans and the freedom of immortal incorporeal angels. Moreover, they are beings who appear (if Mongán is any indication) to be mediaries of the inspired knowledge that is proper to the secular hierarchies, as from a higher to a lower reality.[164] This all being so, terms like 'god' and 'divinity' are at least as descriptive of them as they are of, say, the sub-lunary deities of Martianus Capella's *De nuptiis Philologiae et Mercurii* I–II,[165] and those of its Christian interpreters in the twelfth-century.[166] Or in other words, where such beings are straightforwardly described as 'gods' (*dee*), or 'god-peoples' (*tuatha dé*) in later Old Irish texts, this does not in itself seem to indicate a rival understanding of what they are, so much as a more explicit and conceptual decription of the position which these earlier texts had already implicitly indicated.[167] The identification of them as, in one way or another, the kind of beings that belong to the earthly paradise does not interfere with the idea of their divinity, or emerge as an alternative to it. Far from it. Insofar as they are understood to be the divine causes of the inspired knowledge that is proper to the secular hierarchies, and likewise of the potencies associated with that knowledge, it is this development that is the basis of their intelligibility *as* gods in the Christian cosmological system to which they belong.

[163]See pp. 53–6.

[164]The role of the gods as mediators of the secular arts has been a recurring theme in Carey's work (1987; 1989b: esp. 31; 1991: esp. 174–5; 2006b: 1696; 2015: 57). See also Williams (2016: 103–6, 160–74).

[165]See especially, *De nuptiis Philologiae et Mercurii* I.150–68; Dick, ed., (1925: 64–9); Stahl et al, trans. (1977: 51–5).

[166]e.g. Bernardus Silvestris, *Cosmographia: Microcosmos* II.vii.6–12; Weatherbee, ed. and trans. (2015: ed. 122–6 and trans. 123–7). Carey also takes note of this text as a point of comparison to these Early Irish developments (2018: 17–8).

[167]i.e. we should probably not be so quick to conclude, for example, that *Tochmarc Étaíne*'s portrayal of the *áes síde* as divine causes of the potencies by which the secular hierarchies operate is incommensurable with its portrayal of them as the sinless natural inhabitants of the earthly paradise. Cf. Williams (2016: 87–9). However, insofar as these terms appear to make explicit something that has been implicit in earlier descriptions of the *áes síde*, they are also something more than the terminological equivalents of *áes síde*. Cf. Carey (2006b: 1694).

Back to Pythagoras

The character of this inspired secular knowledge and its association with divine beings of this kind are significant matters in themselves, and, as such, deserve a less impressionistic account on another occasion.[168] However, for the current discussion, their primary significance is that they return us to the comparison of Early Irish and Pythagorean accounts of reembodiment with which we first began. For in the figure of Mongán we have at last an Early Irish example in which the memory of reembodiments is not only a sign of authority regarding historical knowledge, but also regarding the knowledge of reality itself, as it is in the Pythagorean sources. But while the rumor of Pythagoras's divine descent from Apollo reflects only that there truly is something divine about his persistently human identity[169] (where any such distinction between divine and human is possible),[170] Mongán's mortal human existence is ultimately no more than a transitory manifestation of his divinity as the son of Manannán mac Lir. Likewise, the knowledge of which he is the emblematic mediator does not belong to a distinctly human participation in divine life – as does the broadly philosophical teaching revealed by Pythagoras[171] – but to a form of divine life itself, beyond the human, from which such knowledge is received as a providential grace by those for whom it is permitted. In short, so far as the reception of revelatory knowledge is concerned, it is Colum Cille who is the true point of comparison with Pythagoras in the *Immacaldam*, not Mongán mac Fiachnai. The common symptom of rebirth certainly might tempt one to persist in attempting to draw further parallels between Pythagoras and Mongán beyond it. Yet it remains the case that rebirth, and thus the knowledge derived from it, belong to the very nature of humanity in Pythagorean tradition, even if their accessibility to human self-reflection depends on divine help, whereas if such things belong to the nature of anything in Early Irish literature,[172] it is to the nature of the everliving gods, the all-but-immortal beings who have inhabited the earthly paradise from the Creation, and who will abide there until the Judgment.

[168]This is currently in preparation.

[169]This holds true even for Iamblichus's *De vita Pythagorica*, where, of the extant *vitae*, the identification of Pythagoras and Apollo is most fully developed; O'Meara (1989: 35–40). Iamblichus, *De vita Pythagorica* II.3–12; Deubner and Klein, eds (1975: 6–10); Clark, trans. (1989: 25–6).

[170]Materialist interprations of Pythagoreanism tend to see divine and animal life as greater and lesser modes of the existence of the soul respectively, not as essentially superior and inferior kinds of beings. See note 18.

[171]Emblematic here is the famous attribution to Pythagoras of the Platonic distinction [e.g. *Symposium* 204a] between the human 'philosophy' or 'love of wisdom' (φιλόσοφία / philosophia) he practiced and the divine 'wisdom' (σοφία / sophia) of the gods. For discussion and references, see Riedweg (2005: 90ff.). See also, Iamblichus, *De vita Pythagorica* XII.58; Deubner and Klein, eds (1975: 31–2); Clark, trans. (1989: 23–4).

[172]Michael Clarke gave a paper entitled 'The bird-man in *Togail Bruidne Da Derga*: a new explantation of *énchennach*', at the 2019 Tionól, on November 16th, where he showed that reembodiment is sometimes presented as belonging, not to the nature of the gods, but to the magical power often attributed to them.

Abbreviations

BMMM	*Brislech Mór Maige Muirthemni*
DCD	*De Civitate Dei*
Immacaldam	*Immacaldam Choluim Chille ⁊ ind Óclaig oc Carraic Eolairg*
PG	Migne, Jacques-Paul (ed.) 1857–66: *Patrologia Graeca*, 161 vols (Paris).
PL	Migne, Jacques-Paul (ed.) 1841–55: *Patrologia Latina*, 217 vols (Paris).
Scél	*Scél asa mberar co mbad hé Find mac Cumaill Mongán ocus aní día fil aided Fothaid Airgdig*
Suidigud	*Suidigud Tellaig Temra*

References

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

Aicher, Peter 1989: 'Ennius' dream of Homer', *The American Journal of Philology* 110.2, 227–32.

Bergin, Osborn and Best, R. I. (ed. and trans.) 1938: '*Tochmarc Étaíne*', *Ériu* 12 (1938), 137–96.

Best, R. I. (ed. and trans.) 1910: 'The Settling of the Manor of Tara', *Ériu* 4, 121–72.

Best, R. I., Bergin, Osborn and O'Sullivan, Anne (eds) 1954–83: *The Book of Leinster, Formerly Lebar na Núachongbála,* 6 vols (Dublin).

Bettenson, Henry (trans.) 1972: *St Augustine: Concerning the City of God against the Pagans* (London and New York).

Bieler, Ludwig (ed. and trans.) 1979: *The Patrician Texts in the Book of Armagh*, Scriptores Latini Hiberniae 10 (Dublin).

Bondarenko, Grigory 2012: 'Fintan mac Bóchra: Irish synthetic history revisited', in Maxim Fomin, Václav Blažek, and Piotr Stalmaszczyk (eds), *Transforming Traditions: Studies in Archaeology, Comparative Linguistics and Narrative: Proceedings of the Fifth International Colloquium of Societas Celto-Slavica, Held at Příbram, 26–29 July 2010*, Studia Celto-Slavica 6 (Łódź), 129–47.

——, 2013: 'The migration of the soul in *De Chophur in Dá Muccida* and other Early Irish tales', in Gregory Toner and Séamus Mac Mathúna (eds), *Ulidia 3: Proceedings of the Third International Conference on the Ulster Cycle of Tales, University of Ulster, Coleraine 22–5 June, 2009* (Berlin), 137–49.

Borsje, Jacqueline 2009: 'Monotheistic to a certain extent. The "good neighbours" of God in Ireland', in Anne-Marie Korte and Maaike de Haardt (eds), *The Boundaries of Monotheism: Interdisciplinary Explorations into the Foundations of Western Monotheism* (Leiden), 53–82.

Bourke, Angela, Kilfeather, Siobhán, Luddy, Maria, Mac Curtain, Margaret, Meaney, Gerardine, Ní Dhonnchadha, Máirín, O'Dowd, Mary and Willis,

CLAIR (eds) 2002: *The Field Day Anthology of Irish Writing: Volume IV Irish Women's Writing and Traditions* (New York).

BOYD, MATTHIEU (ed.) 2014: *Coire Sois: The Cauldron of Knowledge: A Companion to Early Irish Saga* (Notre Dame).

BOYLE, ELIZABETH 2014: 'On the wonders of Ireland: translation and adaptation', in Elizabeth Boyle and Deborah Hayden (eds), *Authorities and Adaptations: The Reworking and Transmission of Textual Sources in Medieval Ireland* (Dublin), 233–62.

BETT, RICHARD (trans.) 2012: *Sextus Empiricus: 'Against the Physicists'* (Cambridge).

BOWEN, ANTHONY and GARNSEY, PETER (trans.) 2003: *Lactantius: Divine Institutes*, Translated Texts for Historians 40 (Liverpool).

BRANDT, S. and LAUBMANN, G. L. (eds) 1890–93: *L. Caeli Firmiani Lactanti opera omnia*, 2 vols, Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum 19, 27 (Prague, Vienna, Leipzig).

BREATNACH, LIAM 1988: 'Review: Séamus Mac Mathúna, *Immram Brain* (Tübingen 1985)', *Celtica* 20, 177–92.

BRENNAN, MARY (trans.) 1998: *Treatise on divine predestination*, Notre Dame Texts in Medieval Culture 5 (Notre Dame).

BURY, R. G. (ed. and trans.) 1933–49: *Sextus Empiricus*, 4 vols, Loeb Classical Library 273, 291, 311, 382 (Cambridge, MA).

BYRNE, AISLING 2014: 'Fairy lovers: sexuality, order and narrative in medieval romance', in Amandon Hopkins, Robert Allen Rouse and Corey James Rushton (eds), *Sexual Culture in the Literature of Medieval Britain* (Cambridge 2014), 99–111.

BYRNE, FRANCIS JOHN 2005: 'Church and politics', in Dáibhí Ó Cróinín (ed.), *A New History of Ireland: Prehistoric and Early Ireland* (Oxford), 656–79.

CAREY, JOHN 1982: 'The location of the otherworld in Early Irish tradition', *Éigse* 19.1, 6–43.

——, (ed. and trans.) 1984: '*Scél Tuáin meic Chairill*', *Ériu* 35, 93–111.

——, 1987: 'Time, space and the Otherworld', *Proceedings of the Harvard Celtic Colloquium* 7, 1–27.

——, 1989a: 'Ireland and the antipodes: the heterodoxy of Virgil of Salzburg', *Speculum* 64.1, 1–10.

——, 1989b: 'Otherworlds and verbal worlds in Middle Irish narrative', *Proceedings of the Harvard Colloquium* 9, 31–42.

——, 1990: 'The two laws in Dubthach's judgment', *CMCS* 19, 1–18.

——, 1991: 'The waters of vision and the gods of skill', *Alexandria* 1 (1991), 163–86.

——, (ed. and trans.) 1994a: 'An edition of the Pseudo-Historical Prologue to the *Senchas Már*', *Ériu* 45, 1–32.

——, 1994b: 'The uses of tradition in *Serglige Con Culainn*', in J. P. Mallory and G. Stockman (eds), *Ulidia: Proceedings of the First International Conference on the Ulster Cycle of Tales, Belfast and Emain Macha, 8–12 April 1994* (Belfast), 77–84.

——, 1995a: 'On the interrelationships of some *Cín Dromma Snechtai* texts', *Ériu* 46, 71–92.

——, 1995b: ‘The rhetoric of *Echtrae Chonnlai*’, *CMCS* 30 (1995), 41–66.
——, (ed. and trans.) 1997: ‘The three things required of a poet’, *Ériu* 48, 41–58.
——, ([partial] trans.) 2000: ‘Augustinus Hibernicus: *On the Miracles of Holy Scripture*’, in John Carey, *King of Mysteries: Early Irish Religious Writings* (Dublin), 51–74.
——, (ed. and trans.) 2002: ‘The Lough Foyle Colloquy texts: *Immacaldam Choluim Chille 7 ind Óclaig oc Carraic Eolairg*’, *Ériu* 52, 53–87.
——, 2006a: ‘Reincarnation and shapshifting’, in John T. Koch (ed.), *Celtic Culture: A Historical Encyclopedia* (Santa Barbara), 1484–6.
——, 2006b: ‘Tuath Dé’, in John T. Koch (ed.), *Celtic Culture: A Historical Encyclopedia* (Santa Barbara), 1693–6.
——, 2007: *Ireland and the Grail*, Celtic Studies Publications 11 (Aberystwyth).
——, 2009: ‘The three sails, the twelve winds, and the questions of Early Irish colour theory’, *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 72, 221–32.
——, 2011: *A Single Ray of the Sun: Religious Speculation in Early Ireland*, Celtic Studies Publications 3 (Aberystwyth).
——, 2012: ‘*Dee*, “Pagan Deity”’, *Ériu* 62, 33–42.
——, (ed. and trans.) 2014: ‘The end of the world in *The Colloquy of the Two Sages*’, in John Carey, Emma Nic Cárthaigh and Caitríona Ó Dochartaigh (eds), *The End and Beyond: Medieval Irish Eschatology*, 2 vols, Celtic Studies Publications 17 (Aberystwyth) II, 629–45.
——, 2015: ‘The old gods of Ireland in the later Middle Ages’, in Katja Ritari and Alexandra Bergholm (eds), *Understanding Celtic Religion: Revisiting the Pagan Past* (Cardiff), 51–68.
——, 2017: ‘The reception of apocryphal texts in Medieval Ireland’, in T. Niklas, C. Moss, C. Tuckett and J. Verheyden (eds), *The Other Side: Apocryphal Perspectives on Ancient Christian Orthodoxies*, Novum Testamentum et Orbis Antiquus 117 (Göttingen), 251–69.
——, 2018: *The Mythological Cycle of Medieval Irish Literature*, Cork Studies in Celtic Literatures 3 (Cork).
——, (ed. and trans.) 2019a: ‘*Dá Brón Flatha Nime*: The Two Sorrows of the Kingdom of Heaven’, in Martin McNamara et al (eds), *Apocrypha Hiberniae: Apocalyptica* 2, Corpus Christianorum, Series Apocryphorum 21 (Turnhout), 171–221.
——, (ed. and trans.) 2019b: ‘*Fís Adamnáin*: The Vision of Adamnán’, in Martin McNamara et al (eds), *Apocrpypha Hiberniae: Apocalyptica* 2, Corpus Christianorum, Series Apocryphorum 21 (Turnhout), 16–170.
——, 2020: ‘The end of the world and the ends of the earth: apocalyptic thought in medieval Ireland’, in Colin McAlister (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Apocalyptic Literature* (Cambridge), 156–71.
Carney, James 1955: *Studies in Irish Literature and History* (Dublin).
——, 1963: ‘Review of *Navigatio sancti Brendani Abbatis*’, *Medium Aevum* 32, 37–44.
——, 1969: ‘The deeper level of Early Irish literature’, *Capuchian Annual* 36, 160–71.

——, 1976: 'The earliest Bran material', in J. J. O'Meara and B. Naumann (eds), *Latin Script and Letter A.D. 400–900: Festschrift Presented to Ludwig Bieler on the Occasion of his 70th Birthday* (Leiden), 174–93.

CHADWICK, HENRY (trans.) 1991: *Saint Augustine: Confessions* (Oxford).

CHARLES-EDWARDS, THOMAS M. 2002: '*Tochmarc Étaíne*: a literal interpretation', in Michael Richter and J.-M. Picard (eds), *Ogma: Essays in Celtic Studies in Honour of Próinséas Ní Chatháin* (Dublin), 165–81.

CLANCY, THOMAS OWEN 2000: 'Subversion at sea: structure, style and intent in the *Immrama*', in Jonathan M. Wooding (ed.), *The Otherworld Voyage in Early Irish Literature: An Anthology of Criticism* (Dublin), 195–226.

CLARK, GILLIAN (trans.) 1989: *Iamblichus: On the Pythagorean Life*, Translated Texts for Historians 8 (Liverpool).

CLARKE, MICHAEL 2014: 'Demonology, allegory and translation: the Furies and the Morrígan', in Ralph O'Connor (ed.), *Classical Literature and Learning in Medieval Irish Narrative* (Cambridge), 101–22.

COLISH, MARCIA L. 1990: *The Stoic Tradition from Antiquity to the Middle Ages: II. Stoicism in Christian Latin Thought Through the Sixth Century* (Leiden).

CROSS, TOM PEETE and BROWN, ARTHUR C. L. (trans.) 1918: 'Fingen's Night Watch (Airne Fingein)', *The Romanic Review* 9, 29–47.

D'ARBOIS DE JUBAINVILLE, MARIE HENRI 1884: *Le cycle mythologique irlandais et la mythologie celtique* (Paris).

DELUMEAU, JEAN 2000: *History of Paradise: The Garden of Eden in Myth and Tradition*, trans. Matthew O'Connell (Illinois).

DES PLACES, ÉDOUARD (ed. and trans.) 1982: *Porphyre: Vie de Pythagore – Lettre à Marcella*, Collection des Universités de France: Séries Grecques 285 (Paris).

DEUBNER, LUDWIG and KELIN, ULRICH (eds) 1975: *Iamblichi De vita Pythagorica liber*, Bibliotheca scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana (Stuttgart).

DE VRIES, RANKE (ed. and trans.) 2012: *Two Texts on Loch nEchach: De causis torchi Corc' Óche and Aided Echach maic Maireda*, ITS 65 (London).

DÍAZ Y DÍAZ, MANUEL C. (ed.) 1972: *Liber de ordine creaturarum: un anónimo irlandés del siglo VII. Estudio y edición crítica*, Monografías de la Universidad de Santiago de Compostela 10 (Santiago de Compostela).

DICK, ADOLF (ed.) 1925: *Martianus Capella* (Leipzig).

DILLON, MYLES (ed.) 1953: *Serglige Con Culainn* (Dublin).

DOMBART, BERNARD and KALB, ALPHONSE (eds) 1955: *De civitate Dei*, 2 vols, Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina 47–8 (Turnhout).

DOOLEY, ANNE and ROE, HARRY (trans.) 1999: *Tales of the Elders of Ireland: 'Acallamh na Senórach'* (Oxford).

DORANDI, TIZIANO (ed.) 2013: *Diogenes Laertius: Lives of Eminent Philosophers*, Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries 50 (Cambridge).

DRONKE, PETER 2008: The *Spell of Calcidius: Platonic Concepts and Images in the Medieval West* (Florence).

——, 2009: 'Metamorphoses: allegory in Early Medieval commentaries on Ovid and Apuleius', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 72 (2009), 21–39.

DUMVILLE, DAVID 1976: '*Echtrae* and *Immram*: some problems of definition', *Ériu* 27, 73–94.

——, 1977–8: 'Towards an interpretation of *Fís Adamnáin*', *SC* 12–13, 62–77.

DUVAU, LOUIS (trans.) 1888: 'La légende de la conception de Cûchulainn', *RC* 9, 1–13.

EDWARDS, H. J. (ed. and trans.) 1917: *Caesar: The Gallic War*, Loeb Classical Library 72 (Cambridge, MA).

ELLIOTT, J. K. (trans.) 1993: *The Apocryphal New Testament: A Collection of Apocryphal Christian Literature in an English Translation* (Oxford).

FERGUSON, JOHN (trans.) 2005: *Clement of Alexandria: 'Stromateis', Books One to Three*, Fathers of the Church Patristics Series 85 (Washington, D.C.).

FREEMAN, MARTIN A. (ed. and trans.) 1924–7: 'The Annals in Cotton MS Titus A. XXV', *RC* 41, 301–30; 42, 283–305; 43, 358–84; 44, 336–56.

FREEMAN, PHILIP 2006: 'Greek and Roman accounts of the ancient Celts', in John T. Koch (ed.), *Celtic Culture: A Historical Encyclopedia* (Santa Barbara), 844–50.

FOMIN, MAXIM (ed. and trans.) 2013: '*Tecosca Cormaic*', in idem, *Instructions for Kings: Secular and Clerical Images of Kingship in Early Ireland and Ancient India*, Empirie und Theorie der Sprachwissenschaft 2 (Heidelberg), 149–61.

GANTZ, JEFFREY (trans.) 1981a: 'The Birth of Cú Chulaind', in Jeffrey Gantz, *Early Irish Myths and Sagas* (London and New York), 130–33.

——, (trans.) 1981b: 'The Wasting Sickness of Cú Chulaind & The Only Jealousy of Emer', in Jeffrey Gantz, *Early Irish Myths and Sagas* (London and New York), 155–78.

GARDINER, IAIN and LIEU, SAMUEL N. C. (eds) 2004: *Manichean Texts from the Roman Empire* (Cambridge 2004).

GILBY, THOMAS (ed.) 1964–81: *'Summa theologiae': Latin Text and English Translation, Introductions, Notes, Appendices, and Glossaries*, 61 vols (Cambridge).

GOW, A. S. F. and PAGE, D. L. (eds and trans.) 1968: *'Anthologia Graeca': The Greek Anthology, The Garland of Philip, and Some Contemporary Epigrams*, 2 vols (Cambridge).

GRUBE, G. M. A. and REEVE, C. D. C. (trans.) 1997: 'Republic', in John M. Cooper and D. S. Hutchinson (eds), *Plato: Complete Works* (Indianapolis), 971–1223.

GUTHRIE, KENNETH SYLVAN and FIDELER, DAVID 1987–8: *The Pythagorean Sourcebook and Library* (Grand Rapids).

GUYONVARC'H, CHRISTIAN-J. and LE ROUX, FRANÇOISE 1986: *Les Druides* (Rennes).

HARDIE, PHILIP 1995: 'The Speech of Pythagoras in Ovid *Metamorphoses* 15: Empedoclean *Epos*', *The Classical Quarterly* 45.1, 204–14.

HILL, EDMUND O. P. (trans.) 2002: *Saint Augustine: On Genesis [On Genesis: A Refutation of the Manichees, Unfinished Literal Commentary on Genesis, The Literal Meaning of Genesis]*, The Works of Saint Augustine: A Translation for the 21st Century I.13 (Hyde Park, New York).

HOLMES, PETER (trans.) 1886–9a: 'Augustine: *On the Grace of Christ and on Original Sin'*, in Philip Schaff and Henry Wace (eds), *A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church*, 28 vols in 2 series (Oxford), Series 1, V, 217–57.

——, 1886–9b: 'Augustine: *On the Merits and Remission of Sins and on Baptism'*, in Philip Schaff and Henry Wace (eds), *A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church*, 28 vols in 2 series (Oxford and New York) Series 1 V, 15–79.

HULL, VERNAM (ed. and trans.) 1933: '*De Gabáil in t-Shída* (Concerning the Seizure of the Fairy Mound)', *ZCP* 19, 53–8.

——, (ed. and trans.) 1949: '*Echtra Cormaic maic Airt*, "The Adventure of Cormac mac Airt"', *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America* 64, 871–83.

IMHOFF, HELEN 2008: 'The themes and structure of *Aided Echach maic Maireda*', *Ériu* 58, 107–31.

JOHNSTON, ELVA 2015: '*Immacallam Choluim Chille 7 ind Óclaig*: language and authority in an early-medieval Irish tale', in Emer Purcell, Paul MacCotter, Julianne Nyhan and John Sheehan (eds), *Clerics, Kings and Vikings: Essays on Medieval Ireland in Honour of Donnchadh Ó Corráin* (Dublin), 418–28.

JONES, CHARLES W. (ed.) 1975–80: *Bedae opera pars I: Opera didiscalia*, 3 vols, Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina 123 A–C (Turnhout).

JONES, HORACE LEONARD (ed. and trans.) 1917–32: *Strabo: 'Geography'*, 8 vols, Loeb Classical Library 49, 50, 182, 196, 211, 223, 241, 267 (Cambridge, MA).

KABIR, ANANYA JAHANARA 2004: *Paradise, Death and Doomsday in Anglo-Saxon Literature*, Cambridge Studies in Anglo-Saxon England 32 (Cambridge).

KELLEHER, JOHN V. 1971: 'The *Táin* and the Annals', *Ériu* 22 (1971), 107–27.

KEMPF, KARL FRIEDRICH (ed.) 1854: *Valeri Maximi Factorvm et dictorvm memorabilivm libri novem* (Berlin).

KIMPTON, BETTINA (ed. and trans.) 2009: *The Death of Cú Chulainn: A Critical Edition of the Earliest Version of 'Brislech Mór Maige Muirtheimni' with Introduction, Translation, Notes, Bibliography and Commentary*, Maynooth Medieval Irish Texts 6 (Maynooth).

KING, J. CHRISTOPHER 2005: *Origen and the Song of Songs as the Spirit of Scripture: The Bridegroom's Perfect Marriage Song* (Oxford).

KINSELLA, THOMAS (trans.) 1969: 'The Quarrel of the Two Pig-Keepers and How the Bulls were Begotten', in Thomas Kinsella (trans.), *The Táin: Translated from the Irish Epic 'Táin Bó Cuailnge'* (London), 46–51.

KNIBB, MICHAEL A. (ed. and trans.) 1978: *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch: A New Edition in Light of the Aramaic Dead Sea Fragments* (Oxford).

KNOTT, ELEANOR (ed.) 1936: *Togail Bruidne Dá Derga*, Medieval and Modern Irish Series 8 (Dublin).

KOCH, JOHN T. and CAREY, JOHN et al (trans.) 2003: *The Celtic Heroic Age: Literary Sources for Ancient Celtic Europe & Early Ireland & Wales*, Celtic Studies Publications 1, 4th ed. (Aberystwyth).

LAPIDGE, MICHAEL 2005: *The Anglo-Saxon Library* (Oxford).

LAWSON, R. P. (trans.) 1957: *Origen: The Song of Songs: Commentary and Homilies*, Ancient Christian Writers 26 (London and Westminster, MD).

LITWA, M. DAVID (ed. and trans.) 2016: *Refutation of All Heresies*, Writings from the Greco-Roman World 40 (Atlanta).

MACALISTER, R. A. S. (ed. and trans.) 1938–56: *Lebor Gabála Érenn*, 5 vols, ITS 34–5, 39, 41, 44 (Dublin).

MAC CANA, PROINSIAS 1972: 'Mongán mac Fiachnai and *Immram Brain*', *Ériu* 23, 102–42.

——, 1975: 'On the "prehistory" of *Immram Brain*', *Ériu* 26, 33–52.

——, 1976: 'The sinless otherworld of *Immram Brain*', *Ériu* 27 (1976), 95–115.

——, 1980: *The Learned Tales of Medieval Ireland* (Dublin).

——, 1983: *Celtic Mythology* (London).

——, 1987: '*Fianaigecht* in the pre-Norman period', *Béaloideas* 54/55, 75–99.

MAC MATHÚNA, SÉAMUS 1985: *'Immram Brain': Bran's Journey to the Land of the Women*, Buchreihe der Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie 2 (Tübingen).

MAINOLDI, ERNESTO SERGIO N. (ed.) 2003: *Giovanni Scoto Eriugena: De praedestinatione liber: Dialettica e teologia all'apogeo della rinascenza carolingia* (Firenze).

MATTER, E.A. 1990: *The Voice of My Beloved: The Song of Songs in Medieval Western Christianity* (Philadelphia).

MCCONE, KIM 1986: 'Dubthach Maccu Lugair and a matter of life and death in the Pseudo-Historical Prologue to *Senchas Már*', *Peritia* 5, 1–35.

——, 2000a: *'Echtrae Chonnlai' and the Beginnings of Vernacular Narrative Writing in Ireland*, Maynooth Medieval Irish Texts 1 (Maynooth).

——, 2000b: *Pagan Past and Christian Present in Early Irish Literature*, Maynooth Monographs 3 (Maynooth).

——, 2005: *A First Old Irish Grammar and Reader Including an Introduction to Middle Irish* (Maynooth).

MCLEOD, NEIL 1982: 'On the concept of law in Irish jurisprudence', *Irish Jurist* 17, 356–67.

MCNAMARA, MARTIN 1975: *The Apocrypha in the Early Irish Church* (Dublin).

——, 2003: 'Apocalyptic and eschatological texts in Irish Literature: oriental connections?', in Martin MacNamara (ed.), *Apocalyptic and Eschatological Heritage: The Middle East and Celtic Realms* (Dublin), 75–97.

——, 2006: '*Navigatio sancti Brendani*: some possible connections with liturgical, apocryphal and Irish tradition', in Glyn S. Burgess and Clara Strijbosch (eds), *The Brendan Legend: Texts and Versions* (Leiden), 159–93.

MEYER, KUNO (ed.) 1882: '*Macgnímartha Find*', *RC* 5, 195–204.

——, (ed. and trans.) 1895–7: 'The Voyage of Bran Son of Febal', in Kuno Meyer and Alfred Nutt (eds), *The Voyage of Bran Son of Febal to the Land of the Living*, 2 vols (London) I, 1–99.

MILLER, FRANK JUSTUS (ed. and trans.) 1984: *Ovid: Metamorphoses*, 2 vols, Loeb Classical Library 42–3 (Cambridge, MA).

MORAN, DERMOT 2002: 'Time and eternity in the *Periphyseon*', in James McEvoy and Michael Dunne (eds), *History and Eschatology in John Scottus Eriugena and His Time*, Proceedings of the Tenth International Conference of the Society for the Promotion of Eriugenian Studies, Maynooth and Dublin, August 16–20, 2000 (Leuven), 487–508.

MORESCHINI, CLAUDIO (ed.) 2005: *Boethivs: De consolatione philosophiae. Opvscvla Theologica*, Bibliotheca scriptorium Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana (Munich and Leipzig).

MURPHY, GERARD 1961: *Early Irish Metrics* (Dublin).

MURRAY, KEVIN (ed. and trans.) 2001: 'The Finding of the *Táin*', *CMCS* 41, 17–23.

——, (ed. and trans.) 2014: 'The Voyaging of St Columba's Clerics', in John Carey, Emma Nic Cárthaigh and Caitríona Ó Dochartaigh (eds), *The End and Beyond: Medieval Irish Eschatology*, Celtic Studies Publications 17 (Aberystwyth) II, 761–823.

——, 2017: *The Early Finn Cycle* (Dublin).

NAGY, JOSEPH FALAKY (trans.) 1997: *Conversing with Angels and Ancients: Literary Myths of Medieval Ireland* (Ithaca and London).

NEWMAN, J. K. 1988: 'Review: *The Annals of Quintus Ennius* by Otto Skutch', *The American Journal of Philology* 109.3, 431–41.

NÍ DHONNCHADHA, MÁIRIN 2007: 'Seeing things: revelation in Gaelic literature', *CMCS* 53–4 [= *Croesi ffiniau: Trafodion y XIIfed Gyngres Astudiaethau Celtaidd Ryngwladol 24–30 Awst 2003, Prifysgol Cymru, Aberystwyth* / *Crossing Boundaries: Proceedings of the XIIth International Congress of Celtic Studies 24–30 August 2003, University of Wales, Aberystwyth*], 103–12.

NUTT, ALFRED (1895–7a): 'The Celtic doctrine of rebirth', in Kuno Meyer and Alfred Nutt (eds), *The Voyage of Bran Son of Febal to the Land of the Living*, 2 vols (London), II, 1–281.

——, (1895–7b): 'The happy otherworld in the mythico-romantic literature of the Irish', in Kuno Meyer and Alfred Nutt (eds), *The Voyage of Bran Son of Febal to the Land of the Living*, 2 vols (London), I, 101–331.

Ó HAODHA, DONNCHA (trans.) 1997: 'The poetic version of the *Voyage of Snédgus and Mac Ríagla*', in Anders Ahlqvist and Věra Čapková (eds), *Dán do Oide: Essays in Memory of Conn R. Ó Cléirigh* (Dublin), 419–30.

Ó CATHASAIGH, TOMÁS 1978: 'The semantics of *síd*', *Éigse* 17.2, 137–55.

O'CONNOR, RALPH 2008: 'Prophecy, storytelling and the Otherworld in *Togail Bruidne Da Derga*', in Katja Ritari and Alexandra Bergholm (eds), *Approaches to Religion and Mythology in Celtic Studies* (Newcastle), 55–68.

Ó Corráin, Donnchadh 1987: 'Irish vernacular law and the Old Testament', in Próinséas Ní Chatháin and Michael Richter (eds), *Irland und die Christenheit: Bibelstudien und Mission. Ireland and Christendom: The Bible and the Missions* (Stuttgart), 284–307.

O' Donnell, James J. 1992: *Augustine: Confessions*, 3 vols (Oxford).

O'Grady, Standish Hayes 1892: *Silva Gadelica*, 2 vols, London.

O'Kelleher, A. and Schoepperle, G. (eds and trans.) 1918: *Betha Colaim Chille: Life of Columcille. Compiled by Manus O'Donnell in 1532 [Edited and Translated from Manuscript Rawlinson B. 514 in the Bodleian Library, Oxford]*, University of Illinois Bulletin 15.48 (Urbana, Illinois)

Oldfather, C. H. et al (ed. and trans.) 1939–67: *Diodorus Siculus: 'Library of History'*, 12 vols, Loeb Classical Library 279, 303, 340, 375, 384, 399, 389, 422, 377, 390, 409, 423 (Cambridge, MA).

O'Meara, Dominic J. 1989: *Pythagoras Revived: Mathematics and Philosophy in Late Antiquity* (Oxford).

O'Meara, John J. (trans.) 1978: *The Voyage of Saint Brendan: Journey to the Promised Land* (Dublin).

Ó Néill, Pádraig 1999: 'The Latin colophon to the *Táin Bó Cúailnge* in the Book of Leinster: a critical view of Old Irish literature', *Celtica* 23, 269–75.

O'Rahilly, Cecile (ed. and trans.) 1967: '*Táin Bó Cúailnge*': *From the Book of Leinster* (Dublin).

Orlandi, Giovanni and Guglielmetti, Rossana E. (eds) 2014: *'Navigatio sancti Brendani': Alla scorperta dei segreti meravigliosi del mondo* (Florence).

Plummer, Charles (ed. and trans.) 1925: 'Litany of Irish Saints II', in Charles Plummer, *Irish Litanies: Text and Translation*, Henry Bradshaw Society 62 (London), ed. 68–76 and trans. 69–77.

Pokorny, Julius 1928: 'Conle's abenteuerliche Fahrt', *ZCP* 17, 193–205.

Rangos, Spyridon 2012: 'Empedocles on Divine Nature', *Revue de metaphysique et de morale* 74, 315–38.

Riedweg, Christoph 2005: *Pythagoras: His Life, Teaching and Influence*, trans. Steven Rendell (Ithaca and London).

Roberts, Alexander and Rambaut, W. H. (trans.) 1867–85: 'Irenaeus: *Against the Heresies*', in Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson (eds), *Ante-Nicene Fathers: The Writings of the Fathers Down to A.D. 325*, 24 vols (Edinburgh) V, 1 [Books 1–4.5]; IX, 1–157 [Books 4.5–5].

Rolfe, John C. (ed. and trans.) 1989: *Ammianus Marcellinus: History*, 3 vols, Loeb Classical Library 300, 315 and 331 (Cambridge, MA).

Russell, Paul (trans.) 2008: 'Poets, power and possessions: some stories from *Sanas Cormaic*', in Joseph F. Eska (ed.), *Law, Literature and Society*, CSANA Yearbook 7 (Dublin), 9–45.

Russell, Paul, Arbuthnot, Sharon and Moran, Pádraic (eds) 2006–: *Sanas Cormaic* (Cambridge), at the Early Irish Glossaries Database: https://ww.asnc.cam.ac.uk/irishglossaries/texts.php (accessed 1 June 2020).

Sanderlin, Sarah 1975: 'The date and provenance of the *Litany of Irish Saints-II*' (*The Irish Litany of Pilgrim Saints*)', *PRIA* 75 C, 251–62.

SCARRE, A. M. (ed.) 1907–13: 'Airne Fingein inso', in Osborn Bergin, R. I. Best, Kuno Meyer and J. G. O'Keeffe (eds), *Anecdota from Irish manuscripts*, 5 vols (Halle and Dublin) II, 1–10.

SEGAL, CHARLES P. 2001: 'Intertextuality and immortality: Ovid, Pythagoras and Lucretius in *Metamorphoses* 15', *Materiali e discussioni per l'analisi dei testi classici* 46, 63–101.

SIEWERS, ALFRED K. 2014: 'The *Periphyseon*, the Irish "Otherworld", and Early Medieval nature', in Willemien Otten and Michael I. Allen (eds), *Eriugena and Creation: Proceedings of the Eleventh International Conference on Eriugenian Studies, Held in Honor of Edouard Jeauneau, Chicago, 9–12 November 2011* (2014), 321–47.

SKUTSCH, OTTO 1985: *The Annals of Quintus Ennius* (Oxford).

SILVERSTEIN, THEODORE and HILHORST, ANTHONY (eds) 1997: *Apocalypse of Paul: A New Critical Edition of Three Long Latin Versions*, Chiers d'orientalisme 21 (Geneva).

SLINGS, S. R. (ed.) 2003: *Platonis Rempublicam* (Oxford).

SMITH, ANDREW 1984: 'Did Porphyry reject the transmigration of human souls into animals?', *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie, Neue Folge* 127, 276–84.

SMYTH, MARINA (trans.) 2011: 'The seventh-century Hiberno-Latin treatise *Liber de ordine creaturarum*. A translation', *Journal of Medieval Latin* 21, 137–222.

STAHL, WILLIAM HARRIS et al (trans.) 1977: *Martianus Capella and the Seven Liberal Arts: Vol II. The Marriage of Philology and Mercury*, Records of Civilization: Sources and Studies 84 (New York).

STÄHLIN, OTTO (ed.) 1906–9: *Clemens Alexandrinus: Stromata*, 2 vols, Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller 15, 17 (Leipzig) I [= libri I–VI]; II, 1–102 [= libri VII–VIII].

STIFTER, DAVID 2017: 'Ulster connections of *Cín Dromma Snechtai*', in Mícheál B. Ó Mainnín and Gregory Toner (eds), *Ulidia 4: Proceedings of the Fourth International Conference on the Ulster Cycle of Tales* (Dublin), 23–37.

——, 2019a: 'The language of the *Cín Dromma Snechtai* texts', a lecture given at the conference 'A Little Remnant of the Work of the Ancients": 23 N 10, The Book of Ballycumin', at the Royal Irish Academy (Dublin), on March 8th. Accessible online at: https://soundcloud.com/the-royal-irish-academy/david-stifter (accessed 1 June 2020).

——, 2019b: 'The language of the *Cín Dromma Snechtai* texts', the handout for a lecture given at the conference 'A Little Remnant of the Work of the Ancients': 23 N 10, The Book of Ballycumin', at the Royal Irish Academy (Dublin), on March 8th. Acessible online at: https://www.ria.ie/sites/default/files/stifter_david_fri_9am.pdf (accessed 1 June 2020).

STOKES, WHITLEY (ed. and trans.) 1880–1909: '*Acallamh na Senórach*', in Ernst Windisch and Whitley Stokes (eds), *Irische Texte mit Wörterbuch*, 4 vols (Leipzig) IV.1, 1–438.

——, (ed. and trans.) 1895–7: 'The Annals of Tigernach', *RC* 16, 374–419; 17, 6–33, 119–223, 337–420; 18, 9–59, 150–198, 267–303.

——, (ed. and trans.) 1904: 'Tidings of the Resurrection', *RC* 25, 230–59.

——, (ed. and trans.) 1905: *Félire Óengusso Céli Dé. The Martyrology of Oengus the Culdee*, Henry Bradshaw Society 29 (London).

STOKES, WHITLEY and STRACHAN, JOHN (ed. and trans.) 1901–10: *Thesaurus Palaeohibernicus: A Collection of Old-Irish Glosses, Scholia, Prose, and Verse*, 3 vols (Cambridge).

THURNEYSEN, RUDOLF (ed. and trans.) 1904: *Zwei Versionen der mittelirischen Legende von Snedgus und Mac Riagla* (Halle).

TONER, GREGORY 2005: 'Authority verse and the transmission of *senchas*', *Ériu* 55, 59–84.

TURNER, DENYS 1995: *Eros and Allegory: Medieval Exegesis of the Song of Songs*, Cistercian Studies Series 156 (Kalamazoo).

VAN HAMEL, A. G. (ed.) 1933: *Compert Con Culainn,* Mediaeval and Modern Irish Series 3 (Dublin)'.

VENDRYES, JOSEPH (ed.) 1953: *Airne Fíngein*, Mediaeval and Modern Irish Series 15 (Dublin).

WALLIS, FAITH (trans.) 1999: *Bede: The Reckoning of Time*, Translated Texts for Historians 29 (Liverpool).

WATSON, DANIEL JAMES 2018a: 'A law beyond grace in the Prologue to *Senchas Már*', *Dionysius* 36, 200–14.

——, 2018b: *Philosophy in Early Medieval Ireland: Nature, Hierarchy and Inspiration*, unpublished PhD thesis, 2 vols, Maynooth University, Maynooth.

——, [forthcoming] *The limits of human being: varieties of animal reembodiment in early Irish literature*.

WATSON, J. C. (ed.) 1941: *Mesca Ulad* (Dublin).

WATTS, V. E. (trans.) 1969: *Boethius: The Consolation of Philosophy* (London and New York).

WEATHERBEE, WINTHROP (ed. and trans.) 2015: 'Cosmographia', in W. Weatherbee, *Poetic Works: Bernardus Silvestris* (Cambridge, MA and London).

WEBER, DOROTHEA (ed.) *Augustinus: De Genesi contra Manichaeos*, Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum 91 (Vienna).

WILLIAMS, MARK 2016: *Ireland's Immortals: A History of the Gods of Irish Myth* (Philedelphia).

WHITE, NORA (ed. and trans.) 2006: '*Compert Mongáin*' *and Three Other Early Mongán Tales,* Maynooth Medieval Irish Texts 5 (Maynooth).

WOODING, JONATHAN M. (ed.) 2000: *The Otherworld Voyage in Early Irish Literature: An Anthology of Criticism* (Dublin).

—, 2009: 'Reapproaching the pagan Celtic past: anti-nativism, asterisk reality and the Late-Antiquity paradigm', *Studia Celtica Fennica* 6, 51–74.

WRIGHT, CHARLES D. 2014: 'Next-to-last things: the interim state of souls in Early Irish literature', in John Carey, Emma Nic Cárthaigh and Caitríona Ó Dochartaigh (eds), *The End and Beyond: Medieval Irish Eschatology*, 2 vols, Celtic Studies Publications 17 (Aberystwyth), I, 309–96.

ZYCHA, JOSEPH 1894: *Sancti Aureli Augustini opera: De Genesi ad litteram libri duodecim eiusdem libri Capitula; De Genesi ad litteram inperfectus liber; Locutionum in Heptateuchum libri septem*, Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum 28.1 (Vienna).

APPENDICES

1. Irenaeus, Adversus Haereses, *V.v.1*

multo tempore perseverant corpora, in quantum placuit Deo bene habere […] Quandoquidem Enoch placens Deo, in quo placuit corpore translatus est, translationem justorum præmonstrans. Et Elias, sicut erat in plasmatis substantia, assumptus est, assumptionem partum prophetans: et nihil impediit eos corpus in translationem et assumptionem eorum […] dicunt presbyteri, qui sunt apostolorum discipuli, eos qui translati sunt, illuc translatos esse (justis enim hominibus, et Spiritum habentibus præparatus est paradisus, in quem et Paulus apostolus asportatus audivit sermones inenarrabiles, quantum ad nos in præsenti); et ibi manere eos qui translati sunt usque ad consummationem, coauspicantes incorruptelam.' (*PG* 7, col. 1134–5)

'bodies did continue in existence for a lengthened period, as long as it was God's good pleasure that they should flourish […] Enoch, when he pleased God, was translated in the same body in which he did please Him, thus pointing out by anticipation the translation of the just. Elijah, too, was caught up *when he was yet* in the substance of the *natural* form; thus exhibiting in prophecy the assumption of those who are spiritual, and that nothing stood in the way of their body being translated and caught up […] the elders who were disciples of the apostles tell us that those who were translated were transferred to that place [for paradise has been prepared for righteous men, such as have the Spirit; in which place also Paul the apostle, when he was caught up, heard words which are unspeakable as regards us in our present condition], and that there shall they who have been translated remain until the consummation *of all things*, as a prelude to immortality.' (Roberts and Rambaut, trans. 1867–92, ix: 65–6)

2. Augustine, De peccatorum meritis et remissione, *I.iii*

Neque enim Enoch et Elias per tam longam ætatem senectute marcuerunt. Nec tamen credo eos jam in illam spiritualem qualitatem corporis commutatos, qualis in resurrectione promittitur, quæ in Domino prima præcessit: nisi quia isti fortasse nec his cibis egent, qui sui consumptione reficiunt; sed ex quo translati sunt, ita vivunt, ut similem habeant satietatem illis quadraginta diebus, quibus Elias ex calice aquæ et ex collyride panis sine cibo vixit: aut si et his sustentaculis opus est, ita in paradiso fortasse pascuntur, sicut Adam priusquam propter peccatum exinde exire meruisset. Habebat enim, quantum existimo, et de lignorum fructibus refectionem contra defectionem, et de ligno vitæ stabilitatem contra vetustatem. (*PL* 44, col. 111)

'For Enoch and Elijah were not reduced to the decrepitude of old age by their long life. But yet I do not believe that they were then changed into that spiritual kind of body, such as is promised in the resurrection, and which the Lord was the first to receive; only they probably do not need those aliments, which by their use minister refreshment to the body; but ever since their translation they so live, as to enjoy such a sufficiency as was provided during the forty days in which Elijah lived on the cruse of water and the cake, without substantial

food; or else, if there be any need of such sustenance, they are, it may be, sustained in Paradise in some such way as Adam was, before he brought on himself expulsion therefrom by sinning. And he, as I suppose, was supplied with sustenance against decay from the fruit of the various trees, and from the tree of life with security against old age.' (Holmes, trans. 1886–9b: 16)

3. Echtrae Chonnlai *§3, 9 [= Carey (2011) §1, 9]*
'Dodeochad-sa,' for in ben, 'a tírib beó, / áit inna bí bás nó peccad na imorbus. / Domelom fleda búana can rithgnom. / Caíncomrac leind cen debaid. / Síd mór i taam: / conid de suidib nonn ainmnigther aés síde […] [I] n-all suide saides Condla / eter marbu duthainai, / oc idnaidiu éca uathmair. / Totchurethar bíi bithbi. / At gérat do daínib Tethrach, / ardotchiat cach dia / i ndálaib t'athardai, / eter du gnathu inmaini.' (Carey, ed. 2011: 27 and 32; but see also McCone, ed. 2000a: 121–2)

'"I come from lands of living folk," said the woman, / "where there is no death nor sin nor transgression. / We consume everlasting feasts without labour. / There is concord among us without strife. / It is a great *síd* in which we are; / so that because of this we are called *aes síde* […] Upon a cliff's edge is Connlae's seat / among the impermanent dead, / awaiting fearsome death. / Ever-living ones summon you. / You are the darling of the folk of Tethra / who see you every day / in the assemblies of your native place / among the dear folk whom you know."' (Carey, trans. 2011: 28 and 32; but see also McCone, trans. 2000a: 132–6, 169–72)

4. Immram Brain, *§9–10, 44–5*
9. 'Ní gnáth écoíniud ná mrath / hi mruig dénta etargnath, / ní bíi nach gargg fri crúais, / acht mad céul m-bind frismben clúais. / 10. Cen brón, cen duba, cen bás, / cen nach n-galar cen indgás […] 44. Fil dún ó thossuch dúle / cen áiss, cen foirbthe n-úre, / ní-frescam de mbeth anguss, / níntáraill int immorbus. / 45. Olc líth dolluid ind nathir / cosin n-athir dia chathir, / sáib sí céni i m-bith ché / co m-bu haithbe nad búe.' (Meyer, ed. 1895–7: 7 and 23–5)

'9. "Unknown is wailing or treachery / In the familiar cultivated land, / There is nothing rough or harsh, / But sweet music striking on the ear. / 10. Without grief, without sorrow, without death, / Without any sickness, without debility […] 44. We are from the beginning of creation / Without old age, without consummation of earth, / Hence we expect not that there should be frailty, / The sin has not come to us. / 45. An evil day when the serpent went / To the father to his city! / She has perverted the times in this world, / So that there came decay which was not original."' (Meyer, trans. 1895–7: 6 and 22–4)

5. Echtrae Chonnlai, *§4, 7–8*
4. 'Cía ad:gláiter?' ol Conn Cétchathach. Ni:acci nech in mnaí acht Connle a óenur […] 7. Do:cachain íarum for suidiu inna mná co-nna:cóle nech guth inna mná ⁊ co-nna:haccae Connle in mnaí ind úair sin. In tan luide in ben ass re rochetul in druad, do:corastar ubull do Chonnlu. 8. Boí Connle íar sin co cenn mís cen dig cen biad, nabu fiu leis nach tóare do thomailt acht a ubull. Na nní

do:meled, nícon:dígbad ní dend ubull acht ba hóg-som beos. Gabais éolchaire íarom Connle immun deilb inna mná ad:condairc. (McCone, ed., 2000a: 121–2)

'4. "Who are you talking to?" said Conn of the Hundred Battles. No one saw the woman but Connlae alone […] 7. Then he intoned over the seat/location of the woman so that no one heard the woman's voice and so that Connlae did not see the woman at that time. When the woman went away [lit. out of it] in response to [lit. before] the druid's chanting she threw an apple to Connlae. 8. Thereafter Connlae was without drink [and] without food until the end of a month and he did not deem any substance worth eating [lit. any sustenance was not worthwhile with him for consuming] save his apple. Nothing that he ate took anything away from the apple but it remained [lit. was still] whole. Longing then seized Connlae for the appearance of the woman that he had seen.' (McCone, trans., 2000a: 137, 159–63)

6. Immram Brain, *§26–8, 48*
26. Ticfa már-gein íar m-bethaib / nád bía for forclethaib, / mac mná nad festar céle, / gébid flaith na n-ilmíle. / 27. Flaith cen tossach cen forcenn, / dorúasat bith co forban, / isai talam ocus muir, / is mairgg bías fua étuil. / 28. Is hé dorigni nime, / céinmair dia m-ba findchride, / glanfid slúagu fua linn glan, / is hé ícfes for tedman […] / 48. Ticfa tessarcon úasal / ónd ríg dorearúasat, / recht find fuglóisfe muire, / sech bíd Día, bíd duine. (Meyer, ed. 1895–7: 15, 23)

'26. "A great birth will come after ages, / That will not be in a lofty place, / The son of a woman whose mate will not be known, / He will seize the rule of many thousands. / 27. A rule without beginning, without end, / He has created the whole world so that it is perfect, / Whose are earth and sea, / Woe to him that shall be under His unwill! / 28. 'Tis He that made the heavens, / Happy he that has a white heart, / He will purify hosts under pure water, / 'Tis He that will heal your sicknesses […] 48. A noble salvation will come / From the King who has created us, / A white law will come over seas, / Besides being God, He will be man."' (Meyer, trans., 1895–7: 14, 22)

7. Boethius, Consolatio Philosophiae, *V.vi.4–8 [prosa]*
4. Aeternitas igitur est interminabilis vitae tota simul et perfecta possessio, quod ex collatione temporalium clarius liquet [...] 6. Quod igitur temporis patitur condicionem [...] nec coeperit umquam esse nec desinat vitaque eius cum temporis infinitate tendatur, nondum tamen tale est, ut aeternum esse iure credatur [...] 8. Quod igitur interminabilis vitae plenitudinem totam pariter comprehendit ac possidet, cui neque futuri quicquam absit nec praeteriti fluxerit, id aeternum esse iure perhibetur (Moreschini, ed., 2005: 155–6.)

'Eternity, then, is the complete, simultaneous and perfect possession of everlasting life; this will be clear from a comparison with creatures that exist in time [...] Whatever, therefore, suffers the condition of being in time, even though it never had any beginning, never has any ending and its life extends

into the infinity of time [...] it is still not such that it may properly be considered eternal [...] that which embraces and possesses simultaneously the whole fullness of everlasting life, which lacks nothing of the future and has lost nothing of the past, that is what may properly be said to be eternal.' (Watts, trans. (1969: 163–4ff.)

8. Immacaldam, *ll. 22–30*
At-raig Colum Cille, oca ndécsin a muintire, leis for leith dia acaldaim ⁊ dia iarfaigid na rún nemdae ⁊ talmandae […] In tain mboíe a muinter oca guidi Choluim Chille ara foillsiged dóib ní don chobrunn, as-bert Colum Cille friu nád coimnacuir cid oenbréthir do epirt do neuch ro ráided fris; ocus as-bert ba móu do les do doínib a nemaisnéis dóib. (Carey, ed., 2002: 60)

'Looking toward his followers, Colum Cille arises and went aside with him, to speak with him and to ask him about the heavenly and earthly mysteries […] When Colum Cille's followers were asking him to reveal to them something of the conversation (?), Colum Cille told them that he could not tell them even a single word of anything that he had been told; and he said that it was better for mortals not to be informed of it.' (Carey, trans., 2002: 61)

Daniel James Watson

Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies

RÍAGAIL NA MANACH LÍATH 'THE RULE OF THE GREY MONKS': A LATE MEDIAEVAL FABRICATION

Abstract

In this paper it is shown that the text which goes under the name of *Ríagail na Manach Líath* is not in fact an early rule, but rather a collection of heterogeneous verses, and it is argued that they were put together and supplied with the title by the fifteenth-century learned scribe Uilliam Mac an Leagha. Each of the ten verses is edited separately, with a translation and notes.

The texts printed by John Strachan (1905) under the title 'Two monastic rules' are in the form of a diplomatic edition, with a number of comments and suggested emendations in footnotes, but without a translation.[1] The only copies are in section A of RIA MS 23 P 3 (1242); the text with which this paper is concerned is on fol. 13vb37–14ra22, and the other, with the MS heading *Rīag*ail *Chīarāin ann sō* 'The Rule of Cíarán here below', takes up the whole of the first column of fol. 14v.

The contents of Section A are for the most part religious texts, with copies of *Félire Óengusso*, *Apgitir Chrábaid*, homilies, etc., and on folios 13–14va, an acephalous copy of *Ríagail Ailbi*, and a copy of *Ríagail in Choimded*, preceding the text edited here, and copies of *Taibret duit a coibsena*, *Ríagail Chormaic maic Cuilennáin*, and *Ríagail Chíaráin*, following it. Of this latter group, the copies of *Ríagail na Manach Líath*, *Ríagail Chíaráin*, and *Taibret duit a coibsena* are unique to this MS.[2] The other three MS copies of *Ríagail Ailbi* supply the title,[3] and one thing that the rest of this group of texts in MS 23 P 3 have in common is that, apart from *Taibret duit a coibsena*, they are all supplied with a title in the MS, in all cases beginning with *Ríagail*.[4] In this paper I will show that, whatever about the other texts, the so-called *Ríagail na Manach Líath* can under no circumstances be regarded as a rule.

It is presented in the MS as follows:[5]

Riag*ail* namanac*h* líath and so

[1] Coran*n* liat*h* l*eth*et baisi. rolas oclosg*ud* d*r*isi. nípa romór i*n*maisi. ce*n* ní drosa*cht* i*n*d loisi.

[1]References to 'Strachan' below are to this edition together with the footnotes.

[2]*Taibret duit a coibsena* has not been edited; for editions of the others see below p. 80.

[3]See O Neill (1907: 95).

[4]It is abbreviated *Riag–* in every instance.

[5]I number the verses and italicise all abbreviations. Punctuation and word-division are as in the MS. Ligatured *æ* is expanded as *ae*.

 ©Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies

[2] Atloch*ur*. do m*a*c dé uasal amra. oc*r*ois co*m*bac*h*uil núi. beit*h* atai ci*n* labra

[3] Cu*m*a limsa ní do*n*bit*h*. *acht* ropcleircig*h*i rop clit*h*. isc*um*a le*m* gid*h* bé d*h*e. a*cht* rop clit*h* ropcleirc*h*id*h*e

[4] Te*cht* don*i*a*r*me*r*g*h*i mór saet*h*. loiscis i*n*gaet*h* mod*h*á nó. munbad o*m*un fiad*h*at fi*n*d. gid bi*n*d i*n*cloc nit*h*iag*h* dó

[5] Ad*h*a*m* sa*m*so*n* solu*m* rí. romersat a mbanai*r*lí. gid*h*bé *con*tuasi f*r*imná. genguas*acht* ní ernama

[6] Dia*m* do d*er*mat deog*h* dobás. ní fotha gaís gni*m* dot*h*áir. p*at*er terc daca*ch* oclaig*h* nai*m*. mai*r*g ricf*ad* uai*m* if*ir*n áin.

[7] Clogán bi*n*d. inacoth*r*aim osn*ach* gli*n*d. isi toil a*r*fiag*h*ad fi*n*d. uath*ad* br*ath*a*r* fo aen cui*n*g

[8] Oralath*ur* suil da*r*cac*h*. atb*eir* lit*er* aid*h*c*h*ei*n* fei*n* bid apa*r*rt*us* f*er* gi*n* g*r*ad*h*. gid fer gu ng*r*ad bid apein

[9] Mai*r*c dana bés bit*h* diult*ad*. mai*r*c n*ach* orrai*m* a liat*h*a misc*uis* ga*ch* buirb ati*nch*osc. b*er*id*h* slea*m*ai*n* af*h*iac*h*a

[10] Nacl*echt* insirfeall sád*h*al. is n*er*t dílen*n* gadig*h*b*ail*. bid*h* anei*m* isna nellaib. feg*h*aid*h* sei*n* a*r*na si*n*aib.

Scribe

The scribe was Uilliam Mac an Leagha, described by Flower (1926: 470), in his account of British Library MS Additional 30512, also written by Mac an Leagha, as 'one of the most prolific scribes of the second half of the 15th century'. He goes on to say that 'he wrote a MS. now in the King's Inns, Dublin, in 1463 (cf. S.H. O'Grady, *Silv. Gad.*, ii. p. vii); R. I. A. MS. 23. P. 3 in 1467 ... part of the Paris MS. Celt. I in 1473 ... part of T. C. D., H. 2. 7; and Add. 11809 and Eg. 91 (the last three undated)'.[6]

Regarding the supposed MS in the King's Inns Library written in 1463, de Brún (1972: xvii n 58) states 'there is no such manuscript now in the collection ... The only item among these manuscripts that might be in Mac an Leagha's hand is the loose leaf inserted in MS 10 which belongs in RIA 23 O 4'.

As for the date of TCD MS H 2. 7 (1298), Mac an Leagha is the scribe of that part of the MS which contains *Stair Ercuil ocus a Bás*, ed. Quin (1939). The editor shows that this version is based on the first edition of Caxton's *The Recuyell of the Historyes of Troye*, printed at Bruges probably in 1474, and argues that Uilliam Mac an Leagha was not only the scribe, but also the translator of *Stair Ercuil* (and of a number of other texts).[7]

He wrote our MS in 1470 'in the house of Oedh Occ († 1491 AU) Magraith *unnsa Mélaigh Moir ar Sliabh Dile* (a border district between Tipperary and Kilkenny)'.[8] For discussion of the work of Uilliam Mac an Leagha as translator

[6]See also Ní Shéaghdha (1967: 57–9), on NLI MS G 9.

[7]Quin (1939, xiv–xxiv, xxxviii–xl); see *Clavis* §1271.

[8]*RIA Cat*. p. 3435. For the location of Mélach Mór, and for the date 1470 (rather than 1467, as in *RIA Cat*.), see Walsh (2003: 287, 467).

and author see, more recently, Breeze (1987: 117–19), Byrne (2016 and 2019), Poppe (2017) and the works referred to therein.

Title and Contents

The verses are headed *Rīagail na Manach Líath and sō* 'The Rule of the Grey Monks here below' in the MS,[9] and this 'rule' has been regularly included in discussions of rules and poems of advice, most recently by the present writer (Breatnach 2008: 1–2). Strachan did not discuss the subject matter of the verses, and it is listed without comment under the heading 'miscellaneous monastic rules' in Kenney (1929: 474). As far as I know, the first discussion of the text is in Follett (2006: 150).[10] While he took the verses to be a single poem, he did raise the important point of the problem with the MS title, namely that since the term *manaig líatha* 'Grey Monks' refers to the Cistercians, it cannot be earlier than the twelfth century. He notes that the adjective *líath* 'grey' appears twice in the verses, singular *líath* in verse I and plural *líatha* in verse IX, and concludes that 'perhaps the title was added by a copyist who mistook this line as a reference to Cistercians'.

Ó Corráin, *Clavis* 821 §636, took a more sceptical view, and it is worth citing his comments in full:

> Not a rule, but a sarcastic poem (10 st.) by a sardonic and lazy monk: 'It is so hard to go to matins, the wind stings my ears, though sweet the bell, I come not there, did I not the fair Lord fear'. He is acerbic about those in orders – they go to hell, while the unordained go to paradise. He is a misogynist: Adam, Samson and Solomon were deluded by women as will anyone who listens to them. But he likes the monastic life of ease.

These verses were included in a series of seminars I conducted in the Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies in 2015–2016 on unedited early Irish rules, and with a close reading of the text, not only did it become clear that it was of a very different nature to the rules, but also that it did not hold together as a single poem. In other words, what we have in the so-called 'Rule of the Grey Monks' is not a single composition, but an assembly of originally separate verses passed off as a rule.[11] I set out below my arguments in support of this view.

Apart from the problems with the title, as already discussed, and the subject-matter, discussed below, there is the question of the incompatibility of both the metrics and the language of the individual verses.

[9]The first word is abbreviated *riag–* in the MS, and Strachan expanded as *riagul*. Since, as will become apparent, the title must be a late fabrication, the abbreviation is to be expanded to the later nsg. form with pal. final *-l*), rather than the OIr form *ríagul*.

[10]The translation offered in Ó Maidín (1996: 49–52) is for the most part far removed from the Irish text, and will not be referred to again.

[11]No individual verse, then, is a forgery.

The text consists of ten verses, and two significant metrical anomalies are the lack of a *dúnad*, and the variation in metre from verse to verse. The metres used are *debide* and *rannaigecht*, with more than one variety of each. Verse I is in *deibide nguilbnech*, verses III and V are in regular *deibide*, while verse VII is in *deibide scaílte ngairit*. On the other hand, verses IV, VI and VIII are in *rannaigecht mór*, verse X is in *rannaigecht bec*, and verse II is in *rannaigecht gairit recomarcach*. As it stands, the metre of verse IX is an irregular form of *rannaigecht* ($7^3\ 7^2\ 7^2\ 7^2$), but if the variant versions are closer to the original (see notes), this pattern results from the re-making of a verse in *aí fhreislige* ($7^3\ 7^2\ 7^3\ 7^2$).

In most verses only the basic requirements of syllable-count and end-rhyme are consistently met. Verse X, however, stands out from the others because of its elaborate metrical scheme, with end-rhyme between *b* and *d* (*dígail* : *sínaib*), the finals of *a* and *c* (*sádail*, *néllaib*) making *úaitne* (consonance) with these, all the remaining stressed words in *b* rhyming with words in *a* (*nert* : *clecht* and *dílenn* : *sírfhell*), *aicill*-rhyme between *c* and *d* (*néllaib* : *fégaid*), and the remaining stressed word in *d*, *sein*, rhyming with *neim* in *c*. In the other verses, internal rhymes are absent, alliteration is sporadic, and of those in *rannaigecht*, only II (with *nuï* : *tuï*) and IV (in both couplets, with *sáeth* : *gáeth* and *find* : *bind*) have *aicill*-rhyme.[12]

There is also considerable linguistic variation between the verses. While a late date might be compatible with some of the verses, it is certainly not so with all of them. Indeed the level of linguistic variation in the verses is so great that it is impossible to be persuaded that they could all belong to the same period. Thus, for example, verses with diagnostic OIr forms are: II with deponent *Ad-tlochur*, and disyllabic *nuï* and *tuï*, and V with deutero-tonic *con-túaisi*. On the other hand, verses with clear indicators of a later date are: VIII with monosyllabic *bíd*, in lines 3 and 4, and X with *gá dígail* (OIr *oca*), monosyllabic *bíd*, dpl. of article in *isna néllaib*, *arna sínaib*, and the demonstrative *sein* (fixed by rhyme with *neim*).

Then there is the question of the subject-matter. A number of early poems of advice which appear to be intended for a general audience have come down to us; many of them have the word *ríagail* 'rule' in the title, and some are as early as the Old Irish period. See, for example, *Ríagail in Choimded*,[13] *Ríagail Chormaic maic Cuilennáin*,[14] *Ríagail Ailbi*,[15] *Anmchairdes Mancháin Léith*[16] and *A chuirp, not chaith fri crábud*.[17] On the other hand, although the poem *Cinnus atá do thinnrem* is specifically addressed to a student, Máel Brigte,

[12]I do not count the repetition of *bíd*, *fer* and *grád* in the fourth line of verse VIII as rhymes with *bíd*, *fer* and *grád* in the third line.

[13]Edited with translation and notes in Strachan (1904), with addenda in Strachan (1905c). See *Clavis* §633. The title is as in RIA MS 23 P 3 (above p. 72), and the only other of the four MS copies which has a title is Brussels Bibliothèque Royale MS 5100–4, with *Riagail Comhgaill Bendchair ind so*; see Strachan (1904, 192; 1905c, 59).

[14]Edited with translation and notes in Strachan (1905b). See *Clavis* §637.

[15]Edited with translation and notes in O Neill (1907). See *Clavis* §632.

[16]Edited Meyer (1910, 310–12). See *Clavis* §867a.

[17]Edited Meyer (1908: 264–6).

it is still fairly typical of the genre of verse rules or poems of advice.[18] These all take the form of either addresses in the second person, or exhortations in the third person imperative. Taken together, however, our ten verses do not conform to either of these patterns. They form neither an address nor an exhortation, and none of the first four verses can by any stretch of the imagination be regarded as part of a poem of advice. Verses II, III and IV are introspective, and even more striking is verse I, which, in its ridiculing of a cleric's appearance, belongs with the genre of satirical verse.

Furthermore, variants of verse IX appear in two other contexts, once as a marginal verse and once as verse 13 of the poem beginning *Fersaighecht an tempuil tall*; for details see the notes. The MS of the former is RIA MS D iv 2 (1223), dated in *RIA Cat*. to the 15th century, with a query. The MS of the latter is the 16th-century Laud 615 (Ó Cuív, 2001: 88). Carney (1940: 243–4) edited and translated three verses, corresponding to verses 3–5 of *Fersaigecht in tempuil tall*, which appear as a separate item with a prose introduction in UCD Franciscan MS A9. There they are represented as being spoken by the ghost of Mac Méig Uidhir in response to a question as to the effectiveness of prayers uttered in haste. Carney argued that these verses did not belong originally to the longer poem; if so, *Fersaigecht in tempuil tall* would itself be a compilation.[19] If it is not, we could envisage the extraction of the verse *Mairg dianad bés bithdíultad* from *Fersaigecht in tempuil tall* as a marginal verse,[20] and the subsequent assimilation of the marginal verse into our compilation.

Marginal verses and the role of Uilliam Mac an Leagha

As for the person responsible for fabricating our rule, in all likelihood it was the scribe himself. I say this as there are two other instances in the hand of Uilliam Mac an Leagha of compilations of originally independent or marginal verses, although these two compilations differ somewhat in nature from the fabrication in question here.

The first of these is the collection in British Library Additional 30512, where most of the verses are marked with the *q*-like paragraph mark.[21] It begins in the second column of folio 32v, takes up the rest of this column, then goes into the lower margin,[22] and finishes with v. 8 on the upper margin of the next page (fol. 33r).

[18]Edited with translation and notes in Breatnach (2008); for parallels between this and the other poems mentioned see ibid., 1.

[19]The three verses form one of the sections composed in *deibide* in a poem which shows a great deal of metrical variation. Verses 1, 2, 6, 12, 14, 17, 19, 20, and 22–34 are written in various forms of *rannaigecht*, verses 3–5, 7–11, 15, 16, and 18 are in *deibide*, and verse 13 is in *aí freislige*.

[20] Instances of marginal verses excerpted from longer poems are: verse 25 of Smith (1994) in TCD MS the Yellow Book of Lecan, cols. 341–2 marg. inf., and verse 8 of Breatnach (2008) in TCD MS H 3. 17 (1336), cols. 150–1 marg. sup. I recently came across a further instance from the latter poem, viz. verse 12 in TCD MS H 4. 22 (1363) p. 47 marg. inf.

[21]Reproduced here with ¶; see Flower (1926: 470, 483).

[22]At the beginning of the second couplet of v. 5.

1. Fil déde
arna caraimsi déde.
ni geibh edrum ⁊ écc.
hi flaith n*im*i nim leige

2. Ni teidi
imcradi (?) indi co leicci.
arrofedar for dedi.
cengain legu rom leige

3. In tal*am* nod melum-ne
ba romór noc charum-ne.
dotiaghum-ne tairisium.
doraga-sum taraiṅde

4. ¶Maith ar maith.
nod b*eir* do-b*er*id flaith
co frith holc níd ebela.
gein mair ce*c*h aen do-déna

5. ¶Fil tri ní
don*ac*h buidech m*a*c Dé bí.
cradbad maídhmech coicsiud serb.
éccnach duine madh indearb

6. ¶Mor ndruiss mór mbaoes mbaile.
mór coll celle mór mire.
uair is arcenn dul d'eccaibh.
beth a n-etoil m*ai*c Muire[23]

7. ¶IS eol dam
in ni is dech dom anmain.
inomain fada mo thaebh seng.
b*e*c reng do breith fo thalm*ain*

8. ¶An ti csacus[24] tri feirg
ed at-b*er*edh in cresin.
les a cheile ni deine.
adbhail a less fadeissin

There are two further verses in the lower margin of fol. 33r. For the sake of completeness, I supply the text and translation here, although they do not belong with the rest. Not only do they lack the paragraph mark found before

[23]This copy of the verse found also in the Codex Boernerianus, 145, ed. *Thes* 2, 296, is noticed in Stokes (1910: 78).

[24]The reading in the corresponding H10 (see below) is *cūrsachas* 'who rebukes'; *csacus* is at the very top of the page, and an *ur*-compendium has doubtless been lost due to trimming of the margin.

verses 4 to 8, but, whereas all the other verses stand alone, these two have to be read as a unit.[25]

Na trēide.
et*er*a mesa a nÉire.
ap ⁊ [a] tān*ais*e
lesclann oga mbeth gēre;

is dobrān re minīascach
seobacc re hēnaibh slēibhe.
catt re loch*aid* cú re muic.
b*en* mic is m*āthai*r chéile.

'The three between whom[26] things are worst in Ireland: an abbot and his deputy, stepchildren where there is acrimony;

like an otter with small fish, a hawk with mountain birds, a cat with a mouse, a hound with a pig, are a son's wife and a husband's mother.'

Now, the collection above overlaps remarkably closely with a set of eleven marginal verses in section 9 of TCD MS H 2. 12 (1309), which were edited and translated by Beatrice Culverwell over a century ago.[27] The verses are distributed regularly over most of its eight folios, with one verse each in the lower margins of the recto and verso of folios 1–5, and the recto of folio 6.

All of the eight verses in the compilation in Additional 30512 appear as marginal verses in H 2. 12, with, however, a slight difference in order,[28] viz. A1 = H4, A2 = H5, A3 = H7, A4 = H6, A5 = H9, A6 = H8, A7 = H11, A8 = H10. The first three marginal verses in H, however, are not matched in A.

The shared verses are as follows in H:[29]

4. 2v: Fil dēde
arná caraim-si téti;
nī tic etram ocus éc,
do flaith neime ním lēici.

[25]The first line of the first verse signals three categories; two are given in the first verse, and the whole of the second verse is devoted to the third category. Nevertheless, the second verse was edited on its own in Meyer (1908: 268).

[26]The form *etera* is the only attestation of the combination of the preposition *eter* with the relative particle and 3sg. pres. ind. of the copula that I know of; what exactly the form in OIr was is another matter, although it probably ended in *-d* (*GOI* §798).

[27]Culverwell (1913).

[28]A = the verses in the compilation in Additional 30512, and H = the marginal verses in H 2. 12.

[29]For the most part I follow the text and translation in Culverwell (1913), but add hyphens and supply macrons over long vowels; any other differences are indicated in the footnotes.

'There are two things on account of which I love not comfort: it does not come between me and death, it does not let me (pass) to heaven's kingdom.'[30]

5. 3r: Nī tēti
ime-rāider colēici;
ar ro-fetar for tēiti,
cinco lēici, rom lēici.

'It is not comfort which is meditated upon meanwhile; for I know your comfort, though it leaves not off, it has left me.'

6. 3v: Maith ar maith –
nī hed not beir de bithflaith;
fō fri olc – nīt ebēla –
cēn mair cach āen dod-gēna.

'Good in return for good is not what shall bring you to the eternal kingdom, [but] good in return for evil – well for him who shall do it – it will not be a loss to you.[31]

7. 4r: In talam do-melam-ne
ba romór no caram-ne
do-tāegam-ne tairisim,
do-ragha-sam taruindi.

'The earth which we wear away (by walking, etc.) – too much it will be that we shall love [it]: Now we go over it, [but the time will come when] it shall go over us [i.e. when we are in our graves].'

8. 4v: Mór drūs, mór mbāes, mór mire,
mór coll cēilli, mór mbaile:
ūair is aircenn dol d'écaib,
beth a n-ētoil mic Muire.

'Great folly, great nonsense, great madness, great lack of reason [it is] – since going to death is certain – to be in (the) displeasure of Mary's Son.'

9. 5r: Fil trī ní,
donāch buidech mac Dé bī:
crābud ūallach, coisced serb

[30]Culverwell (1913, 134) has 'trede (perhaps dede)' in the first line, with the translation 'three things (or two things)'. The MS has *dede*. Also she took *nī* in the third line differently, translating 'anything which comes between me and death'.

[31]Culverwell (1913, 134) translated *nīt ebēla* as 'he shall not die', with a query.

'There are three things with which the Son of the Living God is not pleased; vainglorious piety, bitter rebuking'[32]

10. 5v: An tī cūrsachas tri feirg
edh as-berat in cresin:–
'les a cēile nī dēni
at-baill a les fodesin.'

'He who rebukes in wrath – it is this the pious say [of him]: "his fellow's profit he works not, his own profit perishes".'

11. 6r: Is éol dam
a nn-í is dech dom anmain:
mo nōin fota, mo taīb seng,
bec, reng, do beith a talmain.

'I know the thing that is best for my soul: –[throughout] my long evening, my slender side, small and thin to be in earth [i.e. in the grave].'

The first three verses in H are not matched in A; they are:

1. 1r inf: An ba maiden, an ba fuin,
an ba for tír nó for muir;
acht ro-fetar rachat d'éc
– mór an bét – ní fetar cuin.

'Be it morning, be it sunset, be it on land, be it on sea (I know not); but I know that I shall go to death – great the deed – I know not when.'[33]

2. 1v: Cairdes fría Caitir Fína –
airdles don tí do-géna
in nem ocus an talam,
is é taradh fo-gēba.

'Friendship with Catherine, a great advantage for the one who enters into it; heaven and earth is the profit they will have.'[34]

[32]Culverwell (1913: 135) supplied the missing fourth line, *ēcnach duine, mād inderb*, from the copy of this verse in RIA MS An Leabhar Breac 225 marg. inf. and translated 'slandering of a person if it be untrue'.

[33]This is a frequently recurring marginal verse; I have thus far noted copies in RIA MS An Leabhar Breac, 172 marg. inf., RIA MS The Book of Uí Maine, 77R (136) marg. inf., TCD MS H 2. 16 (1318), YBL(6), coll. 293–4 marg. inf., BL MS Harley 5280, 46V inf., and Oxford Bodleian Laud 610, 115R marg. inf.

[34]My interpretation of the first line differs from that in Culverwell (1913: 133); for the form of the name of Saint Catherine see Ó Cuív (1986: 166).

3. 2r: Is éol damh
ní do ícfad an slúag-sa:
serc meic Dé, ocus a omhan,
miscais don doman trūadh-sa.

'I know a thing that would save this host: – love of God's Son, and fear of him – hatred of this pitiful world.'

The main text of section 9 of MS H 2. 12 is a copy of part of the prose version of *Saltair na Rann*,[35] written by Tadg Úa Rígbardáin in 1474, a date which would fit with the floruit of Uilliam Mac an Leagha. At first sight, it might appear that A was taken from H. If, however, Flower (1926: 471) was correct in his tentative suggestion that 'Add. 30512 would be identical with the Leabur na carraigi given with Laud Misc. 610 in ransom for Edmond Butler in 1462, although there is nothing in the MS. itself to make this identification certain', the verses in A could not have been taken from H. Nevertheless, it was no more than a suggestion, and his arguments were rejected by O'Sullivan and O'Sullivan (1971: 144–6). But even if A was not written before 1462, there still remains the major difficulty that the last line of verse number 9 is missing in H, but present in the corresponding A5. Although one could argue that it was supplied in A from another source – as indeed was done by Culverwell – this might be stretching the argument a bit too far.

What is certain, however, is that the verses in H cannot have been taken from the compilation as it stands in A, given a number of clearly superior readings in H, for example, *téti* 'comfort', H4 (line *b*), but *déde*, A1,[36] and *fō fri olc* 'good in return for evil', H6 (line c), but *co frith holc*, A4.[37]

The best way then to account for the close connection between A and H might be to take it that both derive from a third source. Whether we postulate this to have been a set of marginal verses in another MS, or a compilation of such verses already in existence, we are still left with an incontrovertible instance of a close relationship between a set of marginal verses and a compilation.

In the second case, Mac an Leagha went a step further, and brought a number of verses together, but did not mark them with the paragraph mark, and thus presented them as forming a single poem. This is the compilation of four verses on folio 34vb of Additional 30512, the same MS in which the compilation just discussed is found. It was edited without a translation by Meyer (1913),[38] and I supply text and translation below.[39]

[35]See McNamara (1975: 18).

[36]The latter reading is a repetition of the end-word of line *a*.

[37]My concern here is solely to establish the connection between the compilation in A and the marginal verses in H. In a forthcoming work on marginal verses I intend to provide a new translation of the verses in H along with a more detailed account of the variant readings in A.

[38]The four verses are printed again as a single poem in Meyer (1918: 385), with readings from TCD MS H 1.11, folio 143r10, although the latter is in fact a copy of the former (see Abbott and Gwynn, 1921: 25).

[39]The text is as in the MS, with the addition of word-division, punctuation, capitalisation, and macrons over long vowels.

It is clear from the subject matter that each of these verses is a separate composition, and the only ones that have anything at all in common are the first and the last. Furthermore, each of them is attested elsewhere in different contexts.[40] The first recurs as a marginal verse in RIA MS 23 P 26 (479), the Book of Fenagh, 4r inf.,[41] the first two in the compilation of nine verses in RIA MS D ii 1 (1225), the Book of Uí Maine, 10 (46) vb13, and the last in commentary on *Auraicept na nÉces*.[42] The third verse, which concerns the descending order of priority for potential candidates for the abbacy or headship of a church, recurs as a marginal verse on p. 86 of the Leabhar Breac, under the verses for April of the *Félire Óengusso*,[43] and in commentary on the *Senchas Már* tract *Córus Bésgnai*.[44]

1. ISaoth lem int aos lēighind
do dul i nd-ifern phīanach,
is ind tī nāt lēg ecna
do dhul hi parrthus ngrīanach.

2. IS ed is dech do senōir
ērge romoch ōn degdōil,
cētul na salm dīa erāil,
ecc na marbh do gabāil.

3. Ērlam grind, manach mīn,
eccluiss, dalta co nglanbrīgh,
combrugaid, is dēorad Dē;
ūadhaib dleghar apdaine.

4. Fogluim feallsamnacht is fās,
lēighind Gaīdhelg ⁊ glūas,
litirrdacht lēir ⁊ rīmh;
is becc a mbrīgh is tigh thūas. as.

1. I find it distressing that learned people should go to torment-filled Hell, and that the person who never studied learned works should go into sunny Paradise.

2. What is best for an elder is to rise very early at daybreak, to chant the psalms to commend him, and to recite the ...[45] for the dead.

[40]Cf. Flower (1926: 486).

[41]Edited and translated in Hennessy and Kelly (1875: 33).

[42]Calder (1917: 6, 173).

[43]Also amongst the verses for April in the collections extracted from the notes and margins of copies of the *Félire* in Brussels Bibliothèque Royale MSS 5100–04 and 5057–59.

[44]For discussion of the variant readings and a restored text see Breatnach (2007), and cf. also Breatnach (2017: 266).

[45]The copy of this verse in Book of Uí Maine, 10 (46) Vb15–16 has the superior reading *ēgnaircc* ‘intercessory prayer’.

3. Vigorous[46] patron saint, gentle church vassal, church, pupil with pure force, a neighbour (?),[47] and exile of God; from amongst them the abbacy is taken.

4. Learning, philosophy, are vain; Latin learning, vernacular literature, and commentary, diligent booklearning, and arithmetic, they are of little import in the house above.

Although Mac an Leagha supplies neither a title nor an ascription, he does the next best thing, in that he contrives a *dúnad*, by placing the verse ending with *thūas* at the end, and drawing attention to it by writing *as* after *thuas*, to echo the first word of the first verse; all of this is clearly intended to pass off the four verses as belonging together.

Meyer (1913) followed the layout in the MS and presented these as a single poem, but as noted many years ago by Flower (1926: 486), 'they are really separate'. This is shown not only by the subject matter, as noted above, but also by the fact the verses are in different metres. Verse 1 is in *rannaigecht bec*, 2 in *deibide nguilbnech*, 3 in regular *deibide*, and 4 in *rannaigecht mór*.

These four verses are epigrammatic or mnemonic (v. 3), types of verse which are commonly found as marginal verses, and indeed two of them, as noted, do actually appear elsewhere as such. The verses of our text are also mostly of these types, and while it cannot be proven, it is likely that at least in part the text represents a compilation of marginal verses.

To conclude, the significant linguistic and metrical variation from verse to verse and the lack of any unifying theme, taken together with the fact that Uilliam Mac an Leagha can be shown to have had a hand in one other compilation of marginal verses and one other fabrication, indicate that the so-called *Ríagail na Manach Líath*, the 'Rule of the Grey Monks', is not in fact a rule, but a fabrication consisting of disparate verses of varying dates of composition, some at least of which were likely garnered from the margins of MSS. The question of Mac an Leagha's motivation in doing this is not easy to answer, but given that it is preceded in the MS by two rules and followed by two others, it is quite possible that he was under pressure from a commission to supply a collection of early monastic rules.

[46]The replacement of original *griän* 'land' (viz. members of the kin of the original landowner) with the adjective *grind* not only results in the loss of a category but also leaves the line a syllable short; this replacement is also found in two of the other four copies (Breatnach 2007: 34–5).

[47]This reading, an otherwise unattested word, perhaps derived from *com* + *bruig* 'land' + agent suffix, is inferior to *compairche* 'a confederate church' in all the other copies.

Edition

I

Corann líath, lethet bise,
ro las oc loscud drise;
nípa romór in maise,
cenidros acht ind laise.

'A grey tonsure, the width of a finger, which caught fire when brambles were being burned; it would not be any great embellishment, if the flame had not set it [on fire].'

A jibe at a cleric with not much hair; his tonsure was set alight when getting a fire going, but it would have made little difference if it had not been.

bise: MS *baisi*. The only rhyming scheme that will work for this verse is the *deibide* pattern of *a* : *b* and *c* : *d*. Rhyme of the *rannaigecht* pattern, between *b* and *d*, is ruled out by the lack of any plausible emendation for either *drisi* or *loisi*; rhyme between *c* and *d*, however, is achieved by simply substituting one phonological variant for another. On the other hand, rhyme between *a* and *b* is achieved by substituting one word (*bise*) for another (*baise*). This emendation is not as radical as it might seem, as both words are similar in form and either word qualifying *lethet* would serve to denote narrowness; furthermore, the conjectured substitution of *baise* for original *bise* could be explained as due to the influence of the final words of the third and fourth lines.

DIL s.v. *1 bise*, cites three examples, viz., from *Dúil Laithne*, *bisi .i. mér*, Stokes (1872: 75 §18), the first of the following three from the *Vita Tripartita* of Patrick, *co torinol lán a utlaig do bisib ega ... is sochmachtu do Día coro lassat cid na bissi amal crínach ... amdar suidigthi na bissi ega forsin teinith 7 a ndorat a anáil foí, ro lassaiset fóchétóir amal crínach*, Mulchrone (1939: 6.125–32), 'he gathered his lapful of icicles ... it is competent to God that even the icicles should flame like firewood ... when the icicles were set on the fire and when he breathed under it, they flamed forthwith like firewood', Stokes (1887: 11–13), and, in an EModIr lapidary, *CRISDALLUS .i. cloch bhansholus i, 7 do cusne no do bise in roigh doniter i*, Greene (1952: 81 §11), 'CRYSTAL, i.e. it is a bright white stone, and it is from an icicle that it is made'. Meyer (1906) gave *biss* as the headword, suggested 'finger' as the basic meaning, comparing Welsh *bys*, and cited two of the above examples from the *Vita Tripartita*, where, qualified by *ega*, it means 'icicle'. The examples cited above from *Dúil Laithne* (nsg.) and the EModIr lapidary (dsg.), however, justify the headword *bise* in *DIL*. If my emendation to *bise* is correct, this would provide the only example outside *Dúil Laithne* with the basic meaning 'finger'.

oc loscud drise: That is, when using brambles as kindling.

nípa romór in maise: This must be an allusion to the term *foltmaise* (lit. 'hair-beauty, comeliness of hair') used for 'tonsure' in Early Irish. That the meaning is 'tonsure' was convincingly shown by Plummer (1923: 39–40),

although *DIL* s.v. *foltmaise* gives equal weight to an interpretation by O'Curry which was shown by Plummer to be mistaken; for the alleged example in *Cáin Adomnáin* see Breatnach (2017: 117).

cenidros acht: I so emend MS *cen ní drosacht*, taking it as the *t*-preterite form of *aigid/ad-aig* preceded by a combination of the conjunction *ceni* with infixed *-d-* (*GOI* §426) and the particle *ro* with a 3sg. fem. infixed pronoun. The combination of *-d-* and an infixed pronoun is unusual, and *GOI* §426 cites only one example, viz. *ma nudub feil* 'if ye are', Wb. 12d28. I take the meaning to be as in the phrase *ad-aig i tenid* 'sets on fire' (*DIL* s.v. *ad-aig* (a)); see also *DIL* s.v. *ad-aig* for the complementary distribution of independent *ad-aig* with dependent *-aig*.

laise: I emend MS *loisi* for the rhyme with *maise*. *DIL* s.v. *loise* 'flame, blaze' etc. does not cite any variants with *la-*, but two instances are found in the Leabhar Breac copy of the MidIr Life of Colum Cille, viz. *Laisse mor tánic dosam fechtus in Hií* 'On a certain occasion in Iona his face flushed greatly', Herbert (1988: 238.446, 262), and *tanic laisse mor da gnúis ⁊ dia agaid* 'a great glow spread over his face and countenance', Herbert (1988: 240.278, 263).

II

Ad-tlochur
do Mac Dé úasail amrai,
oc crois com bachuil nuï,
buith i tuï cen labrai.

'I give thanks to the son of noble wondrous God, at a cross with my new crozier, for being in silence without speaking.'

A pilgrim or retiree to the monastic life rejoices in his new-found state.

Diagnostic OIr features are the deponent verbal form *ad-tlochur* (MS *atlochur*), and the hiatus in *nuï* and *tuï*.

úasail amrai: *uasal amra*, MS. If the rest of the verse is to be restored in accordance with the indications of an OIr date just mentioned, the rhyme with OIr asg. *labrai* requires normalisation of *amra* to the gsg. *amrai*, and *uasal* must then be emended to *úasail*. I take it then that in the original both adjectives qualified *Dé*, but that at some later stage they were re-interpreted as qualifying *Mac*. On the other hand, the same epithets are used of Jesus in the Epilogue to the *Félire Óengusso*, viz. *Rom-śóerae, á Íssu, / á rí úasail amri* 'Mayst Thou save me, O Jesus, O King noble, wondrous!', Stokes (1905: 285.461–2). In the latter case the second line should be normalised to *á rí úasal amrae*, in accordance with *GOI* §315 and p. 678 n. 74, as well as the majority of the MSS, which have *uasal*.

com bachuil: Strachan divided MS *combachuil* as *co mbachuil* 'with a crozier', but given the introspective nature of the verse as a whole, it is more likely that it is to be read with the possessive pronoun. As noted in *DIL* s.v.

bachall, (*gaibid*) *bachail*(*l*) is used both of taking holy orders and of going on a pilgrimage. The reference to *oc crois* and *i tuï*, indicates a monastic regime, and accordingly I take it that what is in question here is *ailithre*, a term which is usually translated 'pilgrimage', but which had a wider meaning in OIr, as Ó Corráin (1989: 261) pointed out:

'The term *ailithre* ... has two meanings which are not properly distinguished in the dictionary (*DIL* s.v.): (i) pilgrimage (in the ordinary sense of visiting a holy place for religious reasons), and (ii) retirement (often from high office in church or secular society) to a monastery (often a distant one) in order to make one's soul and prepare for death'.

d: A close parallel to this is in *adram in coimdid molē / hi toe, cen chomlabrae*, *SR* 1585–6, translated 'Let us worship the Lord together, in silence without speaking together' in Greene and Kelly (1976: 63).

buith: I emend MS *beith* to the OIr form of the verbal noun.

tuï: For this and the rhyming word *nuï* in line *c* the MS has *tai* and *núi*, respectively; the syllable-count in both lines requires forms with hiatus. In the example cited above from *SR*, as well as in *Tuae ocus fēthamlae* 'Silence and stillness', *Ríagail Ailbi* v. 21a (O Neill, 1907: 100–1), hiatus forms (*toë*, *tuäe*) are also confirmed by the syllable count.

III

Cumma lim-sa ní don bith,
acht rop cléirchide rop clith;
is cumma lem cid bé dé,
acht rop clith rop cléirchide.

'I do not care about anything of the world, as long as whatever is a comfort is clerical; at all events then, I do not care, as long as whatever is clerical is a comfort.'

The expression of a smug sentiment that membership of the clergy should be synonymous with a comfortable life.

It seems impossible to decide between an OIr or a MidIr date for this verse, and I restore to a MidIr standard. The word *clith* appears to have died out in the later language, but its presence here is hardly diagnostic of an OIr rather than a MidIr date. I take the syntax of line *b* to be copula (*rop*) + predicate (*cléirchide*) + subject (the headless relative clause *rop clith*), and the same, with inversion, applies to line *d*. Headless clauses are not confined to OIr; cf., for example, from the Metrical *Dindšenchas*, *nā buí i nHére no érad*, *LL* 20799, 'that there was not in Ireland anyone whom he would refuse'.

acht rop: See *GOI* §904.

clith: The rhyme with *bith* shows that this must be a *u*-stem noun, and the existence of the *u*-stem noun is further confirmed by the adjectival

derivative *clithach*. The examples cited in *DIL* (s.v.) of *clith* as an adjective are doubtful, and many of those cited as examples of the noun are either acc. or dat. singular forms where the final is confirmed by rhyme as pal., and thus belong with *2 cleth* 'concealment' etc. (for the vowel alternation in *cleth* see Breatnach, 1997). The suggestion, with a query, in *DIL* that *clith* here is an adjective meaning 'hidden, inviolate' seems to assume a different interpretation of the verse to that proposed here.

DIL offers 'hiding place, protection' as meanings for the noun *clith*, 'protective, close, sheltering' for the adjective *clithach*, and 'protection, shelter' for the abstract *clithchae*.

Under the last of these it cites the example *Trí búada étaig: maisse, clithcha, suthaine*, from the *Trecheng Breth Féne*, without mentioning that the editor translated it as 'Three excellences of dress: elegance, comfort, lastingness' (Meyer, 1906b: 24–5 §182). The meaning of an abstract derived from an adjective derived from a noun will naturally be close to that of the base noun; certainly 'comfort' suits the context of the triad, and as it also suits the context here, I translate accordingly.

cid bé dé: Earlier *cipé* (*DIL* s.v. *1 cía* B(j)) with the adverb *dé* 'then' etc.; for the latter see *DIL* s.v. *de* XLV(a), and Breatnach (1956: 334). Cf., with a different tense, *cīa buī dē*, *LL* 30065 (= Gwynn, 1903–35: 1 p. 396.23).

IV

Techt dond íarmérgiu mór sáeth,
loisces in gáeth mo dá n-ó;
manid omun Fíadat find,
cid bind in cloc, ní tíag dó.

'Great is the hardship going to matins, when the wind burns my ears; but for fear of the bright Lord, however sweet the bell is, I do not go to it.'

A complaint about the hardship of going to matins on a windy night. A similar sentiment is expressed in the marginal verse (another copy of which is in BL MS Harleian 5280, 46v sup.) at the top of p. 90 in the RIA MS An Leabhar Breac, ed. and transl. in Stokes (1880: xcviii). Both of these contrast with the eagerness expressed in the verse beginning *Clocán binn / benar i n-aidchi gaíthe*, ed. and transl. in Murphy (1956: 4–5).

If I am right in my interpretation of *loisces* in the second line, we have to do with an OIr original, and I normalise to an OIr standard. The only serious emendation involved is of *munbad* to *manid* in the third line, but the MS reading would be a difficulty in the Irish of any period.

The verse was translated in Best (1912: 165) as: 'To go to *iarmérge*, great labour, the wind stings my two ears, were it not dread of the blessed Lord, though sweet the bell, I would not go to it'.

a: This line is strikingly reminiscent of the first two lines of the often anthologised verse on the vanity of pilgrimage found in the Codex Boernerianus:

Téicht do Róim / mór saīdo, becc torbai 'To go to Rome, much labour, little profit', *Thes* 2, 296. It is quite possible that the latter verse may have had a wider currency than its surviving attestation in a single MS would indicate.

dond íarmérgiu: On the canonical Hours see Best (1912) and Ó Néill (1990).

loisces: Best's translation 'the wind stings' would be appropriate if the verbal form were *loiscid*. The MS, however, has *loiscis*, and as a preterite form does not suit the context, I take it to stand for the 3sg. pres. relative form, with the not uncommon spelling in later MSS of the unstressed short vowel with *i* rather than *e* before a non-pal. final consonant. For the meaning 'when ... burns' see Breatnach (1980).

manid: The MS reading *munbad* causes a problem with the sequence of tenses, that is, with pres. indic. *ni thiagh* in the next line, rather than the conditional to be expected with the past subj. in *munbad*. The easiest solution is to take *munbad* as a substitution for *manid*, and I emend accordingly. Regarding this combination of *mani* with the 3sg. pres. ind. of the copula, *DIL* s.v. *3 má* I A(b) states that *manid* 'passes early out of use, giving way to the subj. manip (minab, munab)', and this development would help to explain why an original *manid* could be replaced.

The two clauses *manid ... ní ...* might also be translated as 'it is only for fear of the bright Lord ... that I go to it'.

cloc: Thus in the MS; Strachan's reading *cloch* is a slip.

ní tíag: I restore MS *ni thiagh* to the OIr form, rather than the MidIr (and later) form with lenition after *ní*.

V

Ádam, Samsón, Solam rí,
ro mersat a mbanairli;
ci bé con-túaisi fri mná,
cen gúasacht ní érnaba.

'Adam, Samson, King Solomon, the counsels given to them by women unhinged [them]; whoever heeds women will certainly not come well out of it.'

A variation on the theme of misogyny.

The language is early, and could well be OIr; the rhymes in *ab* (*-í* with *-i*) and *cd* (*-á* with *-a*) conform to the OIr distinctions between short unstressed final vowels (although this could be coincidence), and the deuterotonic verbal form *con-túaisi* occurs in the third line.

Samsón: The long *ó* is confirmed not only by the spelling in *gnīmrada Samsóin*, *SR* 5338, but also by the consistent spelling of the nom./acc. *Samson* with *o* (never *a* or *u*) in *SR*; see Knott (1952: 119).

ro mersat: 3pl. perfect of the weak verb *meraid* 'crazes', rather than a later form of *ro mertatar*, perfect of the strong verb *mairnid* 'betrays, deceives', as Strachan suggested.

ci bé: I so emend MS *gidhbé*, on the assumption that the verse is OIr.

d: Lit. 'without peril will not escape'.

gúasacht: Strachan's *guassacht* is due to inadvertently reading the *s* twice in the compendium for *acht*.

érnaba: I follow Strachan's suggestion in so emending MS *ernama*; for lenited *b* > lenited *m* where there is another nasal consonant in the word, see *SnaG* 235, §3.20. In the absence of any counter-evidence, it can be assumed that, as in the case of the other A III verb *ad-roilli* (*GOI* §644), the *f*-future flexion of *as-roinni* is as old as OIr.

VI

Día do dermat deog do bás;
ní fotha gaís, gním do tháir,
paiter tercda óclaig naím;
mairg ricfad úaim ifirn áin.

'To forget God is to drink of death; no wise foundation, an act of contempt, is the infrequent paternoster of a religious youth; woe to him who would reach the pit of fiery Hell.'

On the importance of regular prayers.

That the verse is later than OIr is indicated by the gsg. *gaís*, but it is difficult to date it any more precisely.

Día: Strachan suggested that MS *diam* is an error for *Día*, and I cannot see how it could be anything else.

gaís: This instance is cited (from Strachan's edition) as the only example of an *o*-stem gsg. of *gáes* in *DIL* s.v. (G 12.55); for the later inflexion of abstracts in *-s* as masc. *o*- or *u*-stems see Greene (1963).

gním do tháir: Lit. 'an act resulting from contempt'.

tercda: The MS reading *terc dacach* gives a line of eight syllables. The simplest remedy is to delete *cach* and revise the word-division, so as to read *tercda*, a derivative of *terc* (*GOI* §347), of which one other example is registered in *DIL* s.v. *tercdae*. *DIL* takes it to mean 'scarce', but in this context 'infrequent' would be more appropriate.

ifirn: The MS has *ifn* with the suprascript *er*/*ir* compendium.

VII

Clocán bind,
iná cothraim ós nach glind;
is í toil ar Fíadat find
úathad bráthar fo áenchuing.

'A sweet bell, since I do not ... above any valley, the will of our bright Lord is [that there should be] a small number of brothers under a single yoke.'

There is a major difficulty in the second line, but it seems that the point being made here is that, since a bell cannot be heard over a great distance, those following a strict monastic regime should be gathered together in small numbers, rather than be on their own and dispersed over a wide area. Compare the injunction in the *Regula Coluim Chille*: *Bith i nn-uathad i llucc fo leith hi fail primcathrach minap inill lat cubus beth i coitchenndus na sochaide*, Meyer (1901: 28 §1), 'To be as one of a small number in a site apart, in the vicinity of a major (ecclesiastical) city, if your conscience does not consider it safe to be in the company of the crowd'. Here, as clearly in our text, *úathad* means 'a small number, a few'. It is not ambiguous, as Etchingham (1999: 346) stated when suggesting 'alone' as an alternative translation for *i nn-uathad*; see Greene (1971).

iná cothraim: The first word can hardly be anything other than the combination of *hi*^{N} 'when' with the negative particle, but I can make nothing of the second.

Fíadat: It is difficult to be certain whether the MS has *fiaghad* altered from *fiadhad*, or, as Strachan saw it, *fiadhad* altered from *fiaghad*.

áenchuing: The rhyme with *find* is imperfect in that the internal consonants in the disyllable do not correspond in quality to the initial consonant in the monosyllable. For this type of *rinn ocus airdrinn* rhyme in Old and Middle Irish see Murphy (1961: 32) and Carney (1964: xxxii–iii), and note also *chniss* : *Pharduis*, *LL* 853–4 and *cruind* : *ōebind*, *LL* 29867. The closest parallel to the rhyme in our verse is that of *tinn* with *oenchruinn* in lines 253–4 of the Poems of Blathmac, noted by Carney (1964: xxxiii); here also the *airdrinn* word is a compound with *óen*, where one would expect the vowel of the second element not to have been reduced to schwa.

VIII

Ó ra-láthar súil dar cách,
at-beir Liter – aithgén féin –
bíd a Parrthus fer cen grád,
cid fer cu ngrád bíd a péin.

'When one has taken a look at everyone, Scripture says so – yes, I realise – there is often in Paradise a man without holy orders; even a man in holy orders, he is often in torment [of Hell].'

Membership of the clergy is no guarantee of entry into Paradise.

A similar sentiment is expressed in the first of the four verses edited and translated above pp. 87–8.

The two instances of monosyllabic *bíd*, in lines *c* and *d*, show that the verse is not OIr, while the verbal form *ra-láthar* in *a* points to a MidIr date. The metre is *rannaigecht mór*, but with end-rhyme not only between *b* and *d*, but also between *a* and *c*.

aithgén: MS *aidhchein*, with *d* made on *t*, as Strachan noted. Dr Jürgen Uhlich drew my attention to the line *do-fil áes dam; at-gén féin* 'age is upon me; I myself recognize it', in the 'Lament of the Old Woman of Beare' (Murphy, 1956: 78–9, v. 18d). In his re-edition of the poem, Ó hAodha (1989: 325) discusses the variant readings *atgen*, *aithgén*, *aitgen* and also restores *at-gén*. The last two of the variants, however, point to a prototonic form, as does the MS form in our verse. Taking prototonic *aithgén* as a responsive (see Greene, 1972), in reply to an implied question, would suit the context in both cases, and I restore and translate (lit. 'I myself recognize') accordingly.

IX

Mairc dána bés bithdíultad,
mairc nách orraim a líatha;
miscuis cach buirb a tinchosc,
berid slemain a fhíacha.

'Woe to him who has a habit of always refusing; woe to him who does not revere his elders; what every boor hates is their being corrected, a tactful person obtains his dues.'

This verse is difficult to date closely, but it contains no features diagnostic of an OIr date.

A variant appears as a marginal verse on the upper margin of fol. 52v of RIA MS D iv 2 (1223), ed. Meyer (1910: 298):

Mairg dianadh bes beith diultad.
mairg na*ch* riaraigh a liatha.
olc le borb a chairiug*ud*.
b*en*idh slemain a fiachu.

Another variant appears as v. 13 of *Fersaighecht an tempuil tall*, ed. Meyer (1913b: 172–5):

Maircc dána bēs bithagra,
maircc nāch rīaraigh a līatha,
nī maith borb ré cairechadh,
b*er*idh sleamuin a fīacha

For some comments on the possible relationship of all three see p. 81 above. The most significant differences are in the first line, where the last of these has *bithagra* 'perpetual suing', the second line, where both variants have *nāch rīaraigh* 'who does not obey', and the third line, where the first has *olc le borb*

a chairiugud ‘a boor dislikes being rebuked’, and the second the nearly synonymous *nī maith borb ré cairechadh* ‘a boor does not take kindly to being rebuked’. Furthermore, with a trisyllabic ending in the third line we have the well attested metre of *aí ḟreislige*, whereas disyllabic *tinchosc* leaves us with an irregular form of *rannaigecht*.

orraim: This can hardly be anything other than a denominative verb derived from the noun registered in *DIL* s.v. *airraim*, although I know of no other examples.

miscuis: I so expand MS *misc* + the *us*/*uis* compendium, rather than *miscus*, as in Strachan’s edition.

berid: All three variants write the first syllable of this word as *b* and a suspension-stroke. I expand as *ber*, whereas Meyer varied between *ben* and *ber*.

X

Ná clecht in sírḟell sádail,
is nert dílenn gá dígail;
bíd a neim isna nélaib,
fégaid sein arna sínaib.

‘Do not practise easy constant treachery, with torrential power punishing it; [even] clouds can be virulent, observe that from the storms.’

Wrongdoers will eventually meet their come-uppance, and ‘even a worm will turn’.

A MidIr (or perhaps later) date is indicated by *gá dígail* (OIr *oca*), monosyllabic *bíd*, *na*, the dpl. form of the article, in *isna nélaib*, *arna sínaib*, and the demonstrative *sein* (rhyming with *neim*).

clecht: The MS has *cl* followed by the compendium *s* + suprascript stroke which, while it usually stands for *acht*, can also stand for *echt*.

sírḟell: The MS has *insire*, with the *e* expunged and *feall* above the line with insertion marks. According to Strachan, *feall* is in a later hand, but while the ink is clearly lighter, it not certain to me that the hand is different. I adopt the corrected reading, which is confirmed by the internal rhyme with *dílenn*.

sádail: I replace MS *sádhal* with the variant with a palatalised final, which form will make *úaitne* with the rhyming end-words in *b* and *d*.

dílenn: Gsg. of *díliu* in the sense of ‘torrential, vast, enormous’, and particularly apt in the context of the simile in *cd*.

gá dígail: MS *gadigb–*. As far as I can see, of all words beginning in *díb–* and *díg–*, only the dsg. of *dígal* will both rhyme and make sense in this context, and I emend accordingly.

c: Lit. ‘their virulence is wont to be in the clouds’.

Abbreviations

Clavis Donnchadh Ó Corráin, *Clavis Litterarum Hibernensium: Medieval Irish Books and Texts (c. 400–c. 1600)*, Corpus Christianorum, Claves. 3 vols (Turnhout: Brepols, 2017) 821 §636.

RIA Cat. T. F. O'Rahilly, K. Mulchrone, M. E. Byrne, J. H. Delargy, E. FitzPatrick, L. Duncan, W. Wulf, G. Murphy, A. I. Pearson and T. Ó Concheanainn, *Catalogue of Irish Manuscripts in the Royal Irish Academy* (Dublin, 1926–70).

SR Whitley Stokes, *Saltair na Rann* (Oxford, 1883).

References

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

Best, R. I. 1907: 'The canonical hours', *Ériu* 3, 116.

——, 1912: 'The Lebar Brecc tractate on the canonical hours', in O. Bergin and C. Marstrander (eds), *Miscellany Presented to Kuno Meyer by some of his Friends and Pupils on the Occasion of his Appointment to the Chair of Celtic Philology in the University of Berlin* (Halle), 142–66.

Breatnach, Liam 1980: 'Some remarks on the relative in Old Irish', *Ériu* 31, 1–9.

——, 1997: 'On the flexion of the *ā*-stems in Irish', in Anders Ahlqvist and Věra Čapková (eds), *Dán Do Oide. Essays in Memory of Conn R. Ó Cléirigh* (Dublin), 49–57.

——, 2007: 'A verse on succession to ecclesiastical office', in Pádraig A. Breatnach, Caoimhín Breatnach, Meidhbhín Ní Úrdail (eds), *Léann Lámhscríbhinní Lobháin. The Louvain Manuscript Heritage*, Éigse Publications 1 (Dublin), 32–41.

——, 2008: '*Cinnus atá do thinnrem*: a poem to Máel Brigte on his coming of age', *Ériu* 58, 1–35.

——, 2017: *Córus Bésgnai. An Old Irish Law Tract on the Church and Society*, Early Irish Law Series 7 (Dublin).

Breatnach, R. A. 1956: 'Some Welsh and Irish adverbial formations', *Celtica* 3, 332–7.

Breeze, Andrew 1987: 'The Charter of Christ in medieval English, Welsh and Irish', *Celtica* 19, 111–20.

Byrne, Aisling 2016: 'Cultural intersections in Trinity College Dublin MS 1298', in Axel Harlos and Neele Harlos (eds), *Adapting Texts and Styles in a Celtic Context. Interdisciplinary Perspectives on Processes of Literary Transfer in the Middle Ages. Studies in Honour of Erich Poppe*, Studien und Texte zur Keltologie 13 (Münster), 289–304.

——, 2019: *Translating Europe: Imported Narratives and Irish Readers at the End of the Middle Ages*, Paul Walsh Memorial Lecture 4 (Maynooth).

Calder, George 1917: *Auraicept na n-Éces. The Scholars' Primer* (Edinburgh).

Carney, James 1940: 'A miscellany of Irish verse', *Éigse* 1, 239–48.

——, 1964: *The Poems of Blathmac Son of Cú Brettan Together with the Irish Gospel of Thomas and A Poem on the Virgin Mary*, Irish Texts Society 47 (Dublin).

CULVERWELL, A. BEATRICE 1913: 'Quatrains from H. 2. 12', *Hermathena* 17, 133–6.
DE BRÚN, PÁDRAIG 1972: *Catalogue of Irish Manuscripts in King's Inns Library Dublin* (Dublin).
ETCHINGHAM, COLMÁN 1999: *Church Organisation in Ireland A.D. 650 to 1000* (Maynooth).
FLOWER, ROBIN 1926: *Catalogue of Irish Manuscripts in the British Museum*, Volume 2 (London).
FOLLETT, WESTLEY 2006: *Céli Dé in Ireland: Monastic Writing and Identity in the Early Middle Ages*, Studies in Celtic History 23 (Woodbridge).
GREENE, DAVID 1952: 'Lapidaries in Irish', *Celtica* 2, 67–95.
——, 1963: 'Ir. *gnás* : W. *gnaws* ; OHG *kunst*', *Celtica* 6, 62–3.
——, 1971: 'Varia II. 2. Ir. úathad, óthad: W. odid', *Ériu* 22, 178–80.
——, 1972: 'The responsive in Irish and Welsh', in Herbert Pilch and Joachim Thurow (eds), *Indo-Celtica: Gedächtnisschrift für Alf Sommerfelt* (München), 59–72.
GREENE, DAVID and KELLY, FERGUS 1976: *The Irish Adam and Eve Story from Saltair na Rann I* (Dublin).
GWYNN, E.J. 1903–35: *The Metrical Dindshenchas, 1–5*, Todd Lecture Series 8–12 (Dublin).
HENNESSY, W. M. and KELLY, D. H. 1875: *The Book of Fenagh* (Dublin).
HERBERT, MÁIRE 1988: *Iona, Kells, and Derry: The History and Hagiography of the Monastic* Familia *of Columba* (Oxford).
KENNEY, J. F. 1929: *The Sources for the Early History of Ireland: Ecclesiastical* (New York).
KNOTT, ELEANOR 1952: 'An index to the proper names in *Saltair na Rann*', *Ériu* 16, 99–122.
MCNAMARA, MARTIN 1975: *The Apocrypha in the Irish Church*, (Dublin).
MEYER, KUNO 1901: 'Mitteilungen aus irischen Handschriften. *Regula Choluimb Chille*', *ZCP* 3, 28–30.
——, 1906: Contributions to Irish Lexicography, Supplement to *ACL*.
——, 1906b: *The Triads of Ireland*. Todd Lecture Series 13 (Dublin).
——, 1908: 'Mitteilungen aus irischen Handschriften (*Fortsetzung*)', *ZCP* 6, 257–72.
——, 1910: 'Mitteilungen aus irischen Handschriften (*Fortsetzung*)', *ZCP* 7, 297–312.
——, 1913: 'Ein Gedicht aus Additional 30,512', *ZCP* 9, 470.
——, 1913b: 'Mitteilungen aus irischen Handschriften', *ZCP* 9, 166–77.
——, 1918: 'Mitteilungen aus irischen Handschriften (*Fortsetzung*)', *ZCP* 12, 358–97.
MULCHRONE, KATHLEEN 1939: *Bethu Phátraic: The Tripartite Life of Patrick* (Dublin).
MURPHY, GERARD 1956: *Early Irish Lyrics* (Oxford).
——, 1961: *Early Irish Metrics* (Dublin).
NÍ SHÉAGHDHA, NESSA 1967: *Catalogue of Irish Manuscripts in the National Library of Ireland*, Fasciculus I (Dublin).
Ó CORRÁIN, DONNCHADH 1989: 'Early Irish hermit poetry?', in D. Ó Corráin, L. Breatnach, K. McCone (eds), *Sages, Saints and Storytellers: Celtic Studies in Honour of Professor James Carney* (Maynooth), 251–67.

Ó Cuív, Brian 1986: 'Aspects of Irish personal names', *Celtica* 18, 151–84.
——, 1990: 'The Irish marginalia in Codex Palatino-vaticanus no. 830', *Éigse* 24, 45–67.
——, 2001: *Catalogue of Irish Language Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library at Oxford and Oxford College Libraries. Part 1: Descriptions* (Dublin).
Ó hAodha, Donncha 1989: 'The lament of the Old Woman of Beare', in D. Ó Corráin, L. Breatnach and K. McCone (eds), *Sages, Saints and Storytellers: Celtic Studies in Honour of Professor James Carney* (Maynooth), 308–31.
Ó Maidín, Uinseann 1996: *The Celtic Monk: Rules and Writings of Early Irish Monks* (Kalamazoo).
O Neill, Joseph 1907: 'The rule of Ailbe of Emly', *Ériu* 3, 92–115.
Ó Néill, Pádraig 1990: 'Welsh *anterth*, Old Irish *anteirt*', *Ériu* 41, 1–11.
O'Sullivan, Anne, and O'Sullivan, William 1971: 'Three notes on Laud Misc. 610 (or the Book of Pottlerath)', *Celtica* 9, 135–51.
Plummer, Charles 1923: 'Notes on some passages in the Brehon Laws [13–25]', *Ériu* 9, 31–42.
Poppe, Erich 2017: 'Cultural transfer and textual migration: Sir Bevis comes to Ireland', in Wolfram R. Keller and Dagmar Schlüter (eds), *'A Fantastic and Abstruse Latinity?': Hiberno-Continental Cultural and Literary Interactions in the Middle Ages*, Studien und Texte zur Keltologie 12 (Münster), 205–20.
Quin, E.G. 1939: *Stair Ercuil ocus a Bás*, ITS 38 (Dublin).
Smith, Peter 1994: 'Aimirgein Glúngel tuir tend: a Middle-Irish poem on the authors and laws of Ireland', *Peritia* 8, 120–50.
Stokes, Whitley 1872: *Goidelica: Old and Early-Middle-Irish Glosses, Prose and Verse*. Second Edition (London).
——, 1880: *On the Calendar of Oengus*, Transactions of the Royal Irish Academy, Irish Manuscript Series 1 (Dublin).
——, 1887: *The Tripartite Life of Patrick, with Other Documents Relating to that Saint* (London).
——, 1905: *Félire Óengusso Céli Dé : The Martyrology of Oengus the Culdee*, Henry Bradshaw Society 29 (London).
——, 1910: *A Supplement to Thesaurus Palaeohibernicus* (Halle).
Strachan, John 1904: 'An Old-Irish metrical rule', *Ériu* 1, 191–208.
——, 1905: 'Two monastic rules', *Ériu* 2, 227–9.
——, 1905b: 'Cormac's rule', *Ériu* 2, 62–8.
——, 1905c: 'Addenda to Ériu I, 191 *sq.*', *Ériu* 2, 58–9.
Walsh, Paul 2003: *Irish Leaders and Learning through the Ages, Essays Collected, Edited and Introduced by Nollaig Ó Muraíle* (Dublin).

Liam Breatnach

Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies

OLD NAMES FOR THE RIVER SUCK AND ASSOCIATED SITES[1]

Abstract

This paper examines the evidence indicating that the names *Bré* and *Dubabainn Bré* (and variants thereof) may be regarded as older, alternative names for the river Suck. It also considers textual references to some other toponyms associated with the Suck, including the pools named *Duiblind Ḟroích* and *Duiblind chríche Cíarraige*, and the fort named *Dúnad Átha Deirg* alias *Dún Díarmata*. *Inter alia*, it suggests that the toponomy of the materials discussed raises interesting questions as to the authors' knowledge of the landscape and motivation for referencing it.

That the river Suck (*Int Ṡuca*) may previously have had the name *Bré* has been mooted before.[2] This paper verifies the evidence for identifying the Suck by the alternative names *Bré* and *Dubabainn Bré*. It also clarifies that there were two distinct, significant pools on the river Suck named *Duiblind* ('Black Pool'), although these have been misidentified or conflated in some sources. It suggests that one of these, *Duiblind Ḟroích* ('Fróech's Pool'), may be the pool named *Duiblind chríche Cíarraige* ('the Black Pool of the territory of the Cíarraige') in a late Old Irish source, and that this pool may have been within or contiguous to what later became known as Castlerea, County Roscommon. The name of *Dún Díarmata*, a fort overlooking the Suck near Ballymoe, is also discussed.

The Suck is a major Connacht river, second in importance only to the Shannon. Its source and initial section as far as Castlerea are within the ancestral territory of the Cíarraige. The Cíarraige came to share the plain of Mag nAí with the genealogically distinct Uí Briúin Aí, but into the eighth century, they were still the dominant population group in this territory and are often dubbed *Cíarraige Aí* in the literature.[3] They were the main branch of the population-group known as the *Trí Cíarraige Connacht*.[4] John O'Donovan identified the headwater of the Suck as a small mountain stream of that name in the townland of Coolnafarna, parish of Annagh, County Mayo (some 5 kilometres east of Ballyhaunis). The burgeoning stream runs eastwards into

[1]My thanks to the anonymous reader for various important additions and corrections, and to the editors of *Celtica* for their careful reading.

[2]E.g. Pádraig Ó Riain, Diarmuid Ó Murchadha and Kevin Murray (eds), *Historical Dictionary of Gaelic Placenames / Foclóir Stairiúil na Gaeilge*. Fascicle 2 (Names in B-), 171, *s. n.* Bré (2): 'R. in E. CONN., perh. early name for Suca / area around tl. Dundermot, p. Drumatemple, b. Ballymoe, RN.' The citations in this entry, and others, are discussed below. See, earlier, E. Hogan, *Onomasticon Goedelicum* (Dublin, 1910), 370b: *d[ubh]abha bhreagha*.

[3]See Francis John Byrne, *Irish Kings and High-Kings* (London, 1973), 245–7.

[4]Ibid., 236.

 ©Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies

Lough O'Flynn (*Loch Uí Ḟloinn*), then winds its way further east to Castlerea, where it turns sharply southwards, passing through Ballymoe (*Bél Átha Moga*), Dunamon (*Dún Imdain*), Athleague (*Áth Liac Máenacáin*), Ballyforan (*Bél Átha Feórainne*), and Ballinasloe (*Bél Átha Nadṡluaig*, later rendered *Béal Átha na Sluaigheadh*), joining the Shannon just south of the village of Shannonbridge.[5] From Athleague onwards or thereabouts, the Suck's course is through Uí Maine territory. While one of the two pools to be discussed is in the territory of the Cíarraige, and is clearly identified as such in at least one source, the other can be shown to lie further south, in Uí Maine territory.

The river *Bré* and *Duiblind Ḟroích* in *Táin Bó Fraích*

What appear to be the two earliest references to the river *Bré* occur in the eighth-century tale *Táin Bó Froích*.[6] These do not identify the *Bré* as an alternative name for the Suck; for that, we are dependent on various Middle and Early Modern Irish texts which are cited below. The Connacht warrior Fróech mac Idaith is the central figure in *Táin Bó Froích*,[7] a tale which opens with an extravagantly detailed account of himself and his splendid cavalcade arriving at the royal fort of Ailill and Medb where he intends to court their daughter Findabair. So impressive is the visitors' appearance that sixteen people die of suffocation as the people in the fort press forward to catch a glimpse of them. Fróech's cavalcade plays to this admiring audience: as soon as the horsemen dismount, they unleash their hunting dogs who tear off on a chase that begins and ends at Ráith Crúachan:

> Scoirit a n-echu ocus léicit a mmílchona. Do·sennat secht n-aige do ráith Chrúachan, ocus secht sinnchu ocus secht míla maige ocus secht turcu altai, conda·rubatar ind óic issind aurlaind in dúine. Íar sin fo·cerdat inna mílchoin bedg i mBrei. Gabait secht ndoborchona. Dos·mbertatar dochum na harddae i ndorus inna prímrátha.[8]
>
> 'They unharness their horses and unleash their hunting hounds. They hunt seven deer to the rampart of Cruachain, and seven

[5]O'Donovan, *AFM* s.a. 1263 (vol. III, 390–1, footnote u); based on O'Donovan's letter written in Castlereagh on 5 July 1837, *Ordnance Survey Letters, Roscommon*, 2 vols. (1837–8), vol. I, 146–51 (= Michael Herity (ed.), *Ordnance Survey Letters: Roscommon* (Dublin, 2010), 41–3).

[6]For the most recent edition, see Wolfgang Meid (ed. and trans.), *The Romance of Froech and Findabair or The Driving of Froech's Cattle: Táin Bó Froích* (Innsbruck, 2015).

[7]For discussion of the name-forms *Fróech* and *Idath* see Meid, *Táin Bó Froích*, 78–9 and 80. The hero's patronymic in later texts is usually rendered as *Fidach*. I use the form *Fróech* (genitive *Froích*) in the body of this article.

[8]Meid, *Táin Bó Froích*, 42 (§5). The tale is preserved in four manuscripts 'which are not directly related to one another': for details, see Meid, *Táin Bó Froích*, 27–31. These are: TCD MS H 2.18 (1339; The Book of Leinster), henceforth L; TCD MS H 2.16 (1318; The Yellow Book of Lecan), henceforth Y; BL Egerton MS 1782, henceforth Eg.; NLS Gaelic MS XL, henceforth Ed. Variant readings for *i mBrei* in the citation above are: *issin mBreit* (Eg.); *isin mBree(?) .i. aband mor fail i* connacht*aib* (Y). The letter following the first *e* of *mBree*, while not entirely clear,

> foxes and seven hares and seven wild boars, so the youths could kill them on the front-lawn of the fort. Then the hounds throw themselves into the Brei. They catch seven otters. They brought them to the height at the entrance of the main rampart.'[9]

For the next fortnight the visitors spend part of each day hunting, their course ending always in front of the royal fort at Ráith Crúachan, presumably so that onlookers can watch the spectacle of the kill: *Anait íarum co cenn cóicthigis issin dún, ocus toffunn doib cach óenlae dochum in dúine. Do·saigtis Connachta dia ndécsin* 'They stay then until the end of a fortnight in the fort, and it was hunting for them every single day towards the fort. The Connachtmen used to come in order to watch them.'[10]

A pool on the river *Bré* is identified as the site of the action at a later stage in the tale. This is said to be located at a spot on 'the river' (as the *Bré* is alluded to initially, in §§13 and 16) which is the customary bathing place of the royal household. Ailill, who feels threatened by Fróech, schemes to have him killed by a monster that lives in this pool, and twice he sends him back to the pool to gather berries from a rowan-tree which overhangs it. But when the monster seizes Fróech, Findabair saves his life by leaping into the water and handing him a sword. He duly slays the monster, winning the admiration of all:

> [...] fácaib in claideb i lláim Ḟroích, ocus co·mben a chenn den míl co·mboí fora thóeb, ocus do·bert a mmíl leiss dochum tíre. Is de atá Dublind Ḟroích i mBreib i tírib Connacht.[11]

> '[... Findabair] leaves the sword in Froech's hand, and he cuts off the head of the beast so that it remained at his side, and he brought the beast with him to land. It is from this that there is (named) the Blackpool of Froech in the Brei in the lands of Connacht.'[12]

is almost certainly *e*. The words *i. aband mor fail i* connacht*aib* (written in the same hand as the rest) are not noted in Meid's *Variae Lectiones* (op. cit., pp. 53–61, at 54), but cf. the online image of the MS at www.isos.dias.ie (col. 651, line 8). In his note on the forms (*Táin Bó Froích*, 145), Prof. Meid comments: 'Apparently the same name as that of the river Bray (and eponymous settlement) in Co. Wicklow. In the *Dindšenchus* of Carn Fraích (*RC* 16, 137) the river in Connacht is identified as the *Suca,* the present-day *River Suck*. Inconsistencies in the extant attestations make it impossible to reconstruct the original form and inflection of the name. Tradition *a* at least appears to interpret it as a plural, cf. 200 *i mBreib.* Inflected forms are reminiscent of words like *ré* "time, space", gen. *ree*, acc. *ré*, nom. acc. pl. *rei*, dat. *réib*, or *gléo* "fight", gen. *glee*, dat. acc. *glé*, etc. On the other hand *issin mBreit* Eg. (reading of Y uncertain) seems to point to an *nt*-stem, nom. *Bree* ?, gen. *Bret*, dat. *Breit*. Forms lacking *t* in the other attestations may be based on this nominative. Etymology uncertain.'

[9]Ibid., 66.

[10]Ibid., 44 (§13); 68.

[11]Ibid., 46 (§18). Variant readings for *i mBreib* are: *i mBrae* (Eg.); *i mBrea* (Y). Other references to the pool are *issin lindi* (45 (§16)); *tar dublind* (45 (§17)); *issin ndublind* (47 (§23)).

[12]Ibid., 70.

If the *Bré* is the river Suck by another name, where on this river was *Duiblind Ḟroích*? As the crow flies, Ráith Crúachan is around 12 kilometres from the nearest point of the Suck. It turns out that this is where the river bends at Castlerea. Was *Duiblind Ḟroích* at or contiguous to Castlerea? However, as a bathing-place for the royal household, one would think Castlerea inconveniently distant from Ráith Crúachan. Its remove from Ráith Crúachan also seems to be at odds with the detail that the hounds take a leap into it, straight after hunting a drove of animals onto Ráith Crúachan (cf. citation above, pp. 102–3). And indeed there is a river much closer to Ráith Crúachan than the Suck: the river known today as the Ogulla river. This is almost certainly not the river's original name; rather, it is the name of a townland and civil parish, and church-site, that later came to be applied to the river. The name itself is problematical: early forms include *Odolf* (1306),[13] *Odealba* (1411),[14] *Godeilb* (1414),[15] *Odelb* (1420),[16] and *Doideilbh*.[17] The name of the church-site in its earliest attestation is *Killogealba*.[18] Given that there are only two kilometres or less between Ráith Crúachan and the Ogulla at its nearest point, and that the original name of the Ogulla river is apparently lost, it is tempting to identify it as the *Bré*. However, as we have seen, the copy of *Táin Bó Froích* in the Yellow Book of Lecan describes the *Bré* as a 'great river' (*aband mór*).[19] This description is clearly more apt for the Suck than the Ogulla since the stretch of river to which the name Ogulla is commonly applied is that extending from its source eastwards to the village of Tulsk, a section of a mere 6 kilometres

[13]H. S. Sweetman and Gustavus Frederick Handcock (eds), *Calendar of Documents Relating to Ireland*, 5 vols (London, 1875–86), vol. V (1302–1307), 223.

[14]William Henry Bliss and J. A. Twemlow (eds), *Calendar of Entries in the Papal Registers Relating to Great Britain and Ireland: Papal Letters, A.D. 1198–1498*, 16 vols (London, 1893–1986), vol. VI (1404–1415), 263.

[15]A. Martin Freeman (ed.), *Annála Connacht: The Annals of Connacht (A. D. 1224–1544)* (Dublin, 1944), s.a. 1414.22 (*i nGodeilb*). Note Diarmuid Ó Murchadha, 'A reconsideration of some place-names from the *Annals of Connacht*', *Ainm: Bulletin of the Ulster Place-Name Society* 6 (1994–5), 1–32, at 18: 'Perh. recte **i nOgdeilb*'.

[16]Freeman, *Annála Connacht*, s.a 1420.15 (*co hOdelb*). Ó Murchadha, 'A reconsideration', 24, suggests *Oghdhealbh* as the standardised spelling.

[17]Myles Dillon, 'The inauguration of O'Conor', in J. A. Watt, J. B. Morrall and F. X. Martin (eds), *Medieval Studies Presented to Aubrey Gwynn* (Dublin, 1961), 186–202, at 189 (*ó Dhoidheilbh*; *v. l. ogh deala*). This instance of the name occurs in a prose tract (in two manuscript witnesses) preceding a poem with an attribution to Torna Ó Maoil Chonaire (†1468). Dillon allowed that the poem and prose tract 'might both be as early as the fourteenth century', but equally that there was nothing in the language of either 'that need be earlier than the sixteenth century': cf. ibid., 187.

[18]John O'Donovan, 'The Registry of Clonmacnoise with notes and introductory remarks', *Journal of the Kilkenny and South-East of Ireland Archaeological Society* I.2 (1857), 444–60, at 451. This document is an English translation of a lost Irish-language original. The translation survives in a number of copies; the earliest, which dates from the seventeenth century, is that cited here. On the misattribution of the translation to Dubhaltach Mac Fhirbhisigh see Nollaig Ó Muraíle, *The Celebrated Antiquary: Dubhaltach Mac Fhirbhisigh (*c. *1600–71*) (Maynooth, 1996), 273, 276–7. O'Donovan, *Ordnance Survey Letters: Roscommon*, II, 54–5 (= Michael Herity (ed.), *Ordnance Survey Letters: Roscommon,* 103–4) notes also the existence of *Tobar-Oig-Giolla* 'near the old grave yard'.

[19]See n. 8 above.

or so.[20] Furthermore, it appears that the extant sources employ the name *Bré* as an alias only for the Suck. One might argue that the medieval sources that do so are all in error, and that *Bré* may in fact have been the original name of the Ogulla river, but evidence to support this is not forthcoming. On balance, it seems one must accept that the references in *Táin Bó Froích* to the *Bré* do indeed relate to the river Suck.

Táin Bó Froích tends towards hyperbole, particularly in the opening paragraphs which describe the appearance of Fróech and his retinue as they arrive at Ráith Crúachan, the headlong hunt to the river *Bré* and back, and the description of the fort and the entertainment offered to the guests.[21] Perhaps the image of Fróech's hounds bounding improbably from Ráith Crúachan into the Suck was conscious exaggeration on the part of the author. However the possibility that he was not familiar with the local terrain also deserves consideration. Yet a further possibility is that he did know the terrain, and was well aware of the greater proximity of the Ogulla river to Ráith Crúachan, yet chose to site events at the Suck because his tale was aimed at an audience that might know only the larger rivers of Connacht.[22] While all three possibilities seem plausible, it is difficult to choose between them. In any case, realism is not so characteristic of *Táin Bó Froích* that one is compelled to reject the identification of the river *Bré* with the Suck.

Fróech's name on sites in *Mag nAí*

Before moving on to the references in later texts which *explicitly* identify the Suck with *Dubabainn Bré* (which I take to be a fuller version of the name *Bré*), we may note the number of features which are named for Fróech on the landscape of *Mag nAí*, even today – and there may have been more in the past whose names are now forgotten. In addition to *Duiblind Froích*, there is *Carn Froích*, which for centuries was the traditional inauguration site of the O'Conor kings of Connacht, descendants of a branch of Uí Briúin Aí.[23] There is also *Clúain Froích*, the site of a moated residence built for Áed Úa Conchubhair, the sometime king of Connacht from his installation in 1293 until his death in 1309; this moated residence was the subject of two poems composed to

[20]I am indebted to Daniel Curley, Director of the Rathcroghan Visitor Centre, Tulsk, for detailed information on the Ogulla river. He points out that the river continues after Tulsk on an eastwards course through ribbon lakes in a sequence of townlands with the element *clúain* in their names, including Cloonfree and Cloonfinlough, before emptying into the Scramoge river east of Strokestown. Also, that the stretch of river from Tulsk eastwards to the Scramoge is variously named the Scramoge river and the Ogulla river, and that this stretch is approximately 14–16 kilometres long. For our purposes, it is important to note that the Ogulla/Scramogue is more stream than river at all points.

[21]Meid, *Táin Bó Froích*, 41–3 (§§3–11).

[22]Such an audience is perhaps implied by the sentence already cited: 'It is from this that there is (named) the Blackpool of Froech in the Brei [*sic*] in the lands of Connacht'.

[23]See Elizabeth FitzPatrick, *Royal Inauguration in Gaelic Ireland* c. *1100–1600: A Cultural Landscape Study*, Studies in Celtic History XXII (Woodbridge, 2004), *passim*.

celebrate its construction.[24] Most intriguing of all is the lintel stone in the Cave of Crúachu, a natural rock-fissure *c.* 750 metres south-west of the Mound of Ráith Crúachan known as *Uaimh na gCat*/Oweynagat ('The Cave of the Cats'). This bears the ogam inscription *VRAICCI MAQI MEDVVI* '[The stone of] Fróech son of Medb', the masculine inflexion showing that Medb is a patronymic in this case.[25] Whether the traditions concerning Fróech (mac Idaith/Fidaig), the warrior of Queen Medb, evolved from earlier traditions concerning the individual named in this lintel-inscription is a difficult question. The point I wish to make here is that since *Cluain Froích* and Castlerea are roughly equidistant from Ráith Crúachan, the symbolic epicentre of Connacht royal power, it would not be surprising to find Fróech's name attached to a notable *Duiblind* 'Black Pool' at, or near, Castlerea. The town is situated at the centre of a major groundwater body, where the Suck is joined by the Francis river, both being large rivers at this point.[26] One kilometre further east, the Francis river is joined by the Termon river, named from the early ecclesiastical site of *Termann Cáelainne*, itself named after Cáelainn, patron-saint of the Cíarraige. The earliest annalistic attestation of the name *Caislén Riabhach* appears to be that in the *Annals of the Four Masters sub anno* 1489.[27] A settlement of earlier date might conceivably have been named *Duiblind* from a deep pool in the vicinity of Castlerea. If so, the pool's association with Fróech was probably secondary, and the production of aetiological tales such as the incident in *Táin Bó Froích* concerning Fróech's killing of the water-monster need not have

[24]'Poem to Cloonfree Castle', edited by L. McKenna, *The Irish Monthly* 51 (1923), 639–45 (beginning *Tomhus mhúir Chruachna i gCluain Fraoich*), and 'O'Conor's House at Cloonfree', edited by E. C. Quiggin in *idem* (ed.), *Essays and Studies Presented to William Ridgeway* (Cambridge, 1914), 332–51 (beginning *An tú a-rís, a ráith Teamhrach*?). On the form of the residence see Katharine Simms, 'Native sources for Gaelic settlement: the house poems', in Patrick J. Duffy, David Edwards and Elizabeth Fitzpatrick (eds), *Gaelic Ireland* c. *1250*–c. *1650: Land, Lordship and Settlement* (Dublin, 2001), 246–67, esp. 250–2; also, Tom Finan and Kieran O'Conor, 'The moated site at Cloonfree, Co. Roscommon', *Journal of the Galway Archaeological and Historical Society* 54 (2002), 72–87.

[25]R. A. Macalister, *Corpus Inscriptionum Insularum Celticarum* I (Dublin, 1945), no. 12. For discussion of the name-forms see Meid, *Táin Bó Froích*, 78–9, and Damian McManus, *A Guide to Ogam* (Dublin, 1991), 107, 111. Images and further information on the inscription, site and location are available on the website 'Ogham in 3-D' maintained by the School of Celtic Studies, Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies (https://ogham.celt.dias.ie).

[26]Further north, the Francis river is known as the Cloonard river: it flows southwards from what is now known as Cloonard Lake, named from the townland of Cloonard, parish of Tibohine.

[27]A note by John O'Donovan on the entry for that year (*AFM* IV, p. 1168) states: '*Caislen-riabhach*, i.e. the grey castle, now Castlerea, a small town in the old barony of Ballintober, in the county of Roscommon; but by a late grand jury arrangement the barony has been called Castlerea after the little town itself. The castle from which it is named stood on the west side of the town, but no ruins of it are now visible.' The form *Caisléan Riabhach Meic Ceithearnaigh*, named from the ruling family of Ciarraige Aí, generally anglicised as Carney, is attested in a mid-sixteenth-century copy of a legal document dated 1510: cf. Pádraig Ó Macháin, 'Two legal documents relating to Ó Conchubhair Donn', *Ériu* 57 (2007), 113–19, at 116 and 117. This distinguishes it from *Caisléan Riabhach Clainne Faghartaigh* alias *Cairrgín Riabhach Clainne Faghartaigh*, which site was 'prob. in or nr tl. Cloonyquin, p. Elphin, b. Roscommon' (cf. Ó Riain, Ó Murchadha and Murray, *Historical Dictionary of Gaelic Placenames*, Fascicle 3 (C–Ceall Fhursa), 11 s.n. *Cairrgín Riabhach Clainne Faghartaigh*).

resulted in his name becoming permanently attached to it; at any rate, there appears to be no instance of the name *Duiblind Ḟroích* apart from that in *Táin Bó Froích*. Furthermore, Fróech's killing of the water-monster is associated in the literature with at least one other body of water, namely the small lake called *Loch Bága* (later *Loch Bá*) which is situated at the centre of the modern townlands of Ballaghabaweg and Ballaghabawmore, less than two kilometres to the south-west of Carn Fraích.[28] This tradition is attested in the poem beginning *Carn Fraoich soitheach na saorchlann* ('Carn Fraoich, goodly house of the noble kindreds'), which relates the story told in *Táin Bó Fraích* but with some differences in detail.[29]

Two Middle Irish texts which identify the *Bré* as an alias of the Suck

An item concerning *Carn Fraích* in the Middle-Irish Prose *Dindšenchas* conveys that the Suck was formerly known as *Dubabaind Brea* although, as we shall see, this reading depends on an emendation.[30] This item combines the *Duiblind* tradition witnessed in *Táin Bó Fraích* with other traditions concerning Fróech's associations with *Carn Fraích*, and also with *Síd Fraích* on the border of *Slíab Fúait* – a place far from *Mag nAí*.[31] Only the *Duiblind* tradition need concern us here. The following text and translation are from Whitley Stokes:

> [...] Carn Fraich .i. Fraech mac Fidaig dodeachaid do serc [Ḟ]indabrach do chrothad in chaerthaind robai ar dublind Brea risi n-abar in tShuca indiu, cor' airig pest bona in chaert[h]aind he, cor' len ⁊ cor' geogain co mor, co tuc Fraech a cosc*ur* ⁊ in caerthann co Meidb, co roibi 'ga fothr*us* isin charnn, *con*ad[d]e dogairther Carn Fraich. No comad and fogabad bas lasin pest, ⁊ a adnocol 'sin charnn beos.[32]

> '[...] *Carn Fráich*, that is, Fráech son of Fidach (leg. Idath?) went for love of Findabair to shake the rowantree that was over the black linn of Brei, which to day is called the Suca; but the monster at the foot of the rowan tree perceived him, and pursued him,

[28]Cf. Ó Riain, Ó Murchadha and Murray, *Historical Dictionary of Gaelic Placenames*, Fascicle 2 (Names in B-), 32 s.n. *Baile Locha Bágha*.

[29]For edition and translation see James Carney, '*Carn Fraoich soitheach na saorchlann*', *Celtica* 2.1 (1952), 154–94. He surmised that the poem was 'probably a century or more older' than the Book of Uí Maine, the late-fourteenth-century manuscript in which its unique copy survives: cf. ibid., 154.

[30]Whitley Stokes, 'The prose tales in the Rennes *Dindšenchas*', *RC* 16 (1894–5), 136–9 (§132 *Carn Fraích*).

[31]The last-mentioned tradition is also witnessed in Recension I of *Táin Bó Cúailnge*, in the episode known as *Aided Froích* 'The Death of Fróech'. Garrett S. Olmsted has argued cogently that this episode was displaced from its original position in the *Táin*, with the result that the location of *Síd Fraích* was also moved, from a place near Crúachain to the area of *Slíab Fúait*. Cf. Olmsted, 'On the origin of the *Aided Fraich* episode of *Táin Bó Cúailnge*', *EC* 19 (1978), 537–47.

[32]Stokes, 'The prose tales in the Rennes *Dindšenchas*', 137.

> and wounded him sorely. But Fráech brought Medb the monster in triumph, and the rowan tree; and he was healed in the cairn, wherefore it is called *Carn Fráich*. Or mayhap he was killed by the monster, and his grave is still in the cairn.'[33]

The actual manuscript-reading is *dubaind Brea* and Stokes emended this to *dublind Brea*; however, there is no support elsewhere for such a form.[34] *Táin Bó Fraích* has *dublind*, *in dublind*, and *Dublind Ḟroích i mBreib*, but not *Dublind Brea*.[35] One may conclude that the *Dindṡenchas* reading should be emended instead to *ar dub[ab]aind Brea*.

This is consistent with a further Middle Irish reference in which the Suck is identified by this alias. It occurs in a Middle Irish tract on the kings of Connacht in the late-fourteenth- or early-fifteenth-century Book of Lecan. This relates that the supporters of Sanb, son of Cet mac Mágach, whose territories were to the north-west and south of Crúachu, contended for the kingship of Connacht with Maine Aithremail, son of Ailill and Medb, and that the border between them was *dubaband breaa .i. succa*.[36] A version of this text is given by Dubhaltach Mac Fhirbhisigh (†1671) in his genealogical collection *Leabhar Mór na nGenealach*, with an additional detail on the naming of the Suck:

> [...] agus as í fa coiccrioch eatorra Dubhabhainn Bhrea ris a ráitear Suca .i. o Shogca inghean Chairbre do baidheadh ann.[37]

> '[...] and the frontier between them was Dubhabhainn Bhrea which is called Suca, i.e. from Sogca daughter of Cairbre who was drowned in it.'[38]

TWO EARLY MODERN REFERENCES TO *DUBABAIND BREA*

Two references to the river-name are found in the Early Modern Irish version of *Táin Bó Flidaise*, a tale which commentators sometimes identify as 'The Mayo *Táin*'.[39] This incorporates traditions found in the much shorter

[33]Ibid. 138.

[34]Stokes's emendation (*dublind* in *dublind Brea risi n-abar in tShuca indiu*) is cited as though an actual form in Ó Riain et al., *Historical Dictionary of Gaelic Placenames*, 171 (*s.n.* Bré (2)).

[35]As Stokes's proposed emendation to *dublind brea* underpins the sole entry for this name in Hogan, *Onomasticon Goidelicum*, the entry may be disregarded, as may its reiteration in Kaarino Hollo (ed. and trans.), *Fled Bricrenn ocus Loinges mac nDuíl Dermait and its Place in the Irish Literary and Oral Narrative Traditions: A Critical Edition with Introduction, Notes, Translation, Bibliography and Vocabulary* (2005), 108.

[36]*isi ba coicrich eturru .i. dubaband breaa .i. succa*, Dublin, RIA MS 23 P 2 (535, Book of Lecan), fol. 176ra, ll. 41–2.

[37]Nollaig Ó Muraíle (ed. and trans.), *Leabhar Mór na nGenelach: The Great Book of Genealogies, Compiled (1645–66) by Dubhaltach Mac Fhirbhisigh*, 5 vols (Dublin 2003), I, 232 (§59.5) (cf. similar entry at vol. III, 350 (§1019.3)).

[38]Ibid., I, 233.

[39]Donald McKinnon (ed. and trans.), 'The Glenmasan Manuscript', *Celtic Review* 1 (1904–5), 12–17, 102–31, 208–29, 296–315; 2 (1905–6), 20–33, 100–21, 202–3, 300–12; 3 (1906–7), 10–25, 114–37, 198–215, 294–317; 4 (1907–8), 10–27, 104–21, 202–19.

Old Irish version of *Táin Bó Flidaise*, but expands and alters them substantially, providing many extra details.[40] The first reference to *Dubabaind Bré* occurs in a passage concerning the route taken by Fergus mac Róich when he travels from *Ráith Crúachan* to *Irrus Domnann* (Erris) in north-west Mayo to visit Flidais. Medb implies that he will travel in a southerly direction initially, identifying the place in which he will spend the first night as follows:

> [...] a tigh Mod*h*o mi*n*ad*h*m*a*d*adh* moll*aman* c*er*dasa a *n*dún*ad* at*h*a d*eir*g ar dubabain*n* brea r*é* r*áiter* at*h* s*en*mo*dho* ar suca.[41]
>
> '[...] in the house of Moda Minadhmadadh, my chief craftsman, in the fort of Red Ford [*Áth Derg*] on *Dubabaind Bré* which is called the Ford of old Moda [*Áth senModa*] on the Suck.'

Presumably the adjective *sen-* 'old' in *at*h *s*en*mo*dho was introduced to make alliteration with *Suca*, and the placename in question is *Áth Moga*, a fording point on the river Suck where the modern village of Ballymoe (*Béal Átha Mogha*) now stands. The second reference to *Dubabaind Bré* in this text occurs in a passage describing the route taken by Medb when she and her troops set out to rescue Fergus following his imprisonment at Flidais's house. In this case, no alias is cited for *Dubabaind Bré*, which suggests that the river may still have been identifiable by this name alone in the early modern period:

> Agus is h-i so slighe do dech*aid* Meadb con a maithib agus con a marc-sluagaib .i. tar mín muighei Aéi, agus tar oirter Sleibhi Treblainde, agus tar mullach Cruad-luac(h)rai, agus tar Dubabuind m-Breaa, agus tar iartar cineoil Forcaill, agus tar Moin Coindedha [...][42]
>
> 'And this is the road which Meave with her chiefs and cavalry followed, viz., across the smooth plain of Ai, and over the east of Sliabh Trebland [*sic*], and across the top of Cruad-Luachra, and across the Black-river of Brea, and across the western part of the race of Forcall's land, and across the Moor of Coindeadh [...]'[43]

[40]See Ruairí Ó hUiginn, 'Growth and development in the Late Ulster Cycle: The case of *Táin Bó Flidais*', in Joseph Falaky Nagy (ed.), *Memory and the Modern in Celtic Literatures*, CSANA Yearbook 5 (Dublin, 2006), 143–62.

[41]My reading (for which I consulted the image on www.isos.dias.ie (accessed 10 February 2019)) of NLS MS Adv. 72.2.3, p. 19, col. 37, ll. 14–16, differs somewhat from McKinnon's (in 'The Glenmasan Manuscript', *The Celtic Review* 6, 114). He rendered the last placename as *Ath s mó* with unexpanded suspension strokes above both the *s* and the *ó*. His translation reads 'in the house of Moda Minadhmadadh, my chief steward, in the fort of Red-ford on the black river of Brea, called the Ford of ... on the (river) Suck' (ibid. 115).

[42]McKinnon, 'The Glenmasan Manuscript', *Celtic Review* 3, pp. 6 and 18.

[43]Ibid., 17, 19. Some of the preceding names are no longer extant, and some are probably fictional, but *Móin Choinneda* is mentioned frequently in annalistic and other sources as bogland through which an important routeway passed, part of which is identifed as *Tóchar Móna*

DÚNAD ÁTHA DEIRG ALIAS *DÚN DIARMATA* ON THE SUCK

In his study of the routeways outlined in *Táin Bó Flidais*, R. B. Aldridge identified the aforementioned *tech Modo* at *dúnad Átha Deirg* on the Suck with a now unnamed large rath in Dundermot townland, parish of Drumatemple, on the east bank of the Suck near Ballymoe. The rath, about 1 kilometre ESE of Ballymoe, is 'standing on the high bank above flood level and overlooking the river. The interior measurements of this rath give a diameter of between 165 and 180 feet, roughly circular; the outside vallum is about 27 feet from the inside bank, and there are traces of another fosse and vallum outside this again. This fort guards the fords at Ballymoe, and the approaches are over high ground.'[44] I suggest that this is very likely the *Dun Diarmota os Dubabaind Brea* which is mentioned in an anecdote embedded in a genealogical tract on the Uí Diarmata as the fort built by the Uí Briúin Aí dynast and sometime king of Connacht, Diarmait (†833) son of Tommaltach; he was a brother of the more famous Muirges (†815) son of Tommaltach whose descendants dominated the kingship of Connacht down to the thirteenth century.[45] The purpose of the anecdote is to explain why none of Diarmait's descendants became king of Connacht (their failure to do so is associated with the battle of *Tarbga*, which occurred in 822), and why they settled near Ballymoe, on the southern border of *Mag nAí* (*Áth Moga* is identified as one of the four major fords leading into *Mag nAí* in various sources).[46]

> [...] nir gob Diarmaid fearand aile o [a] brathair .i. o Muirgeas mac Thomaltaigh acht fearann bad chomacus da oidi .i. do [Fh]aithleach, conad airi sin tugad Anarta & in Calad do Diarmaid cona cloind. Acus ro ba cumang leis in fearann sin fo deired co ndechaid a n-airrther na crichi co nderna dun and .i. Dun Diarmota os Dubabaind Brea, conad and ro bai 'na rig an aired ro bai beo & cach neach da cloind.[47]
>
> '[...] Diarmait accepted no other land from his brother, Muirgius son of Tomaltach, but land that was near his fosterfather, Faithleach, which is why Anarta and In Calad were given to Diarmait and his sons. And eventually he found that land cramped and went

Coinneda, the initial element of which forms part of the name of the civil parish of Templetogher, barony of Ballymoe, County Galway, and the townland of Castletogher in the same parish.

[44]R. B. Aldridge, 'The routeways described in the story called Táin Bó Flidhais', *JRSAI* 91.1 (1961), 117–27; 91.2 (1961), 219–28. See 91.1, p. 123.

[45]For edition and translation of this text, and discussion (though not of the placenames), see Gearóid Mac Niocaill, 'The background to the Battle of Tarbga', *Celtica* 11 (1976), 133–40. He suggested that any hypothetical original redaction could hardly be earlier than the late tenth century, and that the text as it stands was unlikely to be earlier than the thirteenth century (ibid., 134–5).

[46]E.g. in the Book of Leinster version of *Táin Bó Cúailnge* (Cecile O'Rahilly (ed. and trans.), *Táin Bó Cúailnge from the Book of Leinster* (Dublin, 1967), 5, ll. 171–2); and in the Stowe version of *Táin Bó Cúailnge* (Cecile O'Rahilly (ed. and trans.), *The Stowe Version of Táin Bó Cúailnge* (Dublin, 1961), 6, ll. 181–2; 159, ll. 5011–12.

[47]Mac Niocaill, 'The background to the Battle of Tarbga', 135 (§1).

> into the east of the territory and built a fortress there, that is, Dún Diarmata above Dubaba Brea, and there he was king as long as he lived, and every one of his sons.'[48]

We may note that in this anecdote, as in one of the two references cited above from *Táin Bó Flidaise*, no alias is given for *Dubabaind Bré*.

Two distinct pools on the Suck named *Duiblind*

It remains to show that there were two distinct pools named *Duiblind* on the river Suck. The clearest evidence for this is found in the late Old Irish tale *Fled Bricrenn ocus Loinges mac nDuíl Dermait*.[49] This tells of Cú Chulainn and a party of warriors travelling from Ulster into Connacht along a route that brought them across the rivers Duff and Drowes, and proceeding as far as *Duiblind Chríche Cíarraige*.[50] On arriving there, they split into two groups and head southwards, one group making its way along the western bank of the Suck, the other along its eastern bank, with both groups eventually arriving at *Áth Ferthain*, and more particularly at *Duiblind Átha Ferthain*.[51] This is implicitly located in Uí Maine territory since Cú Chulainn is said to be accosted there by Findchóem, daughter of the king of Uí Maine, who says she is in love with Cú Chulainn. He and the Ulstermen take her back with them to *Ráith Crúachan*, travelling north by way of the wood called *Fid Manach* (which is between Ballymoe and Dunmore), on to Ballymoe (*Bél Átha Moga*), and back into *Mag nAí*.

Áth Ferthain appears in the form *Áth Feórainne* in the *Annals of the Four Masters sub anno* 1236. John O'Donovan identified this as 'Afeoran, a townland on the east side of the River Suck', noting that its situation was clearly

[48]Ibid., 138 (§1). Faithleach is presumably the saint associated with Cloontuskert on the west bank of the Shannon, about 2 kilometres from Lanesborough, County Roscommon, on whom see Pádraig Ó Riain, *A Dictionary of Irish Saints* (Dublin, 2011), 302. The 'coarb of Faithleach from Cloontuskert' is named as one of the clerics entitled to be present at the inauguration of the king of Connacht in an Early Modern Irish tract on the ritual: cf. Dillon, 'The inauguration of O'Conor', 188–9 (full reference at footnote 16 above). To the anonymous reader I owe the suggestion that *Anarta* underlies the townland name of Anrittabeg in the parish of Cloontuskert, about 3 kilometres west of Lanesborough, and that presumably there was once also an *Anarta*, or an *Anarta Mór*. It follows that *In Calad* is likely a callow nearby, on the west bank of the Shannon. Our text erroneously describes Diarmait's westward move from the vicinity of Cloontuskert to *Dún Diarmata* on the Suck as a move *a n-airrther na crichi*. A copy of the text found in Dubhaltach Mac Fhirbhisigh's *Leabhar Mór na nGenealach* evidences the same slip (*in airthear na críche*), silently identified as such by the editor who translates the phrase as 'into the west of the territory': cf. Ó Muraíle, *Leabhar Mór na nGenealach*, I, 535 (§236.9; full reference at footnote 36 above).

[49]Hollo, *Fled Bricrenn* (full reference at footnote 35 above).

[50]*for Duib 7 Drobaís co Duiblin*n Ch*ríchi Cíarraigi*, Hollo, *Fled Bricrenn*, 53 (§5). As Hollo notes, 'the present-day Duff, which runs along the Sligo-Leitrim border, and the Drowes, which runs from Loch Melvin into Donegal Bay ... were regarded as marking part of the Ulster-Connacht border' (*Fled Bricrenn*, 107).

[51]*Do-dechadar dó co torac*h*tar im airenac*h *i*n *Átha Fertain fri Corra f*or *Ac*h*ud antúait*h (Hollo, *Fled Bricrenn*, 53 (§5)); 'They went thither until they came into the forepart of Áth Ferthain, north of Corra-for-achud' (ibid., 98 (§5)).

described in a grant of 1612.[52] The grant locates it 'between the towns and lands of Bealaforen on the east, and Mucklone on the west side of the river', evidently adjacent to the modern town of Ballyforan (*Bél Átha Feórainne*). Clearly, then, *Duiblind Átha Ferthain* lies well south of the land of the Cíarraige whose territory bounded that of the Uí Briúin Aí, and is quite distinct from *Duiblind Chríche Cíarraige*.[53]

I have suggested above that *Duiblind Ḟroích* may have been located in or close to to present-day Castlerea. If so, it was also close to the important site of *Termann Cáelainne*, the church of Cáelainn, patron-saint of the Cíarraige, which is in the townland of Termon More, about one kilometre to the east of Castlerea. The possibility that *Duiblind Ḟroích* and *Duiblind Chríche Cíarraige* both refer to the same 'black pool' at Castlerea seems strong. Finally, while *Duiblind Ḟroích* was perhaps never more than a fictional name, the name *Duiblind Chríche Cíarraige* or, more likely, the shorter form, *Duiblind*, could conceivably have remained in use until today, were it not for the building of the *caislén ríabach* and its eclipsing of the placename that preceded it.

Máirín Ní Dhonnchadha

National University of Ireland Galway

[52] *AFM* iii, 284–5.

[53] Hogan, *Onomasticon*, 372, *s.n.* 'Dublinn críche ciarraigi', has 'al[ias] Duiblind Átha Ferthain, and was in Hui Maine'. The two *Duiblind*s are also conflated in Hollo, *Fled Bricrenn*, 108. Ó Riain, Ó Murchadha and Murray, *Historical Dictionary of Gaelic Placenames* I, 132, *s.n.* 'Áth Ferthain', has 'perh. on the Sinking r., betw. tls. Ballymoney (N./S.) and Gortnagoyne, p. / b. Dunmore, GY.'; this misidentification was taken over from an earlier publication by Kaarina Hollo, 'The Feast of Bricriu and the Exile of the Sons of Dóel Dermait', *Emania* 10 (1992), 18–24, at 24.

SÍD CRÚACHAN AND ITS NAMES

Abstract[1]

This article discusses the alternative names by which the important Otherworld site of *Síd Crúachan* was known and the traditions associated with them. It also considers the fact that Medb of Crúachu is not associated supernaturally with *Síd Crúachan* and the significance of this for the question of her origins.

Ráith Crúachan, *Síd Crúachan*, and Medb

Ráith Crúachan (Rathcroghan) is the highest point in a densely monumentalized landscape containing over sixty individual monuments and sites in an area of roughly ten square kilometres in the plain of *Mag nAí* in northern County Roscommon.[2] Today, it is a broad circular mound with a basal diameter of around 90 metres. Archaeologists who have studied this landscape speak of there being two complexes of monuments and sites, the northerly one named after *Ráith Crúachan*, and the southerly one after *Carn Fraích* (Carnfree). *Carn Fraích* is identified as an inauguration site in the written sources: in fact, twelfth-century and later sources represent it as the primary inauguration site of the provincial kings of Connacht since time immemorial, and its use for specific inaugurations is detailed into the fifteenth century.[3] Yet the mound of *Ráith Crúachan* was the symbolic heart of the provincial kingdom of Connacht, and this symbolism persisted, especially among the descendants and partisans of the Uí Briúin Aí kings of Connacht (named from *Mag nAí*), including the rulers of the later Ó Conchobair and Mac Diarmata lordships. Thus while terms such as *dol for Carn Fraích* ('to go upon Carn Fraích') pointed up the venue of inauguration of kings of Connacht, titles such as *rí Crúachan* and *airdrí Crúachan* inscribed the symbolic importance of the plain of *Crúachu* and, implicitly, that of its focal monument, *Ráith Crúachan*.

Ráith Crúachan also features prominently in tales and verse from the early eighth century onwards as the residence of the legendary king and queen of Connacht, Ailill and Medb. While this supposedly existed in the material world, it is portrayed as having an Otherworld counterpart in *Síd Crúachan* ('The *Síd*-mound of *Crúachu*'), through which humans might enter the Otherworld or from which its supernatural denizens, the *áes síde*

[1]My thanks are due to the editors of *Celtica* and the anonymous reader for valuable comments, criticism and points of information.

[2]John Waddell, Joseph Fenwick and Kevin Barton, *Rathcroghan: Archaeological and Geophysical Survey in a Ritual Landscape* (Dublin, 2009); John Waddell, *Archaeology and Celtic Myth* (Dublin, 2014), especially 56–69.

[3]Elizabeth Fitzpatrick, *Royal Inauguration in Gaelic Ireland* c. *1100–1600* (Woodbridge, 2004), especially 60–8.

 ©Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies

('the *síd*-folk'), might emerge. The influence of *Síd Crúachan* on human society was, like that of all *síde*, by turns benevolent and malevolent.

Various medieval texts portray *Síd Crúachan* and *Úam Chrúachan* ('The Cave of *Crúachu*') as contiguous.[4] The Old Irish tale *Echtrae Nerai* ('The Adventures of Nerae') tells of its protagonist Nerae going into *Úam Chrúachan*, proceeding along a track within it and thereby entering *Síd Crúachan*.[5] The cave in question has been identified since the nineteenth century, at latest, with the site in the townland of Glenballythomas about 800m south-west of *Ráith Crúachan* (NGR M7958 8311) now more usually called *Uaimh na gCat*, in English Oweynagat ('The Cave of the Cats'). This consists of a souterrain of *c.* 3 metres in length, with passages opening to the south-east and the north-west; the north-west passage, which is partly artificial for *c.* 10 metres, joins a natural fissure which continues for a further 37 metres.[6]

Síd Crúachan and *Síd in Broga* at Newgrange (the *Síd* of the *Bruig* 'Abode' [of Óengus, son of the Dagda and Bóand]) are the two most celebrated *síde* in Irish literature, with the former perhaps the most notable Otherworld site in the so-called Ulster Cycle, and certainly Connacht's most notable Otherworld site.[7] The souterrain in *Uaimh na gCat* incorporates two *ogam* inscriptions on capstones which are presumed to be reused, formerly upright, pillar stones. One of these is incomplete and partly illegible, while the other reads *VRAICCI / MAQI MEDVVI*, 'of Fróech, son of Medb'. The preservation of final *-I* in both names in the latter inscription suggests it is of pre-sixth-century date.[8] As the name *Fróech* is of rare occurrence, it is difficult not to assume some kind of continuity between the Fróech commemorated here and the figure known to later literature as the Connacht warrior Fróech mac Idaith/Fidaig.[9] But the name *Medb* is also of rare occurrence in medieval sources, as we shall see, despite being among the small percentage of personal names that had both masculine and feminine forms. That the name found in the *Uaimh na gCat* inscription is also borne by the legendary Queen Medb of Connacht bears further consideration here.

[4]E.g. Whitley Stokes (ed. and trans.), *Acallamh na Senórach*, in Whitley Stokes and Ernst Windisch (eds), *Irische Texte,* fourth series, 1 (Leipzig, 1900), 213–16 (ll. 7626, 7646, 7677, 7679, 7683).

[5]Kuno Meyer (ed. and trans.), 'The Adventures of Nera', *RC* 10 (1889), 212–28, at 216–19 (§6).

[6]For its location, and a full description (incorporating earlier accounts), see Joseph P. Fenwick and Matthew Parkes, 'Oweynagat, Rathcroghan, Co. Roscommon and associated karst features', *Irish Speleology* 16 (1997), 11–14. On other caves in the vicinity see Caoimhe Hickey and David Drew, 'Caves of County Roscommon', *Proceedings of the University of Bristol Spelaeological Society* 23, no. 1 (2003), 35–50. For an avowedly speculative view of the site's former uses and possible role in medieval cult practises, with extensive citation of literary and archaeological references, see John Waddell, 'The Cave of Crúachain and the Otherworld', in Jacqueline Borsje, Ann Dooley, Séamus Mac Mathúna and Gregory Toner (eds), *Celtic Cosmology: Perspectives from Ireland and Scotland* (Toronto, 2014), 77–92.

[7]On the 'Ulster-Connaught Cycle' as an alternative title, see Thomas Charles-Edwards, '*Táin Bó Cúailnge*, hagiography and history', in John Carey, Kevin Murray and Caitríona Ó Dochartaigh (eds), *Sacred Histories: A Festschrift for Máire Herbert* (Dublin, 2015), 86–102, at 88.

[8]For images and description see the 'Ogham in 3D' internet site hosted by the School of Celtic Studies, Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies (https://ogham.celt.dias.ie). See also Damian McManus, *A Guide to Ogam* (Maynooth, 1991), 207, 121, 122.

[9]For sites in Mag nAí named for Fróech mac Idaith/Fidaig, see above at pp. 105–12.

In addition to the instance of Medb with masculine inflection in the *ogam* inscription, there is the further instance of [*uir*] *Medbu nomine ... prespiter bonus* ('[a man] of the name of Medb ... a good priest') in Tírechán's account of St Patrick in his *Collectanea* in the Book of Armagh, with the same character appearing as *prespiterum Medb* in the *Additamenta* in the same manuscript. Tírechán tells that this Medb was from *Irlochir*, had studied at Armagh and later, as a monk of Armagh, had founded a church at *Imgoe Mair Cerrigi*.[10] The *Additamenta* include him among Patrick's *familiam ... in regione Ciarrichi* along with a certain bishop named Sachellus and some others. Sachellus is identified by Tírechán as bishop of *Bassilica*, presumed to be the church he names more fully as *Bassilica sanctorum*.[11] This important church has been described as 'a genuine fifth-century church' and 'the centre of evangelization in Connacht'.[12] Known today as Baslick, its site is some eight kilometres west of *Ráith Crúachan*. This suggests that Medb's church of *Imgoe Mair Cerrigi* was nearby, and at any rate in the territory of the Cíarraige of Mag nAí (soon to be identified as the territory ruled by the Uí Briúin Aí).

The earliest identifiable historical female named Medb is also connected to the Cíarraige. This is Medb, mother of St Cáelainn who was patron saint of the Cíarraige in Connacht. Cáelainn's church was formerly known as *Daire Cáelainne* ('Cáelainn's Wood'), *Termonn Cáelainne* ('Cáelainn's Precinct') and *In Termonn Mór* ('The Great Precinct'); it is located about two kilometres south-west of Baslick, in what is now the townland of Termon More. Fortunately, Medb's genealogy is recorded in the tract on 'The mothers of Irish saints'.[13] Although it contains unresolved difficulties, it is clear that it identifies Cáelainn's father with an unspecified branch of the Cíarraige, and Cáelainn's mother, Medb, with the Cíarraige Lúachra, the most significant branch of the Cíarraige in Munster, who were located in the north of what is now County Kerry. As we have seen, Tírechán identified *presbiter Medb* as having come to the Mag nAí region from *Irlochair* ('East Lóchair/Lúachair'), which territory bounded Cíarraige Lúachra. There is an early tradition that the Cíarraige migrated from Munster to Connacht in the time of Áed (†577) son of Echu Tirmcharna, a progenitor of the Uí Briúin Aí, and were given land in a transaction for which Cáelainn acted as surety, acquiring in the process the land for her own *Termonn Mór*.[14]

[10]Ludwig Bieler (ed. and trans.), *The Patrician Texts in the Book of Armagh* (Dublin, 1979), 150 (§33.2).

[11]Ibid., 146 (§29.2), 148 (§32.5).

[12]Charles Doherty, 'The basilica in Early Ireland', *Peritia* 3 (1984), 303–18. Also Charles Doherty, 'The cult of St Patrick and the politics of Armagh in the seventh century', in Jean-Michel Picard (ed.), *Ireland and Northern France AD 600–850* (Dublin, 1991), 53–94, at 79–81.

[13]Edited and discussed in Paul Grosjean, 'The pedigree of Saint Caelainn', *JCS* I.1 (November 1949), 193–8.

[14]For the modern edition of this text see Vernam Hull, 'The migration of the Ciarraige', *Speculum* 25 (1950), 184–9. On the various branches of the Cíarraige in Connacht, this text, and St Cáelainn, see Nollaig Ó Muraíle, 'Some early Connacht population-groups', in Alfred P. Smyth (ed.), *Seanchas: Studies in Early and Medieval Irish Archaeology, History and Literature in Honour of Francis J. Byrne* (Dublin, 2000), 161–77.

Contact between the Cíarraige of Munster and of Mag nAí is suggested not only by what Tírechán relates concerning the travels of *prespiter Medb*, and by St Cáelainn's genealogical background, but also by the interest shown by the presumed Munster poet Luccreth moccu Chérai in the traditions of Ailill and Medb and their involvement in *Táin Bó Cúailnge*. Three poems which are usually regarded as Luccreth's work are extant. His *floruit* is deduced from the ascription to him of a genealogical poem in praise of the Eóganacht king, Cathal Cú-cen-máthair, and his ancestors; he ruled Munster from 662 until his death in 665 or 666.[15] Another poem (with an ascription in this case merely to 'Lucreth') is concerned with the eruption of Loch nEchach and the subsequent migrations of the Ulidian Corco Óche, in particular to Munster where they were well received by a remote Eóganacht king, Ailill Fland Bec.[16] These two poems would seem to indicate that Luccreth's career was spent in Munster. However the third poem shows remarkable familiarity for Luccreth's time with the events narrated in *Táin Bó Cúailnge*. Beginning with the dramatic statement, *Con-alla Medb míchuru, / mac do Róich rúadchuru*, 'Medb enjoined evil contracts, bloody contracts for mac Roich', it frames the migrations of Fergus mac Róich by reference to Fergus's expulsion from Ulster, his descendants' time at Tara and subsequent move to Munster, and Fergus's leadership of Medb's forces in the *Táin*.[17] Assuming a *floruit* for Luccreth around the mid-seventh century, this poem provides what is very likely the earliest extant outline of the events of the *Táin* and also the earliest references to Queen Medb.[18] I suggest that one can hardly rule out the possibility

[15]*AU* s.a. 665, but other obits in this entry in *AU* appear s.a. 666 in other annalistic sources; the ambiguity is likely consequent on the plague in these years. For editions of the poem, see Kuno Meyer, *Über die älteste irische Dichtung*, 2 vols (Berlin, 1913), i, 53–8; and M. A. O'Brien (ed.), *Corpus Genealogiarum Hiberniae* (Dublin, 1962), 199–202. Myles Dillon argued that six short poems which follow '*Cú cen máthair maith cland*' in all the manuscripts (and which are edited in O'Brien, *op. cit.*, pp. 203–4) are in fact 'supplementary quatrains for each branch of the Eóganachta': cf. Dillon, 'A poem on the kings of the Eóganachta', *Celtica* 10 (1973), 1–14, at 13. Notwithstanding its attribution to Luccreth moccu Chérai, James Carney was inclined to regard this poem as the work of Cormac mac Cuillenáin (†908): cf. James Carney, 'Three Old Irish accentual poems', *Ériu* 22 (1971), 23–80, at 67. He accepted the other two poems as Luccreth's work, and was inclined to date them as early as *c.* 600 AD (cf. Carney, 'Three Old Irish accentual poems', p. 75; also James Carney, 'Early Irish literature: the state of research', in Gearóid Mac Eoin (ed.), *Proceedings of the Sixth International Congress of Celtic Studies, Held in University College, Galway, 6—13 July 1979* (Dublin, 1983), 113–29, at 122.

[16]Edited by Kuno Meyer, 'The Laud Genealogies and Tribal Histories', *ZCP* 8 (1912), 291–338, at 308.

[17]For edition of the poem, and the preceding prose (*De causis quibus exules Aquilonensium ad Muminenses adducti sunt*), see Meyer, 'The Laud Genealogies and Tribal Histories', 305–7; for edition with translation of poem and prose, see P. L. Henry, '*Conailla Medb míchuru* and the tradition of Fiacc son of Fergus', in Séamus Mac Mathúna and Ailbhe Ó Corráin (eds), *Miscellanea Celtica in memoriam Heinrich Wagner* (Uppsala, 1997), 53–70; and Garrett Olmsted, 'Luccreth's poem *Conailla Medb míchuru* and the origins of the *Táin*', *Mankind Quarterly* 29 (1988), 3–72. See also Garrett Olmsted, '*Conailla Medb míchuru* and the origins of the *Táin*', *EC* 29 (1992), 333–42, and idem, 'The earliest narrative version of the *Táin*: seventh-century poetic references to *Táin Bó Cúailnge*', *Emania* 10 (1992), 5–17.

[18]While the poem *Verba Scáthaige*, which is believed to have been in the manuscript *Cín Dromma Snechtai*, also provides an outline of the *Táin* and a reference to Medb, the contents of

that Luccreth moccu Chérai had some form of contact with the Cíarraige Aí. In any case, this early cluster of characters named Medb in the vicinity of *Ráith Chrúachan* is striking: the patronym in the inscription in *Uaimh na gCat*, the priest contemporary with Patrick who founded *Imgoe Mair Cerrigi*, the mother of Saint Cáelainn, patron of the Cíarraige, and Queen Medb in Luccreth moccu Chérai's poem.

The occurrence of the name *Medb* in historical sources is also remarkably limited and localised. It may come as a surprise that none of the annals records any figure named *Medb* apart from Queen Medb. Even the late and largest genealogical collection, that compiled by Dubhaltach Mac Fhirbhisigh (†1671), has only five of the name, all female: Medb of Crúachain, Medb Lethderg of Tara, Medb, wife of Cathaír Már (remote ancestor of the Laigin), and two women from the historical period, both of Uí Briúin ancestry, namely Meadhbh, daughter of Domhnall Ruadh Ó Máille and Meadhbh, daughter of Flaithbheartach Ó Ruairc.[19] Between them, the published metrical and prose versions of the twelfth-century *Banshenchas* provide references to four historical women named Medb.[20] The paternal identity of one is not given.[21] Of the other three, two are surnamed Ó Ruairc,[22] and one is named as a daughter of Indrechtach (†752) mac Muiredaig, cautiously identified as a scion of the Síl Muiredaig of Mag nAí.[23] Clearly, then, the name Medb was predominantly used by descendants of Uí Briúin, and its earliest attestations are localised to Mag nAí, even before the Uí Briúin emerged as the ruling dynasty there.

This suggests that what limited popularity the name Medb had may have originated from its use among the local élite of the Cíarraige Aí and the emerging Uí Briúin Aí, and that the naming of Queen Medb of Crúachu may well be a reflex of this and not of the supernatural nature long ascribed to her. In fact, there is no evident aetiological link between Queen Medb and *Síd Crúachan*: while she is identified repeatedly in the sources as 'Medb of Crúachu' (*Medb Chrúachan/Chrúachna*), I am not aware that she is ever identified as 'Medb of

this lost manuscript are usually dated to the late seventh or early eighth century. The most closely dated texts in it are those argued to have been composed either during the reign of Fínnechta Fledach (675–95), and perhaps specifically in 688–9, or *c.* 720; on this, see John Carey, 'On the interrelationship of some *Cín Dromma Snechtai* texts', *Ériu* 46 (1995), 71–92, at 86–9; and Edel Bhreathnach, '*Níell cáich úa Néill nasctar géill:* the political context of *Baile Chuinn Chathaig*', in Edel Bhreatnach (ed.), *The Kingship and Landscape of Tara* (Dublin, 2005), 49–68, at 59–68.

[19]Nollaig Ó Muraíle (ed. and trans.), *Leabhar Mór na nGenealach*, 5 vols (Dublin, 2003), i, 490 (§221.4); 600 (§266.3). A rough generation-count puts both historical women in the fourteenth century. The woman identified by Mac Fhirbhisigh as *'Meadhb, dara inghean Baitér de Lacy, bean Gefray Genefeld*' (ibid., iii, 106 (§798E.2)) is in fact Maud (†1304), grand-daughter of Walter de Lacy, wife of Lord Geoffrey de Geneville, Justiciar of Ireland.

[20]Margaret E. Dobbs (ed. and trans.), 'The *Ban-Shenchus*', *RC* 47 (1930), 282–339; 48 (1931), 162–234; 49 (1932), 437–89.

[21]*Meadhbh bean Fhloin*d, ibid., 48, p. 194.

[22]Ibid., vol. 48, 194 and 228.

[23]*Meadb ingen Indrechtaig m. Muireadaig ri Durlais*, ibid., 48, pp. 186 and 225. His identification with *Indrechtach m. Muiredaigh Minn* (AU 752) was made by Dobbs. For the suggestion that he was of the Síl Muiredaig, see Gearóid Mac Niocaill (ed. and trans.), *The Annals of Ulster* (Dublin, 1983), 207, note.

Síd Crúachan' or 'Medb of the *Síd*', nor as far as I know is *Síd Crúachan* ever called *Síd Meidbe*.[24] However *Síd Crúachan* is named for at least one other female. A tradition recorded in the *Dindshenchas*, the *Banshenchas*, and *Cóir Anmann* tells that *Síd Crúachan* (aliter *Crúachu*, *Ráith Chrúachan*) was given this name to requite *Cróchen Chróderg*, maidservant to the Otherworldly Étaín Echraide, for accompanying Étaín when she eloped from her husband with the god Midir.[25] Before Étaín and Midir proceeded to his *síd* in Brí Léith (now Slieve Golry in Co. Longford), they and Cróchen spent three nights together in a *síd* that was then known as *Síd Sinche* ('Sinech's *Síd*'). At Cróchen's request, Midir granted that the place would thenceforth be named for her, and so the name *Síd Crúachan* supposedly came into being. In some versions, Cróchen is identified as Medb's mother.[26]

Until recently, it was generally accepted that Medb of Crúachu was in origin a sovereignty goddess. On foot of this, one would have expected her to be linked supernaturally to *Síd Crúachan*, or to some Otherworld site. But not alone is Queen Medb not so linked to *Síd Crúachan*, it was recently noted that 'no figure named Medb is accorded supernatural traits or associations anywhere in medieval Irish literature.'[27] For over a century, the case for Medb's divine nature was based largely on associating her name with Proto-Celtic **medu-* 'mead', and assuming that a feminine form of an adjective derived from this had been applied to Medb of Crúachu because the meaning, still supposedly transparent, was thought to be reflected in her character and actions. However, a recent in-depth review of the evidence by Britta Irslinger shows that Queen Medb's supposed links to mead and ritual intoxication are not actually borne out by the sources: the traditional image of Medb as intoxicating or drink-dispensing goddess does not stand up to close scrutiny.[28] Irslinger endorses as 'equally possible and plausible' an alternative etymology proposed for the name Medb which takes it to be an adjective with the suffix **-wo/wā* based on the root **med-* 'to measure'.[29] In the sense 'one who measures/rules, a ruler', Medb would seem an appropriate name for either sex while also being particularly apt for a woman constantly represented as a

[24]For the name 'Medb of Crúachu', see Tomás Ó Máille, 'Medb Chruachna', *ZCP* 17 (1927) 129–46, *passim*.

[25]Whitley Stokes (ed. and trans.), 'The prose tales in the Rennes *Dindshenchas*', *RC* 15 (1894), 272–336, 418–84; 16 (1895), 31–83, 135–67, 269–312, at 15, p. 463 (§55); *MD* iii, 348–55; Dobbs, 'The *Ban-Shenchus'*, *RC* 47, 292, 322; *RC* 48, 171, 208; Sharon Arbuthnot (ed. and trans.), *Cóir Anmann: A Late Middle Irish Treatise on Personal Names*, 2 vols (London, 2005, 2007), i, 74 (§287).

[26]See *MD* iii, 354–5 (ll. 85–8); Dobbs, 'The *Ban-Shenchus*', *RC* 48, 171; Arbuthnot, *Cóir Anmann*, i, 74 (§287).

[27]John Carey, 'Tara and the supernatural', in Edel Bhreathnach (ed.), *The Kingship and Landscape of Tara* (Dublin 2005), 32–48, at 47.

[28]Britta Irslinger, 'Medb "the intoxicating one"? (Re-)constructing the past through etymology', in Mícheál B. Ó Mainnín and Gregory Toner (eds), *Ulidia 4: Proceedings of the Fourth International Conference on the Ulster Cycle of Tales* (Dublin, 2017), 38–94.

[29]Irslinger, 'Medb "the intoxicating one"?', 85. For the alternative etymology, see George-Jean Pinault, 'Gaulois *Epomduos,* le maître des chevaux', in Pierre-Yves Lambert and George-Jean Pinault (eds), *Gaulois et celtique continental* (Genève, 2007), 291–307.

queen.[30] One may add that Doris Edel has argued compellingly that tales of Queen Medb are grounded in the contemporary reality of queens and female successors to kingship and the polemics associated with that reality, and that the mythologising of Medb is a later development that occurs in tandem with a change in literary fashion from an epic to a more mythological mode.[31]

As regards the inscription *VRAICCI / MAQI MEDVVI*, 'of Fróech, son of Medb', while one may take it at face value as memorializing Fróech, son of a man named Medb, both otherwise unknown, it seems more than fortuitous that these are also the names of two of the main characters in *Táin Bó Cúailnge* and other tales of the so-called Ulster Cycle. In an influential article, Tomás Ó Máille contended that the Leinster queen, Medb Lethderg, who was associated with the kingship of Tara, was 'the Leinster equivalent of Medb of Cruachan' and that the traditions associated with the two showed that Medb signified 'nothing less than the sovereignty of Ireland'.[32] It was assumed that Medb's primary association was with the sovereignty of Tara and that with Crúachu secondary.[33] However, on the basis of the material considered here, I suggest that Medb's primary association was with Crúachu, not Tara, and her essential identity that of queen, not sovereignty goddess. I also venture to suggest that the earliest extant verse and tales that feature Medb in her role as queen of Crúachu could conceivably derive from authors with connections to, or at least a keen interest in, the contemporary local ruling dynasties, the Cíarraige Aí and the Uí Briúin Aí.[34]

[30]It is noteworthy that the term *rechtaid géill* '(female) hostage ruler' in *Bretha Crólige* is glossed 'who takes hostages, as for instance Medb of Crúachu' (*CIH* 2294.36; 2295.7). Fangzhe Qiu, 'The Ulster Cycle in the law tracts', in Mícheál B. Ó Mainnín and Gregory Toner (eds), *Ulidia 4: Proceedings of the Fourth International Conference on the Ulster Cycle of Tales* (Dublin, 2017), 9–22, at 14, notes that this is 'probably the only reference to Medb of Crúachu in the *CIH*'.

[31]Doris Edel, 'Myth versus reality: Queen Medb of Connacht and her critics, ancient and modern', in Doris Edel, *The Celtic West and Europe: Studies in Celtic Literature and the Early Irish Church* (Dublin, 2001), 152–76; see also eadem, 'Early Irish queens and royal power: a first reconnaissance', in Michael Richter and Jean-Michel Picar (eds), *Ogma: Essays in Celtic Studies in Honour of Próinséas Ní Chatháin* (Dublin, 2002), 1–19. Irslinger, by contrast, leaving aside the issue of the etymology of her name, is inclined to regard Medb as originally divine: 'A thorough re-examination of the evidence shows that there are reasonable, non-linguistic arguments to corroborate the hypothesis that Medb was originally conceived as a goddess, even though absolute proof is missing': see Irslinger, 'Medb "the intoxicating one"?', 91.

[32]Tomás Ó Máille, 'Medb Chruachna', *ZCP* 17 (1927), 129–146, at 136, 139.

[33]See, for instance, T. F. O'Rahilly, *Early Irish History and Mythology* (Dublin, 1946), 170.

[34]The complex issue of the provenance of the *Táin* would have to be considered if this suggestion were to be pursued further. On the dating of the earliest extant version to the second half of the eighth century, and some of the underlying material to the seventh, see Thomas Charles-Edwards, '*Táin Bó Cúailnge*: hagiography and history', *passim*. He makes the salutary comment that 'coincidence of local setting should not be taken too easily as evidence for the place of origin of the *Táin*. The difficulty is the mobility of those most likely to have developed the narrative sequence of the Ulster Cycle up to the eighth century, namely the *filid*, and those most likely to have written the earliest text of the *Táin*, churchmen' (p. 97). We have encountered one such person in the *fili*, Luccreth moccu Chérai.

Síd Crúachan, Síd núamain, and *Síd nochaill*

Returning now to the alternative names of *Síd Crúachan*, we may begin with a doubtful case, that of the name *Síd nÚamain*. The attestation of this name in the Old Irish tale *Aislinge Óenguso* appears to be unique.[35] The tale describes the ultimately successful quest for an extraordinarily beautiful girl who appears to Óengus, son of Bóand and Dagdae, in an *aislinge*, and whose initial unattainability causes him to fall into a wasting sickness (*serg*). In the Ireland-wide search for her, help is given by leading figures, human and divine, from the ancient over-kingdoms. The divine helpers include Bóand, implicitly associated with the Otherworld complex named for her as *Bruig na Bóinde* ('Abode of the Boyne') in Brega; Dagdae, called *rí síde nÉrenn* ('king of the *síd*-mounds of Ireland') in the tale; and Bodb, called *rí síde Muman* ('king of the *síd*-mounds of Munster'), whose abode is identified as *Síd al Femen* ('the *síd* beyond Femen'). Eventually, the beautiful girl is identified as *Caer Iborméith, ingen Ethail Anbuail a ssíd Úamain i crích Connacht*, and Ethal is called *rí int síde* ('king of the *síd*').[36] When Ethal declares that he is unwilling to give his daughter to *macc in Dagdai* ('Dagdae's son'), Ailill and Medb, with help from Dagdae, overrun his *síd*, capture him and force him to reveal where Caer is to be found, with the result that she and Óengus are happily united. Ethal is then released and he and Óengus each form an alliance (*cairdes*) with Ailill and Medb which provides them with crucial assistance when they embark on the great *Táin*.[37]

Narrative symmetry would seem to require that Ethal's *síd* be the pre-eminent *síd* of Connacht, namely *Síd Crúachan*, just as *Bruig na Bóinde* is the pre-eminent *síd* of the Midlands, and Bodb's *síd* (*Síd al Femen*) the pre-eminent *síd* of Munster. In addition, the name *Síd nÚamain* could conceivably inscribe the famously fearsome aspects of *Úam Chrúachan*. The *Úam* is said in various texts to have been the abode of malevolent animals or birds. The fullest account of these is in the ninth-century tale *Cath Maige Mucrama* ('The Battle of Mag Mucrama'); this refers to heathenish pigs, three-headed creatures who lay Ireland waste, and birds whose breath withers the crops, and it also titles *Úam Chrúachan* 'Ireland's gate to hell' (*Dorus iffirn na hÉrend*).[38] Cats are mentioned in some other texts, e.g. the Old Irish tale *Fled Bricrenn* ('The Feast of Bricriu') refers to *tri caittini a húaim Crúachan ... .i. tri bíasta*

[35]Francis Shaw (ed. and trans.), *The Dream of Oengus: Aislinge Óenguso* (Dublin, 1934), 55 (§8); Wolfgang Meid (ed. and trans.), *Aislinge Óenguso: Oengus' Traum* (Innsbruck, 2017), 56 (§8, l. 99). Neither editor comments on the name.

[36]Shaw, *The Dream of Oengus*, 55 (§8); Meid, *Aislinge Óenguso*, 56 (§8, l. 99). The name *Caer Iborméith* should perhaps be taken as *Cáer Iborméith* (and understood to mean 'Plump Yew-Berry'), but I have retained the editors' spelling here. Her name and her father's appear in variant forms in *Airne Fíngein*, on which see below.

[37]Speaking of the relationship of *Aislinge Óenguso* to *Táin Bó Cúailnge*, John Carey has called attention to an allusion in the Middle Irish poem *Dúan in Chethrachat Cest* to a story in which Óengus is said to have slain many warriors of the Ulaid: see his *The Mythological Cycle of Medieval Irish Literature,* Cork Studies in Celtic Literatures 3 (Cork, 2018), 21–2.

[38]Máirín O Daly (ed. and trans.), *Cath Maige Mucrama: The Battle of Mag Mucrama*, ITS 50 (Dublin, 1975), 48–9 (§§34–7).

druidechta, 'three cats from the Cave of Cruachan ... i.e. three beasts of magic'.[39] However it is difficult to know whether this tradition accounts for the name *Uaimh na gCat/*Oweynagat as this appears not to be recorded in pre-modern literature.[40] Another index of the fearsome reputation of *Síd Crúachan* is the occurrence of the title *Úath Úama Crúachan*, 'The Terror of *Úam Chrúachan*', in the medieval Irish list of tales known as List A.[41] In view of all of this, I suggest that *Síd nÚamain* means '*Síd* of Fear' and is a plausible alternative name for *Síd Crúachan*. As Thurneysen noted, the change from original *omun* 'fear' (cp. Welsh *ofn*) to *ómun* was 'probably due to the influence of the synonym *úath* (arch. **ōth*) "terror"'.[42] Both editors of *Aislinge Óenguso* have dated the tale's composition to the eighth century (early or mid-century).[43] Diphthongization of *ō* to *úa* had occurred by this time.

Ethal Anbuail and his daughter Caer Ibormeith also figure under variant forms of their names in the tale *Airne Fíngein* ('Fíngen's Night-Watch').[44] This relates that the eponymous Fíngen is visited by an Otherwordly woman named Rothníam who tells him of all the wonders that happened in Ireland and the Otherworld on the night of Samain. One of these was the appearance of three great lakes, Loch nEchach, Loch Ríach and Loch Léin. Speaking of Loch Ríach (Lough Ree, Co. Galway), the woman says: 'it is in it that Caer Abartaig from Síd Ḟethail Anbudaig bathed the garment of Mac Ind Óc with the abundance of all the wonderful colours of the world ...'[45] Mac Ind Óc is another name for Óengus, whose love for Caer Ibormeith is described in *Aislinge Óenguso*, as we have seen.[46] *Airne Fíngein* tells that another wonder associated with Samain was the finding of three amazing artefacts, one of which was 'the diadem of Brión from the *síde* of Crúachu', Brión being the ancestor of the Uí Briúin of Connacht.[47] However the tale's primary concern is to celebrate the first wonder related by the woman, namely the birth of Conn Cétchathach, apical ancestor of *both* the Uí Néill and the Connacht

[39]George Henderson (ed. and trans.), *Fled Bricrend: The Feast of Bricriu*, ITS 2 (London, 1899), 72, 73. Thurneysen dated the earliest redaction of this tale to the eighth century: see Rudolf Thurneysen, *Die irische Helden- und Königsage* (Halle, 1921), 447–50.

[40]In a note on the line *Dí chait a huaimh Chruachon* ('two cats from *Uaimh Chruachan*') from a *Fíannaigecht* poem, William Wilde wrote: 'I remember, when a boy, being warned by one of the old people against entering it, because it was said to have been inhabited by wild cats, and other venomous creatures of that description.' (W. R. Wilde, 'On the unmanufactured animal remains belonging to the Academy', *PRIA* 7 (1857–61), 181–213, at 190).

[41]Proinsias Mac Cana, *The Learned Tales of Medieval Ireland* (Dublin, 1980), 43. As noted ibid., 66, the list is thought to be based on an older list of the tenth century.

[42]*GOI* §62.

[43]Shaw, *The Dream of Oengus*, 32–8 (esp. 37); Meid, *Aislinge Óenguso*, 48–9.

[44]Joseph Vendryes (ed.), *Airne Fíngein* (Dublin, 1953). On the basis of the oldest linguistic forms, Vendryes dated 'le noyau primitiv du récit' to the ninth or tenth century (ibid., p. xxii).

[45]*is ann ro nenaig Caer Abartaig a Síd Ḟethail Anbudaig cétaig Mic ind Óc co n-ilur n-dath n-ingnad in betha* [...]: Vendryes, *Airne Fíngein*, 13 (ll. 168–9). The translation above is mine.

[46]Óengus is called *In Macc Óc*, and his home is referred to as *Bruig Maicc Ind Óic*: cf. Meid, *Aislinge Óenguso*, 58 (ll. 160, 174 and 178).

[47]*Cathbarr Bríain a sídaib Crúachan* [...], Vendryes, *Airne Fíngein*, 7 (l. 96). It is also mentioned in *Echtrae Nerai*, where it is called *in barr* (*Briuin*): cf. Meyer, 'The Adventures of Nera', 218–20 (§§8, 9).

dynasties.[48] The fact that the Connachta are not the primary concern may be why *Síd Crúachan* is not specifically referenced in relation to Caer and her father in this tale. Indeed, she is not associated explicitly here even with the province of Connacht. But we have other evidence that this was her traditional context in that she is described as *Coer abarboeth, ingen Etail Anbuail a Sidaib a crich Connacht* in a Middle Irish narrative on the naming of *Loch Bél Sét* (Lough Muskry, Co. Tipperary), found in the *Leabhar Breac*.[49] Still, the identification of *Síd Ḟethail* and *Síd nÚamain* as alternative names for *Síd Crúachan* remains a matter of conjecture.

We are on safer ground with the next name, *Síd nOchaill*. *Síd Crúachan* was known by this name, or variants thereof, down to early modern times. The earliest reference to *Síd nOchaill* occurs in the tale *De Chophur in Dá Muccida* ('On the Quarrel (?) of the Two Swineherds'). Two versions of this tale are extant.[50] The earlier was dated by Thurneysen to the ninth century, the later to the first half of the twelfth.[51] The protagonists are two swineherds named Rúcht and Friuch, the former in service to Ochall Oichni, 'the king of the *síd*-mounds of Connacht', the latter in service to Bodb, 'the king of the *síd*-mounds of Munster'. Bodb's *síd* is clearly identifed as *Síd ol Femen*, and Ochall's as *Síd Crúachan*.[52] The tale describes the sequence of transformations, into animal and human forms, that the two swineherds undergo before finally being reborn as the famous bulls, the *Finnbennach* and the *Donn Cúailnge*. While Rúcht and Friuch have the main roles, Ochall and Bodb also feature fairly prominently in the longer version. Their association with the two swineherds does not end with this tale: it features also in the *Dindshenchas*, in the lore concerning *Luimnech* (Limerick), which tells of a battle led by warriors named Fáebur and Rind, the names borne by Rúcht and Friuch in one particular transformation in *De Chophur in Da Muccida* in which they take

[48]On this, see Dan M. Wiley, 'The politics of myth in *Áirne Fíngein*', *CSANA Yearbook 8–9: Narrative in Celtic Tradition: Essays in Honor of Edgar M. Slotkin* (Hamilton, New York, 2011), 276–88.

[49]Printed in Shaw, *The Dream of Óengus*, 19. As Shaw notes, ibid., the account of Caer here 'obviously derives from *Aislinge Óenguso*'.

[50]For both versions see Ulrike Roider (ed. and trans.), *De Chophur in Da Muccida*, Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft 28 (Innsbruck, 1979). The meaning of *cophur* is contested: see Roider, *De Chophur in Da Muccida*, 62–78, and Grigory Bondarenko, *Studies in Irish Mythology* (Berlin, 2014), 183–95. For a newly identified analogue in Welsh tradition to the transformation of the swineherds into dragons, see Carey, *The Mythological Cycle of Medieval Irish Literature*, 23–4.

[51]See Thurneysen, *Die irische Helden- und Königsage*, 278. His dating is echoed in Roider, *De Chophur in Da Muccida*, 19.

[52]*... muccaid Ochaill Oichne ocus muccaid Boidb, rīg síde Muman, alaile rí síde Connacht. Síd mBoidb iss ed Síd ar Femun. Síd nOchaill iss ed Síd Crūachan*: Roider, *De Chophur in da Muccida*, 24, 26 (from the earlier version; the wording in the later version is essentially the same: cf. ibid.). A character named Oichne occurs in the first recension of *Táin Bó Cúailnge* as the name of one of two fosterlings of Ailill and Medb who are among the Connacht warriors who fatally wound the Ulidian Cethern mac Fintain: see *TBC* 1, 97 (l. 3224). The only other occurence of the name of which I am aware also links it to *Ráith Crúachan*: it is in a verse cited in Keating, *Foras Feasa ar Éirinn*, which relates that *Ráith Crúachan* had three earlier names: *Druim na nDruadh*, *Tulach Oichne* and *Ráith Eochach* (cf. Patrick S. Dinneen (ed. and trans.), *Foras Feasa ar Éirinn le Seathrún Céitinn* (London, 1908), ii, 186).

on the form of warriors. The verse tells of Ochall and Bodb guaranteeing the protection, respectively, of Fáebur and Rind:

> Ochaill a Cruachain chróebaig
> rogab fóesam fír-Fóebair;
> oc Síd Buidb ná fóelsad fill
> fofríth fóesam do rúad-Rind.
>
> 'Ochaill from woody Cruachan
> undertook protection of true Faebur;
> at the Sid of Bodb, who would not endure treachery,
> was found protection for fierce Rind.'[53]

The prose speaks of Fóebar putting himself 'under the protection of Ochall from *Síd Crúachan*' ([*for*] *faessam Ochaille a Sidh Cruachna*) and of Rind putting himself 'under the protection of Bodb from *Síd Femin*' (*for foesam mBuidb a Sid Femin*).[54]

I contend that Ochall, together with a daughter of his named Áine, also features in a poem prophesying the Úa Conchobair kings of Connacht. The editor of this poem, Brian Ó Cuív, deduced that it was 'composed between about 1190 and 1228 as part of an attempt by men of learning to provide a corpus of texts which could be seen to be supportive of a build-up of Ua Conchobair power in Connacht.'[55] The poem begins with an anonymous speaker addressing an unidentified man and asking that he not sit on '*Síd nEóchaill*' (spelled thus by Ó Cuív) as this is the prerogative of Síl Muiredaig (the ancestors of the Úa Conchobair royals):

> 'A fhir, ná suid ar an síd,
> Síd nEóchaill co n-ilar gním [...]
>
> Dlegait Síl Muiredaig móir
> a uaisle ocus a onóir [...].'
>
> '"O man, do not sit on the fairy mound, Síd nEóchaill of the many deeds [...]
> The race of great Muiredach are entitled to its nobility and its honour [...]."'[56]

[53] *MD*, iii, 272–3 (ll. 87–90).

[54] Stokes, 'The prose tales in the Rennes *Dindshenchas*', *RC* 15, 453. The story of the battle fought by these warriors is also related in the *dindshenchas* of Áth Luain, but without reference being made to Ochall and Bodb: see *MD*, iii, 366–75, and Stokes, 'The prose tales in the Rennes *Dindshenchas*', *RC* 15, 464–7. For discussion, see Kevin Murray, 'Sources of Irish mythology: the significance of the *dinnṡenchas*', *North American Journal of Celtic Studies* 3.2 (2019), 155–70, at 158–61.

[55] Brian Ó Cuív (ed. and trans.), 'A poem of prophecy on Ua Conchobair kings of Connacht', *Celtica* 19 (1987), 31–54, at 31.

[56] Ibid., 40 (qq. 1*ab*, 2*ab*).

It goes on to tell of a foray made by one Cathal Úa Conchobair to Munster before which he had a vision in which he was visited by two females of Otherworldly appearance.[57] The first of these, named Aíbend, prophesies his imminent defeat, while the second explains that Aíbend's prophecy is merely a deceitful strategy (*cealg*) to mislead him into abandoning his foray. She then foretells his success on this foray, and the successes of various Úa Conchobair kings into the future. She identifies herself in quatrain 24 as Áine, the daughter of *Eóchaill a Síd Chruachna*:

> 'Eóchaill a Síd Chruachna cuirr
> m'athair, a rí cinid Chuinn,
> Áine m'ainm féin ac fledaib
> do Shíl mórgarg Muiredaig.'
>
> '"Eóchaill from rounded Síd Cruachna is my father, o king of Conn's race; my own name at feastings by the great strong Síl Muiredaig is Áine."'[58]

In the absence of other references connecting an Áine to Síl Muiredaig, Ó Cuív cited J. V. Kelleher's suggestion that Áine of the poem represents a transferral to Connacht of the Munster goddess Áine, associated with Cnoc Áine and other places, whose father was named Eógabal: the poet, suggested Kelleher, may have altered the name Eógabal to Eóchaill and made Áine's father a Connacht figure, 'knowing that few of his hearers would know the old Munster legend and fewer would care.'[59] However, in the unique copy of the poem in the Book of Uí Maine, the toponym in quatrain 1*b* is written *sith neothaill* and the personal name in 24*a* is written *Eochaill* (and not *Eóchaill* as in Ó Cuív's edition).[60] While it is true that length-marks are frequently omitted in this and other texts in the manuscript, the clear assocation of Ochall/Ochaill with *Síd Crúachan* in the earlier material cited above renders it highly likely that the poem's *Eochaill a Síd Chruachna* is the same character.

Traditions concerning Ochall survived into the modern period. At least two Early Modern Irish texts refer to him. The poet Tadhg Dall Ó hUiginn (*c.* 1550–*c.* 1591), who lived in the barony of Leyny, County Sligo, addresses one of his poems to an unnamed woman whom he claims to have seen in an

[57]The man in question was identified by Ó Cuív, ibid., as Cathal (†1010) son of Conchobar (†973).

[58] Ibid., 45.

[59]Ibid., 32.

[60]The manuscript reading *neothaill* in 1*b* is not mentioned by Ó Cuív. His note (p. 50) says: 'In emending to *nEóchaill* I have taken into account the occurence of the name *Eóchaill* in §24 and the existence of the name *Ráth nEóchaill* (*TD* 40 §21).' The latter form, in a poem by Tadhg Dall Ó hUiginn, is in fact written *Ráth nEochaill* (on this, see below).

aisling and whose like, he says, will not to be found even in the preeminent *síde* of Ireland, one of which is *Ráith Eochuill*:

> Ní fuil i Síth Bhóinne Breagh
> bean do chrotha acht an chéidbhean,
> ná i Sídh chaomhchlochach na gCuan,
> a mhín aolchrothach ionfuar.
>
> Ná i Síth Easa Ruaidh rámhuigh,
> ná i nDún oide an Ioldánuigh,
> ná i Síth bhláith tirmleapthaigh Thruim,
> ná i Ráith ilreachtaigh Eochuill.
>
> 'There is not in the fairy mounds of the Boyne a woman of thy beauty save that woman, nor in the fair castles of *Síodh na gCuan*, thou gentle, white-formed, pleasing one.
>
> Nor in the fairy mound of oared Assaroe, or in the castle of the *Ioldánach*'s fosterfather, or in the smooth, warm-couched mound of Trim, or in the many-shaped castle of *Eochall*.'[61]

Dubhaltach Mac Fhirbhisigh's *Leabhar Mór na nGenealach* provides a reference to 'Oc[h]all Crúachna', in a section dealing with the prehistoric kings of Connacht. Speaking of a certain Forga, who fought along with Art son of Conn Cétchathach in the battle of Mag Mucrama, it says:

> Agus as isin chath sin Mhuighe Mucramha do marbhadh Forga (iar ffairinn). Ad-bearaid araile a bhreth tar és an chatha i Sidh Rionduilbh mc Ocuill Cruachna, conadh ann atá o sin anall.
>
> 'And it was in that battle of Magh Mucramha that Forgha was killed (according to some). Some say that he was brought after the battle into Síodh Rionnuilbh s. Ocoll of Cruachain, and that he is there ever since.'[62]

[61]Eleanor Knott (ed. and trans.), *A bhfuil aguinn dár chum Tadhg Dall Ó hUiginn (1550–1591): The Bardic Poems of Tadhg Dall Ó hUiginn*, 2 vols, ITS 22 and 23 (London, 1922, 1926), i, 271; ii, 179–80 (poem 40, qq 21–2). It seems to me that quatrain 16 of this poem epitomizes the twelfth-century poem *'A fhir, ná suid ar an síd'* (see footnote 16 above), and I suggest that Ó hUiginn's *Ráith ilreachtaigh Eochuill* may have been inspired by the reference in the earlier poem to *Síd nEochaill* (the reference to *Ráith Eochuill* appears to be unique). In passing it may be noted that Knott's translation of *ráith* as 'castle' is anachronistic; the word is commonly used of an earthen rampart or mound: see dil.ie/34837 (s.v. '2 ráth, ráith'). In any case, *Ráith Eochuill* seems to be a proper noun here.

[62]Nollaig Ó Muraíle (ed. and trans.), *Leabhar Mór na nGenealach: The Great Book of Irish Genealogies, compiled (1645–66) by Dubhaltach Mac Fhirbhisigh* (Dublin, 2003), 236, 237 (§61.7).

In the absence of further evidence, one cannot determine whether *Síodh Rionnuilbh maic Oc[h]aill* was regarded as an alternative name for *Síd nOchaill/Síd Crúachan*, or the name of a different *síd*, perhaps in this vicinity, associated with Ochall's son, Rionnulbh.

Máirín Ní Dhonnchadha

National University of Ireland Galway

CONNACHTA CID DIA TÁ INT AINM[1]

Abstract

The *dindšenchas* poem *Connachta cid dia tá int ainm*, found in the Book of Leinster and the Book of Uí Maine, has not been edited hitherto. Considerations are advanced in support of the view that it and another *dindšenchas* poem, *Mide maigen na marc mer*, were both the work of a single author, Áed Ollbarr Úa Carthaig, who made similar use of Muirchú's *Vita Sancti Patricii* in the two compositions. Áed, who seems to have been active in the mid-to-late twelfth century, belonged to a family which had supplied *ollamain* to the kings of Connacht; his own claims to this dignity were however probably only aspirational.

If the title *Lebor Gabála Érenn* is (following general scholarly usage) taken to apply, not only to the main Middle Irish account of the early settlements of Ireland and the origins of the Gaels, but also to the ensuing catalogues of kings extending down to 'the reigns and times of Ireland after the Faith',[2] then the poem presented here is the second text in the Book of Leinster. Despite having such a prominent position in such an important manuscript, *Connachta cid dia tá int ainm* has attracted remarkably little scholarly attention: its inclusion in the diplomatic edition of the Book of Leinster has (so far as I am aware) been the only occasion of its seeing print hitherto,[3] and a critical edition and translation are still lacking.[4] Although not perhaps aesthetically arresting,

[1]This poem was studied in the postgraduate research seminar of the Department of Early and Medieval Irish, University College Cork, during the academic year 2018–19. I am grateful to the participants: Máire Herbert, Seán Ó Coileáin, Kevin Murray, Caitríona Ó Dochartaigh, Emma Nic Cárthaigh, Riona Doolan, Philip Healy, Ksenia Kudenko, Andrea Lane, Iordanis Notaridis, Cian Ó Cionnfhaolaidh, Ken Ó Donnchú and Tadhg Ó Síocháin. I am further grateful to Kevin Murray for his kindness in reading a draft of the present edition, to Ruairí Ó hUiginn and Barry Lewis in their editorial capacity, and to an anonymous reader: their perceptive comments have rescued me from several mistakes and oversights. All remaining errors and infelicities are my own.

[2]Thus Rudolf Thurneysen, 'Zu irischen Handschriften und Litteraturdenkmälern: Zweite Serie', *Abhandlungen der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Philologisch-historische Klasse*, neue Folge 14.3 (1913), 3–9; R. A. S. Macalister, *Lebor Gabála Érenn: The Book of the Taking of Ireland*, ITS 34, 35, 39, 41, 45 (London, 1938–56), vol. i, xxv–xxix; R. Mark Scowcroft, '*Leabhar Gabhála* – part I: the growth of the text', *Ériu* 38 (1987), 79–140.

[3]*LL*, i, 100–2.

[4]A synopsis of the poem's content was provided by Eugene O'Curry, *On the Manners and Customs of the Ancient Irish*, 3 vols (London, 1873), ii, 10–11.

 ©Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies

the poem does afford some points of interest, which I shall endeavour to address in what follows.

MANUSCRIPTS

I know of only two copies of our poem: besides that in the Book of Leinster there is another, to which my attention has been called by Marie-Luise Theuerkauf, in the Book of Uí Maine.

In the Book of Leinster, the text appears on p. 27a; it is in the hand recently identified by Elizabeth Duncan as T2.[5] According to Duncan's analysis, T2 was the latest of the manuscript's scribes by a significant margin, active in a period between the extreme limits 1181 × 1224;[6] nevertheless, he 'either thought himself part of the original compilation or at least wished posterity to think this'.[7] T2 also wrote the conclusion of the immediately preceding final section of *Lebor Gabála Érenn*, and the *senchas* poetry which occupies the next few pages, indicating that he intended our poem to occupy its present position in the manuscript; Dagmar Schlüter, noting that in *Lebor Gabála Érenn* the regnal section 'originally closed with the high-king Ruaidrí mac Tairdelbaig Ua Chonchobuir from Connacht', suggests that 'beginning [the subsequent] section with a poem on Connacht thus ensures a smooth transition from the *Lebor Gabála* to the series of poems'.[8]

In the Book of Uí Maine our composition belongs to the group of poems, called an 'appendix' by E. J. Gwynn, that is found at the end of that manuscript's collection of *dindšenchas* texts.[9] It is found on fol. 112r, in the hand of Adam Cusin, one of the manuscript's two named scribes, and credited by William O'Sullivan with being the 'real architect' of the manuscript, 'who turned Muircheartach [Ó Ceallaigh]'s collection of loose texts into an impressive volume'.[10] Although this version of the poem is generally inferior to that in the Book of Leinster,[11] it occasionally supplies useful variants; it is provided in its entirety (as *UM*) below.

[5]Elizabeth Duncan, 'Turning over a new leaf: the manuscript context of *Leabhar na Nuachongbhála*, commonly known as the Book of Leinster', *Ossory, Laois and Leinster* 5 (2012), 146–86, at 155.

[6]Elizabeth Duncan, 'A reassessment of the script and make-up of *Lebor na Nuachongbhála*', *ZCP* 59 (2012), 27–66, at 54–5. As Duncan notes, however, T2 need not have been active later than 1201.

[7]Duncan, 'Turning', 183.

[8]Dagmar Schlüter, *History or Fable? The Book of Leinster as a Document of Cultural Memory in Twelfth-Century Ireland*, Studien und Texte zur Keltologie 9 (Münster, 2010), 116.

[9]E. J. Gwynn, 'The Dindshenchas in the Book of Uí Maine', *Ériu* 10 (1926–8), 68–91, at 71.

[10]William O'Sullivan, 'The Book of Uí Maine formerly the Book of Ó Dubhagáin: scripts and structure', *Éigse* 23 (1989), 151–66, at 156, 158.

[11]Speaking of the *dindšenchas* poems in the Book of Uí Maine generally, Gwynn observed that the scribes (he used the singular 'scribe') were 'abominably careless. Of all texts of the Dindshenchas this has the lowest intrinsic value' (*MD*, v, 5). A more detailed discussion is forthcoming: Marie-Luise Theuerkauf, 'The *Dindšenchas* in the Book of Uí Maine', in Elizabeth Boyle and Ruairí Ó hUiginn (eds), *The Book of Uí Maine*, Codices Hibernensis Eximii 3 (Dublin).

CONTENT

The poet begins by asking rhetorically why Connacht is so named: if none of the learned know this then he, Áed Ollbarr '*ollam* of Crúachu and of Ireland', can supply the information. Once the king of the province was one Conn, youngest son of Ceithrenn. When the Túath Dé Danann used to come, he would oppose them with freezing snow, and with heaps of stones and trees to which he would set fire. No druid had greater power than he; and he brought injury to the Túath Dé Danann, carrying off their cattle and destroying their fortresses without their being able to retaliate.

The Túath Dé Danann (who are at this point called 'the men of Ireland') then appealed to Dálach – Conn's uterine brother, and possessed of power equal to his own – to oppose Conn on their behalf. Dálach replied that he would need three hundred white-faced, red-eared cows from every herd. The cows were to be slaughtered, and their ears all brought together in one place: in this way Dálach would gain the knowledge that he needed. When these things were done, he proceeded to the plain where the army was, and melted the magical snow. Hence Mag nAí (interpreted as *Mag nÓe* 'Plain of Ears') and Connachta (interpreted as *Conn-ṡnechta* 'Conn-snow') derive their names.

The logic of the narrative is not always easy to follow: in particular, it seems odd that Conn should be making use both of snow and of fire, especially as the melting of the snow appears to lead to his defeat. A simpler version of the story, apparently the only other reference to it that is attested, appears in the 'long version' of *Cóir Anmann*:

> Connachta: cidh dia ta? Ni ansa. Imurbhadh dhruidhechta dorala iter dá dhruí do Thuaith Dé Danann .i. Cithnellach druí ⁊ Conn draí a n-anmanna. Dorat Conn sneachta mór a timchell Connacht ⁊ co mba de sin ro lean int ainm. Is Connachta in cóigedh o sin gus aniú .i. Cuinn-sneachta .i. sneachta Cuind druídh.
>
> 'Connachta [< Conn + *snechta* "snow"]: how did it come about? It is not difficult. A contest of magic took place between two druids of the Tuatha Dé Danann. Their names were Cithnellach the druid and Conn the druid. Conn brought a heavy fall of snow around Connachta and that was why the name stuck. The province has been Connachta from then until today, i.e. Conn's snow, i.e. the snow of Conn the druid.'[12]

Here it is not only noteworthy that the *Cóir Anmann* account is shorter and less complex, but also that it assigns a different name to Conn's antagonist.

[12]Sharon Arbuthnot, *Cóir Anmann*: *A Late Middle Irish Treatise on Personal Names*, ITS 59–60 (London, 2005–7), ii, 24 (text), 100 (trans.). On p. 169, Arbuthnot calls attention to the similarity of the story in our poem. *Cóir Anmann*'s version of the story is alluded to by Geoffrey Keating: David Comyn and P. S. Dinneen, *Foras Feasa ar Éirinn*: *The History of Ireland by Geoffrey Keating, D.D.*, ITS 4, 8, 9, 15 (London, 1902–14), i, 116.

AUTHOR

No Áed Ollbarr figures as *ollam* of Crúachu, let alone of Ireland, in the annals. A poem on the rights of the Connacht dynasty of Mac Diarmada, however, beginning *Atá sonn sochar na ríogh*, gives the poet's name in the concluding quatrain as *Aodh Ollbharr* […] *ollamh Cruachna*;[13] in the accompanying prose, the poem's author is designated *Aodh Ollabhair Ó Carrthaigh*.[14] Katharine Simms is inclined to regard *Atá sonn* as a composition of the twelfth century, noting that features indicative of a later date in the prose are not found in the verse, and that 'the loose metre, *óglách*as of *deibhidhe*, includes some rhymes between monosyllabic and trisyllabic words […] more characteristic of the twelfth century than later versification'.[15] Mícheál Hoyne, by contrast, regards the poem as being 'falsely attributed', but does not state his reasons for this judgement.[16]

Kuno Meyer proposed that 'Aedh Ollabhar ua Carthaigh' was identical with the Áed Úa Carthaig who composed the *dindšenchas* poem *Mide magen na marc mer*:[17] the copy of the latter in the Book of Leinster carries an ascription to *Aed h- Carthaig*, and the final quatrain in all copies requests a prayer for his soul.[18] If Áed Ollbarr, Áed Ollbarr Úa Carthaig and Áed Úa Carthaig are indeed all the same person – and this would certainly seem to be the most natural interpretation of the evidence – then there are two further compositions which can be attributed to our poet. How plausible are these attributions?

The most straightforward criterion is afforded by the testimony of the poems themselves: in both *Connachta* and *Atá sonn*, the author identifies himself as Áed Ollbarr, and claims to be *ollam* of Crúachu. Both compositions are evidently being assigned to a single poet, whether or not one or both of these attributions may be spurious. For the identification of Áed Ollbarr with Áed Úa Carthaig, by contrast, the sole explicit evidence is found in later ascriptions: that attached to the copy of *Atá sonn* in the seventeenth-century RIA MS A iv 3 (743); and that in the prose tract accompanying the poem, attested only in manuscripts of the eighteenth century.

[13]Nessa Ní Shéaghdha, 'The rights of Mac Diarmada', *Celtica* 6 (1963), 156–72, at 163. Two copies of the poem occur independently of the prose tract, both carrying ascriptions to Áed: that in RIA MS A iv 3 (743), a manuscript of the seventeenth century, names him as *Aodh Ollbharr Ó Carthaigh .i. Ollamh Crúachan*; while the nineteenth-century RIA MS 4 A 28 (1099) names him simply as *Aodh Ollbhair Ó Carthaigh*.

[14]Thus the copy in RIA MS 23 M 23 (340): T. F. O'Rahilly et al. (eds), *Catalogue of Irish Manuscripts in the Royal Irish Academy*, 27 fasc. (Dublin, 1926–48), viii, 945. In the other copy of the prose, in NLI MS G 18, the name is given as *Aodh Ollbharr Ō Conáin* (Ní Shéaghdha, 'The rights', 160).

[15]Katharine Simms, *From Kings to Warlords: The Changing Political Structure of Gaelic Ireland in the Later Middle Ages* (Woodbridge, 1987), 133 and n. 33.

[16]Mícheál Hoyne, Fuidheall Áir: *Bardic Poems on the Meic Dhiarmada of Magh Luirg* c. *1377*–c. *1637* (Dublin, 2018), 44. I am grateful to Ken Ó Donnchú for calling my attention to Hoyne's discussion. For 'Aodh Ollabhar O'Carthach' as the author of *Atá sonn*, see already Edward O'Reilly, *A Chronological Account of Nearly Four Hundred Irish Writers*, Transactions of the Iberno-Celtic Society 1:1 (Dublin, 1820), lxxxvi.

[17]Kuno Meyer, *A Primer of Irish Metrics* (Dublin, 1909), 27.

[18]*MD*, ii, 42–5; *LL*, iv, 941–2.

Another approach is afforded by Brian Ó Cuív's study 'Some developments in Irish metrics', in which he proposed that increasing adherence to three of the requirements for *deibide* verse in Classical Irish *dán díreach* – these being *rinn-airdrinn* rhyme; internal rhyme of all stressed words (other than the last words in their respective lines) in the second couplet of a quatrain; and alliteration in each line, with alliteration of the last two stressed words in a quatrain's final line – can be traced in the course of the Middle Irish period.[19] According to this reckoning, *Connachta* has a percentage of 42.4%, *Atá sonn* a percentage of 51%, and *Mide* a percentage of 63.5%.[20] There is nothing here to suggest shared authorship.

A more differentiated look at the statistics, however, suggests a somewhat different picture. The contrast between the figures for *Connachta* and *Mide* is due to their sharply divergent treatment of internal rhyme (4.8% vs 35%): they resemble one another closely in their use of *rinn-airdrinn* rhyme (73.5% and 77%) and alliteration (79% and 77%). If we were to limit ourselves to these two criteria, the figures would be *Connachta* 77.5%, *Atá sonn* 60.6%, *Mide* 76.9%. And a further aspect of the treatment of internal rhyme in the three poems may also be significant. While *Mide* has far more internal rhymes in second couplets than has *Connachta*, it nowhere observes the rule that all stressed words save the last in line *c* must rhyme with words in line *d*. In *Atá sonn*, on the other hand, this rule is either observed (in the sequence qq. 3–7), or else it is ignored entirely: the only exceptions are q. 8 (*dul : cur*, but no other rhymes) and q. 11 (the *caoch* rhyme of *fiaghuin* and *fiaghain*). Thus where the first two poems appear to be oblivious of the rule for internal rhyme in *dán direach*, the third poem shows awareness of it even though it is generally not observed. There is also a disparity between the figures for alliteration in *Connachta* and *Mide* (79% and 77%) and that in *Atá sonn* (57%). As far as they go, then, these indications would seem to be consonant with a shared authorship for *Connachta* and *Mide*, while pointing to a noticeably different poetic practice on the part of the author of *Atá sonn*.

With these reflections as background, we can now compare the subject matter of the two *dindṡenchas* poems. The protagonist of *Mide* is Mide son of Bráth son of Deáith, who lit a 'secret fire above the descendants of Nemed' that burned for seven years, granting him the right to tribute of a measure of meal and a white pig from every household in Ireland. Seeing this fire, the druids of Ireland described it as a 'bad smoke' (*mí-dé* = *Mide*). Mide gathered the druids together into a single house, cut out their tongues, and then buried the tongues at Uisnech, enthroning himself above them as 'chief sage and chief historian'. His fostermother declared to Mide that their house was built 'above something' (*ós nech* = *Uisnech*).

[19]Brian Ó Cuív, 'Some developments in Irish metrics', *Éigse* 12 (1967–8), 273–90.

[20]In arriving at these figures, I have only counted as *rinn-airdrinn* rhymes those in which the second rhyming word has only one syllable more than the first. For internal rhyme, I have reckoned a ratio between stressed non-final words in *c* which have rhymes in *d*, and those that do not.

Donnchadh Ó Corráin, who dismissed *Mide* as 'inept', astutely noted that it is 'built about a conceit borrowed from Muirchú's work on St Patrick […], re-positioned in remote pagan times'.[21] The derivation is indeed unmistakable: when the eponymous Mide is described as kindling a fire which is regarded as an affront by the druids of Ireland, we can see an echo of the Easter fire kindled by Patrick at Slane; while the primacy which that fire is said to have had over every hearth in the country is evidently modelled on that of Lóegaire's fire at Tara in the same episode of Muirchú's *Vita Sancti Patricii*.[22] The central image in *Connachta* appears to have been arrived at in the same fashion: with the fall of magic snow, produced as a hostile act by the druid Conn but then melted by the superior magic of his rival Dálach, may be compared the fall of magic snow produced by the druid Lucet Máel as a challenge to Patrick, but then melted by the saint.[23]

There are further parallels between the poems. Both are situated within the framework of the legendary settlements of Ireland: Conn son of Ceithrenn opposes the arrival of the Túath Dé Danann, while Mide's patronymic *mac Brátha* would make him the uncle of Íth, the first of the Gaels to set foot in Ireland. But neither Mide son of Bráth nor Conn son of Ceithrenn is otherwise attested in pseudohistorical lore: the only other reference to Mide mac Brátha known to me is in the prose version of the poem *Mide*, and the only other reference to Conn the druid is the passage in *Cóir Anmann* cited above. Together with this creative intervention in the tradition, the two poems also share the theme of a protagonist who triumphs by assembling objects acquired through wholesale mutilation: the ears of cattle are brought together into a single place by Dálach, the tongues of druids by Mide.[24]

When these narrative parallels are taken together with the prosodic parallels already discussed, it does indeed seem likely that *Connachta* and *Mide* are the work of a single poet, Áed Ollbarr Úa Carthaig. As we have seen, however, metrical considerations appear to tell against the same individual having composed *Atá sonn*. Why, if this be the case, this poem was attributed to such an apparently obscure figure cannot be determined with any certainty:[25]

[21]Donnchadh Ó Corráin, *Clavis Litterarum Hibernensium*: *Medieval Irish Books and Texts (*c. *400*–c. *1600)*, Corpus Christianorum Claves 1, 3 vols (Turnhout, 2017), iii, 1565.

[22]Ludwig Bieler, *The Patrician Texts in the Book of Armagh*, Scriptores Latini Hiberniae 10 (Dublin, 1979), 84–7. The poet presumably drew on a vernacular retelling of Muirchú's account, e.g. the version in Whitley Stokes, *Three Middle-Irish Homilies on the Lives of Saints Patrick, Brigit and Columba* (Calcutta, 1877), 20–3.

[23]Bieler, *Patrician Texts*, 94–5; cf. Stokes, *Three Middle-Irish Homilies*, 24–7.

[24]I am grateful to Daniel Watson for pointing out to me a striking parallel (perhaps an influence) in 1 Sam. 18:25–8: here David presents Saul with the foreskins of a hundred Philistines as dowry for his daughter Michal.

[25]Although I do not know of any other evidence that later poets actively identified themselves as Áed Ollbarr, Kevin Murray has called my attention to a poem falsely attributed to *Aodha Ollbhar Ó Carrthoidh ollamh na Cruachan* in one eighteenth-century manuscript: this is *Tosach féile fairsinge*, a poem in praise of a Mac Diarmada chieftain who died in 1458. Discussion in Katharine Simms, '*Gabh umad a Fheidhlimidh*: a fifteenth-century inauguration ode?', *Ériu* 31 (1980), 132–45, at 138.

perhaps its author was familiar with our poem, and felt that the self-styled *ollam Crūachan /is Hērend* would be suitably authoritative as a mouthpiece for the rights of the Meic Dhiarmada.

While I am not aware of any references to Áed Ollbarr Úa Carthaig apart from the three poems discussed above, the surname Úa Carthaig was born by various high-ranking Connacht poets in the eleventh and early twelfth centuries: Muirchertach Úa Carthaig, 'chief author and chief *ollam* of Connacht' (died 1064);[26] In Drúth Úa Carthaig, '*ollam* of Connacht' (died 1097);[27] and Fer Dána Úa Carthaig, '*ollam* of Connacht' (died 1131).[28] This family does not however figure subsequently in the annals: the next two men to be called *ollam* of Connacht, a father and son, both bore the surname Úa Clúmáin.[29]

Áed Ollbarr Úa Carthaig claims to be *ollam* of Crúachu, the traditional stronghold of the kings of Connacht: he surely belonged to the same family. Why is he not mentioned in the annals? In the absence of evidence, we can only speculate. One possibility might be that Áed wrote after the prerogative of supplying the *ollam* of Connacht had been assumed by the Uí Chlúmáin: in *Connachta* (where his assertion of the superiority of his own knowledge of Connacht's past to that of other men of learning may be aimed at professional rivals), he would have been attempting to lay claim to a status which he was no longer in a position to possess.[30] Speculating further, it could be that *Mide*, with its concluding reference to the king of Mide, represents Áed's search for another patron following the failure of the attempt to re-establish himself in Connacht.[31]

DATE

Connachta must antedate its earliest copy, in the Book of Leinster; as noted above, Elizabeth Duncan has argued that this is the work of a scribe who may have been writing as late as 1224. The conjectures advanced in the last few paragraphs suggest that our poem may be the work of an author writing after the Uí Charthaig had ceased to supply the *ollam* of Connacht, *c*. 1130. I do not see anything in the poem's language that is not consonant with a date in the mid-to-late twelfth century. That the poem is Middle Irish

[26]William M. Hennessy, *Chronicum Scotorum: A Chronicle of Irish Affairs from the Earliest Times to A.D. 1135* (London, 1866), s.a.: *prim ughdar ocus prim ollamh Connacht*. Cf. *AFM* s.a. 1067, where he is called *prímh druith ⁊ primh ollamh Connacht*.

[27]*AFM* s.a. 1097.

[28]*AFM* s.a. 1131; cf. Hennessy, *Chronicum Scotorum*, s.a. 1127.

[29]*AFM* s.a. 1143, 1170.

[30]For further possible allusions to this state of affairs in the poem, see the notes on §2*c dīlse rand* and §3*b imnúathad*.

[31]Whatever about Ó Corráin's view that the poem as a whole is 'inept', Áed's application to Mide and to its king of the epithet *midcharthach* 'mead-loving' (*MD*, ii, 44.38, 52) is ingenious. Possibly a coinage of the poet's own, this compound adjective combines the poet's own surname with the first syllable of the region with whose ruler he is seeking to ingratiate himself.

is obvious e.g. from use of *ar* for *for* (§3*d*, §4*d*, §5*c*); from the independent object pronoun *īat* (§8*c*); from the use of the new 1st singular future ending in *ragat* (§12*a*); and from the adoption of a deponent ending by the 1st singular subjunctive in *co fagbur* (§12*c*) and *coro c(h)uiriur* (§14*d*). Notably late features, discussed in the textual notes, are: intensive use of *im-* (§3*b*); the independent subject pronoun in *Do·beired sē* (§5*a*; but note *sin* in the Book of Uí Maine); the dental suffix in accusative plural *ndindgnada* (§9*d*); relative *-s-* in *ros car* (§10*c*); use of *cascrad* in a sense otherwise only attested of the related word *coscairt* in the later language (§13*c*); and *séin* with a long vowel (§17*c*).

I have noted above that, while use of internal rhyme varies sharply between *Connachta* and *Mide*, the treatment of *rinn-airdrinn* rhyme and alliteration is closely similar, yielding (if we limit ourselves to these two criteria) figures of 77.5% and 76.9% respectively. These are fairly high percentages in Ó Cuív's terms, and can be compared with the 79% that he assigns to *Éire óg inis na náem*, by Gilla Mo Dutu Úa Caiside (*fl.* 1147); as Ó Cuív goes on to observe, however, 'It would be reasonable to conclude that in spite of the tendency to increase ornamentation, twelfth-century poets generally considered themselves free to follow their own inclinations'.[32]

Also compatible with this suggested dating (but perhaps only coincidentally so) is the circumstance that the only other instances of the adjective *oll-barr* listed in *eDIL* are found in the *Martyrology of Gorman*, composed 1166 × 1170/1174 (see textual note on §2*d*).[33]

EDITION AND TRANSLATION

Below, I present the text as it appears in the Book of Leinster (*LL*), followed by the text from the Book of Uí Maine (*UM*). Unambiguous contractions are expanded silently, and missing letters are supplied in square brackets. Long vowels in *LL* that are not so marked in the manuscript are provided with macrons, and elided vowels are indicated with a subscript dot; other letters to be omitted are enclosed in round brackets, while square brackets are used for letters that are to be supplied. Problematical readings are discussed in the textual notes.

[32]Ó Cuív, 'Some developments', 287; cf. Kevin Murray, 'Gilla Mo Dutu Úa Caiside', in John Carey, Máire Herbert and Kevin Murray (eds), *Cín Chille Cúile – Texts, Saints and Places: Essays in Honour of Pádraig Ó Riain* (Aberystwyth, 2004), 150–62.

[33]Pádraig Ó Riain, *Feastdays of the Saints: A History of Irish Martyrologies*, Subsidia Hagiographica 86 (Bruxelles, 2006), 148–9.

TEXT

1. ‘Connachta’: cid dia tā ịnt ainm,
a eōlcho Fāil, re sírgairm?
In fail acaib, túaid nā tess,
eōlach ạca fail a eōlass?

2. Mani fuil acaib uile,
a eōlcho betha(d) buide,
da·gēna dúib dīlsi rand
int eōlach ān Æd Ollbarr.

3. Æd Ollbarr, ollam Crūachan
is Hērend, ní imnūathad:
iss é sluinnes, síd re lá,
mar ạtá ạrin crích ‘Connachta’.

4. Cond – cā cumachtach rap f̣err? –
sósar molbthach mac Cet[h]rend.
Ịs hé ro gab rīg[e], can acht,
ar cōiciud cendf̣ind Connacht.

TRANSLATION

1. ‘Connachta’: whence is the name, learned men of Fál, as a lasting proclamation? Is there among you, north or south, a learned man who has knowledge of it?

2. If you all do not have it [i.e. such knowledge], learned men of the yellow world, the splendid scholar Áed Ollbarr will make for you (its) truth in verse.

3. Áed Ollbarr, *ollam* of Crúachu and Ireland (it is no great innovation): it is he who declares, peace in his day, how ‘Connachta’ is [the name] upon the territory.

4. Conn – what powerful one could be better? – [was] the praiseworthy youngest of the sons of Ceithrenn. It is he who assumed kingship, without doubt, over the fair-headed province of Connacht.

TEXT FROM *UM*

1. Connacht cræd ma buil int ainm | a eolcha fail re firgairm. | in fuil agaibh tuaidh na thæis | eolach ga fuil a theolas.
2. Muna fuil agaibh uili | a eolcha in beatha buidhe | dogeansa dhibh dísli in rann | int eolach an æd ollbharr.
3. *[as final quatrain in the poem]* Æd ollbarr ollamh cruachan | is eir*enn* ni thim< >uathad | is se sloindeas lith re la | mar ata in crich connachta.
4. Cond ca cumachtach bhu fearr | soiser menmnach mac n-eithleand | < >s e ro gabh ríge gan acht | ar coigeadh ceindfind connacht.

5. Do·beired sē, ba slicht fír,
snechta nemi, co nertbríg,
ar lár a thíri, co tend,
tan tictis Túath Dē Danand.

6. Craind ⁊ clocha in domain
da chur ind 'na urchomair.
Ra loisced, lór a chrúade,
re haidbri[ti]ud ōenūaire.

7. Tess gr*én*e and dó fadéin,
ba hiṅgnad re cāch do chéin.
Nī dērna druí, dían ngarta,
a chobēs do chumachta.

8. Do·riṅgni immarbáig n-aird
re Túaith [n]Dé Dan*ann* [n]drechgairg,
co n-airgfed īat tōlaib crand,
's nā airgfitis a f̀erand.

9. Arna bárach dádaig dó,
ra airg cách uili ị n-ōenló.
Ra loisc ar ṁbreith a mbó trā
a ndúni 's a ndindgnada.

5. He used to bring (it was an account of truth) freezing snow, with mighty force, upon the surface of his land, strongly, when the Túath Dé Danann used to come.

6. Putting the trees and stones of the world into it *[i.e. his land?]* to oppose them: it *[i.e. his land?]* was burned, its harshness was great, in a moment of a single hour.

7. The heat of the sun was in it, for him himself: it was a wonder for everyone, from afar. No druid, swift (and) generous, (ever) wrought so great (a feat) of power.

8. He waged a great struggle against the Túath Dé Danann of harsh countenance, so that he would destroy them with multitudes of trees, and they would not destroy his territory.

9. On the night of the next day, he destroyed all of them in a single day. Moreover, after carrying off their cattle, he burned their strongholds and their fortresses.

5. Dabhereadh sin fa sleict f̀ír | sneachta nimhe gu neartbrigh | ar lar a thiri gu teand | in tan tigdis .t.d.d.
6. Croind ⁊ clocha in domhain | do cur ind i n-ænconair | do loisgfeadh iad leor druagi | re thalamh 'na ænf̀uaire.
7. Teas grene and do bhudhein | dob ignadh le cach do cein. | nír thualaing drai dian-gharta | a cobheis do cumachta.
8. Connachta ocoindneachta cuind | o neas [al- o drobais *sup. lin.*] gu leim con cuilind. | on cond is o tṡneacta | ata connachta for connachta. Connacht< >
9. —.

10. Mac māthar Cuind, nír chlecht góe,
Dálach, lethet cech láng[n]óe.
Inund cumachta ros car,
inund úaill, inund borrfad.

11. Tecait fir Hēr*enn* uili
co Dālach in degruiri,
da guidi co tīsad leō,
coro chuired re Cond cóemgleó.

12. 'Ragat-sa lib imbárach,
cid duilig lim,' ar Dálach,
'ac[h]t co fagbur, feib as dlecht,
cach ní ari ndiṅgén druīdecht.

13. 'Trī chét da chrud cach elgga,
's íat aigfinda óidergga:
a cascrad, is celgg calma,
can fascin, can erlabra.

14. 'Tab(a)r[aid] a n-oī lib ille,'
ar Dālach, 'i n-óenbaile,
co nn-eōlór leo, lāthar ṅglond;
coro c(h)uiriur cath is cæmChond.'

10. The son of Conn's mother (he did not practise falsehood), was Dálach, expanse of every ample fame. Equal was the power which he loved, equal the pride, equal the fury.

11. All the men of Ireland come to Dálach the fair over-king, to entreat him that he should come with them, so that he might wage a fair battle against Conn.

12. 'I will go with you tomorrow, although I may find it troublesome,' said Dálach, 'provided that I obtain, as is right, everything for the sake of which I will perform wizardry.

13. 'Three hundred of the cattle of every nobleman (?), and they with white faces and red ears: that they be slaughtered (it is a bold trick) without looking, without speaking.

14. 'Bring their ears with you hither,' said Dálach, 'into one place, so that I can find my way with them, a bold course; so that fair Conn and I may wage battle.'

10. Mac mathar cuind nar cleacht ṅgæi | dalach leithit gu langnaidh. | inand cumhachta roscar. | inand uaill inand ængnadh.
11. Tegaid fir eir*enn* uile | gu dalach gun deagdhuine | da guigi gu dísadh leo | gu gureadh re cond cruaidhgleo.
12. Racatsa lib amareach | gi doli [dam *sup. lin.*] ar dalach | ach gu fagar fibh istleacht | gach ní le nigein dræiacht.
13. .IX.c. do cru gach tsealga | síad comhfind cluasdearga | acasgradh is cealg calma | ganfaisgin [f *appears to be added sec. man.*] gan urlabra
14. Tabraidh fein anæi uile | lib anænaitt nænmaigi | gu neacaind leo lathir ghlond | gugurind catha is cæmcond.

15. Do·bertar a n-óe uile
i n-óenáitt, i n-ōenbuile,
cor gab don maig i mbuī in slūag,
coro leg in snechta sīrbúan.

16. Ō ṡain immach is Mag nOí
in mag-sain, can imargoí.
Is ōn dáil-sin, dían in smacht,
atá Cōiced Ól nÉcmacht.

17. 'Condṡnecta' ō ṡnechta Chuind
is ó ḟertaib, co hālaind.
A hṡéin dúib, aní dia tá
'Connachta' for Connachta.

15. All their ears are brought into one spot, into one place, so that he went to the plain in which was the host, so that he melted the long-enduring snow.

16. Since then that plain is Mag nAí, without great falsehood. And from that assembly, forceful the dominion, there is Cóiced Ól nÉcmacht.

17. 'Conn-ṡnechta' is [so called] from the snow of Conn, and from his magical deeds, pleasantly. Thence is the reason for you, for which Connachta is called 'Connachta'.

15. Daberar a næi uile | du dhalach dundegdhuine | gurgabh in magh a ṁbi sluagh | gur leadh in sneacta síthbuan.
16. Oṡin mach is mag e | in magh sin gan inmargæ | is odail sin dian indsmacht | ata coigead ol negmact.
17. *UM has here the quatrain which appears as §3 in LL.*

TEXTUAL NOTES

1*b*: For *sírgairm*, *UM* has *ḟirgairm*. This gives alliteration, and arguably also gives preferable sense: 'for true naming'. On the other hand, *gá sírgairm* appears as a cheville rhyming with *ainm* (with alliteration with *Shláinge*) in *Eachtra Thaidhg mheic Céin*.[34]

1*d*: *aca* must here be read as *'ca* for correct syllable count; cf. *ga UM*.[35]

2*b*: *LL* has *bethad*, gen. sg. of *bethu* 'life', when the sense calls for *betha*, gen. sg. of *bith* 'world'; *bith buide* is a frequent collocation in poetry.[36] Cf. *beatha UM*.

2*c*: *UM* has 1st sg. *do·gēan-sa*, requiring line *d* to be in apposition to the subject of the verb.

2*c dīlsi rand*: My rendering '(its) truth in verse' is very free; more literally, perhaps something like 'propriety of quatrains'. Cf. *dísle an sgéil*, apparently

[34]Standish Hayes O'Grady, *Silva Gadelica*, 2 vols (London, 1892), i, 348.2.

[35]Discussion of this type of elision in Cáit Ní Dhomhnaill, *Duanaireacht: Rialacha Meadarachta Fhilíocht na mBard* (Baile Átha Cliath, 1975), 33 (§60).

[36]Thus *eDIL* s.v. 1 buide speaks of this adjective as being 'freq. in vague sense with *bith*', giving examples from Whitley Stokes (ed.), *Saltair na Rann* (Oxford, 1883), l. 7513; and (citing O'Donovan's edition) from Ruth P. Lehmann (ed.), *Fled Dúin na nGéd*, Mediaeval and Modern Irish Series 21 (Dublin, 1964), l. 520.

meaning 'the truth of the story', in the poem *Cúig cáis 'na raibh Muire mhór*, variously attributed to Donnchadh Mór Ó Dálaigh (died 1244) and to Aonghus na Diadhachta Ó Dálaigh.[37] That *dílse* is also used of the properties and claims to which one is legally entitled may also be relevant, given that Áed asserts his status of *ollam* – although, as suggested above, he may well not have possessed it in fact.

2*d*: The instances of *ollbarr* in *eDIL* are all from the twelfth-century *Martyrology of Gorman*;[38] see the discussion of dating above.

3*b*: I take *imnúathad* to be *núadad* 'renewal' with intensive *imm-*; according to *eDIL* s.v. 2 imm, the intensive use of this prefix is rare in the early language but 'becomes very common in EModIr'. In saying that his rank as *ollam* is 'no great innovation', Áed may allude to the fact that his family had supplied at least three *ollamain* of Connacht in the past.

3*c*: *síd re lá* 'peace in his time' (*UM*: *líth re lá* 'prosperity in his time'/'a festival for a day'). One reading would give alliteration with *sluinnes*, the other with *lá*. Other examples of *re lá* meaning 'in the time of' are found in a range of Middle Irish texts: *Serglige Con Culainn*, *Cocad Gaídel re Gallaib*, and the poems *Fil súil nglaiss* (in the copy in *An Leabhar Breac*) and *Scíath rígh Gáela, glantar hí*.[39]

3*d*: *atá* and *arin* must both undergo elision to yield correct syllable count in the line. Liam Breatnach observes: 'Is annamh a chaillear an chéad siolla neamhaiceanta de *atá*, m.sh. *tá sund … LL* 26037 (*MD*), *tá sin tochur … LL* 26033 (*MD*)'.[40] Both of the instances to which he refers occur within a single poem; and they may be a special case, as the poem in question plays upon the words *táthum* 'I have' and *tátham* 'sleep, death'.[41]

4*a*: With *cā cumachtach rap ferr*, cf. *ca sén dob ferr* 'what could have been more fortunate?' in the thirteenth-century poem *Mór loites lucht an indluig*.[42] *Cumachtach* may well here have the connotation 'possessor of magical power'. Several instances of its use in this sense (and of *cumachtae* in the sense 'magical power') are furnished in *eDIL*: note for instance the pairing of *cumachtach* with *bantuathaid* 'witch' in the tale *Aided Chrimthainn meic*

[37]The first quatrain, in which this phrase occurs, is printed in Standish Hayes O'Grady, *Catalogue of Irish Manuscripts in the British Museum*, vol. 1 (London, 1926), 540; the entire text is given as §567 in the Bardic Poetry Database, on the website of the School of Celtic Studies, Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies.

[38]Whitley Stokes (ed.), *Félire Húi Gormáin: The Martyrology of Gorman* (London, 1895), *sub* 10 May, 4 September, 7 October.

[39]Myles Dillon (ed.), *Serglige Con Culainn*, Mediaeval and Modern Irish Series 14 (Dublin, 1953), l. 756; James Henthorn Todd (ed.), *Cogadh Gaedhel re Gallaibh: The War of the Gaedhil with the Gaill* (London, 1867), 110.19; RIA MS 23 P 16 (1230; *Leabhar Breac*), p. 239c, final line; Kuno Meyer, 'Mitteilungen aus irischen Handschriften', *ZCP* 8 (1912), 102–20, 195–232, 559–65, at 227.10.

[40]*SnaG*, 323.

[41]*MD*, iv, 286.40, 44.

[42]Eleanor Knott (ed.), 'Address to David O'Keeffe', *Ériu* 4 (1908–10), 209–32, at 224 q. 45. Knott was unable to identify the dedicatee; I discuss the identification, and the consequent dating, in a forthcoming essay.

Ḟidaig; and the pairing of *bancumachtach* with *bandrai* 'witch' in *Tochmarc Cruinn ocus Macha*.[43]

4*b*: That *Cet[h]rend* is a variant of the genitive of *Eithliu* is confirmed by *Eithleand UM*; cf. *Loga m. Cethnenn* in a genealogy of the Benntraige, where the Book of Lecan reads *Eithlend nó Cethrend*.[44] Eithliu is portrayed as an ancestress of the Túatha Dé Danann in general in a poem in the second recension of *Lebor Gabála Érenn*, where the Dagda, Dían Cécht, Creidne, Luichne, Núadu Argatlám, Lug mac Céin and Goibniu, figures widely scattered in the genealogies of the Túatha Dé, are all collectively designated 'the seven noble great sons of Eithliu'.[45]

4*b*: Instead of *molbthach*, *UM* has *menmnach* 'spirited'.

4*c*: That *rig* should be emended to *ríge*, suggested in seminar by Kevin Murray, is confirmed by the reading of *UM*. For other instances of *is* as *'s* preceding a vowel at the beginnings of lines, cf. e.g. *LL* 21361, 27170 (written *is*), 21712 (written *'s*).[46] Cf. also *'s* at the beginning of §8*d* below.

5*a sē*: This appears to be an instance of an independent pronoun used as the subject of an active verb; according to Kim McCone, this was the latest of the Middle Irish extensions of the usage of the independent pronoun.[47] Breatnach too characterises this usage as 'déanach'; almost all of the examples that he gives are taken from *LL*, with only a few from *LU*.[48] Since this is the only example in the poem of an independent pronoun being used in this way, it may be worth considering *UM's* reading *sin* as an alternative: if the latter were understood as *sín*, the text could be translated as 'He used to bring a storm […] of freezing snow'.

5*a ba slicht fír*: *Fír* must be understood here as genitive singular of the word employed as a substantive, not as a nominative singular adjective, in order to have rhyme with dative singular *nertbríg* in the following line.

5*b snechta nemi*: I am grateful to Ruairí Ó hUiginn for pointing out to me that this expression, meaning literally 'snow of poison', appears to have been used to designate snow associated with intense cold. This is evidently the sense of *sneachta neime* in the *Annals of Loch Cé* and the *Annals of Connacht* for 1245; *snecta na nemi* is recorded in the *Annals of Boyle* for 1179.[49]

6*b 'na urchomair*: Although the possessive pronoun is singular here, I translate 'them' as I take the reference to be to the (grammatically singular but semantically plural) Túath Dé Danann. This interpretation assumes that the

[43]Whitley Stokes (ed.), 'The Death of Crimthann son of Fidach, and The Adventures of the Sons of Eochaid Muigmedón', *RC* 24 (1903), 172–207, at 178 (§7); Rudolf Thurneysen (ed.), '*Tochmarc Cruinn ocus Macha*', *ZCP* 12 (1918), 251–4, at 252.15.

[44]M. A. O'Brien, *Corpus Genealogiarum Hiberniae* (Dublin, 1962), 92.

[45]Macalister, *Lebor Gabála Érenn*, iv, 246.

[46]Cf. *MD* i, 48.33; ii, 4.41; iii, 78.5.

[47]Kim McCone, *The Early Irish Verb*, second ed. (Maynooth, 1997), 177.

[48]*SnaG*, 272.

[49]Discussion in Seán Mac Airt, 'Lexicographical notes', *Celtica* 3 (1956), 262–71, at 262.

h- prefixed to a vowel following the 3 sg. feminine possessive pronoun has not been written here, following the older spelling convention.

6*c Ra loisced*: Cf. *ra airg* §9*b*, *Ra loisc* §9*c*. *Ra* for earlier *ro* is frequently found in the Book of Leinster.[50]

6*d*: *LL*'s *haidbriud* is presumably to be emended to *haidbritiud*, as suggested in *eDIL*, to provide the correct number of syllables. All of the other instances noted in the dictionary are trisyllabic: *aibritid*, *aibritiud*, *aibrithiudh*. *UM*, perhaps finding this word obscure, reads instead *do loisgfeadh iad* […] *re thalamh* 'he would burn them […] to the ground'.

7*c dían ngarta*: For the adjective *gartae* 'generous', not listed in *eDIL*, see e.g. *Audacht Morainn* §55(*g*).[51] Cf. the compound noun *dían-garta* in the poem *Bairend Chermain cid dia tá*, translated 'ready hospitality' by Gwynn.[52] I do not understand the basis of the nasalisation here; it may be an instance of the ungrammatical nasalisation that is sometimes found in chevilles.[53] Contrast *diangharta UM*, where the lenition indicates that the scribe takes the elements to comprise a compound; but this reading goes against the metre.

8–9. *UM* here substitutes a single quatrain, which may be translated as follows: '"Connachta" is from the Conn-snow of Conn, from the waterfall ["otherwise, from Drobaís" added above the line] to Léim Con Culainn. From Conn, from his snow, "Connachta" is upon Connacht.'

8*c co n-airgfed īat*: There is already an instance of this vocalism of *orgaid* in *Saltair na Rann*, l. 6729. Otherwise the earliest examples noted in *eDIL* appear to be in *LL*; in our poem, it recurs in §9*b*. Note the independent object pronoun, a usage held by Liam Breatnach to be attested from the eleventh century onward.[54]

9*a dádaig*: This word usually appears as *dadaig*; but cf. *dádaig* in *LL* 11305.[55]

9*b cách uili*: This is an example of the use of *cách* 'with follg. emphasizing word' noted by *eDIL*. Cf. *cách uile* translated 'everyone' in 'A narrative of the Caesarian tax and the birth of Christ' in *An Leabhar Breac*.[56]

9*d ndindgnada*: An instance of the characteristically Middle Irish dental flexion of original *io*-stems. David Greene held that there are no 'examples available from texts which might with some confidence be dated to the eleventh century. On the other hand, there are plenty of examples quotable from

[50]Several examples are listed by Breatnach: *SnaG*, 279.

[51]Fergus Kelly (ed.), *Audacht Morainn* (Dublin, 1976), 16. There are further instances in *eDIL* s.v. 1 gart: J. Carmichael Watson (ed.), *Mesca Ulad*, Mediaeval and Modern Irish Series 13 (Dublin, 1941), l. 405; L. McKenna (ed.), *Iomarbhágh na bhFileadh*, ITS 20–21 (London, 1918), i, 4 (§8).

[52]*MD*, iii, 88.2.

[53]A few further examples from *dindšenchas* poems are *co neim n-úr* (*MD*, i, 2.7), *níb adba mbróin* (*MD*, ii, 20.34), *ba gním nglé* (*MD*, iii, 10.107), *ní hicht mbille* (*MD*, iii, 54.3).

[54]*SnaG*, 271.

[55]Cf. *TBC LL*, l. 3868.

[56]Martin McNamara et al. (eds), *Apocrypha Hiberniae I: Evangelia infantiae*, Corpus Christianorum Series Apocryphorum 14 (Turnhout, 2001), 573 (§4.5).

twelfth century texts'.[57] Kenneth Jackson dated *Aislinge Meic Con Glinne* to the eleventh century, and consequently regarded this as evidence that this usage of dental endings was already current then; but he acknowledged that it 'is very little found before PH, which has many exx […] and is common in LL'.[58] Breatnach notes that there are no examples in *Saltair na Rann*.[59]

10*a nír chlecht góe*: *UM* has relative *nar cleacht ṅgœi* 'who did not practice falsehood'.

10*b Dálach*: Could use of this rare name here be intended as an allusion (presumably playful) to the learned family of the Uí Dhálaigh? That they were already eminent in the twelfth century is apparent from the obit of Cú Chonnacht na Sgoile Ua Dálaig, *ard-ollam le dán*, in 1139.[60] According to the *Leabhar Mór na nGeinealach*, Cú Chonnacht's son Tadhg Doichleach founded the Uí Dhálaigh Bréifne.[61] I do not believe that there are any indications of relations, whether friendly or otherwise, between the Uí Dhálaigh and the Uí Charthaig; so this suggestion can only be put forward extremely tentatively.

10*b lethet cech láng[n]óe*: I have emended on the strength of *langnaidh*, the reading of *UM*. Cf. the line *ro leth a ngnaī sund co sāl* 'their fame here extended as far as the sea', in the poem *Do·luid Mílid asin Scithia*, in the second and third recensions of *Lebor Gabála Érenn*.[62]

10*c ros car*: Note relative *-s*. According to Jackson, this is 'largely a feature of the later MI period […] likewise common in PH'.[63]

11*a degruiri*: The accusative singular of *ruiri* is regularly *ruirig*, which would not give rhyme with *uili*; the problem is avoided by *UM*, which reads *deagdhuine* here.[64] I am grateful to Barry Lewis for noting that *degruiri* could be an instance of the relatively rare use of the nominative in apposition to a noun in an oblique case.[65]

11*d coro chuired*: This form yields an 8-syllable line; contrast *gu gureadh* in *UM*. I take it that *cor* is to be understood here; cf. *cor gab* §15*c*. The same emendation is required in order to secure correct syllable count at §14*d*, §15*d*.

[57]David Greene, 'Distinctive plural forms in Old and Middle Irish', *Ériu* 25 (1974), 190–9, at 196.

[58]Kenneth Jackson (ed.), *Aislinge Meic Con Glinne* (Dublin, 1990), 82. PH = Robert Atkinson (ed.), *The Passions and the Homilies from the Leabhar Breac: Text, Translation, and Glossary* (Dublin, 1887).

[59]*SnaG*, 246.

[60]*AFM* s.a. 1139.

[61]Nollaig Ó Muraíle (ed.), *Leabhar Mór na nGenelach*: *The Great Book of Irish Genealogies Compiled (1645–66) by Dubhaltach Mac Fhirbhisigh*, 5 vols (Dublin, 2003), i, 320–21 (§133.2–5).

[62]Macalister, *Lebor Gabála Érenn*, ii, 110 q. 7.

[63]Jackson, *Aislinge Meic Con Glinne*, 95.

[64]Cf. the closely similar variant reading in *UM* at §15*b*.

[65]*GOI* §247(c). The single example that Thurneysen provides (from *Thes*, ii, 240.13) resembles the present instance in that a nominative form is in apposition to an accusative.

12*c feib as dlecht*: For the relative of the copula after a conjunction, and indeed for a comparable phrase, cf. *mar as dlecht* in the poem *Éistid a Laigniu na llecht*, apparently of the eleventh century.[66]

12*d ndingén*: Cf. in *Fled Bricrenn* the phrase *ni dingon comlond*, where *dingon* is presumably a slip for *dingén*.[67]

13*a elgga*: I am grateful to Seán Ó Coileáin for the suggestion that this could be an error for *elba* 'herd'; this would make excellent sense, but the rhyme would be imperfect as *elba* has a lenited *b*. As a further alternative, Kevin Murray suggests *elta* 'flock, herd'. It is hard to see what the *UM* variant *tṡealga* 'of a hunt' would mean in this context. Tentatively, I accept Keating's assertion that *ealga* is a synonym for *uasal* 'lofty', i.e. a variant of *elg* 'noble, distinguished'.[68] Alternatively (and perhaps preferably), *elgga* could simply be the genitive of *elg*; note *Elga* as the genitive of *Elg* 'Ireland' (*eDIL* s.v.).

13*c cascrad*: The usual medieval sense of *coscrad* is 'destruction'. Another instance of its application (in the later form *coscairt*) specifically to the killing of cattle occurs in the tale *Eachtra Airt meic Cuind*: *an bó do cascairt* 'slaughtering the cow'.[69] This is a standard sense of *coscairt* in the modern language.

14*a Tab(a)r[aid]*: *LL*'s *tabar* appears to be imperative 2 sg. of *do·beir*; but the use of *lib* here and at §12*a* above indicates that Dálach is addressing people in the plural. If the verb is taken as representing the passive imperative *tabarr* (cf. Ml 104^{b}2), there is still the problem that the referent (*oí* in this case) is plural. Imperative 2 pl. *Tabraidh* in *UM* is accordingly preferable.

14*a oī*: O'Curry translates this as 'livers',[70] thinking perhaps of the derivation of the name *Crúachna Aí* from *áe* 'liver' in the Book of Leinster *Táin*.[71] But various medieval explanations for the toponymic element *Aí* existed, so that there is no need to regard this one as having been prevalent to the exclusion of others.[72] In the present case, understanding *oī* as 'ears' is strongly indicated by the circumstance that the cows from which they are taken are red-eared (*óidergga*; §13*b*).[73]

14*c co nn-eōlór*: Here it seems necessary to postulate an otherwise unattested denominative verb: **eólaid* from *eól* 'knowledge (of the way)', hence 'so that I may find my way'. *UM*'s *gu neacaind* is presumably for *co ndechainn*,

[66]*MD*, iii, 20.255; discussion of date on p. 471 (and cf. Ó Corráin, *Clavis*, 1601–2, with references to further scholarship).

[67]George Henderson (ed.), *Fled Bricrenn: The Feast of Bricriu*, ITS 2 (London, 1899), 38.19; cf. *LU* 8457.

[68]Comyn and Dinneen, *Foras Feasa ar Éirinn*, i, 98.6; as cited in *eDIL* s.v. 2 Elg. For this sense, see e.g. *do cach elc oirrdric* 'to every conspicuous noble', in Macalister, *Lebor Gabála Érenn*, ii, 120.634; also in George Calder (ed.), *Auraicept na n-Éces: The Scholar's Primer* (Edinburgh, 1917), l. 2294.

[69]R. I. Best (ed.), 'The Adventures of Art son of Conn, and the Courtship of Delbchæm', *Ériu* 3 (1907), 149–73, at 160 (§13).

[70]O'Curry, *On the Manners and Customs*, ii, 11.

[71]*LL TBC*, l. 4902.

[72]Thus *MD*, iii, 380 (from the name of a chieftain), 404 (from the name of a hound).

[73]Red-eared cows are frequently mentioned in Irish sources; discussion in Osborn Bergin, 'White red-eared cows', *Ériu* 14 (1946), 170; Fergus Kelly, *Early Irish Farming* (Dublin, 1997), 33–4; Jessica Hemming, '*Bos primigenius* in Britain: or, why do fairy cows have red ears?',

with 1 sg. subjunctive imperfect of *téit*. It is hard to see which has the better claim to be regarded as the preferable reading.

14*c lāthar ṅglond*: Seán Ó Coileáin suggests: 'What if *lathar nglond* is not a cheville for a change, but rather the object of the verb? We might then translate "the place of (heroic) deeds" or some such, i.e. the place of battle, to which he duly proceeds having been directed by the magic ears, in the following quatrain'.

14*d* This line has 8 syllables in *LL*, so that elision of the final syllable of *coro* is called for; cf. *gu UM*.

15*b i n-óenáitt, i n-ōenbuile*: Here *UM* reads *du Dhalach, dun degdhuine* 'to Dálach, to the good man'; cf. its reading *gu Dalach, gun deagdhuine* at §11*b* above. This reading gives a better rhyme with *a*; while the wording of *LL* is so close to that of §14*b* as to seem like a partial dittography. *UM* may preserve the original reading, or else may have sought to improve upon its exemplar.

15*c cor gab don maig*: I here take *gaibid* in the sense 'goes', and *do* as 'to' of destination; it may be noted however that *co* is the preposition usually employed with *gaibid* in this way (cf. *eDIL* s.v. gaibid II(a)). *UM* reads *gur gabh in magh* 'so that he reached the plain', which is perhaps preferable.

17*c A hṡéin*: The form of the demonstrative is peculiar here. According to *eDIL* (s.v. 1 sin), *séin* with a long vowel 'occurs only in bardic verse and is usually introduced for the sake of the rhyme'; but here it is found in a Middle Irish manuscript, in non-rhyming position, in a poem which is clearly not aspiring to meet the standards of *dán díreach*. Also curious is the spelling *hṡ-* for lenited *s-*, as well as ungrammatical lenition after the preposition *a*. I think that it is necessary to take *a* as a slip for *ó* here: cf. *Ō ṡain immach* in §16*a* above.

JOHN CAREY

University College Cork

Folklore 113 (2002), 71–82; Dorothy Bray, 'Further on white red-eared cows in fact and fiction', *Peritia* 19 (2005), 239–55.

UNACCUSATIVITY AND THE SUBJECT PRONOUN IN MIDDLE AND EARLY MODERN IRISH*

Abstract

This article examines Middle and Early Modern Irish sentences like *in mairenn hé?* 'does he live?' and *do-chádar d'éag uile iad* 'they all died' in which the subject pronoun has the form normally associated with the subject of a passive-impersonal verb or the direct object of a transitive verb. References to this construction in the Classical Modern Irish grammatical tracts are discussed first, Middle and Early Modern Irish examples are then presented, and their syntax and semantics are investigated. It is argued that the subject in these sentences is not the semantic agent and that this motivates the use of these pronominal forms. This construction is then placed in a wider typological context. Finally, attention is drawn to a possible precursor construction in which the subject pronoun takes the form of an infix.

Introduction

1 The following couplet is cited twice in the Classical Modern Irish grammatical tracts:

(1) *Do bhádar dá dhuine dhéag*
's do-chádar d'ég °uile °íad (*IGT* III 123 = *BST* 241.11)

'They were twelve in number and they all met their deaths.'

*This article arises out of a discussion of the marking of verbal-noun arguments during Prof. Barry Lewis's weekly seminar on the Welsh bardic grammars, held in the Institute in Michaelmas Term 2019. I am grateful to Prof. Lewis for discussion and for supplying references to relevant Welsh scholarship (§37), and to Prof. Ruairí Ó hUiginn and the anonymous reader for helpful feedback. I am especially indebted to Prof. Damian McManus for his careful reading of a draft of this paper, for supplying examples (20), (21), (29), (32)–(34) and (43) and other additional material, and for suggesting important improvements. I revised this paper in April 2020, when libraries were closed, and I thank my colleagues Dr Christina Cleary and Dr Andrea Palandri for helping me access material I would otherwise have been unable to consult. All the errors, omissions and infelicities of this paper are my responsibility alone.

When referring to 'verb' below, I mean to exclude the copula *is*, *ba*, *budh* etc. and other verb-like particles (such as *ol*/*ar* 'says') from consideration. In this paper, I use the term 'impersonal' to refer to the 3 sg. (or pl.) verbal form in the analytic construction. For the passive or autonomous verb, the term 'passive-impersonal' is preferred. Where relevant, *uaim* (roughly 'alliteration') between two words is indicated by °, rhyme by a colon (*bean* : *fear*). Invented sentences which are certainly or possibly ungrammatical are marked *; in cases where an invented sentence is certainly grammatical, I have not marked it in this way. Where the reference follows both an Irish quotation and the English translation, the translation is that of the cited publication; where the reference follows the Irish quotation only, the translation is mine.

 ©Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies

No copy of the full poem from which the Bardic grammarians extracted this half-quatrain is now extant, to my knowledge, but the scribe of the copy of *IGT* III–IV in TCD MS H 2.17 (1319/2/7) attributes it to Gofraidh Fionn Ó Dálaigh (d. 1387) (Hoyne 2019: 46). In the first line, the predicate of 3 pl. *do bhádar*, past tense of the substantive verb, is *dá dhuine dhéag*, an example of the so-called 'nominative of accompaniment' (T. F. O'Rahilly 1941: 245–6).[1] The focus of this paper is the construction *do-chádar... iad* in the second line. *Do-chádar... iad* is an analytic construction, in which an impersonal verbal form (formally identical with the 3 person but devoid of any personal force in and of itself) is combined with a personal pronoun. In (1) the impersonal verb *do-chádar* matches the pronoun in number; such concordance is noteworthy in the Early Modern Irish period, as we will see. The pronoun itself is disjunctive; subject pronouns normally follow the verb. In addition, the form of the pronoun is interesting: in place of the usual 3 pl. subject pronoun after an active verb (*siad*), we have here the form more commonly found as subject to a passive-impersonal verb or as direct object to an active transitive verb (*iad*).

BST

2 In *IGT* III, example (1) above is given to demonstrate the form of the 3 pl. simple past of the verb *téid* 'goes' (*do-chádar* : *bhádar*); there is no comment on the syntax or morphology of the pronoun. In *BST*, it is introduced as part of a discussion of concordance between the verb and a pronominal subject (*BST* 240.17–241.11). The core of the relevant passage in *BST* is the following rule:

> *Dénmhus neith innsgne é ⁊ í as .c. res gach n-éininnsgne achd muna thí barr nó focal eatarra, ⁊ a-dearar nach athruigheann le barr mur do-ní le focal. Agus a dénmhus neith féin ris gach n-éninnsgne ó thig ní eatarra.*
>
> 'A 3 sg. of a verb is the correct form before (nom. of) any personal pronoun unless an enclitic or a word be between them, and it is said that the way in which a pronoun changes with an enclitic differs from the way in which it changes with a word and the verb with its person-endings may occur before any personal pronoun when something comes between them.' (*BST* 241.2–5; McManus 2017: 226 n. 36)

3 The analytic form of the verb in Classical Modern Irish is normally third singular. As a free-standing or synthetic verbal form, *do-cháidh* means 'he/she/it went'. It can, however, be employed impersonally: the 3 sg. of a verb can serve as a kind of default form which may be combined with an explicit subject pronoun, so that one finds the likes of *do-cháidh mé* 'I went' (in place of synthetic *do-chádhas*), *do-cháidh sé* 'he went' (with the addition of an explicit subject pronoun) and *do-cháidh siad* 'they went' (in place of synthetic

[1] In Old Irish, this construction called for the dative rather than the nominative (*GOI* §251.2).

do-chádar) (Greene 1958). There are some restrictions on the use of 3 sg. forms in this manner, however: with simple verbs, only the suffixless form of the past may be used; *do mhol sé* 'he praised' is correct but **molais sé* and **do mholasda*(*i*)*r sé* are not (*SnaG* IV §7.30), a restriction which probably reflects the fact that the suffixless form was the ordinary preterite/perfect form, the other forms belonging to the literary register only (but see fn. 14 below). In the passage from *BST* cited in §2 above, I would translate *barr* as 'suffix' rather than as 'enclitic' for this reason (cf. *BST* 236.20). *BST* 241.2–5 does not allow for the likes of *a-táid siad* 'they are', in which the analytic construction is employed but the 3 person impersonal verb is marked as plural in concordance with the 3 pl. subject pronoun. Such agreement is sometimes found, however (see the relevant notes in *BST* and *SnaG* IV §7.30 and fn. 2 below).

4 Following the passage in *BST* cited above, 3 sg. *do-cháidh* cannot be used with a subject pronoun belonging to any other person unless the pronoun immediately follows the verb. Even if it were metrical, **do-cháidh ... iad* could never be read for *do-chádar... iad* in (1) because the pronoun is disjunctive. *BST* 241.2–5 mandates the likes of **do-chádhas... mhé* 'I went', **do-chádhais... thú* 'you went', etc. In other words, *do-chádar... iad* is analysed as an instance of obligatory agreement between the verb (3 pl. *do-chádar*) and the person of the pronoun (3 pl. *iad*); it is understood (or rather misunderstood) as a synthetic not an analytic construction. This explains why (2) is marked *cóir* 'correct' by the grammarian, while (3) is labelled *lochtach* 'faulty':

(2) *Mar thánuig go h°Eamhuin °é*
ránuig sé Thealaigh Dá Thí .c. (*BST* 241.6)

'As he came to Eamhain, he obtained Tealach Dá Thí [i.e. the kingship].'

(3) *Mar thánuig go h°Eamhuin °ibh*
ránuig sibh mheadhair nach mair .l. (*BST* 241.7–8)

'When you (pl.) came to Eamhain, you obtained mirth that does not last.'

To conform to the rule set out in *BST* 241.2–5, a 2 pl. verbal form like *tángabhair* would be required in place of 3 sg. *tánaig* in (3) because the disjunctive subject pronoun is 2 pl. (*ibh*). This would not be metrical, of course.

5 Synthetic constructions with a superfluous disjunctive subject pronoun like **tángabhair... ibh* are without parallel in the history of Irish syntax. In examples (2) and (3), the verb *tánaig* is really impersonal. When the analytic construction developed in the Middle Irish period, person was marked by the pronoun only, and number was further indicated in the form of the verb only when the impersonal verb was combined with a 3 pl. pronoun (*ní biat síat* 'they will not be', for example, where both *biat* and *síat* are 3 pl.) (*SnaG* III §10.19; McCone 1997: 177). By the Early Modern Irish period, even this instance of agreement was breaking or had broken down, so that a 3 pl. pronoun could

follow immediately after a 3 sg. impersonal verbal form (*ní bhia siad*).[2] When the subject pronoun was disjunctive, however, it seems the Middle Irish pattern of obligatory number-agreement between verb and pronoun in the 3 pl. survived into the Early Modern Irish period, as illustrated by *do-chádar... iad* in (1).[3] By the early sixteenth century, when *BST* were compiled, at least one grammarian had over-generalised this limited concordance-rule: *do-chádar... iad* was interpreted as an example of the verb agreeing not only in **number** but also in **person**, and this 'rule' was extended artificially to other persons. It is telling that the author of *BST* 240.17–241.11 had no metrical examples to hand to justify his putative **tángabhair... ibh*.

[2]Though the likes of *a-táid siad*, *creidid siad* etc. occur in manuscripts, no rhyming examples have been noted (McManus 2017: 227 n. 36). Cf. the use of the 3 person impersonal in a relative clause after a subject antecedent in Classical Modern Irish. Though the grammarian responsible for *BST* 219.2 was aware of the use of the 3 pl. impersonal verb in a relative clause after a plural nominal subject antecedent (*na fir a-táid 'san bhaile* 'the men who are in the settlement'), he considered this faulty (*lochtach*), allowing only *na fir a-tá 'san bhaile* (in which the impersonal relative is formally 3 sg.). For the situation in Middle Irish and in Early Modern Irish prose, see *SnaG* III §14.3 and IV §7.33 respectively.

[3]I know of only one instance where the impersonal verb occurs with a 3 pl. disjunctive pronoun but does not agree with it in number, viz. (28) below, *nó co táir ... iad* 'until they meet their end'. *Táir* is 3 sg. present subjunctive (and also future) to *tarnaig*/*tairnig* (also *do-arnaig*/*do-airnig*) 'comes to an end, wears away' (see Hoyne 2018a: 113–14). This highly defective verb is treated in *IGT* III §9. No non-3 sg. forms are authorised by the tract (but see the examples cited in Hoyne (2018a: 114), if they do indeed belong to this verb). In the version of *IGT* III preserved in RIA MS E iv 1 (Cat. 751), we read *táir .l. iollradh 'na bheól, ⁊ aderar gurab .c. 'táir mo ghiobuil' do chanamhain*, 'it is faulty for *táir* to have a plural in front of it [i.e. coming after it as subject], and it is said that *táir* (3 sg.) *mo ghiobail* (nom. pl.) "my clothes will wear out" is correct as an anomalous construction'. In other words, given the gap in the paradigm, it appears that 3 sg. *táir* was sometimes used where a 3 pl. form would otherwise be expected. The specification by the grammarian that a plural cannot follow this particular verb presumably reflects the fact that it was possible for *táir* to have a plural subject antecedent as the verb in the following relative clause would regularly be 3 sg. (cf. *a-táid na fir* but *na fir a-tá*, fn. 2 above). (28) occurs in a prose text, but *IGT* III 140 and 141 prove that some poets did indeed combine *táir* and a plural subject: *Biaidh nó go táir taisi an rígh* / *ar an Síl gCaisi* [i.e. *gCais-se*] *gráin gliadh*, 'These descendants of Cas will fear battle until the remains of the king fade away' (*IGT* III 140); *Slega reamra re headh n-áigh* / *táir le fear mBearba acht a mbuaidh*, 'In the course of battle thick spears will be worn out by the hero of Bearbha but their victories [will endure]' (*IGT* III 141). Both of these examples are marked faulty (*lochtach*) in the tract. Regarding the first, it is important to note that *IGT* II §180 gives *taise* as *plurale tantum* and it is presumably taken as a plural in *IGT* III also. However, as Damian McManus points out to me, the unknown author of this particular citation may have regarded *taise* as singular. In this he would have had the support of no less an authority than Giolla Brighde Mac Con Midhe, in one of whose poems we find *A dhuine ó ndeachaidh a bhean,* / *oslaig an uaigh 'nar cuireadh; féacha mar tá a taise a-nois* / *na mná caise do charois* 'O you man whose woman has died, open the grave in which she was buried; see what the smoothness of the ringleted woman looks like now', where *taise* is the subject of a 3 sg. verb (*tá* : *mná*) (Williams 1980: poem 20.37cd). Williams takes *taise* as 'smoothness', but in this context 'remains' is far more likely to be the true meaning. For other 'faults' in Mac Con Midhe's poetry, see McManus (2017: 216–17, 220–1, 223–4) and Hoyne (2019a: 30–2). Note also that the noun-phrase *a taise ... na mná ...* contains both a possessive pronoun and the article; cf. Mac Con Midhe's 'violation' of the double article constraint (Hoyne 2019a: 32 n. 24).

6 In examples (1), (2) and (3) the disjunctive pronoun is the subject of an intransitive verb, but the grammarian responsible for *BST* 240.17–241.11 makes clear that his supposed rule applied to transitive verbs as well. Indeed, this section of the tract begins with three pairs of transitive sentences (*BST* 240.17–241.1).[4] Each consists of the verb *meallaidh* 'seduces' with a pronominal subject and pronominal object, but in the first iteration of the sentence the word-order is VSO, in the second VOS. The grammarian states that the change of word-order does not alter the meaning; both versions have the same sense (*ó éinchéill*). The first pair is *mealluidh mé thú*, *meall*aidh *tú mé*, 'I seduce you'. To accord with the rule set out in *BST* 241.2–5, we should really expand the suspension stroke in the second sentence as *meall*aim and read *meallaim thú mhé*.[5] The second pair is *meall*uidh *tú mhé*, *meallae mhé thú* 'you seduce me', where *meallae* is the 2 sg. synthetic present indicative 'required' by the disjunctive 2 sg. subject pronoun.[6] In the third example, we have *mealluidh síad mhé*, *meall*aidh *mhé íad*, 'they seduce me'. Though the suspension stroke here is dotted, it should probably be understood as 3 pl. *meallaid* to agree with the 3 pl. disjunctive pronoun *iad*.

7 The grammarian concludes these sample sentences with the observation:

> *.c. mur sin uile ar gach énaimsir achd gurab é 'do ghonf*adh *mé* [MS *mhé* (?)] *sibh' nó 'do ghonadh mé sibh' as .c. ann ó nach fuil cuid ag innsgne sibh don dá aimsir*[-]*sin*.
>
> 'That is correct in every tense except that it is *do ghonfadh mhé sibh* ['you (pl.) would wound me'] or *do ghonadh mhé sibh* ['you (pl.) wounded me'] that is correct, since the 2 person plural does not have a particular form in those two tenses'.

The point is that, as there is no 2 pl. synthetic verbal form in the secondary future or past habitual, *do ghonfadh* and *do ghonadh* respectively are not obliged to agree with the disjunctive subject pronoun in the same way as 2 sg. present indicative *meallae* in *meallae... thú* or 3 pl. future indicative *meallfaid* in *meallfaid... iad*; synthetic forms were available for the latter two but not the former.[7] Perhaps the example at *BST* 241.9–10 was meant to illustrate this point, but the tract must be corrupt here, as the same half-quatrain is given

[4]Given the difficulty of interpreting this passage as published, I have consulted the manuscript and indicate in the quotations below where the editor, Lambert McKenna, has expanded a suspension stroke. Though I disagree with McKenna on some points in this paper, my admiration for his pioneering investigations of the Tracts and Irish bardic poetry more generally remains.

[5]For the forms of the 1 and 2 sg. pronouns with a lenited initial in Classical Modern Irish, see §§28–9 below.

[6]McKenna emended MS *meallae* to *meallaidh*.

[7]No synthetic forms of the 2 pl. of the past habitual or secondary future are attested in Middle Irish manuscripts (*SnaG* III §12.2). Cf. also Roma (2000: 116, 130).

twice with only minor spelling variation, once marked correct (*.c.*) and once faulty (*.l.*).[8] It reads

(4) *do ghonfadh Mhóir °sibh le °sleidh*
ní libh do-chóidh ón Choimdhidh

'you (pl.) would wound Mór with a spear; you would certainly not be left unpunished for it by the Lord'[9]

This citation may originally have been labelled *lochtach* in the tract. In *do ghonfadh Mhóir sibh*, the personal name *Mór* is clearly marked as accusative (*Mhóir* : *do-chóidh*), meaning that *sibh* is the subject pronoun. As the subject pronoun is separated from its verb, our grammarian might have preferred that it have the same form as the corresponding subject pronoun of a passive-impersonal verb or direct object pronoun of an active transitive verb (*ibh*); if we read *ibh*, however, the *uaim* with *sleidh* is ruined. Against this interpretation, it should be noted that earlier our grammarian (at least as transmitted to us in the sole manuscript copy) registered no objection to *do ghon*(*f*)*adh mhé sibh* (*BST* 240.20–1).

8 Whatever about the grammarian's interpretation of (4), similar objections can be raised to his treatment of transitive verbs as were raised in §5 with regard to intransitive verbs. There are no authentic examples of transitive synthetic constructions with redundant disjunctive subject pronouns marked like the subjects of passive-impersonal verbs or the direct objects of transitive active verbs at any stage of the Irish language: the likes of *meallae... thú* do not occur in texts. Our grammarian has extended the same person-concordance rule that he extrapolated from intransitive examples like *do-chádar... iad* – namely that verbs inflect to agree with the person of their disjunctive subject pronouns – to transitive constructions. Though the source of (4) is not now known, it seems genuine. The syntax of the pronominal subject in (4) is quite distinct from that in (1), (2) and (3), however. The pronoun in (4) has the normal subject form. True, it appears to be disjunctive, but this is no more than metrical licence. Underlying (4) is the ordinary prose sentence *do ghonfadh sibh Mhóir le sleigh*. This is warped for metrical purposes to provide end-rhyme (*sleigh* : *Choimdhidh*), internal rhyme (*sibh* : *libh*) and alliteration (*sibh... sleigh*) in the appropriate places. We must distinguish between conjunctive pronouns (like *sibh* in *do ghonfadh sibh*) that are artificially separated from their verb for metrical purposes and pronouns that are genuinely disjunctive in ordinary language. As we will see, the subject pronouns in (1), (2) and (3) could be disjunctive in prose as well as poetry. Our grammarian may even have been aware that his interpretation of these sentences was open to criticism. His observation *a-dearar nach athruigheann le barr mur do-ní le*

[8]Incidentally, the reading *Choimhidh* printed in *BST* 241.10 is a slip for MS *Choimdh*idh.

[9]I take the second line as an example of the idiom *ní théid X le Y* 'Y does not go unpunished for X' (*eDIL* s.v. *téit* IV.13(b)), in which *do-chóidh* is a modal preterite used with the sense of the conditional (see Quin 1974: 45–8).

focal 'it is said that the way in which a pronoun changes with a suffix differs from the way it changes with an [intervening] word' (*BST* 241.2–5) may be a somewhat crude reference to an alternative analysis, in which the genuinely disjunctive *do-chádar ... iad* and the 'originally' conjunctive *do ghonfadh Mhóir sibh* were distinguished, the former showing a 'change' of the subject pronoun (*siad* > *iad*) with a suffix (the ending of the inflectional form *do-chádar*), the latter showing no such change with an interposed word (*Mhóir*).

Rudimenta Grammaticae Hibernicae

9 The author of *Rudimenta Grammaticae Hibernicae* also had occasion to cite (1) (Mac Aogáin 1968: ll. 2029–40). In a discussion of agreement between the verb and the subject pronoun, which may be based on the passage in *BST* discussed above or something similar, he notes that the 3 sg. of the verb is used with every person in the analytic construction, and explicitly faults the double-marking of person when the pronoun follows immediately after the verb: *do mharbh siad* and *do mharbhadar* 'they killed' are correct but *do mharbhadar siad* 'they killed' is not. The author specifies 'immediately' (*Dixi 'immediate' ...*) because he is aware of the likes of *do-chádar ... iad* in (1). He informs us that this construction is felt to be less elegant (*sed id minus eligans videtur*), presumably because of the redundancy it entails.

10 Sadly, neither *BST* nor *Rudimenta* comment on the form of the pronoun in (1). As already noted, we might expect the subject pronoun of an active verb like *téid* 'goes' to have the form *siad* rather than the vowel-initial form associated more commonly with the role of subject to a passive-impersonal verb or direct object to an active transitive verb. This is also the case in (2), where we have the 'object' pronoun *é* rather than *sé*, and (3), where we find *ibh* rather than *sibh*. Indeed, the author of the *Rudimenta* classifies *é*, *ibh* and *iad* as 'accusative' pronouns elsewhere in his grammar (Mac Aogáin 1968: l. 1114). That the vowel-initial pronouns are authorial in (1), (2) and (3) is confirmed by *uaim*.

11 Semantically, there can hardly be any doubt that *é*, *ibh* and *iad* do indeed refer to the subject in these examples. In (1), *téid X d'éag* can only be construed as an intransitive construction; there is no vacant slot for a direct object. The syntax of (1) further confirms this conclusion. It is well known that the placement of the pronominal object is quite fluid in Irish (Ahlqvist 1976; *SnaG* III §10.15; Bennett, Elfner and McCloskey 2015): it can occur immediately after the verb which governs it and any accompanying subject or at some point later in the clause, after a prepositional object or adverb. This applies too to the pronominal subject of the passive-impersonal verb. No matter where the object pronoun is placed in the sentence, however, the verb never inflects to match the object in number. The very fact that there is concord in number between verb (*do-chádar*) and pronoun (*iad*) in (1), therefore, leaves no doubt as to the role of the pronoun. While it was no longer obligatory for an analytic verb to agree in number with a conjunctive 3 pl. subject pronoun in the Early Modern Irish period, such agreement is still met with on occasion (the likes of *a-táid siad*). An even closer parallel to the agreement between

verbal number and the number of the 3 pl. subject pronoun in *do-chádar ... iad* is provided by the 'preterite passive plural' in Classical Modern Irish (for which see McManus 1992), where we find the likes of *do díoghluid ... iaidséin* 'they were avenged', in which both the passive-impersonal verb and its disjunctive subject pronoun are 3 plural.

12 The following is a list of examples from Middle and Early Modern Irish texts of the construction seen in (1), (2) and (3) above.[10] In compiling this list, I have drawn on *eDIL* and previous discussions of this construction and related matters, in particular Ahlqvist (1976), Breatnach (*SnaG* III), Dillon (1932: 64), Greene (1958, 1972), McManus (*SnaG* IV) and Roma (2000: 127–8). No claim is made to comprehensiveness.

FURTHER EXAMPLES

13 The following examples are found in contemporary Middle Irish manuscripts and are cited in *SnaG* III §10.19.

(5) *cīa do-lluid i n-écaib* ***hí***[11] (*LL* 25447, Metrical *Dindṡenchas*)

'Though she died'

(6) *Ro bátar acá aslach for Pelias Iasōn do marbad arnāch tīssad friss* ***hē*** (*LL* 30874–5, *Togail Troí*)

'They were urging Pelias to kill Jason so that he would not come to oppose him'

(7) *da-fuit lessium* ***hé*** (*LL* 31217, *Togail Troí*)

'He [Giron] fell by him [Hercules]'

(8) *Ocus Mani in marend* ***hé*** (*LL* 33927, *Tochmarc Ferbae*)

'And Maine, does he live?'

(9) *Tuitfid ónd fíach* ***é*** (*LL* 38590, *Bórama*)

'He [Áed mac Ainmerech] will die by the raven'[12]

[10]The construction examined here was, of course, impossible in Old Irish. For the purposes of this article, I classify as Middle Irish some texts which are thought to go back to the Old Irish period but in the form in which they are transmitted to us show later linguistic features.

[11]This example is from syllabic verse and there is *úaimm* between *écaib* and *í*. I have not marked *úaimm* here, however, as it is not found in every line of this short poem. In the longer poem from which (10) is excerpted, *úaimm* is found in almost every line and I feel justified therefore in marking *úaimm* in the usual way.

[12]This refers to a prophecy that a raven will attack Áed.

14 From Middle Irish texts in later manuscripts, the following have been noted.

(10) *rom-icfa lá, a Dé in doluid*
atá ar conair °***é*** *im* °*aigid* (Meyer 1907: 216, quatrain 9*cd*; from a poem on death attributed to Cormac mac Cuillenáin)

'[Death] will come to me one day, O God of the toll; it is on its way to meet me'[13]

(11) *nī roerchōidigestar dō* ***hí*** (Preface to Secundius's Hymn in the Leabhar Breac)[14]

'it [the fire] did not hurt him [Míliuc]' (Stokes 1887: ii 392–3)

(12) *Acht masa i n-uamas an catha Troíanna rohairged in fi[d]ceall ní torracht hÉrinn and sin* ***í*** (Middle Irish *Cath Maige Tuired*)

'But if *fidchell* was invented at the time of the Trojan war, it had not reached Ireland yet' (Gray 1982: §69)

(13) *gur ben a lám dē, co raib* ***hī*** *isind achad ina fíadnaisi* (Thurneysen 1935: 10; Rawlinson B 512 version of *Scéla Mucce Meic Da Thó*)[15]

'and it [the cast of the spear] chopped his hand off, so that it was on the grass in front of him'[16]

(14) *ocus dá lá déc ro baí immuigh* ***hí*** (from 'Stories from the Law-Tracts')

'and she [Taidell] was away twelve days'[17] (Dillon 1932: 46, 57)

(15) *'Ragaid duitsiu* ***hí****,' ar Mac Rethi* (from 'Stories from the Law-Tracts')

'"Thou shalt have her," said Mac Rethe'[18] (Dillon 1932: 47, 57)

[13]Or perhaps, following *eDIL* s.v. *dolud* and taking *in doluid* as nominative, 'The toll will come to me some day, O God'.

[14]Note that the impersonal form here has the deponent ending *-estar*. In Classical Modern Irish, it is normally the suffixless 3 sg. past tense that combines with a conjunctive pronoun, but see McManus (2017: 226–7) for *térnastar sé* (*IGT* III 157). This rule may not have applied with a disjunctive pronoun, in the same way that in Classical Modern Irish **do-chádar siad* was incorrect but *do-chádar ... iad* was permitted.

[15]*Raib* is no doubt for *raibe*.

[16]Cf. *co mbert a lāim dē, co mboī for lár* in Thurneysen's edited text.

[17]She had been kidnapped by the wizard Cotrebe.

[18]Literally, 'she will go to you'. Mac Rethe has agreed to give his daughter in marriage to the poet Trusc.

(16) *Mā tāit tall* ***tāt*** [...] (*CIH* 68.35–6, commentary on *Bretha Comaithchesa*)

'If they [the cattle] are within the field [...]' (*ALI* iv 86–7)

(17) *Mās re rē na fochraice tāinic amuigh* ***hē****, dēnait in fine a imfulung gu tī in rē* (*CIH* 77.7–8, commentary on *Bretha Comaithchesa*)

'If it is before the term of the hire he [the deserter] has come outside,[19] the family shall support him until the expiration of the time' (*ALI* iv 134–5)

(18) *.i. don eisert,* ⁊ *īar rē na focreca tāinic amuich* ***hē*** *ann sin* (*CIH* 199.30–1, commentary on *Bretha Comaithchesa*)

'that is, to the deserter, and that applies if it is after the term of hire he comes in (?)'

(19) ⁊ *is ē cuit in* acht *and, uair* no*co bīa comroind uirri-side,* nō *noco bīa itir* ***hī*** *nō cor dībda in fine uile* (*CIH* 216.10–12, commentary on *Din Techtugad*)

'And the force of "except" here is, because there is no division of this *cumhal*; or it shall not exist at all until all the tribe shall have become extinct' (*ALI* iv 42–3)

(20) *mas edh adeir in banḟiadnaise nuccun uil fuithi itir* ***hī****, in choibchi do breith di-si* (commentary on a fragmentary Old Irish law-text)

'if the female witness says she is not suffering from it [*lecc diīcce* 'incurable stone'] at all, the bride-price is to be given to her' (Kelly 2014: §10e)

(21) *Mas edh adeir in ben atā in fuil mīsta uirri* ⁊ *adeir in fear nuccun uil uirri* ***hī****, is ed dleghar banḟiadnaise dā indsaigidh* (commentary on a fragmentary Old Irish law-text)

'If the wife says that she is menstruating, and the husband says that she is not, it is necessary to seek female witness' (Kelly 2014: §11bc)

(22) *'*[...] ⁊ *inní ro bói a menmain ind óclaig,' ar Caīlte, 'ní raibe a n-aicned dūinde* ***eisseíc****'* (Stokes 1900: ll. 6034–5, *Acallam na Senórach*)

'"[...] and that which the warrior planned to do," said Caílte, "it was something we did not expect"'[20]

[19]Better 'has come in', reading *a mmaig*, i.e. 'returned home'? The *eissert*'s land has been let out after he has absconded.

[20]More literally, 'that was not in our mind'. The curious anaphoric morpheme *-séic* is not found in contemporary Middle Irish manuscripts, but cf. *-sáic* and *-sidéic* (*SnaG* III §10.22) and note *eissidéic* in the *Acallam* (Stokes 1900: l. 4833).

(23)‘ʒ *nā bīth a menma rissin fiannaigecht trē bithu intí nach tibra a ail* ʒ *a urraind* [read *urlaind*] *ar siūt nóco torchair lib* ***hé’*** (Stokes 1900: ll. 6039–40, *Acallam na Senórach*)

‘“and let the *fian* never think that it knows the mind of any man who will not give over his spear-head and spear-shaft (?),” said he [Finn] “until such time as he has fallen by you”’

15 The following example from the twelfth-century Irish *notitiae* in the Book of Deer is problematic.

(24) *do-raten ri Colum Cille* ***sí*** (Jackson 1972: 30, ll. 5–6)

‘it pleased Colum Cille’

The pronoun *sí* refers back to acc. *cathraig*, here a potential site for a future ecclesiastical settlement rather than an actual existing monastery. *Sí* is postponed in a manner more commonly associated with the object pronoun (or the pronominal subject of the passive-impersonal), but morphologically the pronoun itself retains the standard conjunctive form. Greene (1972: 169, 1973: 123) suggested that *sí* in (24) is hypercorrect for *í* and as such was evidence that in Scotland *í* was already the normal subject pronoun with an active verb at this date. It has been suggested by Ahlqvist (1976: 174) and Ó Sé (1996: 23–4) , however, that *sí* here is a late survival of a pronominal form that only subsequently died out in Scotland.[21] Whether we read *sí* or *í*, the syntax justifies including (24) in this survey.

16 In my experience, the construction under discussion is not very common in the prose of the Early Modern Irish period with the exception of the verb *tarla* ‘happened’ (see §18). I have noted the following example in the Annals of Connacht:

(25) *Do cētloit Tuathal Constapla na nGall* ʒ *do toit le Taichlech* ***hē*** (*AC* §1225.24)

Mac Airt renders (25) into English as ‘the Constable of the Galls was first wounded by Tuathal and then slain by Taichlech’. This translation makes both verbs passive. I would translate rather ‘Tuathal wounded the Constable of the Galls first and he [then] fell by Taichlech [Tuathal’s brother]’. The Annals of Connacht in their present form were probably written in the early sixteenth century, though this entry may well preserve a contemporary early-thirteenth

[21]It is, of course, uncontroversial that the Irish spoken in Scotland would have had 3 sg. fem. *sí* in its early history, and *sí* (and other *s*-initial pronominal forms) may well have survived into the Middle Irish period in Scotland before being levelled out entirely in favour of the vowel-initial forms. Ó Sé (1996: 23–4) confuses the issue in his discussion of (24), however. Examples such as *fàgas i* (but *fàgaidh e*) in modern Eastern Lewis may or may not point to the possible survival of the **conjunctive** subject pronoun *sí* at a late stage in Scotland, but they do nothing to alleviate the suspicion that **disjunctive** *sí* in (24) is hypercorrect. The nature of the evidence allows no definitive conclusion.

century syntagm. In the closely related, late-sixteenth century Annals of Loch Cé, the sentence that concerns us has been altered to *do thoit* ***sē*** *la Taichlech* (*ALC* i 286).

Three additional prose examples are identified and discussed by Roma (2000: 127–8). Two are from the Glenmasan version of *Oidheadh Chloinne hUisnigh* (Mac Giolla Léith 1993: 66–79).

(26) *co rabatar co subach sobrach [so]menmnach uile* ***iat***
'so that they were all in good and cheerful and high spirits'

(27) *as geis doitsi fled d' fhāgbāil nō co táirsi*[*o*]*dh* ***í***[22]
'it is forbidden for you to leave a feast until it has finished'

Roma also draws attention to an example from *Cath Finntrágha* (C. O'Rahilly 1962):

(28) *nó co tāir lim* ***iad*** *uili*
'until they all meet their end by me'[23]

17 The following instances of this construction have been noted in Classical Modern Irish poetry (see especially *SnaG* IV §9.1) in addition to (1), (2) and (3) above. The relevant *uaim* is marked in the usual way.

(29) *Luath cuach go nglaindigh fa ghnaoi*
luath a cruach ó Chailligh Dé;
tarrla i gceann an einigh °***í***
ní fearr do bhí i n°*Eimhir h*°***é****.*
'Readily in all graciousness does Cailleach Dé bestow her goblet with bright wine and quickly sink her corn-stack; she is devoted to generosity [better 'she has come to be at the pinnacle of generosity'] – it was not more lavish in Eimhear.' (*AiD* 1.9)

(30) *Do bhí an baile gan bheannach*
go raibhe °***í*** *ag* °*Éireannach* (*IGT* II 490 = III 882)
'The settlement was without a blessing until it was in the hands of an Irishman'

(31) *níor ghiall a meadhair do mhnaoi,*
gur fhaoi lé triar d'°*fhearaibh* °***í***

[22]As correctly analysed by Roma, *táirseadh* is 3 sg. past subjunctive. For the defective verb *tairnig*/*tarnaig* (also *do-airnig*/*do-arnaig*) 'comes to an end, wears away', see fn. 3 above.

[23]Cecile O'Rahilly suggested reading *nó co táir lim iad uile* [*do mharbhadh*] 'until I finish killing them all', but Roma (2000: 128) correctly argues that this emendation is unnecessary. For the 3 sg. impersonal verb with a 3 pl. pronoun, see fn. 3 above.

'she [St. Anne] yielded to no woman in dignity and married three husbands' (*IBP* 21.3*cd* = *IGT* III 325)

(32) *Tadhg Mág Aonghusa fhuair gnaoi,*
rug buaidh d'ú °*Aonghusa* °***í***

'Tadhg Mac Aonghusa enjoys (his folk's) favour – this has brought all success to the scion of Aonghus' (*Magauran* 2.46*ab*)

(33) *Siur ar dtoghuine i dtigh Dé*
siur sin dán roghuire an rí
banógh nach bean mar gach mnaoi
do bhaoi seal ar °*anshógh* °***í.***

'This sister, our loved one in Heaven, she to whom the Lord is nearest, maid different from all women, was for a time in anguish.' (*PB* 13.8)

(34) *Do-chóidh gu Raílinn an rí*
saelim nách tí gan fh°*óir h*°***é*** (*IGT* III 326)

'The king has gone to Raoilinn;[24] I believe he will not come back without a host.'

(35) *Cia úaibh do agaill an rí*
an uair do bhí °*againn* °***é*** (*IGT* III 570)

'Who of you did the king speak to while he was still among us?'[25]

(36) *A Í Bhríain a bhranáin Chaisil,*
cuimhnigh an teagusg tug mé,
gan bheith ar seól na ríogh romhad,
ná bíodh na sgeól °*orad* °***é***.[26]

'O O Briain, thou chessman of Caiseal, remember the teaching I gave thee, "let it not be said of thee that thou dost not imitate the career of the kings before thee"' (*BST* 210.1–3/12a25–7/42b1–2)

(37) *Crann na haithne tré iomadh*
– a aithne is ann do cailleadh –
do chuir sé mnaoi dar milleadh
do bhaoi i gcinneadh h°***é*** *d'*°*aingeal* (*DiD* 10.4)

'Through envy it was there, [at] the Tree of Knowledge, that his commandment was violated; he sent a woman to destroy us, it was fated that an angel should bring this about'[27]

[24]For the declension of *Raoilinn*, gen. *Raoileann*, in Classical Modern Irish, see *IGT* II §129.
[25]Or perhaps 'while we still had him'.
[26]*BST* reveals that this half-quatrain was sourced from a poem beginning *I dTeamhraigh ríoghthar rí Éireann*, but no copy of the entire poem is extant, to my knowledge.
[27]More literally simply 'it was fated for an angel'.

(38) *Art Aoinfhear nó Oilioll Ólom*
*ór fhºás º**eision***

'Art the Lonely or Oilill Bare-ear, from whom he [Maol Ruanaidh Ó Cearbhaill] is sprung' (*TD* 34.31*ab*)

(39) *Inghean Méig Shamhradháin sheing*
*dá daghraláimh do-ºéid º**inn***

'Daughter of graceful Mág Shamhradháin – we flee to her kindly hand' (*Magauran* 9.28*ab*)

(40) *Do biadh **inn** mar duine ndaor*
mar nār aomh sinn luigi a lāmh.

'We would be like a base person because we did not consent to swear by his hands.' (Ó Cuív 1999: quatrain 23*cd*)

(41) *Do chruthaigh Dia diadha an obair*
*Éabha is Ādhamh ór fhºás º**ibh***

'He created – holy work! – Adam and Eve from whom ye come' (*Dán Dé* 31.8*ab*)

(42) *Atāmaid mar bhudh lind lān*
*o rānaig **ind** co Siuān.* (Ó Macháin 1998: 42, quatrain 56*cd*)

'We are like a full pool since we came to Siuán'

In the last example, *uaim* requires reading *sinn* for *ind*, but it may be significant that *ind* was introduced in the course of transmission.

18 In poetry and prose, examples with *tarla* (< OIr *do-rala*, suppletive to *do-cuirethar*), which in Early Modern Irish is felt to be the past tense of *teagaibh* 'happens' (< OIr *do-ecmaing*) (*IGT* III §2), are common. Very occasionally examples are met with after other forms. In addition to the examples below, see also (29) above.

(43) *'Nā tegmad **thū** do nech inā nech duit ō sō gu brāth'*

'"Do thou meet no one, and let no one meet thee hence for ever"' (Life of Feichín) (Stokes 1891: 248–9)[28]

(44) *Clanna Somhuirle, síol nGofraidh,*
ór ghin tú, nár thaisigh bhú,
a lubhghort cuir, a chráobh abhla,
*sáor gach fuil ó a ttarla **thú**.*

'The House of Somarled, the Race of Godfred, whence thou art sprung, who did not store up cattle, O fresh-planted orchard,

[28]Better '"May you not encounter anyone and may no-one encounter you ..."'.

O apple-branch, noble is each blood from which thou comest' (*IBP* 45.29)

(45) *Coineasgar do-chuaidh a-mach;*
tarla °***é*** *ar an* °*each riabhach*

'On the evening he went forth; he happened upon a bridled steed' (*GB* 9.11)

(46) *A shlógh fhir na n-abhra ndubh,*
gé tharla °***ibh*** *ag* °*ól fhleadh*

[...]

'O troop of the dark-browed hero, though ye are now drinking banquets [...]' (*Magauran* 29.8*ab*)

(47) *dā tegm*adh *h*°***é*** *a n-*°*uath*adh *sl*uaigh (*Cia chosnas clann Dálaigh?*, RIA MS 24 P 25, Cat. 475, 79r, p. 151, quatrain 26*b*)

'if he happened to be with a small host (?)'

(48) *fágbhuim rat[h] cloinne* ⁊ *conāigh* ⁊ *búaidh náithis* ⁊ *ninnsgne* ⁊ *nurlabhra* ⁊ *nealadhan ar gacháon coimheóllfus* ⁊ *thoibhéobhus mo chíoscháin* ⁊ *nach leigfidh mo mhaoir do shárughadh a naónionadh ina tteigeōbhadh* ***é***

'I lay the blessing of offspring and good fortune, and all benefits of happiness, of sex [better 'speech'], of ready speech and of sageness on each who shall fulfil and levy my tribute, and permits not my steward to be attacked in any place in which he may happen to be' (Gwynn 1911: 100–1, Life of Lasair)

19 This paper is concerned primarily with Middle and Early Modern Irish, but it should be mentioned that reference has been made to sporadic examples of the construction under discussion in the later language. As an example of a postponed subject pronoun the following spoken example is cited by Bennett, Elfner and McCloskey (2015: 66).

(49) *nuair do chuaigh i dtalamh* ***iad*** (Póirtéir 1996: 12)

'when they [the potatoes] went into the ground'

The speaker was Seán Mac Mathúna from Co. Clare, who was born *c*. 1876.

Syntax and phonology

20 It will be noted that almost all the examples of the construction under discussion here are intransitive. In Middle Irish (in a non-contemporary manuscript) an exception is (12), where we have a verb of motion (*-toracht*, the preterite of *do-roich*) and a destination as direct object (acc. *Érinn*). While *do-roich*

is, indeed, transitive here, we should note that in terms of thematic roles, it is similar to an intransitive construction like (2). In (2), as in (12), we have a destination as object (thematically, this could be labelled 'Goal'); semantically, *go hEamhain* in (2) and *Érinn* in (12) fulfil the same function in the verbal predicate, even though they are formally distinct (the former a prepositional object, the latter a direct object). Semantically, a transitive verb of motion like *do-roich* in (12) is quite distinct from a transitive verb like *gonaid* 'wounds, slays', the direct object of which would be classified thematically as 'Patient': in *gonaid X Y*, the argument Y is at the receiving end of the action in a way that Y is not in *do-roich X Y*; furthermore, in *gonaid X Y*, the direct object changes state in a way that Y in *do-roich X Y* does not.[29]

That this construction was normally **intransitive** in Middle Irish has been recognised by others (Dillon 1932: 64; *SnaG* III §10.19, McCone 1997: 177). It has sometimes been stated that Classical Modern Irish allowed the disjunctive passive-impersonal subject/direct object pronoun in the role of subject in active **transitive** clauses, but sure examples are difficult to find. *eDIL* s.v. 1 *sí* VIII and Greene (1958: 111) give *rug báire ar gach aonlocht í* (*DiD* 32.5d) as an example of the subject pronoun *í*, but the pronoun in question could belong to the copular clause (*bean ... í*) and accordingly may not be the subject of the verbal predicate *rug báire*, which is a relative clause with *bean* as its antecedent:

(50) *bean nach tug náire dá naomhthacht*
rug báire ar gach aonlocht ***hí*** (*DiD* 32.5cd)

'She [St. Margaret] was a woman who was not ashamed of piety,
who triumphed over every fault'[30]

[29]For the accusative of destination in Irish and Welsh, see Mac Cana (1990).

[30]On this occasion I have only considered examples in which the pronoun certainly is in the role of subject; I have excluded some ambiguous examples from consideration. For instance, Damian McManus draws my attention to *A cluasa da-b*eir *don bodhor* / *blodh do mirbuilibh [meic Dé]* / *is cur luith* [read *lúidh*] *i mbund in bac(h)aigh* / *sūil don dull gu n(f)ac(h)aidh* ***ē*** (*ABM* 345.8). I take it that *do-bheir* in line *a* is historical present and that the miracles here were supposedly performed by Christ on earth. It seems more likely to me that *é* in line *d* is an object pronoun. I would translate, 'He gave hearing to the deaf man and put the power of movement into the foot of the cripple, he gave sight to the blind man so that he could see Him – these are just some of the miracles of the son of God!' However, it is by no means impossible that *é* is a subject pronoun here, and that miraculous healing more generally is meant, in which case one might translate the last line simply as 'he gives sight to the blind man so that he has [since] been able to see'. As we will see, this latter interpretation does not contradict the analysis of this construction presented below.

McKenna (*Magauran*, note on l. 1012) draws attention to two potential examples of our construction that I have not included in the list above. In *is iad ro fhill ag baidhbh Bhreagh* / *na hairm do bhean* ***inn*** *ó fhior*, 'the weapons we take from foe, they are shrinking back in presence of the Raven of Breagha' (*Magauran* 29.22*cd*), I would interpret *inn* as a direct object and translate 'the very weapons that saved us from a [hostile] man, it is they which have bent because of the [exertions of] the Raven of Breagha'. Similarly, in *déana mar do fhógair* ***inn****:* / *tógaibh sgéala do sgríbhinn*, 'Do as I have declared and display the message of your document' (*GB* 18.5*cd*), I would translate 'Do it, as it has [supposedly] outlawed us [poets]: reveal the contents of your document', which seems to me to make better sense in the context. The context is the poet's challenge to a cleric who claims that he has a papal bull prohibiting bardic poetry.

(32) cannot be explained away though. It contains another idiomatic expression with *beiridh*, viz. *beiridh X b*(*h*)*ua*(*i*)*dh* 'X triumphs'. Formally, this expression is transitive, but *beiridh ... b*(*h*)*uaidh* is a single lexical unit: *buaidh* is not a true semantic object in (32) (neither is *báire* in (50), whatever the function of the following pronoun). Whatever thematic role we assign *buaidh* in (32) (or *báire* in (50)), neither 'Theme' or 'Patient' would be appropriate. *Beiridh ... b*(*h*)*ua*(*i*)*dh* is quasi-intransitive.[31]

21 It could be argued that the examples of *teagaimh*/*tarla* are not, in fact, intransitive. Historically, both *do-cuirethar* and *do-ecmaing* are, indeed, transitive, and the sense 'happens' develops in an impersonal construction (*dom-chuirethar* 'it puts me' > 'I happen to be, etc.', *dom-ecmaing*; cf. *atom-chomnaic*). However, at an early period *teagaimh*/*tarla* are found as intransitive verbs (see the relevant entries in *eDIL*). As the verb *teagaimh* and its adopted past-tense are commonly found with conjunctive subject pronouns (*tarla sé* etc.) and equipped with a full set of synthetic forms (*teagmhaim* 'I happen ...', *tarladh* 'I happened' etc.) in Classical Modern Irish, there can be no doubt about their intransitivity.[32]

Synchronically then, with the partial exceptions of (12) and (32), all examples of this construction in both Middle and Early Modern Irish are in fact intransitive.[33]

22 While the subject pronoun in this construction is often separated from the verb, (8), (13), (27), (30) and (38)–(48) illustrate that this is not always the case, as has already been noted by Breatnach (*SnaG* III §10.22). In this regard, our subject pronouns behave like passive-impersonal subject/direct object

Incidentally, I have argued recently that the poem from which this last half-quatrain is cited, the famous *A theachtaire thig ón Róimh*, is not in fact the work of Giolla Brighde Mac Con Midhe (Hoyne 2019a: 38–41). I would like to take this opportunity to register two slips in that paper. At p. 42, I refer to a 'forthcoming' publication by Gordon Ó Riain: this is in fact Ó Riain (2016: 166–73). On p. 57, in discussing the analytic construction with past-tense forms of *do-ní*, I should have noted that *IGT* III §1 disapproves of *do-róna* as a 3 sg. form. With regard to *caidhead*/*caidhid* (p. 53 n. 75), see *BST* 1aa22–4, 11b22–6.

[31] Cf. Mod. Ir. *faigheann* X *bás*, which in the perfect can behave like an intransitive verb (*tá* X *fachta bás*, not **tá bás fachta ag* X) (Doyle 2004).

[32] With impersonal constructions such as *dom-chuirethar*, *dom-ecmaing* and *atom-chomnaic*, we should also note *-fil*, which is in origin an impersonal transitive verbal form but is suppletive to the substantive verb. The subject of the substantive verb is expressed by an infixed object pronoun with *-fil* in Old and Middle Irish (*ním fuil* 'I am not') and a nominal subject is marked as accusative (*ní fil maccu* etc.) even into Classical Modern Irish (*SnaG* III §12.191; IV §3.2(a)). In Middle Irish it develops personal inflection (1 sg. *-fuilim* etc.).

[33] Another false Classical example is given in *eDIL* s.v. 1 *é* VIII: *Dál féirleabtha d'inghin é / imridh sé éinbhearta is í* (*IGT* II 1113), 'He is the reason a young woman makes a tryst in a bed of grass; he makes the same moves as her' or 'as she does'. The pronoun *í* is a disjunctive pronoun employed independently in syntactical ellipsis. *Imridh sé éinbhearta is í* is an example of brachylogy; it represents a shortened version of **imridh sé éinbhearta is imreas sí* 'he makes the same moves as she makes'. The same sort of ellipsis is allowed with the conjunction *ioná*. For example, *is fearr imreas sé ioná*(*s*) *í* for **is fearr imreas sé ioná imreas sí* would be perfectly grammatical. Cf. Hoyne (2017: 169–73). For the honorand's irresistibility to women in Bardic poetry and in particular his outdoor trysts with women, see McManus (2009: 93–5). For the erotic connotations of board-games in contemporary poetry, see Greene (1955).

pronouns, as noted above (§11).[34] In poetry, metrical exigencies undoubtedly played a part in the placement of the pronoun, but the occurrence of the pronoun at a point later in the clause cannot be conditioned by metrical considerations in (6), (7), (9), (11)–(12), (14)–(26), (28) (or (49)). We are dealing, of course, with written evidence, and whatever phonological distinctions there were in Middle and Early Modern Irish between the conjunctive subject pronouns (like *siad* in *do-cháidh siad*) and their disjunctive counterparts (*iad* in *do-chádar ... iad*) beyond their surface differences cannot be determined with absolute certainty. Be that as it may, some reasonable speculation is possible. Greene (1973: 122–8) argues convincingly that the conjunctive subject pronouns of the analytic construction were normally unstressed enclitics; they can be analysed as pronouns or as suffixes (*do-cháidh siad* = *do-'cháidh-siad*). In syllabic poetry, all independent pronouns count as fully stressed words, of course, something which allows *sibh* in (4) to rhyme and participate in *uaim* and to be separated from the verb to which it would have been enclitic in ordinary speech (*do 'ghonfadh ... 'sibh* for *do-'ghonfadh-sibh*). Greene attributes this artificial system of accentuation to the fact that the basic rules of syllabic poetry were devised in the Old Irish period, prior to the emergence of the analytic construction, when independent pronouns were indeed always fully stressed (see §24 below). Bearing this in mind, even in (8), (13), (27), etc., we are justified in referring to the subject pronoun as disjunctive (*in mairend hé* ≠ *in-'mairend-é*). Like the passive-impersonal subject/direct object pronoun, the subject pronoun of the construction under discussion here was not enclitic to the verb but could move around quite freely even, we can assume, in ordinary speech. Even when it occurs immediately after a verb, the subject pronoun in our construction is disjunctive in the sense that it is not enclitic to the verbal complex in the way a suffix is.[35]

23 What about the semantics of sentences like *do-chádar ... iad*? Does the use of the passive-impersonal subject/direct object pronoun in the role of subject after an active intransitive verb convey something that would not be expressed by the bare synthetic *do-chádar* or the standard analytic *do-cháidh siad*? In order to clarify the semantic distinction involved, it may be helpful first to give a brief overview of the history of the independent pronoun in Irish.

A BRIEF HISTORY OF THE INDEPENDENT PRONOUN IN IRISH

24 The only stressed pronominal forms in normal Old Irish were nominative,[36] and these were found exclusively as predicates after the copula (*is mé* 'it is I')

[34]For Modern Irish, Bennett, Elfner and McCloskey (2015) demonstrate that the movement of the object pronoun rightwards in a clause is entirely insensitive to semantic and discourse factors and is instead conditioned by the demands of phonological phrasing (a 'binarity' requirement). This analysis may hold for the earlier language also. Note that nominal subjects can also occur later in the clause in the earlier language (see Lash and Griffith 2018: 116–31) (see also fn. 49 below).

[35]In the foregoing, I do not mean to suggest that 'object' pronouns were always or even normally fully stressed in ordinary Middle and Early Modern Irish.

[36]Voc. *a thusu* (Sg. 204b6), as Thurneysen (*GOI* §406 n.) notes, is a Latinism created to parse Lat. *o tu*.

and interrogatives (*cía tussu?* 'who art thou?') or independently in non-verbal clauses (*apstil i tossug, sissi íarum* 'Apostles first, ye afterwards') (*GOI* §§406–8). The pronominal subject of an active verb could only be expressed morphologically in the form of the verb itself (*do-gníu* 'I do, am doing, etc.', *do-gní* 'you/he/she/it does'), though the appropriate *nota augens* could be used 'to reinforce the pronominal concept' where necessary (*GOI* §401). Old Irish had no independent accusative pronouns. A pronominal direct object was indicated by infixing an unstressed pronoun into the verbal complex (*GOI* §409f.), as in *rom gab* 'he has taken me'; **ro gab mé* is unknown in Old Irish. This infixing was also used to indicate the subject of the passive-impersonal verb, except in the 3 person singular and plural.

25 The forms of the independent pronoun in Old Irish (ignoring *notae augentes*) are as follows (*GOI* §405).

1 sg.	*mé*
2 sg.	*tú*
3 sg. m.	*é*
3 sg. f.	*sí*
3 sg. n.	*ed*
1 pl.	*sní*
2 pl.	*sí*
3 pl.	*é*

2 pl. *sib* (a reduplicated form of *sí*) is already found in the Würzburg Glosses (*GOI* §§405, 448).

26 The functions of the independent pronoun began to increase in the Middle Irish period. It had established itself in copular clauses like *roba lesmac dí é* 'he was a stepson of hers' (earlier *ba lesmac-som dí* with *nota augens* to clarify the pronominal reference) as early as *Saltair na Rann* (*c*. 988). By the eleventh century, it is found with the passive-impersonal (*fritháilter misi* 'let me be looked after', for earlier *fritom-áilter* with a 1 sg. infix; *tucad hí* 'she was brought', for earlier *tucad* without any explicit pronoun or with enclitic *-si*) and in combination with or replacing the infixed direct object pronoun of transitive verbs (*ra marb hé* 'he killed him', for earlier *ra marb* with a nasalising infix; *ro baist hí* 'he baptised her', with the new 3 sing. pronominal form *í*, for earlier *ros baits*) (*SnaG* III §§10.14–17; McCone 1997: 176–7). As we have seen, these same forms occur as the subjects of intransitive verbs: *da-fuit leis-sium hé* 'he falls at his hand' (earlier *do-fuit* without explicit pronominal reference). The more general use of a 1 and 2 person pronoun (sg. or pl.) or a 3 sing. pronoun to indicate the subject of the verb after a 3 sg. verbal form and of the 3 pl. pronoun after a 3 pl. verb in the same function was slower to develop, though it is certainly met with in Middle Irish (*ragaid missi* 'I will go' beside *ragat-sa*; *ní biat síat* 'they will not be', with the new 3 pl. subject pronoun *síat*, beside synthetic *ní biat*) (*SnaG* III §10.19, McCone 1997: 177).

27 The Middle Irish forms of the independent pronoun are given below (again omitting the forms combined with emphatic/contrastive suffixes).

We will return later to the issue of the distribution of A- and B-forms, labels borrowed from *SnaG* IV §9.1.

	A	B
1 sg.	*mé*	
2 sg.	*tú*	*thú*
3 sg. m.	*sé*	*é*
3 sg. f.	*sí*	*í*
3 sg. n.	*sed*	*ed*
1 pl.	*sinn*	
2 pl.	*sib*	
3 pl.	*síat*	*íat*

Some of the changes undergone by the independent pronouns in the Middle Irish period have already been mentioned in the preceding paragraph. A variant form of the 1 sg. pronoun, *mí*, is attested (*SnaG* III §§10.13, 14, 21).[37] Where the 2 sg. pronoun follows the copula and the initial is not de-lenited after a homorganic consonant (e.g. *ní thú* but always *is tú*), where it follows a passive-impersonal verb or where it functions as the object of an active verb, the form *thú* is sometimes found. Alongside 3 sg. m. *é* a new form *sé* developed (through re-segmentation of *is é* and analogy with *sí*), and this also resulted in neuter *sed* (*SnaG* III §10.13). The reverse process led to the development of 3 sg. fem. *í* alongside historical *sí*. The 3 pl. pronoun *síat*/*íat* (< *eat*, i.e., 3 pl. *é* + suffix *-at*) emerged with the same variation of initial letter found in its singular counterparts (*SnaG* III §10.20). In addition, the innovative 1 pl. pronoun *sinn* was back-formed from the emphatic/contrastive form *sinni*,[38] and *sib* entirely ousted 2 pl. *sí*.

28 By the end of the Middle Irish period, *sinn* had developed a variant without the initial *s-* (*SnaG* III §10.20), and by the Early Modern Irish period (perhaps earlier but the form is not attested in Middle Irish manuscripts), the 2 pl. pronoun also had a form with vocalic initial like the 3 person pronouns.[39]

[37]Though never written with a long vowel, this form is attested in the Book of Leinster. I assume on the basis of Breatnach (2003) that Middle Irish could not have tolerated a final short vowel in a stressed monosyllable without some following enclitic. It is not beyond the realms of possibility that by the end of the Middle Irish period stressed monosyllables ending in a short vowel were emerging, if changes such as *-th* > /Ø/ had already begun (see Hoyne 2016: 197), but it seems unlikely that stressed monosyllables ending in a short vowel were found before the thirteenth century. It should also be noted here that the 1 sg. B-form *mhé* attested in Early Modern Irish may well have existed in the Middle Irish period (cf. *thú*), but because of contemporary orthography this cannot be determined.

[38]*Sinni* itself resulted from metathesis in *snini*, a dissimilated form of *snisni* (reduplicated *sní*) (*GOI* §448).

[39]Middle Irish orthography does not allow us to determine whether the final consonant of *sinn* was always palatalised at that stage of the language. As noted above, *sinn* is in origin a back-formation from *sinni*. Although *-nai* is sometimes found in Old Irish (Carney 1941–3: 223–4), in Middle and Early Modern Irish the 1 pl. *nota augens* is always *-ni*/*-ne*. The forms of the 1 pl. independent pronoun with non-palatalised *-nn*, like those with the palatalised final, were back-formed from *sinne*, but in the case of *sionn* the consonant preceding the *nota*

The following are the forms of the independent pronoun found in Classical Early Modern Irish (*SnaG* IV §9.1):

	A	B
1 sg.	*mé*	*mhé*
2 sg.	*tú*	*thú*
3 sg. m.	*sé*	*é*
3 sg. f.	*sí*	*í*
3 sg. n.		*eadh*
1 pl.	*si*(*o*)*nn*	*i*(*o*)*nn*
2 pl.	*sibh*	*ibh*
3 pl.	*siad*	*iad*

By the Early Modern Irish period, then, each person had at least two independent pronominal forms (with the exception of the vestigial neuter pronoun, which has lost its variant in *s*-).

29 As the independent pronoun established itself in its new environments in Middle Irish, the functional distribution of A- and B-forms became more clear-cut. Middle Irish texts still show some A-forms in environments where – thinking teleologically – the modern reader might expect B-forms (see, in particular, *SnaG* III §10.20). By Early Modern Irish the system had become more well-defined. The A-forms of the pronoun are normally found in the role of subject immediately after a verb; the syntax of the B-forms is more flexible. The A-forms are conjunctive; the B-forms disjunctive. The B-forms are generally used to indicate the subject of a passive-impersonal verb and the direct object of an active transitive verb. They may also be used, as we have seen, for the pronominal subject of an intransitive verb. It will be argued below that the use of the B-form in the latter instance is semantically conditioned. When used with an active verb, whether transitive or intransitive, the A-forms may designate the semantic Agent, though this is not always the case. On the other hand, the B-forms of the pronoun are unambiguously and clearly Not Agent. In other words, the use of the B-forms with an intransitive verb is a highly marked construction that indicates the lack of agentivity on the part of the subject in the act described by the verb.[40]

augens was de-palatalised; *sinne* was felt to be the result of *sionn* + *-ne* just as, for example, *ar mbeannaicht-ne* is the result of *ar mbeannacht* + *-ne*.

[40]On the present occasion I am not concerned with the use of the pronoun except as an argument of a full verb (active or passive). The distribution of A- and B-forms of the pronoun in other environments is still somewhat fluid in Middle Irish, but again by Early Modern Irish the distribution has become more rigid. In Early Modern Irish, the B-forms are the only independent pronouns found outside of a verbal predicate, i.e. not as the subject or direct object of a full verb. This distribution is to be expected given that these forms are disjunctive. Exceptionally, after copula *is* and the conjunction *agus*/*is* (which has also absorbed Old Irish *os*) both the A-forms in *s*- and the corresponding vocalic B-forms are found, but this variation is found only after unstressed elements in *-s*: as the copula *is* is proclitic, the prosodic word *isé*, with stress on the second syllable, could be analysed as either *is é* or *is sé*. The verb-like particle *ar* 'says, said' also allows the A-forms. This is probably a legacy of an original *sé* 'this' of *olsé*, as my colleague Dr Christina Cleary points out to me, though some have seen the *s*- as secondary. For *olsé*, see Quin (1960), Breatnach (2003) and Sims-Williams (2019: 92–4).

SEMANTICS

30 As mentioned above, one of the functions of the B-forms of the pronoun in both Middle and Early Modern Irish was to designate the subject of the passive-impersonal verb. Another was to signify the object of a transitive verb. Having discussed the rise of the independent pronoun in these environments in the Middle Irish period, McCone (1997: 177) writes: 'It was but a small step from passive to quasi-passive intransitive types like *da:fuit leis-sium hé* (*LL* 31217) "he falls at his hand" [= (7)] and then to an intransitive active construction such as *arnach:tíssad friss hé* (30875) "that he should not come against him" [= (6)].' While I do not agree with McCone's analysis of the second example in the quotation, his term 'quasi-passive intransitive' is a useful starting point for understanding the use of the B-form pronouns in the construction we have been examining. What the direct object of a verb and the subject of the passive-impersonal verb have in common semantically is that they do not bring about the action described by the verbal predicate; rather they undergo it and may or may not change state as a result. Viewed in terms of semantic roles, both are normally Theme or Patient, not Agent (cf. §20). Semantically, many of the pronominal subjects in (1)–(3), (5)–(49) have a similar role vis-à-vis their verbal predicates as the pronominal subjects of the passive-impersonal verbs and the direct objects of transitive verbs. Consider (7) again.

da-fuit lessium ***hé***

'He [Giron] falls by him [Hercules]'

Da-fuit X means 'X falls, dies violently' here. This telic, dynamic verbal predicate is not an action consciously undertaken by the subject in the same way that the physical action described by *gonaid X Y* is; the subject undergoes the action described (dying violently) like the object of a transitive verb (the Y of *gonaid X Y*) or the subject of the passive-impersonal (*gonair*/*gonta*(*i*)*r X*) and the subject changes state (becomes dead). Similarly, in (1) the verbal predicate *téid X d'éag* 'X dies' does not describe an act brought about by the deliberate effort of X. In fact, seven of our examples have to do with dying (1, 5, 7, 9, 23, 25, 28). The atelic, stative verbal predicate of (8), *mairid* 'lives, survives' could be considered an antonym of *da-fuit* and the like, but semantically they have common ground – it is a predicate which does not describe a volitional act. Cf. also (35), probably from a lost elegy on a dead noble.

Cia úaibh do agaill an rí
an uair do bhí againn ***é****?*

'Who of you did the king speak to while he was among us?'

In (35), 'while he was among us' has the force 'while he was still alive'. Similarly, the verb *fásaidh* 'grows, springs (from)' in (38) and (41) does not describe a willed action – Ó Cearbhaill in (38), for example, had no control over whether or not he was born let alone from what stock. By definition, *teagaimh* 'happens' implies no agency on the part of the subject.

31 The subjects of the verbs of dying, living and happening discussed in the previous paragraph were all human. While a human may choose to undertake a voluntary action like that described by the verb *gonaid* in a way that he or she cannot undertake the continued state described by *mairid* (8) or the change of state described by *téid d'éag* (1), inanimate subjects are not in a position to consciously undertake an action at all: they can never be true Agents. In (11) the subject pronoun *í* refers back to *lassair* 'flame'.

nī roerchōidigestar dō ***hí***
'it did not hurt him'

In the anecdote in question, Míliuc is miraculously preserved from the harmful effects of a fire. Even if we ignore the question of whether the verb *airchóitigid X do Y* 'X harms, injures Y' implies deliberate action on the part of its subject in general, there is no doubt that a flame, while certainly capable of causing harm, is incapable of choosing whether or not it does so. The flame may be the subject of the verb *airchóitigid*, but it is not a semantic Agent. Obviously this applies too to other inanimate or abstract subjects in the list above: Death (10), the game of *fidchell* in (12), the severed hand in (13), the division of property in (19), the stone of (20), menses in (21), the secret intention of the warrior in (22), the pieces of land in (24) and (30), the feast of (27), the virtue of generosity (29), the state of not following in one's ancestors' footsteps in (36), the temptation of Eve in (37) and the potatoes of (49). This may also be relevant to the cattle of (16), who are lower on the animacy scale than human Agents, though the substantive verb certainly allows a non-agentive reading (see §33).

32 In §30, we looked at examples of our construction in which the verb describes a non-voluntary action (dying, living, growing, happening) and in which the human subject cannot be thought of as exercising agency in relation to the verbal predicate. In §31, we addressed the general lack of agency of inanimate subjects. Even when the subject of a verb is human (or otherwise highly animate), an action may or may not be volitional. Compare, for example, the following two sentences in English: 'I slipped through security and went on deck' and 'I slipped on the wet surface and went overboard'. In the former, 'I' is the subject of 'slipped through' and 'went on deck', and also the thematic Agent. But in the latter, 'I' is the subject of two non-volitional actions and cannot be thought as deliberately bringing the actions about. The verb 'goes' can describe a purposeful or non-purposeful act in different circumstances. In *téid X d'éag* (1), X is certainly not an Agent. In (15), the subject pronoun *í* refers to the speaker's daughter, whom he has agreed to give to the poet, Trusc, in marriage.

'Ragaid duitsiu ***hí,' ar Mac Rethi***
'"She will go to you," said Mac Rethe'

In a society in which arranged marriage is practised, the bride-to-be – who is not named once in the story – is not conceived of as an Agent. She will go to

live with Trusc, but it was not her decision that she should go but her father's. She occupies the role of Theme (she undergoes the action). Dillon's translation of *ragaid duitsiu hí* as 'Thou shalt have her' has something to recommend it. Presumably the poet who composed the poem from which (31) is excerpted was thinking of St. Anne fulfilling a role rather like the unnamed daughter of Mac Rethe in (15): *gur fhaoi lé triar d'fhearaibh* ***í***, 'and [she] married three husbands'. St. Anne is the subject of this example, but the use of the B-form of the pronoun indicates that she was not imagined as the Agent of the act described by *faoïdh X le Y* 'X sleeps with, marries Y'. The poet is not necessarily suggesting that she was married off against her will, but she is not imagined as an active participant in the arrangement. To convey this into natural English, one might emend Bergin's translation above to a passive construction, 'she was married to three men' (cf. Mac Airt's translation of example 25). Contrast the following example of the same verb from the Book of Ballymote version of *Togail Troí* (cited in *eDIL* s.v. *foaid*):

(51) *ō ro grādaig Telamōn Esiōna d'aī* ***sī*** *leis*

'since Telamon loved Hesione, she took up with him'

In (15) and (31), the pronouns are marked morphologically as Not Agent. In (51), we have to do either with an independent pronoun (*sí*) or a suffix (*-si*) (*SnaG* III §10.19; cf. Roma 2000: 115). Either way, Hesione is imagined as an Agent who has made a conscious decision based on the knowledge that her husband-to-be loves her. If we were to read the B-form of the pronoun here the meaning would change significantly: **ó ro grádaig Telamón Eisióna d'fhaí leis í* might best be rendered into English as 'since Telamon loved Hesione, she was married off to him'; Hesione's active consent and the role her husband-to-be's love for her played in her decision-making have been deleted by substituting the B-form (thematically Not Agent) for the A-form, which alone is compatible with the semantic role Agent.

33 The substantive verb, when not used as part of a periphrastic progressive construction (*a-tú ag déanamh neith*), is normally stative not dynamic: it describes the subject's state; it does not generally describe a volitional action on the part of the subject. It appears in particular from (14), (26), (33) and (40) that our construction could be used with the substantive verb to underscore the fact that the state described was not the result of deliberate action by the subject. Taidell, a poet's daughter in a legal anecdote (14), has been kidnapped by the wizard Cotrebe: *go ruc in ingen leis aill ar áis aill ar égin*, '[he] carried off the girl partly by consent partly by force' (Dillon 1932: 47, 57). However much Taidell consented to her abduction or not, it was Cotrebe who was responsible for her being away from home for twelve days. Taidell is not an Agent bringing about this state of affairs, hence the use of form of the pronoun associated with the passive or direct object (*ro baí immuigh* ***hí***). Similarly, the Virgin Mary did not cause her own state of misery in (33), and the hypothetical patron-less poet of (40) would hardly have wished for or deliberately brought about his own degradation. The guests at the feast in (26), having been well plied and

supplied, experienced a more pleasant state of affairs, but it was nonetheless not of their own making. As mentioned above (§31), the cattle of (16) may not have been conceived of as having any agency in their own right.

34 The remaining examples which have not been discussed are verbs of motion, in particular *tic*/*tig* 'comes' (2, 3, 4, 17, 18, 34), *téid* 'goes' (39) and *rig* 'arrives' (42).[41] We have already seen instances where the subject of *téit*/*téid* is not the semantic Agent of the action it describes. *Tic*/*tig* can have senses which do not allow for a semantic Agent – 'comes about, takes place, happens', for instance (*eDIL* s.v. *do-icc* II (a)). In (6), one might indeed translate *arnách tíssad friss hé* as 'that he should not come against/oppose him', following McCone (see §30), but this rendering might imply Agency on the part of the subject, which would be inconsistent with the thematic function of the B-form of the pronoun in other examples (Not Agent). Instead, I would prefer a translation like 'that he would not come to oppose him', where 'come to' has the same sense as 'come to' in 'he will come to no good', or 'so that he would not end up opposing him'. In examples like (2), we should perhaps understand *mar thánuig go hEamhuin é* as meaning something like 'when he came to be in Eamhain'. With regard to (17) and (18), Prof. Lewis points out to me that the focus is on the actions to be taken by the *fine* 'kin-group' with regard to the *eissert* 'one who neglects his holding', and this may be a further motivation for the use of the 'accusative' pronominal form in reference to the *eisert*: his agency or non-agency is not the focus of attention in the passage.

35 While the use of the B-form of the pronoun in an intransitive construction like (2) indicates that the subject is **not** agentive, it does not follow that every instance of the corresponding A-form or, indeed, a synthetic construction without any independent pronoun is necessarily agentive. For example, though inanimates and abstracts cannot be thought of as true Agents, it does not follow that they cannot be referred to using the standard conjunctive subject pronouns even when the verb in question is intransitive. The pronoun *sé* in (52) refers to *ar ghabhabhair do ghné an chróigh* 'what you got of the colour of saffron'. This pronominal form is not confirmed by alliteration, but there seems no reason to doubt the reading.

(52) *Ar ghabhabhair do ghné an chróigh*
do-chóidh ***sé*** *ar alamhuin úaibh.* (*IGT* II 318)

'What you got of the colour of saffron, it faded away to alum on you.'

The subject of (52) has no more agency than the flame that spared Míliuc in (11). It has already been mentioned that *teagaimh* 'happens', *tarla* 'happened' are found with both A- and B-form subject pronouns and in the synthetic construction (§21): given the semantics of the verb, it seems unlikely that there is any great distinction in meaning between *tarla sé*, *tarla é* or synthetic *tarla*/*do-rala*. Returning to the idiom *téid X d'éag* (1), I have one fifteenth-century

[41]Note, however, that in this last instance, the poet had *ránaig sinn*, though *ránaig inn* is found in the manuscript.

example in Classical Modern Irish of the pronoun *sí* used in this phrase, and, while it is not confirmed by alliteration, the editor notes no variant readings in this regard.

(53) *Fan gcroich mar do chuaidh dá hiomchar*
an t-aodhaire ór theich an tréad
ní 'n-a beathaidh do bhí Muire
's ní dheachaidh ***sí*** *uile d'éag.*

'When the shepherd left by His flock, suffered the Cross, Mary was no longer in life, and yet died not.' (*PB* 9.33)

The phrase can also be used without an independent pronoun at all. Both (54) and (55) come from a late-sixteenth-/early-seventeenth-century poem (Breatnach 1999), but earlier examples of the same type are attested (*eDIL* s.v. *éc*). The plural subject of (54) is abstract.

(54) *Ceól agus imirt is ól,*
Mac Muiris do budh mór clú,
cosmhail ris an dán a gcor,
do chuadar *d'éag dá dhol súd.*

'Mac Muiris of high renown – owing to his death music and play and carousing too have departed; their plight is like that of poetry.' (quatrain 9)[42]

(55) *Dá mbeinnsi im chompánach chóir,*
an beangán glóir atá im chionn
do rachuinn *d'éag mar mo dhán,*
ga fearr damh cách dá chur riom.

'If I were a true companion I would die like my art. Of what avail to me is the modest glory attending me that is wished upon me by everyone?' (quatrain 12)

Similarly, the cattle of (16) are designated by a B-form pronoun in that example (*atáit ... íat*), but in similar sentences a little later in the same passage of commentary, the pronoun does not occur and the subject is expressed on the verb alone (*atáit*). To fully understand why a synthetic or analytic variant was chosen on a particular occasion, we would have to consider the discourse function of a pronoun as against a verbal ending + *nota augens* or a bare verbal ending. I attempt no such analysis on this occasion.[43] The point being made here is only that the B-form pronoun is not obligatory when the non-agentive subject is not expressed by a noun-phrase: A-form pronouns do occur in these

[42]More literally, 'Music, playing and drinking [...] their downfall is like that of poetry: they have died out owing to his death'.

[43]See the topic accessibility hierarchies set out in Roma (2000: 144) and the discussion there.

environments and non-agentive subjects can also be expressed synthetically. The only claim made in this paper is that the construction in (1) and the likes highlights the non-agentivity of the subject when that subject is expressed by a pronoun; it is not being suggested that the subject is a thematic Agent wherever this construction could have been used and was not.[44] The decision to avail of this construction or not may have been conditioned by semantic or pragmatic factors, issues of register and (in poetry) metrical requirements. Change over time may also play a role.

36 Our construction marks the non-agency of the subject of an intransitive verb by employing the same form of the pronoun as that which is used to designate the subject of the passive-impersonal verb and the direct object of a transitive verb. We have seen that this is semantically justified. Syntactically, an intransitive sentence with a B-form pronoun is more similar to a passive-impersonal sentence than a transitive one in that the passive-impersonal and the intransitive verb have only one obligatory argument. In addition, in both types of sentence the morphosyntactic marking of the thematic function Not Agent is normally possible only when the subject is pronominal. I have no examples of the nominal subject of an intransitive verb being marked accusative to make salient its lack of agency: to my knowledge, **ragaid in mnaí duitsiu* is not found despite the grammaticality of (15) *ragaid duitsiu hí*. The 'subject' of the passive-impersonal verb is sometimes marked as accusative in Middle and Early Modern Irish (*SnaG* III §5.2; Hoyne 2018: 396–7 and the works cited there),[45] but this is not the norm despite the use with the passive-impersonal of subject pronominal forms that are formally and thematically identical with pronominal direct objects.[46] McCone (1997: 177) is probably right therefore in seeing a direct link between the emergence of independent subject pronouns with the passive-impersonal and the 'quasi-passive intransitive' construction.

Typology

37 We have seen that the defining characteristics of our construction are that (a) the verb is normally intransitive, (b) the subject is a pronoun that is syntactically and morphologically identical with the passive-impersonal subject pronoun/direct object pronoun (but see example 24), and (c) the subject is not the semantic Agent of the verb. To my knowledge, it was Elisa Roma (2000: 127–8) who first suggested that use of the B-form pronouns in examples like those gathered above is related to the **unaccusativity** of the verbs involved. Verbs whose subjects are not semantic Agents can be classified as 'unaccusative', making use of a term first introduced into wider linguistic discourse

[44]As Prof. Lewis points out to me, we can compare English 'finds oneself' or 'happens to be', which are highly marked non-agentive constructions. The use of a less marked equivalent, however, does not necessarily imply agency.

[45]In addition to the examples cited in the publications referenced above, Damian McManus draws my attention to *ABM* 96.28d: *dream lé múchthar gach móirchiaigh* (: *ngliaidh*), 'a group [poets] by whom every great confusion [in learning] is cleared up', where *ciaigh* is acc. sg.

[46]Contrast also the accusative case-marking of a nominal subject after *-fil* (see fn. 32 above).

by Perlmutter (1978); those intransitive verbs whose subjects are volitional Agents are 'unergative'. The Irish language in the Middle and Early Modern period is in most respects a **nominative-accusative** language: broadly speaking, the nominal subjects of transitive and intransitive verbs are distinguished morphologically (by initial mutation and case-marking) and/or syntactically (by word-order) from the nominal direct objects of transitive verbs.[47] With respect to pronouns, however, the Irish language in this period shows some clear **ergative** features. In an ergative system, the subject of an intransitive verb and the direct object of a transitive verb will be marked in the same way; the subject of an intransitive verb behaves differently from the subject of a transitive verb. The morphosyntax of the pronominal subject in Irish can be described as a 'split' (or more accurately 'fluid') intransitive system.[48] This is certainly not without parallel in other languages. For example, Dakota Sioux is a split ergative language in which the same set of pronouns is regularly used to mark the subject of an unaccusative verb and the object of a transitive verb (Pinson 1990: 79–81; Riggs 1893: 13–14; cf. Perlmutter 1978: 165–6). *Wa-nowan* 'I was swimming' is an unergative verb, *m-iŝtima* 'I was sleeping' is an unaccusative verb; the subject pronoun in the former is *wa-*, while the subject pronoun in the latter is the same as the object pronoun *ma-* in *A-ma-ya-p^{h}a* 'you hit me'. Irish differs from a split ergative language like Dakota in that the ergative-type marking of the subject of particular intransitive verbs is not obligatory. A comparandum is provided by Middle Welsh. In marking the arguments of intransitive verbal nouns, Middle Welsh also shows a more fluid type of unaccusative/unergative split. The logical subject of an unaccusative verb is normally marked by a possessive pronoun or by a genitive construction (see *eu hanuot* lit. 'their originating' in the following example).

> *Ac wynteu a dywedassant **eu** hanuot o lys Arthur.*
>
> 'And they said that they were from Arthur's court.'

The logical subject of an unergative or transitive verb on the other hand is indicated by the preposition *o* (see *uarchogaeth* 'riding' + 3 sg. masc. *ohonaw* below).

> *Yr ymdidan yssyd yn dywedut uarchogaeth **ohonaw** ... yny doeth hyt y vanachlawc.*
>
> 'The story says that he rode ... until he came to a monastery.'

[47]The accusative case-marking of the direct object was on the wane in the Middle and Early Modern Irish period, of course.

[48]A 'split' ergative language is – crudely put – one in which some constructions can be analysed as nominative-accusative, others as ergative-absolutive. The label 'fluid' is preferable in a case like that discussed here in that the split is not clear-cut but subject to specific pragmatic and semantic conditions (see Manning 1995: 172).

At least with some verbs, it was apparently possible in Middle Welsh to select between an unaccusative or an unergative reading. Consider *mynet o'th tad* lit. 'going by your father' below.

> *... dan amot mynet **o**'th tad ... y wrha y'r amherawdyr Arthur ...*
>
> '... on condition that your father ... go to pay homage to Emperor Arthur ...'

In the example above, the logical subject could have been indicated perfectly grammatically by *mynet dy dad*. It has been argued that in instances where *o* is used with a verbal-noun argument which otherwise might be marked by a genitive phrase or a possessive pronoun 'the subject is conceived of as being agentive'. In the specific example just given, the preposition may be used 'to highlight the conscious and deliberate nature of going to pay homage', whereas 'zero-marking (*mynet dy dad ...*) would merely state the change of location' (Borsley, Tallerman and Willis 2007: 327–8; cf. Manning 1995: 189–91). If this interpretation is correct, it is the unergative reading of an optional unaccusative/unergative verb that is more marked in Middle Welsh verbal-noun clauses, while in Irish, the unaccusative construction *ragaid í* is more salient than the unmarked variant *ragaid sí*; further, Middle Welsh can distinguish between unaccusative and unergative readings of verbal nouns but not of finite verbs, whereas the Irish pronominal strategy discussed here is relevant only to finite sentences. Whatever about these differences between the Middle Welsh and Middle/Early Modern Irish systems, on the present occasion it is sufficient to note that the kind of fluid ergativity attested in the Irish pronominal system is not unparalleled.[49]

38 It may be no more than an accident of the evidence that so few examples of the Irish unaccusative construction examined in this paper contain a 1 or 2 person pronoun and that the 1 sg. is not found at all. Most of our texts are 3 person narratives, but, even if we had a broader range of texts, it may be that in ordinary discourse the 1 and 2 persons were not often employed in sentences that emphasised lack of agency as commonly as other persons. As we saw earlier, inanimate objects cannot be true Agents. Humans can occupy different thematic roles, but in normal discourse, humans are more likely to be Agents than, say, Patients, and the first and second person pronouns in particular are more likely to occupy the role of Agent than any other thematic function. This is captured by Silverstein's Animacy Hierarchy (1976), a version of which is given below (from Griffith 2008: 61–2).

1 pronoun > 2 pronoun > 3 pronoun > proper noun > human > animate > inanimate

[49]For unaccusativity in Early Irish syntax, specifically as it relates to verbal agreement with co-ordinate subjects, see Lash and Griffith (2018). For unaccusativity in Modern Irish syntax, see McCloskey (1996) and Doyle (2004).

We must also, of course, reckon with the difficulties of interpreting the data. If Middle Irish *ro-fitir mē* (*LL* 33503) 'I knew' were an example of our construction, for instance, it would be impossible to recognise it as such. The pronoun occurs immediately after the verb, but that does not mean it could not be disjunctive, as we saw earlier (§22). Furthermore, even if Middle Irish had a B-form of the 1 sg. pronoun (Classical Modern Irish *mhé*), contemporary Middle Irish orthography would not have distinguished between this and the A-form *mé*. In any event (3), (39)–(44) and (46) are sufficient proof that our construction was not confined to the 3 person alone. If we are prepared to accept that the B-type subject pronoun with an unaccusative verb had as its precursor an infixed pronoun, we may also have an additional 2 sg. example.

THE INFIXED SUBJECT PRONOUN

39 Given the similarity of our construction to the passive-impersonal (§36), it would be worth investigating whether examples are found in which the subject pronoun of an intransitive verb is marked as Not Agent by infixing it in the same manner as the subject of the passive verb (or, indeed, the direct object of an active transitive verb). In his edition of *Scéla Mucce Meic Da Thó*, Thurneysen (1935: 27) drew attention in the notes to the following sentence:

(56) ***Dot·luid*** *i mbernai armo chennsa*

He remarked: 'The impersonal construction *do-t·luid* for "thou camest" is uncommon but not without parallels'. He proceeded to connect this example with idioms of *téit* and *do-icc* combined with the preposition *do*, such as *tic dī co aos togai* 'she comes to the age of choice'. In a brief note in the second volume of this journal, M.A. O'Brien (1952–4: 216) gave further examples of the idiom *do-icc do X Y* in connection with *dot-luid* and sought to clarify its meaning:

> [...] Thurneysen equates the two constructions personal and impersonal and translated *dot·luid* 'you came'. But, as is clear from the two examples given by Thurneysen and the seven quoted above, there is the important distinction that the impersonal forms always imply lack of volition on the part of the logical subject. I suggest translating *dot·luid i mbernai ar mo cheannsa* 'it came to your turn to face me in the gap' more especially as this sentence is immediately preceded by *Tānacais-siu dano* 'you came'.

I broadly agree with O'Brien on the semantics of *dot-luid*, but I would suggest an alternative analysis of the infix. Both Thurneysen and O'Brien appear to assume that the infixed 2 sg. pronoun in *dot-luid* had dative force, that *dot-luid* was equivalent to *do-luid duit* (cf. *SnaG* III §10.3). While this interpretation is certainly possible, (56) could be analysed in the same way as the unaccusative construction with an independent pronoun that has been the focus of this

paper and translated ‘you came to be in the gap before me’. In other words, we could take *dot-luid* to be equivalent to *do-luid tú* with impersonal *do-luid* and 2 sg. infixed *-t* as a subject pronoun. The same analysis might hold for (57) also.

(57) *Mar at-chúala Eua in sain,*
reba adchosain Ādaim,
***dos-fuit** for lār, luid i ssás,*
is bec nā dechaid díanbās.

‘When Eve heard that, Adam’s outbursts of reproach, she fell to the ground, she was trapped, she nearly died speedily.’ (Greene and Kelly 1976: ll. 1717–20, *Saltair na Rann*)

It has been suggested that the infix of (57) *dos-fuit* is ‘without real meaning’ (McCone 1997: 175; cf. Strachan 1904: 170). Certainly, because the verb is intransitive, we cannot imagine an impersonal like *dom-chuirethar*. Strictly speaking, the infix is indeed unnecessary: one could read simply *do-fuit*. But like its later analogue with an independent B-type subject pronoun *do-fuit ... í*, the infixed subject pronoun of (57) lends the expression a slightly different shade of meaning: morphosyntactically viewed *do-fuit* is neutral as to whether the act described was volitional or not; *dos-fuit* and *do-fuit ... í* make explicit that the subject did not exercise agency in relation to the verbal predicate.

40 Three further examples of an apparently meaningless infix in contemporary Middle Irish manuscripts may be instances of our unaccusative construction with an infixed subject pronoun.

(58) ***Dosluī** Mac Cēcht īar sin hi Conachta co ndernad a leges i mMaig Bréngair.* (*LU* 7979–80, *Togail Bruidne Da Derga*)

‘Mac Cécht escaped after that into Connacht and he was given medical treatment in Mag Bréngair.’

(59) *Fer bethadh nó élūthach argni dina curadaib ra chathaig ic comét na cathrach **nīn érlá** acht atrullai di rennaib gaī ⁊ di ardéssaib claideb* (*LL* 31378–80, *Togail Troí*)

‘Any man left standing or survivor of the warriors who fought protecting the city, he did not make it out alive unless he escaped from the points of spears and the very tips (?) of swords.’

(60) ***Dosluíset** Ulaid assede co hInis Ulad* (*LL* 38580, *Bórama*)

‘The Ulaid escaped from there to Inis Ulad.’

We have seen that a verb of motion like *do-tét* (56) or *do-fuit* (57) may be unaccusative or not and that the subject pronoun may be infixed if the former meaning obtains. If (58) and (60) are examples of this construction, the subject is marked twice – by a masc. sg. infix (*-s*) and the proper name *Mac Cécht* in

(58) and by a 3 pl. infix (*-s*) and the proper noun *Ulaid* in (60).[50] Given that the subject infix of intransitive *as-luí* 'escapes, makes it out alive' is morphologically and syntactically equivalent to the subject infix of a passive-impersonal verb or the direct object infix of a transitive verb, this double-marking is not necessarily problematic. Cf. the likes of *rod bí int aingel ... Iäcób* 'the angel struck Jacob' (*Saltair na Rann* 3049 , cited in *SnaG* III §10.1), where *-d* is an infixed direct object co-referential with *Iäcób.*[51] I have no examples to hand with the passive-impersonal verb, however.[52]

41 It is generally accepted that *Scéla Mucce Meic Da Thó* is fundamentally Old Irish in date, but it survives only in later copies and has undergone a certain amount of linguistic modernisation. (57) might indicate that the unaccusative construction seen in these examples was in existence by *c*. 988, though the manuscript itself, Rawlinson B 502, is later in date (late eleventh/early twelfth century) and the infix is not metrically confirmed. It seems likely that the infixed subject pronoun of the passive-impersonal provided the main model for this construction as it did for the later independent pronominal construction that probably emerged (in the literary language at least) after the eleventh century when the independent subject pronoun is first seen in use after the passive (*SnaG* III §10.15). For the history of the analytic construction in general, it is significant that (56) is an example of the 3 sg. used as an impersonal with the pronoun of another person.[53]

42 In his compelling account of the origin of the analytic construction, Greene (1958) pointed out that the copula *is* functions less like a true verb in Old Irish than a demonstrative particle. Its de-personalisation is reflected in the fact that *am fer* is possible in Old Irish ('I am a man') but not **am in rí*

[50]For the 3 sg. masc. infixes *-n* and *-s* in Middle Irish, see *SnaG* III §10.6.

[51]Some examples are ambiguous as to whether the infix is genuinely proleptic (*SnaG* III §10.1) or a mere relative marker (*SnaG* III §11.36), as Prof. Ruairí Ó hUiginn reminds me. The infixed *-d* of *cip hé nod marba ... Cäin* 'whoever kills Cain' (*Saltair na Rann* 1993, cited in *SnaG* III §10.1) is a case in point.

[52]Though the case distinction is not marked, I assume that *Mac Cécht* is nominative in (58) like *Ulaid* in (60), while *Iäcób* should be acc. in *rod bí int aingel ... Iäcób.* Cf. *ragaid ... í* but not **ragaid in mnaí* (§36 above). Our construction is distinct in this respect from the double-marking of the accusative in a sentence like *nís toirche in muicc* (acc.) *fon indas-sin* 'you will not get the pig in that way' discussed by Lucht (1994). If a passive-impersonal sentence with explicit nominal subject and co-referential infix were extant, it would provide a better parallel in this respect for (58). The use of 3 person infixed pronouns for the subject of the passive-impersonal is already attested in *LU* (McCone 1997: 175; *SnaG* III §11.40).

[53]Given the diachronic argument made here, I have confined myself on this occasion to a discussion of Middle Irish examples of the unaccusative construction with infixed (proleptic) subject pronoun found in contemporary manuscripts. Some of the examples registered by Strachan (1904: 170) of infixed *-s* with 'no apparent force' from manuscripts later than the twelfth century can certainly be analysed as instances of this construction. I would also note that, just as the infixed subject pronoun of the passive-autonomous and the infixed object pronoun remained part of the scholar's literary register along with their independent counterparts down to the collapse of the bardic order in the seventeenth century and long after they had vanished from ordinary speech, we do not need to assume a definite watershed in the case of our unaccusative construction with all examples with an infixed subject pronoun belonging to an earlier period than those with an independent pronoun.

'I am the king', in place of which a reprise construction is necessary (*is messe in rí*, etymologically 'the king, it is me'). In Middle Irish, the personal forms of the copula (*am*, *at*) began to give way to what is in effect the combination impersonal *is* + infixed subject pronoun + predicate: *isam fer* 'I am a man'. The infixed subject pronoun of the copular phrase functions like the infixed subject pronoun of the passive-impersonal. The 3 sg. pronominal subject of the copula and the passive-impersonal was not normally expressed except by the relevant *notae augentes* (*is fer-som* 'he is a man'). From the beginning of the eleventh century, the individual 3 sg. independent pronouns began to take the place of their respective *notae augentes*, so that *is fer-som* was replaced by *is fer é* – a process that probably began with the 3 sg. fem., where there was a minimal distinction between the suffix *-si* and the independent pronoun *sí* (*is ben-si* > **is ben sí*), though this use of *sí* (as opposed to the later *í*) is not actually attested in Middle Irish manuscripts (*SnaG* III §10.14). *Isam fer* became *is fer mé* by analogy with *is fer é*. Part of the spread of the independent pronoun then was the extraction of infixed pronouns from within the copular verbal complex (see McCone 1997: 18–19) and their translation to post-verbal position. Now that the infixed *-am* of *isam fer* had become the independent and disjunctive *mé* of *is fer mé*, the way was free for the subject infixes of the passive-impersonal to make the same transition. It is at this point that we also find our unaccusative construction with an independent pronoun, and, as suggested above, the independent pronoun there may have developed out of the infix in *dot-luid* and similar sentences. The direct object infix of the active transitive verb then underwent the same change.[54] Finally, the transformation of the 3 sg. suffix into an independent subject pronoun affected active verbs. As has been pointed out by Liam Breatnach (*SnaG* III §10.19), the most likely starting point was again the 3 sg. fem.: it was a short journey from *a-tá-si* to *a-tá sí*. The slot occupied by *sí* could then be filled with any other pronoun, except in the 3 pl. which could only combine with an impersonal verb inflected like a synthetic 3 pl. verb (*ní biat síat*).[55] The fact that the passive-autonomous and unaccusative verbs were found with independent subject pronouns may have contributed to the pressure for active verbs to adapt to the analytic construction also. As we saw (§§24–9), the language eventually furnished itself with two sets of independent pronouns – one for the subjects of passive-autonomous and unaccusative verbs and the direct object of active transitive verbs, and another for the subjects of active verbs more generally.

[54]Of course, just as synthetic and analytic verbal forms both found a place in the literary register, whatever the precise distribution may have been in the spoken language of the time, we find both infixed and independent pronouns in these environments in our sources down to the end of the Early Modern Irish period.

[55]In a thought-provoking paper on the spread of the analytic construction, Roma (2000: 118–19, 140–2) proposes a different but to my mind less convincing account of the spread of the independent subject pronoun. Roma's starting point is a sentence like *tusa ruccad* 'it is you who was born', where *tusa* is a cleft with a deleted copula (i.e. it is equivalent to *is tusa* ...). *Pace* Roma (2000: 118–19), it does not seem to me that 'it was but a small step from *tusa ruccad* to *ruccad tusa*'. On the other hand, Roma's lucid account of the pragmatic factors which might have encouraged the spread of the 3 sg. pronouns in particular is more convincing (ibid: 142–7).

43 If the analysis of (56)–(60) above is accepted, a small part of the rise of the independent subject pronoun and the analytic construction has been overlooked. The earliest independent subject pronouns with active verbs, as we have seen, are the 'quasi-passive' or unaccusative type. Semantically, these partially overlap with the passive-impersonal; structurally, they are identical with it. Take *not-sōerfaider* 'you will be saved' (*Saltair na Rann* 3806), for instance. *Sóerfaidir* without an infix is a 3 sg. form ('he/she/it will be saved'), but outside of the 3 sg. it functions as an impersonal. It is only the addition of an infixed subject pronoun that lends the construction person here: *-sōerfaider* has voice and tense but no person. *Dos-fuit* 'she falls' (57) or *dot-luid* in (56) have the same structure: in both, we have an impersonal 3 sg. verbal form (active not passive in morphology, quasi-passive in meaning) which acquires personal reference by means of an infix. In other words, the use of the 3 sg. form of an active verb as an impersonal or zero-form with a subject pronoun that marks person and number may not be an innovation of the analytic construction with an independent pronoun in the eleventh century. It has been argued that it was probably found already with unaccusative verbs prior to the emergence of 'the quasi-passive' type *da-fuit ... hé*; the subject pronoun was simply infixed as with a passive-impersonal verb (*dot-luid*).[56]

44 The independent subject pronoun spread first to environments where we later regularly find only the B-forms; the pronoun is the result of the transformation of pronominal suffixes (*is fer-som* > *is fer é*) and the extraction of infixed pronouns from their verbal complexes (copula *isam fer* > *is fer mé*; passive-impersonal *not-sóerfaider* > *sóerfaidir thú*; unaccusative *dos-fuit* > *do-fuit í*). The spread of the independent subject pronoun to the environments where we eventually find only the A-forms is later and involves only the transformation of 3 sg. pronominal suffixes (*a-tá-si* > *a-tá sí*) and the analogical spread of the new independent pronouns to other persons. Be that as it may, the crucial role of the passive-impersonal (and also the copula) in the formation of the analytic construction is still reflected in the concord-rules of both the A- and B-forms. In early Middle Irish, when the analytic construction was taking root, one still finds the copula inflecting for number before a 3 pl. pronoun (*it é*) (*SnaG* III §10.13) and the passive-impersonal was regularly inflected for number in the 3 pl. (*SnaG* III §11.40). This lies behind the obligatory agreement-rule whereby a 3 pl. subject pronoun took a 3 pl. impersonal verb in Middle Irish (McCone 1997: 177). As we saw, this concord-rule lingered on into the Early Modern Irish period in the unaccusative

[56]I have no examples to hand but one would expect that the impersonal verb in this construction would be inflected 3 pl. with a 3 pl. infixed subject pronoun. In this it would contrast with the likes of impersonal *dom-chuirethar* and *atom-chomnaic*, and also impersonal *-fil*, which should remain 3 sg. regardless of the number of the infixed subject/object. Note also here constructions with a 3 sg. verb and a logical subject indicated by a prepositional phrase like *madmaid ar X* 'X is routed, put to flight' (Lash and Griffith 2018: 135–8); the construction *a-tá de X* 'there are X' (ibid.: 98–9); and the reflexive construction with *imma-* + 3 sg. verb, in which the logical subject of the action can be expressed by a prepositional phrase (e.g. *co 'mma-muirfe doib* 'so that they will kill one another') (O'Brien 1938: 234–4).

construction, so that we find the likes of *do-chádar ... iad*, with which we began this investigation.

Abbreviations

AC	A. Martin Freeman (ed.), *Annála Connacht: the Annals of Connacht (A.D. 1224 –1544)* (Dublin, 1944).
AiD	L. McKenna (ed.), *Aithdioghluim Dána*, ITS 37/40 (London, 1939/40).
ALC	W. M. Hennessey (ed.), *The Annals of Loch Cé*, 2 vols (London, 1871).
ALI	W. N. Hancock et al. (eds), *Ancient Laws of Ireland*, 6 vols (1865–1901).
Dán Dé	L. McKenna (ed.), *Dán Dé: The Poems of Donnchadh Mór Ó Dálaigh, and the Religious Poems in the* Duanaire *of the Yellow Book of Lecan* (Dublin, [1922]).
DiD	L. Mac Cionnaith (ed.), *Dioghluim Dána* (Dublin, 1938).
IBP	O. Bergin (ed.), *Irish Bardic Poetry* (Dublin, 1970).
LCAB	T. Ó Donnchadha (ed.), *Leabhar Cloinne Aodha Buidhe* (Dublin, 1931).
Magauran	L. McKenna (ed.), *The Book of Magauran/Leabhar Méig Shamhradháin* (Dublin, 1947).
PB	L. McKenna (ed.), *Philip Bocht Ó hUiginn* (Dublin, 1931).
TD	E. Knott (ed.), *The Bardic Poems of Tadhg Dall Ó hUiginn*, ITS 22/23 (London, 1922/6).

References

Ahlqvist, A. 1976: ‘On the position of pronouns in Irish’, *Éigse* 16, 171–6.

Bennett, R., Elfner, E. and McCloskey, J. 2015: ‘Pronouns and prosody in Irish’, in L. Breatnach, R. Ó hUiginn, D. McManus and K. Simms (eds), *An XIV Comhdháil Idirnáisiúnta sa Léann Ceilteach, Maigh Nuad 2011: Imeachtaí / Proceedings: XIV International Congress of Celtic Studies, Maynooth 2011* (Dublin), 19–74.

Borsley, R. D., Tallerman, M. and Willis, D. 2007: *The Syntax of Welsh* (Cambridge).

Breatnach, L. 2003: ‘On words ending in a stressed vowel in Early Irish’, *Ériu* 53, 133–42.

Breatnach, P. B. 1999: ‘A poem on the end of patronage’, *Éigse* 31, 79–88.

Carney, J. 1941–3: Review of M. Joynt (ed.), *Contributions to a Dictionary of the Irish Language. N-O-P fasciculus*, *Éigse* 3, 223–6.

Dillon, M. 1932: ‘Stories from the Law-Tracts’, *Ériu* 11, 42–65.

Dixon, R. M. W. 1996: *Ergativity* (Cambridge).

Doyle, A. 2004: ‘“The king is dead”: unaccusative verbs in Irish’, in J. Carey, M. Herbert and K. Murray (eds), *Cín Chille Cúile: Texts, Saints and Places. Essays in Honour of Pádraig Ó Riain* (Aberystwyth), 105–15.

GRAY, E.A. 1982: *Cath Maige Tuired*, ITS 52 (London).
GREENE, D. 1955: '*Un joc grossier* in Irish and Provençal', *Ériu* 17, 7–15.
——, 1958: 'The analytic forms of the verb in Irish', *Ériu* 18, 108–12.
——, 1972: Review of Jackson 1972, *Studia Hibernica* 12, 167–70.
——, 1973: 'Synthetic and analytic: a reconsideration', *Ériu* 24, 121–33.
GREENE, D. and KELLY, F. 1976: *The Irish Adam and Eve Story from* Saltair na Rann. *Volume I: Text and Translation* (Dublin).
GRIFFITH, A. 2008: 'The animacy hierarchy and the distribution of the *notae augentes* in Old Irish', *Ériu* 58, 55–75.
GWYNN, L. 1911: 'The Life of St. Lasair', *Ériu* 5, 73–109.
HOYNE, M. 2016: 'On stressed monosyllables ending in a short vowel in Classical Modern Irish', *Celtica* 28, 186–200.
——, 2017: 'Early Modern Irish miscellanea', *Ériu* 67, 169–86.
——, 2018: *Fuidheall Áir: Bardic Poems on the Meic Dhiarmada of Magh Luirg c. 1377 – c. 1637* EMITS 1 (Dublin).
——, 2018a: '*Seacht bpearsain fhichead uair mé*: a poem on the optative subjunctive in a copy of *Irish Grammatical Tracts* III–IV', *Ériu* 68, 99–127.
——, 2019: '*IGT*/*BST* citations and duplicate entries: the ascriptions in the H 2.17 copy of *IGT* III–IV', *Ériu* 69, 41–53.
——, 2019a: 'Transmission, metre and language: some observations on the poetry of Giolla Brighde Mac Con Midhe', in P. Riggs (ed.), *Giolla Brighde Mac Con Midhe: The Poet and His Craft*, ITS Subsidiary Series 31 (Cork), 24–71.
JACKSON, K. 1972: *The Gaelic Notes in the Book of Deer* (Cambridge).
KELLY, F. 2014: *Marriage Disputes: A Fragmentary Old Irish Law-Text,* Early Irish Law Series 6 (Dublin).
LASH, E. and GRIFFITH, A. 2018: 'Coordinate subjects, expletives and the EPP in Early Irish', *Journal of Celtic Linguistics* 19, 87–156.
LUCHT, I. 1994: 'Doppelte Markierung des Akkusativs beim Transitivum im Altirischen', *ZCP* 46, 80–118.
MAC AOGÁIN, P. 1968: *Graiméir Ghaeilge na mBráthar Mionúr,* Scríbhinní Gaeilge na mBráthar Mionúr 7 (Dublin).
MAC CANA, P. 1990: 'On the accusative of destination', *Ériu* 41, 27–36.
MAC GIOLLA LÉITH, C. 1993: *Oidheadh Chloinne hUisneach*, ITS 56 (London).
MANNING, H. P. 1995: 'Fluid intransitivity in Middle Welsh: gradience, typology and "unaccusativity"', *Lingua* 97, 171–94.
MEYER, K. 1907: 'Neue Mitteilungen aus irischen Handschriften', *Archiv für celtische Lexicographie* 3, 215–47.
MCCLOSKEY, J. 1996: 'Subjects and subject positions in Irish', in R. D. Borsley and I. Roberts (eds), *Syntax of the Celtic Languages* (Cambridge), 241–83.
MCCONE, C. 1997: *The Early Irish Verb*, second edition, Maynooth Monographs 1 (Maynooth).
MCGREGOR, W. B. 2010: 'Optional ergative case marking in a typological semiotic perspective', *Lingua* 120, 1610–36.
MCMANUS, D. 1992: 'The preterite passive plural in *BST*', *Éigse* 26, 13–19.

——, 2009: ‘Good-looking and irresistible: the hero from Early Irish saga to Classical poetry’, *Ériu* 59, 57–109.
——, 2017: ‘Fault-finding in the Grammatical Tracts’, in G. Ó Riain (ed.) *Dá dTrian Feasa Fiafraighidh: Essays on the Irish Grammatical and Metrical Tradition* (Dublin), 199–231.
O’Brien, M. A. 1938: ‘Varia II’, *Ériu* 12, 236–44.
——, 1952– 4: ‘An impersonal construction in Old Irish’, *Celtica* 2, 216.
Ó Cuív, B. 1999: ‘Elegy on Féilim mac Maghnusa Méig Uidhir ob. 1487’, *Celtica* 23, 261–8.
Ó Macháin, P. 1998: *Téacs agus Údar i bhFilíocht na Scol* (Dublin).
O’Rahilly, C. 1962: *Cath Finntrágha*, MMIS 20 (Dublin).
O’Rahilly, T. F. 1941: *Desiderius*, reprinted 1955 and 1975, Medieval and Modern Irish Series 12 (Dublin).
Ó Riain, G. 2016: ‘*Táinig an tráth nóna*: old age in Classical Irish religious verse’, in C. Breatnach and M. Ní Úrdail (eds), *Aon don Éigse: Essays Marking Osborn Bergin’s Centenary Lecture on Bardic Poetry (1912)* (Dublin), 155–92.
Ó Sé, D. 1996: ‘The forms of the personal pronouns in Gaelic dialects’, *Éigse* 29, 19–50.
Perlmutter, D. M. 1978: ‘Impersonal passives and the unaccusative hypothesis’, *Proceedings of the Fourth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society* 38, 157–89.
Pinson, T. M. 1990: ‘Possessor ascension in Dakota Sioux’, *Work Papers of the Summer Institute of Linguistics* 34, 75–96.
Póirtéir, C. 1996: *Glórtha ón Ghorta* (Dublin).
Quin, G. 1960: ‘Old-Irish *ol* “inquit” ’, *Celtica* 5, 95–102.
——, 1974: ‘The Irish modal preterite’, *Hermathena* 117, 43–62.
Riggs, S. R. 1893: *Dakota Grammar, Texts and Ethnography* (Washington).
Roma, E. 2000: ‘How subject pronouns spread in Irish: a diachronic study and synchronic account of the third person + pronoun pattern’, *Ériu* 51, 107–57.
Silverstein, M. 1976: ‘Hierarchy of features and ergativity’, in R. M. W. Dixon (ed.), *Grammatical Categories in Australian Languages*, 112–71 (Canberra).
Sims-Williams, P. 2019: ‘The quotatives Old Irish *ol*/*olsé* and Middle Welsh *heb*/*hebyr*’, *Celtica* 31, 90–123.
Strachan, J. 1904: ‘The infixed pronoun in Middle Irish’, *Ériu* 1, 153–79.
Stokes, W. 1887: *The Tripartite Life of Patrick* [...], 2 vols (London).
——, 1891: ‘Life of S. Féchín [*sic*] of Fore’, *RC* 12, 318–53.
——, 1900: ‘Acallam na Senórach’, *Irische Texte* 4, 1–438.

Mícheál Hoyne

Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies

ADDENDA AND CORRIGENDA

Ad *Celtica* XXVII (2016), 191

In my discussion of *té*/*te* 'hot' in Classical Modern Irish, I cited the following example of uncompounded *te*:

> Moille mé ná crann re sruth;
> atá mo ghuth ar mo bhreith;
> dá mbeidís bruit Leithe Cuinn
> fá mo dhruim, do bheith sé te.

The loose rhyme *bhreith* : *te* confirms the short vowel of the latter.[1] These four lines occur in Cú Chonnacht Ó Cléirigh's poem *Neimhthinn an galar é an grádh* (Ó Rathile 1926: poem 8, ll. 13–16), a satire of the conventions of courtly love poetry. My translation (Hoyne 2016: 191) missed the point entirely. I would now translate as follows:

> 'I am [in fact] slower than a tree being carried away by the stream; I have not lost my voice; if all the cloaks of Leath Cuinn were around me, I would [indeed] feel warm.'

Ad *Celtica* XXXI (2019), 213–98

The term *liter shelbhuighthe* 'radical letter' occurs in Godfrey Daniel's 'Brief and plain rules for the reading of the Irish tongue' (1652) (Cló 35) (p. **231**).[2] I should have made reference to the discussion of *sealbh*(*ugh*)*adh* in Ó Riain (2017: 147–9), which I had overlooked in preparing Hoyne (2019).

I also overlooked two examples in *IGT* I of technical terms which occur in Dowley's 1663 *Mionghraimer* (Cló 42). For the idiom, *gabhaidh .h. greim* (p. **236**), see also *IGT* I §2 (Mac Cárthaigh 2014: ll. 171–2). I was probably wrong to suggest that Dowley's *cumhachta .h.* is a translation from Latin. Cf. the likes of *cumhachta soil* in *IGT* I §30 (Mac Cárthaigh 2014: ll. l. 388). Dowley's reference to *gramadach Gaoidhilge* ('grammar of Irish' or perhaps more likely 'Irish-language grammar') could be taken to refer to *IGT* I rather than *Rudimenta Grammaticae Hibernicae* (p. **240**). His debt to a more Latinate grammar at other points is not in doubt, however.

Since the appearance of Hoyne (2019), I have noticed some additional examples of brief rules in printed books. Denn's notes on 'mortified letters' in *The Catholic Children's Religious Primer* (1825) (Cló 388) (p. **274**) had

[1]For a hypersyllabic alternative version of line *b* above with the rhyme now *féin* : *té*, see Ó Riain (2018: 58 n. 13).

[2]Page references below are to Hoyne (2019) unless otherwise stated. For details of the primary sources, see R. Sharpe and M. Hoyne (forthcoming). The 'Cló' numbers refer to entries in that publication.

 ©Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies

probably already appeared the previous year in his *Stuiratheoir an Pheacuig* (Cló 375), but no copy of this printing is now known to survive. They are found in the 1834 reprint of *Stuiratheoir an Pheacuig* (Cló 506). The heading of the 1834 'mortified letters' is briefer than in the *Religious Primer*. Importantly, the wording in 1825 is exactly the same as the preamble to the rules in *The Spiritual Rose* (first published 1820) (Cló 331), confirming that Denn copied them from that source.

Townley's brief rules of 1836 (Cló 543) (p. **278**) appear in at least one other publication of his: *The Irishman's Friend, a three-version testament, with anecdotes*, an undated Munster Irish translation of the Gospels, entered in Sharpe and Hoyne (forthcoming) s.a. 1836.

Two sets of brief rules by John O'Daly (alias Seán Ó Dálaigh) published in 1844 (Cló 691) and 1858 (Cló 868) respectively are discussed at pp. **286–8**. The latter accompanied an edition of the *Pious Miscellany*. O'Daly produced a third effort headed 'Short rules for reading Irish' for his 1868 edition of the *Miscellany*, pp. [x]–xi (Cló 976). Judging by a remark on p. ix of his preface, O'Daly believed the book would be read by those learning Irish, as he makes reference to the needs of 'a beginner who did not speak the language from his infancy'. First the eighteen letters of the Irish alphabet are given. The vowel-graphs are then listed as are the 'diphthongs' and 'triphthongs'. O'Daly subsequently devotes a sentence or two to each of the vocalic digraphs, focusing primarily on whether or not they are long and the correct use of the length-mark. The treatment is patchy and rather vague. <ao> is 'like *ay*, in the word mayor, but a little heavier'. <ae> is said to be used only rarely; we are not told how it is realised. No pronunciation is given for short <ai> as it 'has no equivalent in English'. Though O'Daly implicitly recognises short <eo>, he gives no advice on how to pronounce it. Surprisingly, he gives the pronunciation of <ia> as '*ee* in the word cheer', as if it were not a true diphthong. <u> is the only single vocalic graph to get an entry. On the authority of John O'Donovan (see pp. 26–7 of O'Donovan's *Grammar*, published in 1845) all 'triphthongs' are said to be long, but no information is given on how to pronounce them. O'Daly remarks that in the 'terminations' <aidhe>, <aighe>, <aighim>, <uidhe> and <uighim> the 'accent should be placed on the *i*' (in the case of <aighim> and <uighim>, he means the first <i>). His concern with these endings and their placement in this guide recall the comments made by his peer M'Sweeny in 1843 (Hoyne 2019: 283). The consonants (including <h>) are listed. The following observations are noteworthy. We are told that the consonants 'never change their natural sound except when aspirated'. There is no mention of eclipsis or *t*-prothesis, though the orthography of both of his editions of the *Pious Miscellany* contains spellings like *a m-bídheach* and *san t-sliabh* (these are not mentioned in the 1858 guide either). Aspirated <b> 'sounds like an English *v*'. No distinction is made between palatalised and non-palatalised <ch>. Aspirated <d> and <g> sound 'like *y* in English'. '*l*, sounds like ll, thick before the broad vowels *a*, *o*, *u*; slender after the small vowels *e* and *i*.' Aspirated <m> 'sounds like an English *w* before the vowels *a*, *o*, *u*, in the beginning of words [...]. But in the termination of words, after

the small vowel *i*, it sounds like an English *v* [...].' <nn> 'produces a thick nasal sound'. <rr> 'sounds rather full'. Having discussed the pronunciation of <sh> and <th>, O'Daly writes, 'The change caused by the aspirate on these two consonants [i.e. *t* and *s*?] removes the necessity of using the letter *h* in many cases; but when consonants are left unaspirated, it must be used to show the aspirate.' I do not understand this sentence. O'Daly concludes, 'A little practice at the foregoing brief rules will enable the reader to read the following poems with elegance and ease.'

Finally, it should be noted that though the title-page of *The Introduction to an Universal Irish Grammar* [...] (?1825) (Cló 385) advertises accompanying 'instructions for reading the Irish [...] containing comprehensive rules, which, with a little application, will enable an Irishman to read his native language with great facility, even without the assistance of a teacher', these never appeared. The book is in fact no more than a reprint of *Blaithfleasg na Milsean* [...] *le Uilliam O Meachair* (1816).

References

Hoyne, M. 2016: 'On stressed monosyllables ending in a short vowel in Classical Modern Irish', *Celtica* 28, 186–200.

——, 2019: 'Brief rules for reading Irish found in printed books, 1571–1863', *Celtica* 31, 213–97.

Mac Cárthaigh, E. 2014: *The Art of Bardic Poetry: A New Edition of Irish Grammatical Tracts I* (Dublin).

Ó Rathile, T. F. 1926: *Dánta Grádha*, second ed. (Cork).

Ó Riain, G. 2017: 'A fragment of an early modern tract on grammar and metrics', in G. Ó Riain (ed.), *Dá dTrian Feasa Fiafraighidh: Essays on the Irish Grammatical and Metrical Tradition* (Dublin), 131–86.

——, 2018: 'Terminology in the Grammatical Tracts: *ciall teasaidheachta*', *Ériu* 68, 55–64.

Sharpe, R. and Hoyne, M. forthcoming: *Clóliosta: Printing in the Irish Language, 1571–1871 – An Attempt at Narrative Bibliography.*

Mícheál Hoyne

Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies

A DESCRIPTIVE CATALOGUE OF TCD MS H 3. 18 (1337), VOLS 2–4, PP. 1–87: 'MÁEL ÍOSA'S BOOK'

Abstract

'Máel Íosa's book' consists of some eighty-seven pages bound into the composite volume TCD MS H 3. 18 (1337). It was compiled by Máel Íosa, who was assisted by several other scribes, at various locations, in the early 1500s. It is an invaluable medieval miscellany that contains numerous legal texts and glossaries, as well as texts of poetic, pseudo-historical, religious, or medical subject matter, among others, and many marginalia. 'Máel Íosa's book' was inadequately described in the *Catalogue of the Irish Manuscripts in the Library of Trinity College, Dublin* (1921). This article presents a detailed descriptive catalogue of the codicological aspects and textual contents of this book.

Part 1. Description of Manuscript[1]

16th century. Vellum and paper.

Pp. 87, paginated by Edward Lhuyd in light ink. From 50–53, however, the sequence is: p. 50(a), col. 51, col. 52, p. 53; on the unusual construction of this section, see further below. There is an unnumbered blank page between pp. 75 and 76. Inserted vellum tabs are foliated.

30cm x 20cm (pp. 1–87); 2.2cm x 2.2cm (fol. v); 4.2cm x 4cm (fol. vi); two vellum pieces 12.5cm x 8.5cm each (p. 49); two vellum pieces 23cm x 8.5cm, 12.5cm x 32cm (p. 50(a)).[2]

[1]I am grateful to this journal's reader whose many suggestions helped improve this manuscript study. I am indebted to Professor Liam Breatnach for taking the time to carefully read through drafts of this article and providing me with suggestions and corrections. My thanks also go to Dr Pádraic Moran who kindly discussed aspects of the codicology and contents of the manuscript with me during the earlier stages of this article. Any outstanding errors are solely my responsibility. I would like to thank Caoimhe Ní Ghormáin, assistant librarian, and her colleagues at the Manuscripts and Archives Research Library in Trinity College Dublin Library for their kind assistance and patience.

TCD MS H 3.18 (1337) was previously catalogued in *TCD Cat*. 140–58; 358–63. On the provenance of 'Máel Íosa's book', and other volumes in H 3.18, see O'Sullivan and O'Sullivan (1962: 61–3); O'Sullivan (2000: 440–3). The original manuscript was consulted as well as the digital images available on Irish Script On Screen (https://www.isos.dias.ie; accessed on 27 April 2020). In referring to the manuscripts in Trinity College Dublin Library, I follow the style of *CIH* and *CompCIH* in using the more distinctive shelf numbers from 'case H', rather than the current catalogue numbers (as in O'Sullivan 1976). I do so to aid the reader when seeking to cross-reference material in *CIH* and *CompCIH*. However, the reader is advised that the current catalogue reference numbers (e.g. 1337, etc.) are required when consulting these manuscripts in the library.

[2]These vellum pieces are discussed in more detail on p. 188.

©Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies

Scribes

(1) main scribe *Máel Íosa* (p. 14b29); (2) *Cairbre Ua Maoil Chonaire*, at Moycullen, Co. Galway in '1511' (p. 25a11); (3) *Gilla na Náem* (p. 25b35); (4) *Aireachdach* (p. 60b44); (5) pp. 76–83, no scribal signature;[3] (6) *Páidín Óg Ó Maoil Chonaire*,[4] writing for one Anlúan, perhaps a Mac Aodhagáin (p. 83 *i*). The following places and dates of writing are also noted: 'Druim Goll' in '15<.>9' (p. 58b15);[5] '152<0>' (p. 85b44); 'Gort na Croise', Co. Galway (p. 87b28).

Binding and repairs

The composite manuscript TCD MS H 3. 18 (1337) was previously bound in two volumes, in sheepskin leather over strawboards, bearing the gold letters 'Miscellanea Hibernica H 3.18'. More recently, the two volumes were separated and rebound into twenty-five volumes by the conservator Matthew Hatton of Trinity College Library, a task which he completed in May 1987.[6] Three of these twenty-five volumes represent 'Máel Íosa's book', namely, vol. 2 (pp. 1–14), vol. 3 (pp. 15–59), vol. 4 (pp. 60–87). Each rebound volume is sewn into a limp Italian goatskin binding (with sewing terminals corresponding to existing sewing stations) and placed within a three-wrap folder.

Pp. 55 and 56 consist of two segments of vellum stitched together with original green silk thread. Pp. 49–52 consist of two vellum off-cuts placed side by side that were originally bound together with twisted thongs that remain intact. The upper half of p. 50(a) extends outwards and is folded inwards to fit the dimension of the book.[7] The lower half of p. 50(a) is L-shaped, with a long section which is folded upwards in three to fit the dimension of the book. Original vellum 'flag' tackets are still visible between pp. 44 and 45 and pp. 50 and 50(a).[8] Fol. v is a small vellum tab that is inserted between p. 6 and p. 7; similarly, fol. vi is a small vellum tab inserted between pp. 70 and 71. Both of these tabs have original tiny sewing stations in the top right corners.

The manuscript has original defects such as slight holes on pp. 3 left marg., 7 marg. sup., 55 left marg. The vellum is thin on occasion resulting in ink bleeding through, e.g. p. 39. There is evidence of vellum scraping on pp. 27, 33, 36, 38, 39. The ink is stained on pp. 11, 12, 13, 14, 36, 37, 50, 57, 58 and 87. It is faded on pp. 14 and 87, and rubbed and worn on the lower right hand corner of p. 59.

Original repairs include the stitching of a tear with black animal-hair (perhaps horse-tail or whisker) on p. 39 and sewing holes visible for mending a tear on p. 42 marg. inf. On p. 53, the defective lower edge was carefully

[3]The two paper bifolia, possibly a later insertion, contain the writing of three hands that are different from those found in the vellum sections, as observed by Moran (2019: 25).

[4]This is perhaps the same Páidín Óg Ó Maoil Chonaire who flourished in the 1580s, see Cunningham and Gillespie (2008–9: 19 and 21).

[5]Angular brackets are used here and below to indicate illegible or faded text, and the number of illegible letters is indicated by dots where possible. For a discussion of the date in this colophon, see Breatnach (1981: 45–6).

[6]The twenty-five volumes are outlined in *CompCIH*, 4–5.

[7]Edward Lhuyd left this unnumbered. The digitised image has been assigned the page number 50(a) (https://www.isos.dias.ie; accessed on 27 April 2020).

[8]These are frequently lost when a MS is rebound or during the conservation process, with only their sewing stations remaining visible; on the use of tackets see Gumbert (2011).

mended prior to writing by stitching another piece of vellum, measured to size, to it by means of flattened vellum thongs. Modern repair of tears can be found on the initial vellum stub and pp. 1, 9, 15, 17, 42, 57, 71 and 74.

Collation[9]

Vol. 2 (pp. 1–14) contains a single quire of eight conjoined bifolia. It lacks the first folium, of which only a stub remains. There is a small vellum insert after p. 6. The collation of vol. 3 (pp. 15–58) is complex and irregular. It consists of four quires: i^{4+1} (= pp. 15–8 -conjoint- pp. 53–8, a singleton inserted after p. 54, i.e. pp. 55 and 56); ii^{10} (= pp. 19–28 -conjoint- pp. 29–38); iii^{4+1} (= pp. 39–44 -conjoint- pp. 45–8, a singleton inserted after p. 40, i.e. pp. 41 and 42); iv^{2} (= pp. 49–52, folded). Quires *ii*, *iii* and *iv* are inserted into *i*. There are no catch-words to connect these quires. However, there is continuity of text across the boundaries of *ii* and *iii*, namely, from pp. 38 to 39, suggesting this was an original arrangement. Vol. 4 (pp. 59–87) is a single quire of four bifolia (pp. 59–64 -conjoint- pp. 84–7; a singleton inserted after p. 60) into which a quire of six bifolia (pp. 65–70 -conjoint- pp. 71–5; vellum tab insert after p. 70) has been inserted. A paper gathering of two bifolia (= pp. 76–9 -conjoint- pp. 80–3) is possibly a later insertion. Quire numbering was added later in lighter ink on p. 1 marg. sup. (*i*), p. 58 marg. sup. (*.iii.* with line drawn through the numerals) and p. 59 marg. sup., which is barely legible.

Ruling

Ruling is by plummet, or possibly light ink, with between 37 and 53 lines per page. Marginal prickings are made with a knife-point for bounding lines. Inner bounding lines are visible on pp. 8, 12, 13, 20, 22, 23 24, 25, 36, 41, 54, 55, 67, 75. Dry-point ruling is used in the paper insertion (pp. 76–83).

Layout, script and decoration

All scribal colophons and notes are written within the main text block at the end of texts. Margins are reserved for quatrains and other citations (see the full list of marginalia given below). Single columns are used on pp. 30–33, 36–37, 41, 43–45, 49–50, 59; double columns on pp. 1–13, 14–29, 38–40, 42, 46–48, 53–58, 60–62, 84–87; three columns on pp. 63–83, with space left for additional entries in glossaries on pp. 64a (c. 10 lines); 69d (c. 3 lines); 70b (c. 4 lines at the end of the *f* entries and 5 lines at the end of the *G* entries); 71c (c. 2 lines); 72a (c. 5 lines); 72d (c. 3 lines); 73b (c. 4 lines at end of the *N* entries); 73b (c. 3 lines end of *O*); 73c (c. 1 line end of *P*); 74a (c. 2 lines); 74b (c. 2 lines); 75b (*c*. 28 lines after the *pereccul* and *polan* entries).

The layout on p. 59 is unique, with the central text block surrounded by a text written in a frame-like fashion that occupies the outer margins of the page.[10] The marginal text begins at the top left corner, continues across two lines of the upper margin, down the left margin, across the bottom and up

[9]For collation diagrams, see Kobel (2021, forthcoming).

[10]William O'Sullivan suggested to D. A. Binchy that 'this arrangement was copied from the manuscripts of the "legists" of the later Middle Ages in Italy and elsewhere who enclosed the text in a frame and wrote their glosses and commentaries in the surrounding margins' (Binchy 1983: 14 n. 2).

the right margin. The ruling for the outer text suggests this is an intentional layout design.

The script is generally in a neat, steady and clear minuscule, with the first line of a text written in display script on pp. 7, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14 and 19. The main text is written entirely in display script on pp. 49–58, with glosses in a smaller, neat minuscule written by the same hand.

Initial letters and *cenn fo eite* are coloured frequently with green, blue, red or yellow. Many minor initial letters (1 to 3 lines) also have rudimentary ornamentation. An ornate zoomorphic ribboned capital letter is found on p. 19, as well as an ornamented capital letter on p. 53, which is coloured in a mosaic style with red, green and purple. Guide-letters are written in margins and spaces are reserved for decorative initials (2 to 4 lines) on pp. 3, 16, 26, 27, 63, 64, and 66. Initials containing zoomorphic figures resembling birds are found on pp. 22a22, 47a13; 68b13. A drawing of an ornate animal in the shape of a dog is on p. 53b18, marg. inf., where it functions as a run-over symbol. On p. 16, marg. inf. a marginal verse written in a zig-zag manner is enclosed in a decorative frame, at the end of which is drawn a hen. A similar decorative frame, drawn in a lighter brown ink, surrounds a marginal note on p. 1 marg. sup. This is a textual omission and reference marks indicate its correct insertion into the main text. Line fillers are used at pp. 10a36, 63a35. The final line of text on p. 17b overruns and extends in a square shape into the lower margin. Decorated run-over symbols are used at pp. 8b7, 22a41, 67c38, 73c40, 75c20.

Paragraph signs are employed on pp. 39 right marg., 46 left marg., 46Av, and 60 left and right marg. Marginal verses are frequently preceded by *.r.* (*rann*), for which see below. Three such abbreviations are found on p. 41 right marg., indicating individual quatrains written in the main text block.[11] Similarly, *.r.* is used to mark quatrains in the main text of *Dúil Dromma Cetta* on pp. 63 left marg., 64 right marg., 66 right marg., 67 left marg. The scribe employs inversion marks (= *.a.*, *.c.*, *.b.*) on p. 28 left marg. to note the correct sequence of passages in the *Lebor Ogaim* tract. Likewise in *Dúil Dromma Cetta*, the scribe inserts *.a.* on p. 73c31 right marg. and writes *gab a ndíaig .s* in the line immediately below it to indicate that the entries beginning with *r*, located on p. 74, should correctly follow here. On the following page, the relevant entries are marked *.b.* (p. 74a22 left marg.), *.c.* (p. 74a30 left marg.) and *.d.* (p. 74b30).[12] The scribe also writes *.lii.* or *.l.ii.* to mark additional entries that are taken from a different source:[13] pp. 65a18 right marg. (*.lii.*), 65c18 (*.lii.*), 67b31 (*.lii. so sís*), 68a1 (*.lii.*), 69b25 (*.l.ii.*), 70a8 right marg. (*.lii.*), 70b marg. sup. (*.lii. t*ar *lí*n*e*), 71a1 right marg. (*.lii.*), 72a1 right marg. (*.lii.*).

[11]See the description below on p. 202.

[12]This is noted in *CIH* ii, 619 n. g and *CIH* ii, 620 n. j.

[13]Russell (1996: 149) suggests *.lii.* may be expanded as *lebor aile* ‘another book’ or *lorcc aile* ‘another copy’ (see *eDIL* s.v. 1 *lorg* (b)).

Scribal colophons, notes and jottings

(a) 1 marg. sup., in the hand of Edward Lhuyd: *Constat fol. 218 Edw. Lhwyd a Agniu*.

(b) 7b20, scribal note: *Ni fuar*us *a imtuilled de si*n.

(c) 8 marg. inf., written in a later hand and barely legible: *.o*m *fagui o* <....>*bea*<.....>

(d) 9b34, scribal note: *Nodl*aic *mor* (*.i. re*cht *nuad*h *tic re cél*eabhradh)[14] *f*or *oi*n*e an*ús[15] ⁊ *a ndæ mec fl*a*ith*im *atú*.

(e) 10a4, written interlinear by a later hand, possibly Dubháltach mac Fhir Bhisigh: *na fine*.

(f) 11 marg. inf., assorted scribbles as pen trials.

(g) 14b29, scribal note: *Timái*n *pe*n*n so o Mæl Iosa* ⁊ *ni sai*n ⁊ *fo fri*th <*o di*>[16] *l*ethe *Emai*n*d hí Deor*ad*ai*n ⁊ *ari*n *di*n*n uasin loc*h *i*n*a*r *baisd*ed *sena* <..>.

(h) 15 marg. sup., written in dark ink in script smaller than the main text: *IN* <*nom*ine>[17] *De*i *Ihesu* Christ*i*.

(i) 15 marg. sup., repetition of the opening line to the main text, written in very faint ink, a pen trial perhaps: *is lir togarmand te*cht*aite miadlechta m*.

(j) 18 col. b, written in a later hand: *in ma*c *sin féin*.

(k) 25a5–12, scribal colophon: *Bui f*or *næib ána na hEalga i*n *ní atbath isin aig*h*e so. i*d est *isi*n *cuairt uete*r*ens* (?) *.i. Donnch*adh *ma*c *Cai*r*bre ma*ic *Aodagáin foir*m *is ferr da roibi re healad*ha*i*n *i cru*th *i céill i míne i máerrd*acht *i n-ealad*ha*i*n *i n-enac i*n*a aimsir. rec*h*ta a*r *ga*c *æ*n *leig*hus *mun*a *tice or*oit ⁊ *aill a*r *aini*m *D*h*onnch*adha ⁊ *i*n*ti ros graif* ⁊ *tuc rit*h *pairti ar*i*n pairt asro sgrib*ad *so .i. Cai*r*bre ua Maol* Con*aire. an*n*o d*omi*ni .m. ccccc .xi. i Mag*h *Cuilli*n *itú*.

(l) 25b35, scribal colophon: *Gilla na Næ*m *son*n *a*r *pai*r*t M*h*ailysa*.

(m) 26 marg. sup.: *i*n *Dei Nomi*n*e amen*.

(n) 39b3, scribal note: *Ni mait*h *in ni sin*. *Fi*n*it*.

(o) 39b11, scribal note: *ni be*c *liu*m *si*n.

(p) 44.4, scribal note: *Be*n*n*acht *a*r *an*m *Mic Mat*h*gam*n*a. Isa*m *tria*m*y*n.

(q) 58b15, scribal colophon: *B. a*r *a. peit*h*epocc a*r (?) <. . . . . .> *ga*(*ch*?) *domnull fer* (or *fer*n?) *e* <..> *ath* <. . . . .> *ga aiti. intagux*m (??) *con cai*us*e co*con*cl* (?) <. . . . .> *foi*c*heda* (?) *anatgeonta isi*n *annoso* ⁊ *andruim* (?) *goll atu* ⁊ *15*<.>*9 aeis indo*m*ini* <. . . . . .>, Breatnach (1981: 45–6).

[14]This gloss is written above the line. Glosses written above the line in the manuscript are placed within parentheses throughout this article.

[15]MS *an* + *us*-compendium and length-mark. Meyer (1918: 364 n. 1) reads *aniu*.

[16]The text is obscured here due to staining.

[17]The ink is faded here and barely legible.

(r) 59.21, scribal note: *t*//*i*//*c*// ⁊// *l*//*e*//*u*//*g*// in// *b*//*r*//eth// *.b–*.

(s) 60b42–44, scribal colophon: *Is fuar in dia aníu ⁊ go foired*h *Día oru*m *fama trist ⁊ tab*hradh g*ac áen leit*h*feas bean*nacht *ar an*m*ain i*n *te do sgrib*h *i*n *droc*h*nín*. *Aitea*c*h*d*a*c*h sun*n.

(t) 76 marg. sup., in a lighter ink: *in Dei Nomen am*<..>.

(u) 83 marg. sup., scribal note: *misi do sgriob*h *si*n. A later hand, possibly Páidín Óg Ó Maoil Chonaire, has also added a series of scribbles as pen trials.

(v) 83 *i*, scribal colophon, in a lighter ink by a later hand: *Ac sin duit a Andluain o fPaidin Og O Maol Conaire*.

(w) 85b44 scribal colophon: *An fog*h*mur a ndiaid*h *Murch*ada *mic C*um*sgraig*h *so*. ⁊ *is i aois i*n *Tig*er*na 152*<0> *bl*iadain.[18]

(x) 87 marg. sup.: *ego s*u*m alfa ol* Crist ⁊ *O*.

(y) 87b27, scribal note: *bl*iadhain *na ndroc*hqu*nartha it*ir *cond ⁊ colt in bl*iadhain *ata*m ⁊ *a gGort na* Croise *atú*.

Marginalia

The following marginalia are non-scribal. They consist mainly of quatrains, as well as several prose and glossarial citations. I have attempted to identify their sources to the best of my knowledge and to give an account of any other witnesses in which these marginalia are preserved.

(i) fol. [iv]r, marg. inf. two lines, mostly illegible. <.....>*da*ir/ <.....> *mnai fritcart cua*<.di..>.

(ii) fol. [iv]v, marg. inf. The following two verses are incomplete due to the excision of the first folium, leaving only a small vellum stub remaining:

[...] *rag*h*at d'ég.*
*mor in b*ét *ni f*etur *cuin*.[19]

[...]acht *ina la*m*a*.
cin cuach acht *a cúara*n*a*.[20]

(iii) 1, marg. inf.

*Denat lu*cht *na foglu*m*a*.
*doib bodei*n *niba tac*h*a*.
*log*h *do cin*n *a fog*h*lu*m*a*.
*u*m*aloit do cin*n *rat*h*a*.

[18]On the date in the colophon, see Ó Cuív (1985: 113). Cf. Ó Cuív (1954: 30).

[19]The complete quatrain is in TCD MS H 2.16 (1318; Yellow Book of Lecan), cols. 293–4, marg. inf.; Oxford, Bodleian Library, Laud Misc. 610, fol. 115r, marg. inf. (ed. and trans. Dillon 1963: 150–1); RIA MS D ii 1 (1225; Book of Uí Mhaine) fol. 77r, marg. inf.; TCD MS H 2. 12 [9] (1309), fol. 1r, marg. inf. (ed. and trans. Culverwell 1913: 133); BL MS Harley 5280, fol. 46v, marg. inf.; NLI MS G 1, fol. 73v7; RIA MS 23 P 16 (1230; An Leabhar Breac), p. 172, marg. inf.

[20]The complete quatrain is in BL MS Harley 5280, fol. 46r, marg. inf. (ed. Meyer 1892b: 170; trans. Meyer 1892c: 115). I am grateful to Liam Breatnach for providing me with the latter reference.

*M'écnac*h-*sa*.
*is c*et *do neo*ch *not raid*he.
*mad go cid a*r*no*m *luaide*.
*ma fir cid a*r*no*m c*raide*.[21]

(iv) 2, marg. sup. *at*-con*nac b*r*ac* ⁊ *bru*.
⁊ *baig*h*le et*a*ru*.
*soch*aidh*e déch a*r*i*n *mag*h
⁊ *bréch* (*.i. m*a*c .t.*) *aca ma*r*b*ad*h*.[22]

*Ea*r*ca* (*.i. i*m*at*) *br*é*c*h (*sic* ⁊ *ron*n) *biat*hus *da b*hi*r*. (*.i. gai*)
*rí*a*ch*u*is a*r g*ac fir a ngleó*.[23]

(v) 3, marg. sup. *Do ba bét co mbleig*h*e ndeg*hóil.
*sgeil*e (*.i. truaig*h*i*) *ég fan senoir sáer*.[24]

(vi) 3, marg. inf. *fé* (*t*r*úag*h) *i*d est *ue amaí i*d est *lim amin i*d *est ué. A*r *is fern laisin laidneoir* ⁊ *u laisi*n *gaid*el.[25]

(vii) 4, marg. inf. *A Flaind Line na*c*am luaid*h
*nad rot-bréccat mesc*h*oin* (*.i. díb*h*rai*) *muaid* (*.i. fir étaid*h).
*mai*n*bad leca* (*.ruici* ⁊ *at*h*is*) *lugdach liss* (*.i. póic* ⁊ *meirtrec*h).
eoin bicc baile no*t-béitíss*.[26]

(viii) 5, marg. sup. *IN tan d*a*no atai-siu aniu a nirt* ⁊ *a n-airech*us *ni aisg* (*.i. ni dlig*ed) *duit guairug*ud *frium-sa ol Éigsi*.[27]

Ni dolíth (*.i. geis*) *do roi*n*e an Coi*m*d*h*e ga*ch *dúil*.[28]

[21]The quatrain is also in BL MS Harley 5280, fol. 46v, marg. inf.; RIA MS 23 P 26 (479; Book of Fenagh), fol. 10r, marg. inf. (ed. and trans. Hennessy and Kelly 1875: 107).

[22]This quatrain is found in the prose *dindšenchas* of Mag Mugna and Brechmag (ed. and trans. Stokes 1894: 419).

[23]This is the second couplet in quatrain 4 in the poem ascribed to Medb Lethderg beg. *Macc Moga Corbb celas clú* (*LL* 6398–9) (ed. and trans. O'Curry 1861: 480–2); also in TCD MS H 2. 18 (1339), p. 380b36–8 (ed. Atkinson 1880).

[24]This couplet = *IGT* II, §2 103. This is the second couplet in quatrain 22 in the poem ascribed to Donnchadh Mór Ó Dálaigh beg. *Marthain duit, a chroch an Choimdheadh* (ed. McKenna 1938: 41).

[25]The scribe employs dots here in the manuscript, which serve to cross-reference, namely, three dots from *fé* to *fern* and two dots from *ue* to *u*. Ed. Meyer (1912f).

[26]Ed. Meyer (1912f). The quatrain is also in BL MS Egerton 1782, fol. 52ra28–30. See quatrain 7 in the poem beg. *Úar in lathe do Lum Laine* (ed. and trans. O Daly 1968: 102).

[27]Ed. Meyer (1912f). Meyer takes this and the following marginal entry as one unit. However, they are two separate extracts, the source of the second which is unknown to me. The first is a citation taken from *Airec Menman Uraird Maic Coisse*, §15 (ed. Byrne 1908: 54.10).

[28]Ed. Meyer (1912f).

(ix) 5, marg. inf.

*Ceit*h*re fed*h*a fat*h *gi*n *g*h*eis.*
*i c*r*oi*c*h Mic Dé dia f*h*égmais.*
*cedir cupr*i*s is gí*us *gan*n.
*b*ethe *bán i mbuí i*n *sgr*i*b*h*en*n.

*Cedir i*n *cos feib*h *ad-cúas.*
*gí*us *in cr*a*n*n *boi et*urb*húas.*
*a tenga ba cuip*r*is cain.*
*ba b*ethe *cla*r *a titail.*[29]

(xiv) 6, marg. sup.

*Grain*n*e scibai*r *sciat*h *mu*gh*rin*n.
*malu th*e*mi*n *c*r*ic*h *tograi*m
*crub énc*h*i adbli uaisli*
*barr cluaisi ruaid*h*i rud*r*índ.*

(xv) 6, marg. inf.

Slabra is ainm do bocethraib
*7 d'echsrian*aibh *amroib.*
*coibche is ainm di etaig*h*oib*
[ ] *amlaid.*[30]

tochrai is ainm do décceurcaib
7 do muccaib míne.
tindscrai is ainm d'or is d'airgut.
*7 d'uma ca*c*ha tíre.*[31]

(xvi) 7, marg. sup.

*do-g*h*niat ib*h*ail ga faigs*in
*mirb*h*ail* (*.i. ingnad*)[32] *i*m*in moraisgid.*

(xvii) 8, marg. sup.

*laith .i. med .i. sc*r*eplaig. Lugbai .i. ainm*
*c*er*da.*[33]

(xviii) 10, marg. sup.

*Duib*h*ith*ir *dat*h *a berrt*h*a.*
*bru*i*n*n*e b*r*ain bróllach oíd*hc*he.*
*étgud lu*i*n lú*th *ngaim*h*e.*
*cai*r*e fí*n*dc*h*i fuarc fu*i*nchi.*[34]

(xix) 14, marg. sup.

<...>*elba .i. an*m*a*n *altora na n-idal.*[35]

[29]Ed. Meyer (1912f).

[30] There is text omitted in the manuscript; for the full line of verse, see *CIH* v, 1564.15.

[31]These two quatrains are also in TCD MS H 4. 22 (1363), vol. II, p. 65b1 (= *CIH* v, 1564.14–6); TCD MS H 3. 18 (1337), vol. 20, p. 632a (= *CIH* iii, 1068.11–3); BL MS Harley 5280, fol. 57v29–31 (ed. Meyer 1913b). See Thurneysen (1936: 121); *CompCIH*, 68–9.

[32]The gloss is written below the line in this instance.

[33]This is also in TCD MS H 3. 18 (1337), vol. 13, p. 363a11 (= *CIH* iii, 881.11). It is a gloss on a poem that is part of the Old Irish glossing of *SM*, more specifically, the glossing of the first section of *Di Chethairślicht Athgabálae*, the second tract in *SM* (*CompCIH*, 286–7). The poem is ed. and trans. with notes in Qiu (2013).

[34] This quatrain is also in RIA MS B iv 2 (1080), fol. 151r5–6 (ed. Meyer 1913).

[35]A similar gloss is found in Corm Y 752.

(xx) 16, marg. sup.

*uii. mbl*iadn*a ria srit*h *Sla*n*i.*
a do fo .x. co n*dírgi.*
*ro det ni brec in bai*r*i.*
.ui. c. da .c. da míle
*re F*h*innta*n *it*er *d*h*aine*
*ba haig*h*i a*r *illtaib ili.*[36]

(xxi) 17, marg. sup.

*Dat*h *sula Mœil mic Míl*chon
i n-*airt*hu*r l*est*ai*r *línaig*h
*brat brai*n *len*n *lui*n *lui*m *luai*m*nig*h.
*gual c*r*ain*n *glai*n *guir*m *giuis gi*m*aig.*[37]

(xxii) 19, marg. sup.

*.r. Coi m'*a*cain mis-n-i*n*gar*a*t.*
*dord gaill i*ar *néra*ch *a bar*c.
*mo co*m*aid fr*i *Coi*m*ine*
*i*n *tan fo-t-roilge a a*r<*c*>[38]

(xxiii) 21, marg. sup.

*Do m*a*c do mog*h*aig*h *do gr*é*s.*
*rot*h*las ríu nirb é* do bés.
*ní mait*h *m*a*c rig*h *gan rig*h*e.*
*ní mai*n *mog*h *gan m*h*ittaine .i. gressac*h*t.*[39]

(xxiv) 22, marg. sup.

*Beim ort da*m-*sa nib*ad[40] *des*
*imi*n *olc bf*h*allsa cian ro clos.*
*do fuai*r *me da leig*h*is l*us.
*b*er*is g*a*c t*l*us *mar hé as.*

(xxv) 38, marg. inf.

*Caill*ech *Berre br*igh *go mbl*aid
*m*athai*r fíralain*n *Fi*n*tai*n.
*7 i*n *Fenned*h*a F*h*in*n.
*do c*h*ui*reth *cat*h *i C*r*omglin*n.[41]

(xxvi) 39, marg. sup.

*IN gæt*h *t*ar *Guair*e *Mucais* (*.i. nom*en *mon*t*is*
i Tir Con*aill*).
*tairb*ir *feda na cai*rq*ib.*
bid foidmin (*.i. is fudo*mai*n no is fogér mi*n)
*re hathlæc*h*aib.*

[36]Ed. and trans. Manning (2004: 2–3).

[37]Ed. and trans. Manning (2004: 3–4).

[38]The ink has faded here. Ed. Meyer (1919: 41 §5); ed. and trans. Mac Eoin (1977: 28, §5); ed. and trans. Byrne (1980: 116, §7). This quatrain is also in BL MS Harley 5280, fol. 46b, marg. inf.

[39]This quatrain is also in BL MS Harley 5280, fol. 46v, marg. inf. It is from the poem concerning the sons of Cormac, for which see TCD MS H 2. 18 (1339; Book of Leinster), p. 149a50; TCD MS H 2. 16 (1318; Yellow Book of Lecan), col. 811.33–5.

[40]I am grateful to Liam Breatnach for suggesting to me to expand *nib–* as the copula form *níbad*.

[41]This is quatrain 1 from the poem on mothers of famous Irish persons, preserved in RIA MS 23 P 2 (535; Book of Lecan), fol. 192v11–13.

i n*dib* t*rath*aib *na haid*hq*i* (*.i. i*m *espar*t*ain*
*⁊ i*m *iarmge*[42] *ag dol don ecl*ais *a nGlen*n *Da*
*L*och*a*).[43]

(xxvii) 40, marg. sup. *.r. Do-rat Mæl S*ec*lain*n *so*m*a*. *.c. mbó mb*rech*tlain*n
*da*r *Bai*rr*e*. *da*m-*sa Cen*n *Corad*h *fin*n*e*. *níbda*r *ba bill*e (*.i. meta*) *baille*.[44]

(xxviii) 40, marg. inf.
*Ailen i*n*i Suillib*h*ai*n.
*b*en *dilta na clía*r.
*dodéna mé uinec*h*ú*n
*uirre sía*r *'s aniar.*
*ara*n *miliu*m *.i. t*r*atnin*

(xxix) 41, marg. sup.
*.r. Afomen-sa do-gnét*h*ea.*
⁊ bád edh *do dei*mh*l*e.[45]
*reid*h*e f*r*i rig*h *na ndúil*e.
*⁊ dúire f*r*i déi*mh*ne*.[46]

(xxx) 43, marg. sup.
*.r. Dent*ar *do*m *mu* qu*it co cas.*
*i tig i b*r*uig do bád*us.

(xxxi) 45, marg. sup.
*Long*ad *i reilgib sruit*h*ib*
*a co*m*uid doín*i*b mait*h*ib.*
*ni col cia bíe dia muic*h*e*
*cid æi*n *did*h*in a lait*h*e*. *.r.*[47]

(xxxii) 46, marg. sup. *Buí F*ingen *m*a*c Lu*chta *fe*cht *an*n *i nDrui*m *Fíngi*n *i*
n-airne (*.i. i* n-*e*cht*ra*) *.i. aid*hch*e sa*m*na int sai*n*dr*ud. *tos*ac air*ni F*íngin *so*.[48]

(xxxiii) 47, marg. sup. *Is iat .ui.*ur *Cloin*n*e Cailiti*n *ro m*ar*b* Qú Qu*l*ainn *trena*
*n-orc*um*ol ⁊ triana nd*r*aie*cht *.⁊c–*.[49]

(xxxiv) 65, marg. sup. .
*r. Du*nc*ad di*n *sl*úaig.
*sab*h catha *i*n *ciúi*n.
*cui*m*n*id *r*echt*a ruaid*
*re síl mbuid*h*nec mB*r*iúin*.[50]

[42]Unfortunately, the MS is badly stained here. There is probably an *er*-compendium above the *m*, giving *iarmerge* which is the required reading.

[43]This quatrain is also in BL MS Harley 5280, fol. 46v, marg. supr.; RIA MS 23 P 16 (1230; An Leabhar Breac), p. 90, marg. supr. (ed. and trans. Stokes (1880: xcviii)).

[44]This quatrain is also found in Corm YAdd 179.

[45]This is written in the MS as *dei* + m-stroke + *l* + suspension-stroke, with a *punctum delens* above the stroke.

[46]This quatrain is also in BL MS Harley 5280, fol. 46v, marg. inf. (ed. Meyer 1906b: 603–4).

[47]This quatrain is also in BL MS Harley 5280, fol. 47r, marg. inf.; Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Laud Misc. 610, fol. 31v, marg. inf. (ed. and trans. Dillon 1963: 138).

[48]This is the opening sentence in *Airne Fíngein*, §1 (ed. Vendryes 1953: 1).

[49]This refers to the six children born to Cailitín's wife in the Early Modern Irish version of Cú Chulainn's death, *Brisleach Mhór Mhaighe Muirtheimhne* (ed. Van Hamel 1933: 69–133).

[50]This quatrain is in *MV* II, §19 (ed. Thurneysen 1891: 37).

.r. .ii.	*Mai*n *d*úse *ga*c *da*th*a*. *i Ciui*n *ca*n*i* ét*da*th*a*. ét*s*echt *re ceol co mbi*nn*e*. *ol fí*n*a ao*ngr*i*nn*e*.[51]
(xxxv) 86, marg. sup. .	*r. ceac*h *mo ailan*. *si* (no *s*ec*h*) *ga*ch *ailan fors*i*n li*nn*m*uir. *clasa ai*ng*el imi*m *an*mu*i*n. *robo i*n*main*.
(xxxvi) 87, marg. sup.	*Ag aisg*id *ni fuil ga*n *mai*n. *ni sgris* for *a*i*n aist*ir *Bri*a*in*. *7 arna ba scris f*um *ain m*uir*isi*.[52]

PART 2. DESCRIPTION OF CONTENTS

P.

1a1. [CRÍTH GABLACH] Beg. *bes bid cethrar no ch*óic*iur beit*h *hi comarbus boairec*h. Ends (7b20) *Cis ndíthle do trebaib na tuillet dire*. Status text concerned with lay grades, namely, commoners, nobles and kings. The first folium, which contained the beginning of this text, was excised with only a small vellum stub now remaining. Some words and letters of the text are still visible on this stub, for which see *CIH* ii, 563 n. a. Ed. *CIH* ii, 563.1–571.16, see *CompCIH*, 26, 241–4; this is recension B in Binchy (1970). The *roscad* beg. (7a10) *Mad bé ríg rofessir recht fl*ath*a* (*CIH* ii, 570.34–571.16) is ed. and trans. in Binchy (1971). Two other independent copies are preserved in TCD MS H 3. 18 (1337), vol. 10, pp. 252.10–256.37, breaks off incomplete (*CIH* iii, 777.6–783.38) and TCD MS H 3. 18 (1337), vol. 14, p. 419a1–419b38, acephalous and breaks off incomplete (*CIH* iii, 952.1–953.9).

fol. [v]r and v. [Glossarial material] Beg. *For-congar*tar *.i. deonugh*. Ends *Groid*h *mic Lir ia*r *loch fo tuaid*. Written on an inserted small vellum tab. Contains five entries. The entry beg. *ar ecnairc* corresponds to the Prologue to *Félire Óengusso*, l. 266 (Stokes 1905b: 28). The entry beg. *cerba tolgda* corresponds to the Prologue to *Félire Óengusso*, l. 125 (Stokes 1905b: 22).[53] The final entry beg. *Cuthal .i. tlait*h, which includes a quatrain, corresponds to *OM* 268 and *DDC* (Stokes 1860: 177 = *CIH* ii, 609.15). N. p.

7b21. CÁIN ÓNAE Beg. *CAIN ONA DANO LA* FENIU *ON FRI HAIRCHENN ON FRI HANHAIRCHEN*N. Ends (8b7) *dia ndligth*er *i n-águ a n-éurca*. A treatise on two types of lending. The first two lines are written in display script. Followed by two blank lines. No other copy known. Ed. *CIH* ii,

[51]This quatrain is in *Immram Brain*, §13 (ed. and trans. Meyer and Nutt 1895, repr. 1994: 8; Mac Mathúna 1985: 35).

[52]Cf. O'Dav. 20. I am grateful to Liam Breatnach for providing me with this reference.

[53]These two entries are also in TCD MS H 3. 18 (1337), vol. 19, p. 617a13 and 22 (ed. Stokes 1862: 126).

571.17–572.19, see *CompCIH*, 26, 218; ed. and trans. with notes in Breatnach (1998).

8b8. [A tract on the Áes Fíachach] Beg. *Fir elgnais og cinaith cen comairb i cein*. Ends incomplete (8b15) *Fir fo luith co alderg .x.*mad. Without commentary. On people, including accessories, with varying degrees of responsibility for a crime. Ed. *CIH* ii, 572.20–572.24, see *CompCIH*, 26; ed. from this MS in Meyer (1918b: 361). This version (M) is also ed. in Smith (1934), along with two other copies, i.e. A = TCD MS H 3. 17 (1336), vol. 3, cols. 551.2–552.34 (*CIH* vi, 2031.31–2032.34); B = TCD MS H 3. 18 (1337), vol. 17, pp. 507.1–508.19 (*CIH* iii, 1055.1–1056.13), with commentary.

8b16. [On wandering animals] Beg. *Rofesear rupu tria foindel caich laithiu*. Ends (8b20) *muiccai cen mucalaig ndorca*.[54] No other copy known. Ed. *CIH* ii, 572.25–572.27, see *CompCIH*, 26; ed. Meyer (1918b: 361.17–25).

8b21. [Pronouncement by Conall Cernach on contracts] Beg. *Conla Conall Cernach qundrathau*. Ends (9a3) *cen gait is aire cen cor cen qhundrath*. No other copy known. Ed. *CIH* ii, 572.28–573.4, see *CompCIH*, 26; ed. Meyer (1918b: 362.1–16).

9a4. [Dialogue between Coirpre and Cormac on the seduction of a woman] Headed 'Coirpri dixit fri Cormac'. Beg. *Ro gabus ben ar éicin*. Ends (9a22) con-*ralat* con-*ralsat*. Followed by two blank lines. No other copy known. Ed. *CIH* ii, 573.5–16, see *CompCIH*, 26; ed. Meyer (1918b: 362.17–30).

9a23. [Dialogue between Bríathrach and Cormac on the judge who decides neighbourhood law] Beg. *Briarach dorsaid Corbmaic*. Ends (9b8) *co mmuir cach ndicend*. No other copy known. Ed. *CIH* ii, 573.17–29, see *CompCIH*, 26; ed. Meyer (1918b: 362.31–363.14). For a trans. of *CIH* ii, 573.18–9, see Breatnach (1990: 10).

9b9. [Fragments on prescription] Beg. *Ataat rudrad mair ⁊ bic*. Ends (9b24) *age selbai in so a .ix. fínet*. Followed by one blank line. No other copy known. Ed. *CIH* ii, 573.30–574.6, see *CompCIH*, 26; ed. Meyer (1918b: 363.15–29).

9b25. [On the twenty-seven things that confer 'worthiness and dignity' on a person] Beg. *Secht rann .xx.it*. Ends (9b35) *Tria imrad* no *décsin i nDia na ndula*.[55] No other copy known. Ed. *CIH* ii, 574.7–17, see *CompCIH*, 26; ed. Meyer (1918b: 363.30–5).

10a1. [On treaty-relationships] Beg. *Slan aitire cairde*. Ends (10a27) *dognither iter olta ⁊ féne*. Extracted from the OIr. glossing to the *SM*. Ed. *CIH* ii, 574.18– 35, see *CompCIH*, 26–7; ed. from this MS in Meyer (1921). The beginning of the text as far as *CIH* ii, 574.30 and *CIH* iii, 893.10 is ed. and trans. in Thurneysen (1928: 32–3). Another version (B) is preserved in TCD MS H 3.18 (1337), vol. 13, pp. 372b15–38 (*CIH* iii, 892.31–893.10).

10a28. [On the possessions left by a *manach* after death] Beg. *Iar grinde* (no *iargríne*) *gach manaig iar n-egaib ⁊ a dícelt*. Ends (10a36) *.uii.*

[54]Cf. *i ndorca*, *CIH* ii, 572.27, but there is no *i* in the MS.

[55]Cf. *déc*(-) *sin*, *CIH* ii, 574.14. MS *décsin* (written across the line boundary), acc. sg. of *eDIL* s.v. *décsiu* 'viewing, searching, inspecting'.

*mui*ne no *dia cris corma*. Ed. *CIH* ii, 574.36–575.3, see *CompCIH*, 27; ed. Meyer (1908c); trans. Etchingham (1999: 439–40).

10b1. [Extracts from *BRETHA COMAITHCHESA*, with commentary in Old Irish] Beg. BRETHA COMAITHCHESA IN SO. Ends (14b28) acht *a ndilsi*7 *a ruid*h*ilsi* 7*rl–*. Extracts from the main text of *Bretha Comaithchesa*, a tract belonging to the 'middle' third of *SM*, written in display script, followed by commentary written in minuscule. Ed. *CIH* ii, 575.4–582.22, see *CompCIH*, 27, 292, 346–8. The following passages are ed. and/or trans.: p. 11b4–9 (*CIH* ii, 576.27–30) = Plummer (1923: 117); p. 12a24–36 (*CIH* ii, 577.36–578.7) = Plummer (1923: 33); p. 12a39–12b5 (*CIH* ii, 578.10–18) = Binchy (1971:164); pp. 11b43–12a4; 12b13–27 (*CIH* ii, 577.19–23; 578.24–33) = Charles-Edwards and Kelly (1983: 134, 186–8). A corresponding copy of this commentary is in TCD MS H 3. 18 (1337), vol. 7, pp. 149b15–150.22 (*CIH* ii, 677.28–678.15). A third copy forms part of the commentary on the continuous text in *Bretha Comaithchesa* in TCD MS E 3. 5 (1433), pp. 1a1–6b1, acepholous (*CIH* i, 191.1–205.21).[56] For a discussion of the tree-list beg. p. 14a44,[57] see Kelly (1976).

14b31. [On horses] Beg. *Co hérena*r *grai*ghe? Ends (14b41) *aithgin olchena*. Ed. *CIH* ii, 582.23–8, see *CompCIH*, 27. Another copy is preserved in BL MS Rawlinson B 487 (3), fol. 58vb53–60 (*CIH* i, 32.12–8), in the commentary on *SM*2, 9. *Sechtae* (see *CompCIH*, 13 and 291–2).

14b43. [A gloss on *Elga*] Beg. *Elga .i. Eire*. Ends (14b45) *fil fuirre*. Ed. *CIH* ii, 582.29–30, see *CompCIH*, 27.[58]

14b45. [A gloss on *melg*] Beg. *Melg d*ano. Ends (14b46) *tene mbais*. Ed. *CIH* ii, 582.30–31, see *CompCIH*, 27. Corresponds to Corm Y 862.

15a1. MÍADṠLECHTA Beg. [*C*]*is lir togarmand te*chta*ite miadle*chta. Ends (17b53) *fri macc*leire*c n-ait*hr*ige tri caecait aid*h*che doib*. Status text concerned with the lay grades, ecclesiastical scholars, poets and churchmen. This is the only complete surviving copy. Ed. *CIH* ii, 582.32–589.32, see *CompCIH*, 27, 264–5. Incomplete copies are preserved in TCD MS H 3. 18 (1337), vol. 7, pp. 148a1–149b14 (*CIH* ii, 676.17–677.27); TCD MS H 4. 22 (1363), vol. II, p. 67A (*CIH* v, 1567.1–35).[59] Ed. and trans. from all MSS in Manning (2004).[60]

18a1. [On the *aigne* and the 'five paths of judgement'] Beg. *Gaeth cach co fonadmaim fo-nascar fri com*us *n-ae*. Ends (18a16) con-*scara ai et*ar-*da-scara*. Ed. *CIH* ii, 589.33–590.09, see *CompCIH*, 27, 234; ed. Meyer (1918b: 364.6–20).[61]

18a17. [Dialogue between Fachtnae and Sogen on contracts] Beg. *Fa*cht*na. Ni foc*h*en Sog*h*en suí g*h*ena g*us*mai*r. Ends (18b7) *ar is cumrac*h*ta fotha fri flaith fri heclais* //*f*//i//*n*//i//*t*//. Remainder of column left blank. This

[56]For a discussion of the MS transmission of additional texts or 'satellites' to *Bretha Comaithchesa*, and the MS witnesses, see Charles-Edwards (2014: 98–104).

[57]*CIH* ii, 528.1 notes that this passage begins on p. 14b.

[58]Another version of this is found in *Cóir Anmann*, ed. Arbuthnot (2007: 65, §253; 192–3).

[59]This manuscript page is now lost (see comment in *TCD Cat*. 204; *CIH* v, 1567 n. a).

[60]For a discussion of the structure and content of the tract, see MacNeill (1923: 311–13).

[61]See discussion in Thurneysen (1925: 11–3); Stacey (1994: 271 n. 17).

possibly belongs to *Tulbretha Fachtnai*, see discussion in *CompCIH*, 314–15. Ed. *CIH* ii, 590.10–591.7, see *CompCIH*, 27; ed. Meyer (1918b: 364.21–365.25).

19a1. Berrad Airechta Headed (marg. sup.) 'Berr*ad* Air*echta*'. Beg. *Atait da*no *ruidlesa tuait*he *la* Feniu. Ends (25a4) *a*r*napat huidec*h *airechtæ. f*//i//n//i//t// .7 *setera*. Law-tract concerning surety. Followed by two blank lines. No other copy known. Ed. *CIH* ii, 591.8–599.38, see *CompCIH*, 27, 169–70; the portion of text corresponding to *CIH* ii, 591.8–594.18 is ed. in Meyer (1921); the full text is ed. and trans. in Thurneysen (1928); with additions and corrections in Thurneysen (1930) and Thurneysen (1933: 130–2); trans. into English in Stacey (1986).

25a13. [The distribution of *cró* and *díbad*] Beg. *Ropu doraid*h *lais na huctaru na nGaidel*. Ends (25b35) *athroin*n *si*n *ar cro*. Text concerning the distribution of body-fine amongst kinsmen. Remainder of column left blank. Ed. *CIH* ii, 600.1–601.11, see *CompCIH*, 27; ed. and trans. Murray (2000).[62]

26a1. [In Lebor Ogaim] Beg. [*C*]*aide locc* 7 *ams*er 7 *per*s*a* 7 *fat*h *airic i*n *og*h*aim*. Tract dealing with *Ogam* and the varieties of *Ogam*. The poem (34) beg. *M*[*o*] *Neire ne*mh*nig*h *nuallbret*h*aig* is surrounded by a frame containing an *ogam*-key, headed '*T*r*aig*h*s*rut*h* Feirc*er*tni so.' Three series of *Bríatharogaim* or 'Word-Ogams' are appended to the end of the tract in this MS and are presented in columnar form. They consist of kennings on the Irish letter names: (A) headed 'B*r*iath*aro*g*am* Morain*n* mic Maí*n*', beg. (34a4) *FEOCHAS FOLTCHAIN* (25 entries); (B) headed 'Briath*aro*g*am* Mic in Óicc', beg. (34b20) *GLAISEM CNIS* (24 entries); (C) headed 'Briath*arogam Con* Caul*aind* so', beg. (34d3) MAISI MALAC*H* (21 entries). Complete copies of the tract are also in RIA MS 23 P 12 (536; Book of Ballymote), pp. 308b44–314;[63] NLI MS G 53, pp. 1–22 and a corresponding fragment (but without the *bríatharogaim*) in BL MS Add. 4783, fol. 3. The tract is ed. from this MS in Meyer (1910c); ed. and trans. from all MSS with textual notes in McManus (1988); also McManus (1997: 42–3). The poem is ed. and trans. in McManus (1997: 141).

35. [Numerical and alphabetical tables] A table, written across the upper half of the page, listing the names for Hebrew, Greek and Syrian numerals, accompanied by their roman numerical value. Written below this is the Greek alphabet, followed by each letter's name and roman numerical value. Alongside this are the Egyptian and African alphabets and their equivalent in Latin script.[64] Unpublished.

35a46. [On the different lengths of life of various creatures and elements] Beg. *Tr*e*gort c*r*and*. Ends *bit*h*béo Día*. Without glosses. Copies also in NLI MS G 1, fol. 38v6–12 (with glosses); NLI MS G 2, fol. 34rb21–24 (without glosses); RIA MS 23 P 12 (536; Book of Ballymote), p. 14a7–16

[62]See discussion in MacNeill (1921, repr. 1981: 119–20).

[63]It should be noted that *In Lebor Ogaim* is independent of *Auraicept na nÉces*. The copy in the Book of Ballymote is ed. and trans. in Calder (1917: 272–313).

[64]Similar alphabetical tables are found in the following copies of *Auraicept na nÉces*: RIA MS 23 P 12 (536; the Book of Ballymote), fol. 175vb; RIA MS 23 P 2 (535; Book of Lecan), fol. 158r; BL MS Egerton 88, fol. 71r, TCD MS H 2. 16 (1318; Yellow Book of Lecan), col. 535. See Calder (1917: 86–7 and 229–32).

(without glosses); NLI MS G 3, fol. 19va1–10 (without glosses);[65] NLI MS G 131, p. 83 *i* (written in display script with glosses in minuscule); UCC, Book of Lismore, fol. 193v (illegible), but see RIA MS 23 H 6 (478; Book of Lismore O'Longain Transcript), fol. 193vbm; RIA MS 23 E 29 (1134; Book of Fermoy), p. 156a25–b17 (a versification); BL MS Egerton 118, fol. 51a; BL MS Egerton 133, fol. 229a. Ed. from this MS and the Book of Ballymote in Meyer (1905b: 184).

35b29. [Prose introduction to TREḞOCAL TACRAIT FILID] Beg. *Trefoclaí in so am*al *ro* c*h*u*m*s*ad na baird* ⁊ *na patr*e*ne*. Ends (35b40) *do-gníat .ꝛrl–*. Followed by a blank line. Ed. from this MS in Meyer (1907: 293.1–14). Copies also in RIA MS 23 P 2 (535; Book of Lecan), fol. 161vb28–40; RIA MS 23 P 12 (536; Book of Ballymote), fol. 179rb4–15; NLS Adv. 72.1.1, fol. 25rb4–14.[66]

35b41. 'Fing*h*en m*ac* Flain*n* dalta Dubdartaig*h*' Beg. *A mo Cho*m*dh*íu *néll*. 70 qq. Begins with the introductory sentence *Is hí so sís im*morro *in tr*e*foc*a*l focrai fadesin do-rig*h*ne Fing*h*en *m*ac *Flai*n *dalta Dubdartaig*h ⁊ *do F*e*raib*h *A*r*ddai do-rig*h*ne .ꝛrl–*. No other copy known. Ed. Meyer (1907: 293.14–301); ed. and trans. Meroney (1953).

37.22. Beg. *Do-berain*n *com*a*irle do*m *c*h*arait* 16 qq. No other copy known. Ed. Meyer (1908e).

37.38. 'Corbm*ac* m*ac* Cuil*enai*n *cecinit*' Beg. *Eoc*h*a*i*r céille cloist*echt. 12 qq. Gnomic poem. Another copy is in TCD MS H 2. 16 (1318; Yellow Book of Lecan), col. 248.1–19 (p. 420b1–19). Ed. from YBL with variants from this MS in Meyer (1908b).

38a1. SCÉL TUÁIN MEIC CAIRILL Headed (marg. sup.) 'SGEL TUA*I*N MIC CA*I*RILL i*n* so do Fi*n*den Muig*h*i Bile'. Beg. *IAr tuid*echt *do Fin*n*én Mui*g*h*e *Bili*. Ends (p. 39b3) *bid oirdnig*h*i do loc-sa ar Tuán*. Four other copies are in Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Laud Misc. 610, fols. 102b14–103b21; RIA MS 23 E 29 (1134; Book of Fermoy), pp. 155a1–156a24 (begins incomplete due to missing folium); Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Rawlinson B 512, fols. 97vb1–98va33; RIA MS 23 E 25 (1229; *Lebor na hUidre*), pp. 15a34–16b41. Ed. and trans. with notes from all MSS in Carey (1984).

39b4. [Genealogical note concerning Muinter Éolais] Beg. *Conmaicne da*no *dos-rala cat*h *f*o*r Con*nacht*aib*. Ends (39b11) ⁊ *is uad Muinn*t*iur Eoluis*. Unpublished. Copies are also in TCD MS H 3. 17 (1336), vol. 6, col. 863.26–34 and BL MS Egerton 1782, fol. 40b2.[67]

39b12. [CEIST NA CANTAIRECHTA] Beg. *Ata na c*est *an*n *so do rer Aug*ust*in cr*e*d is canta*irecht *an*n. Ends (40a9) *.ꝛ go ngairth*er qu*m*acht*a De .ꝛc–*. A text on the musical scale. No other copy known. Ed. Meyer (1905c).

40a10. [FOSCÉL AR BRENAINN] Beg. *In n-agh*ther *eg ol a daltae f*r*i Brenain*n. Ends (40a24) *a*r *cinn br*eth*emon agor eug. finitt*. A dialogue with Moínenn of Clonfert. Ed. and trans. Grosjean (1937: 280–2). Longer copies are found in

[65]The copies in NLI MS G 3 and the Book of Ballymote are ed. and trans. in Carney (1969: 129–30).

[66]The copy in the Book of Ballymote was ed. and trans. in Calder (1917: 148, ll. 1940–51); discussion in Breatnach (2017: 5).

[67]Ed. from the Egerton copy in Meyer (1913c: 176, ll. 24–9).

UCD-OFM MS A 3, p. 17a1–61; Paris, BnF, fonds celtique 1, fol. 29va; NLI MS G 9, fol. 7ra11–35.[68]

40a25. [Apgitir Chrábaid] Headed 'De prudentissimo hom*in*e'. Beg. *Cia is trebairem inti*. Ends (40b7) *dal fria hes*erg*i i llathe mbrathai*. *F*//i//n// *i*//t//. Contains only the final three paragraphs of *Apgitir Chrábaid*. For a full account of the MS tradition, ed. and trans., see Hull (1968).

40b8. [Immacallam Chormaic ocus Fíthail] Headed 'Fit*h*ell d*ix*i*t* f*r*ia Corbm*ac* iar n-ól fleid*h*e bice b*r*igmai*r*e secha'. Beg. *Nugua mé*. *an*f*us ag neach*. Ends (40b31) *ni ba me*. *Nugua me*. 9 qq. The initial of the person speaking is written in the right margin. Followed by four blank lines. For a discussion on the poet and judge known as Fíthal, see *CompCIH*, 364–5. This is omitted in *CIH*. Other copies of the poem are in TCD MS H 2. 18 (1339; Book of Leinster), p. 149a19–36; Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Ir. d 5; BL MS Rawlinson B 512, fol. 116b5–38, which also includes a prose introduction and two additional verses.[69] Ed. and trans. Yocum (2013), based on all MSS.

41.1. 'Dub Da T*h*uath c*ecinit*' Beg. *Diambad mese bad rig réil*. 28 qq. Poem on the advice to a king. For a discussion of the other MS witnesses and an ed. and trans. with variant readings from this MS, see O'Donoghue (1921–3).

41.42. A series of three individual quatrains written at the bottom of the text block that serves as a gap filler. Each quatrain is followed by *.r.* in the right marg.

*Ai*n*mne fr*i *cec*h *ndaidbr*e *ndait*h.
*ni measite saidb*re *neic*h
*ain*m*ne fr*i *ce*ch *ndaibr*e *n-úi*r
*ni bí a*r *súil ní do reit*h *.r.*

*Do*m*u*n *dia*n
*cia b*eth*t*er *fai*r *ni ba cia*n.
*is boet*h *do neo*ch *ren*us *fír*.
*a*r *ascna*m *i tir na pian .r.*[70]

*Cid ile lat-sa na haig*h*id*.
*ma do-gnet*h*ea a c*h*oir*.
*fogeis i*nd *rig*h *las bia*.
*ni c*r*ía bíad doib .r.*

All three quatrains are ed. in Meyer (1910b); (1913).

42a1. [Tadhg mac Céin and the Badgers] Beg. *Co<r>m*a*c Gaileagg m*a*c Taidg m*aic *Céin*. Ends (42b18) *Gail*enga *Murbuilg* ⁊ *Gail*enga *C*h*ail .⁊rl–*.

[68]Ed. and trans. Carey (2014: 447–51).

[69]Ed. Meyer (1894: 82–3), with trans. of the prose introduction.

[70]This is found as a marginal quatrain in RIA MS 3 B 23 (1227), p. 15 marg. inf., ed. and trans. Gwynn and Purton (1911–1912: 119).

A story about Cormac Gaileng, son of Tadhg mac Céin, progenitor of the Gailenga. Ed. and trans. Stokes (1862: xlii–xlv).[71]

42b19. [CAILLEACH BÉRRI] Prose introduction beg. *Sentane Berre Digdi a ain*m *di C*h*orco Dubne di*. Ends (42b31) *Is ant is rubard sii*. Poem (42b32) beg. *Athbe dam-sai bes mar*a. 35 qq. A shorter version of the prose introduction is found in RIA MS 23 P 2 (535; The Book of Lecan), fol. 191vb8–15.[72] The poem is ed. and trans. from this MS in Ó hAodha (1989: 308–11). Copies of the poem, derived from a different tradition, are preserved in NLI MS G 7, cols. 23.21–26.22; TCD MS H 3. 18 (1337), vol. 23, pp. 764.19–766.17; TCD MS H 4. 22 (1363), vol. I, p. 44; TCD MS H 5. 6 (1378), p. 187. The prose introduction and poem, based on the five copies, is ed. and trans. in Murphy (1953).

44.5. Beg. *Ocht n-airic go ngolaige* 6 qq. On the eight canonical hours that defeat the deadly sins. Ed. from this MS in Meyer (1908d). The poem (5 qq. only) is also found in *Acallam na Senórach*: UCC, Book of Lismore, fol. 220rb4–13;[73] Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Laud Misc. 610, fol. 127ra7–15.[74]

44.11. Beg. *Ri ro ordaig na .uii. n*ime 6 qq. An enumeration of the seven heavens. No other copy known. Ed. Stokes (1905b: 464).

44.17. [On the influence of the planets on the formation of the body] Beg. *IS e .c. airdren*nac*h oibr*igius. Ends (45.2) *na .uii. n-air*ɪ*dr*e*nac i*m*in cr*ʊ*hug*ud. No other copy known. Unpublished.

45.3. Beg. *Sec*h*t n-affrin*n *écnairce áin*. 3 qq. On the seven Masses to free the soul from hell. Ed. from this MS in Meyer (1907c). A copy is also in Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Laud Misc. 615, p. 129.

45.8. [On the four reasons to visit crosses] Beg. *Ce*thr*i tucaite ar*a *tiag*h*ar do c*h*rois*. Ends (45.14) *Intí nad adli in crois ni*co n-*a*ɾ*fæm cesad Cr*ist *a//i//r//e//.* No other copy known. Ed. Meyer (1905d).

45.15. Beg. *Ca lin triuch*adh *a nEir*inn *áin*. 12 qq. On the subdivisions of Ireland. Other copies in RIA MS D ii 1 (1225; Book of Uí Mhaine), fol. 115va57–vb22;[75] Royal Library of Belgium, MS 2569–2572 (4640), fols. 59v13–60r8; TCD MS H 1. 15 (1289), p. 654; TCD MS H 6.15 (1419), p. 13; TCD MS H 6. 18 (1408), p. 146. Ed. and trans. O'Curry (1855: 106–109) with reference to this MS copy.

46a1. [On how Partholón mac Sera came to Ireland] Beg. *Mad*h *ail a fh*is *cid*h *ar*a *tainic Partolon*. Ends (46a23) *ar*a *mb*eth *gac*h *neach dib is aml*aid *do geib*ed *bás*. Unpublished. Another copy is in TCD MS H 4. 22 (1363), vol. I, p. 37, col. 2.[76]

46a24. [On the descendants of Adam] Beg. *Mat*h*asáileam as é do-rig*h*ne an .c. cuirm*. Ends (46a32) *is iat fuai*r *Eir*inn *ar t*ús. This passage and the following two are treated as one item in Carey (1982: 42). However, the

[71]An earlier version is ed. and trans. in Mac an Bhaird (1980).
[72]Ed. and trans. Hull (1933: 175).
[73]Ed. and trans. O'Grady (1892, vol. 1, 160; vol. 2, 177).
[74]Ed. Stokes (1900: 83–4).
[75]The copy in the Book of Uí Mhaine is ed. and trans. in MacCotter (2008: 255–7).
[76]Ed. and trans. Macalister (1933: 264–5).

distinguishing use of a paragraph sign in the margin before each passage,[77] and the fact that each passage is concerned with a different topic, suggests that each should be taken as a separate entity.

46a33. [On the location of hell] Beg. *Ca hairm a fuil iffer*n. Ends (46a34) *a trian i talmui*n. Ed. Carey (1982: 42).

46a35. [Extract from the prose *dindšenchas* of Lumman Tige Srafáin] Beg. *Ro claid*h*ed ind uag*. Ends (46a36) *a luamai*n *tairis .i. a sgiat*h. This corresponds to TCD MS H 2. 18 (1339; Book of Leinster), p. 193b27–9.[78] Ed. Carey (1982: 42).

46b1. [Tochmarc Cruinn ocus Macha] Beg. *Cruin*n *mac Agnamai*n *mic Fir Ul*ad. Ends (47a12) *conad*h *é toch*m*arc Cruind* ⁊ *Macha conuice sin*. Third recension of *Noínden Ulad*. Ed. and trans. Thurneysen (1918).

46Ar. [The *Tindrum* Glossary] Beg. *tindru*m *.i. sgél*. Ends *co cúal*a *in crois isi*n *tuip lúachr*a. Written on the recto of the protruding stub of a singleton. This is omitted in *CIH*. Only the last entry is given in Meyer (1906b: 526).

46Av. [On those who may neither sue nor respond in a law-suit] Beg. *Cis l*ir *feichem*ain *at urcuilti tagra* ⁊ *fregra r bel*aib *brith*e*man*? Ends *naro lonnaidth*er *an feich*em .ꝛrl–. Written vertically on the verso of the protruding stub. No other copy known. Ed. *CIH* ii, 601.12–19, see *CompCIH*, 28.

47a14. Baile Binnbérlach mac Búain Beg. *Baile Binnberlach mac Buain*. Ends (p. 48a29) *Sun*n *ro claid*h*ed mac Buain Báin*. Ed. and trans. from this MS in O'Curry (1861: 472–5). Two other complete copies are in RIA MS 23 N 10 (967; Book of Ballycummin), pp. 129–30;[79] BL MS Harley 5280, fol. 48r–48v;[80] the beginning only in Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Rawlinson B 512, fol. 122v.

48b1. Compert Conchobair Headed (marg. sup.) 'Co*mpert Con*co*bair*'. Beg. *Ness i*ngen *Ea*ch*ac Salbuite*. Ends (48b16) *uc flith uthir ba halacht*. Other copies of this short version are in RIA MS 23 P 2 (535; Book of Lecan), fol. 191va42–191vb7; TCD MS H 4. 22 (1363), vol. I, p. 40.1–10; Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Rawlinson B 512, fol. 100vb; NLI MS G 7, col. 4, l. 7. Ed. and trans. Hull (1934).

48b18. [Scéla Guairi meic Colmáin ocus Óenu moccu Loígse] Beg. *Óeno mac .h. Loígsi* (*.i. comorba Cíarai*n) *rob an*m*cara do Guair*e *Aid*h*ne*. Ends (48b37) *céi*n *ro bat*ar *i mbíu díb línaib*. A copy is also in BL MS Harley 5280, fol. 25v; BL MS Egerton 1782, fol. 61r12–25.[81] Ed. from the Egerton copy with variants from this MS in Meyer (1907b).

49.1. Amrae Con Roí Headed (marg. sup.) 'F*ercer*tnæ d*ixit* amra *Con* Roí'. Beg. [N]I *HADH*A *DOM ANMUIN*. Ends (col.52.2) *RO BIT*H *NIE NAMAIT* .ꝛc–. Poem only. Written in display script with interlinear glosses in a smaller minuscule. Independent copies of the poem are interpolated with *Aided Chon*

[77]On the use of the paragraph mark to distinguish prose items or verse from surrounding text, see Breatnach (2017: 77).

[78]Ed. and trans. Gwynn (1924: 330).

[79]Ed. Hull (1950).

[80]Ed. and trans. Meyer (1892); (1896).

[81]Ed. and trans. O'Grady (1892: vol. 1, 401; vol. 2, 437).

Roí in BL MS Egerton 88, fols. 10vb2–11ra, TCD MS H 2. 16 (1318; Yellow Book of Lecan), col. 776.46. Ed., with glossarial index, from this MS, with variant readings from the other MSS, in Stokes (1905); Henry (1995).

50(a). [The INDIUTH Glossary] Beg. *INdiut*h *.i. indisi*n. Ends (col. 52 i) *ut* est *treit senaigh*t*he agh**u***. This glossary is written on the recto and verso of a folded piece of vellum at the bottom of 50(a) and col. 52. It contains 99 entries. This glossary is omitted in *CIH*. Several entries are discussed in Meyer (1907e). Unpublished.

col. 52.3. Beg. *FEOCHAI*R *MU LUAN REM LESMAC.* 9 qq. Written in display script with interlinear glosses in a smaller minuscule. Ed. from this MS in Meyer (1918). Another copy, with fewer glosses, is in RIA MS B iv 2, fol. 137v.[82]

53a1. [THE CALDRON OF POESY] Beg. *MO COIRE COIR GOIRIATH GOR*. Ends (57b5) *B*ER*AIG*H *CO HECNA EC*H*RAID FRI BORBA*. Written in display script with interlinear glosses in a smaller minuscule. Ed. and trans. Henry (1981); Breatnach (1981); with addenda and corrigenda in Breatnach (1984).

57b6. [On court procedure] Beg. *CIS LI*R *CENELA AIR*ECHT*A DO CH*US*IN LA* FENIU. Ends (58b15) *SUITENGTAID*H *NODO-FETHAIGTHEAR*. Written in display script with interlinear glosses in a smaller minuscule. Ed. *CIH* ii, 601.20–602.23, see *CompCIH*, 28; ed. and trans. Kelly (1986).

59.1. [SLISNECH CORMAIC MAC AIRT] Headed ‘Cormac .h. *Qu*int d*ix**it*** an slisne*ch*-sa’. Beg. *Ma amruire bid*h *amruanaid*. Ends (59.13) *i*t*er roilicca. tic*. Ed. *CIH* ii, 602.24–30, see *CompCIH*, 28. Another copy is in TCD MS H 3.18 (1337), vol. 17, pp. 539b27–540a6.

59.14. [A legal question and answer on evidence] Beg. *Can asa ngabar fir lui na hantesta*. Ends *i fir lai na anteistea foan cuma cetnæi*. No other copy known. Ed. *CIH* ii, 602.31–3, see *CompCIH*, 28.

59*marg.* [On the Roman Twelve Tables] Beg. *Is aml*aid *tainic tosach dlig*id *an impir*. Ends *.i. ploc plut ploc*ar (?) *rucon .ꝛrl–*. Written in a frame-like fashion in the margins. No other copy known. Ed. *CIH* ii, 602.34–603.15, see *CompCIH*, 28; ed. and trans. Binchy (1983).

60a1. TOGAIL TSÍTHA TRUIM Headed (marg. sup.) ‘TOG*H*UIL TSITHA TRUIM in*n* so’. Beg. *To-luid*h *Bod*h*p in réimim*. Ends (60a14) *con buiretar i cao*m*thac*h *na soduine*. *Finit*. No other copy known. Ed. Meyer (1912b); ed. and trans. Carey (1996).

60a14. TOCHMARC BAÍSI Headed ‘TOG*H*MARC BAISI BA*NDR*UAD ind so’. Beg. *Bais bandruad*h *ingen sid*h*e Chrun*n*moil hi síd*h*aib*. Ends (60a22) *olis fo*r*band F*acht*na Fac*h*tna .ꝛrl–. Fínít*. Ed. Meyer (1912c), with variants from BL MS Harley 5280, fol. 48v. Another copy is preserved in RIA MS 23 N 10 (967; Book of Ballycummin), p. 55.

[82]Ed. Meyer (1907d).

60a22. Bruiden Senbicc Ébric Headed 'Bruigen Séinbic h sobric ind so sís'. Beg. *Boi sid*he *ænlau for bruag Boi*ne. Ends (60a32) *ao*n *nec*h *rus-tara*i*g*h *anu .n. .ɼrl–. Finít*. No other copy known. Unpublished.

60a32. Táin Bó Rúanaid Headed 'Tain bo Ruanaid ind so'. Beg. *Do-luid*h *Ruanaid fo*r*sin tai*n. Ends (60a41) con*id*h *an*n *ro soíed*h *i*n *tai*n *.ɼrl–. Fínít*. Ed. Meyer (1912d), with variants from BL MS Harley 5280, fol. 48v; trans. Hyland (1999: 119). Another copy is preserved in RIA MS 23 N 10 (967; Book of Ballycummin), p. 55.

60a43. [Fís Coluim Chille] Prose introduction beg. *Fis at-chon*n*airc Col*um *Cilldea*. Poem beg. *Tarfas da*m-*sa d*ul *f*o*r .s.*, 3 qq. Ends (60b8) *mu b*eith *ic ti*m*tac*h *ci*n *t*ár *.t. .ɼrl–. Fínít*. No other copy known. Ed. Meyer (1908).

60b9. Cath Sléibhe Caín Headed 'Cath Slépe Caín in*n* so'. Beg. *Scuchaid*h *cac*h *co araili díob*h. Ends (60b15) *ɼ maid*h*id*h *f*o*r Clai*n *Morndai .ɼc–. Fínít*. No other copy known. Ed. Meyer (1912e).

60b15. 'Suib*h*ni c*ecinit* so thíos' *Fuar*us *inb*er *soirc*h*i sunt*. 6 qq. No other copy known. Ed. Meyer (1905).

60b31. [Prose *dindšenchas* on Slíab Mis] Beg. *Sliab Mís caun as ro hain*m*nig*ed. Ends (60b41) *la Fótla ɼ Banb*ha *ɼ Eire .ɼc–. Fínít Amen*. Unpublished.[83]

61a1. [The *Aidhbriugh* Glossary] Headed 'A Br*etha* Nei*me* Deid*hi*nach so'. Beg. *aid*h*briu*gh *.i. i*n*dilsiu*gud. Ends (62b17) *it*er *enecl*ainn *ɼ log*h *aisti*. A glossary containing citations from *Bretha Nemed Dédenach*. Ed. *CIH* ii, 603.16–604.38, see *CompCIH*, 28 (includes additional cross references); ed. Stokes (1860: 168–70).

63a1. Dúil Dromma Cetta Headed (marg. sup.) 'Duil Droma Ceta i*n* so', possibly added by a later hand. Beg. [*A*]*rt .i. uasal*. Ends (75b13) *ni ciuin ima crand indiu*. This is an alphabetical glossary and is the most complete extant copy. However, a block of citations under A beg. (74c1) *Annon .i. ébr*aice, and ending (75a42) *ditin .i. dol* (= *CIH* ii, 620.32–621.30) follows the block under T and is therefore out of alphabetical sequence. This glossary also includes a block of six entries written on fol. [vi]r, a small vellum slip between pp. 70 and 71, beg. *M*uin*t*er *.i. cland*. The entries on this vellum tab are omitted in *CIH* but ed. in Stokes (1860: 189).[84] The entire copy is ed. in *CIH* ii, 604.39–621.3, see *CompCIH*, 28; ed. Stokes (1860: 170–96).[85]

75c1. [Glossarial material] Beg. *In principio* (*.i. tos*ac) *fetsit* (*.i. do-roi*ne) *d*eu*s celum ɼ terrum*. Ends (75b21) *m*ur *i*m*at*h *ɼ ce*th *.i. to*n. The source text is *Lebor Gabála Érenn*. Followed by a blank line. Ed. *CIH* ii, 621.36–622.3; ed. Stokes (1860: 196).

75c23. [Glossarial material] Beg. *Ci*n*d*us *a rad*h*a do-s*om *g*ur*ba dalta*. Ends (75c38) *faillec .i. f*er *roi*n*dti na litr*i *re díuis*us. The source text is possibly

[83]For a description of other MS copies, see Stokes (1894: 446–7).

[84]This block is also included in the transcription of this copy of *DDC* on the Early Irish Glossaries Database (www.asnc.cam.ac.uk/irishglossaries; accessed on 27/4/2020).

[85]For a discussion of the MS tradition, see Russell (1996).

Lebor Gabála Érenn. Followed by an unnumbered blank page. Ed. *CIH* ii, 622.4–12; ed. Stokes (1860: 196–7).

76a1. [The *LOMAN* Glossary] Beg. *Lom*h*on .i. lua*m*ain*. Ends (79c3) *ut* est *uci*n*g la sesu*r *f*o*r mui*r. Written on a paper insertion. Contains entries L to U, consisting of *c*. 235 articles corresponding to Corm YAdd 834 onwards (as far as Corm YAdd 1299).[86] Ed. *CIH* ii, 622.13–627.35, see *CompCIH*, 28; ed. Stokes (1860: 197–206).

79c4. [The *IRSAN* Glossary] Beg. *Irsan a*r*si*n uel *g*r*ece ersonu*m. Ends (83b5) *.i. isin sroi*n *bis*. Written in a paper insertion. Contains entries A to S. The text of *Irsan* is closely related to *OM* (see further Moran 2019: 50–3). The glossary is copied by three scribes. One scribe copied the first stratum of glossary material on the top of the page, and left space so that each letter block could be expanded at a later stage. A second scribe then copied additional material underneath into the empty spaces. A third scribe, copying a second stratum, is more haphazard in the placement of the entries. These do not follow alphabetical order and are sometimes written in spaces preceding the relevant letter blocks, thereby giving the impression of a scribe working backwards when copying from a source text.[87] For a more detailed discussion of the process of compilation visible in the *Irsan* Glossary, see Moran (2019: 25–7). Ed. *CIH* ii, 627.36–633.33; Stokes (1860: 206–15); ed. and trans. Moran (2019: 25–7, 249–71).

83*i*. Beg. *M'aonaran dam*h *dar sliab*. 10 qq. This poem was added by a later hand (i.e. Páidín Óg Ó Maoil Chonaire) on the lower half of the page.[88] It occupies eleven lines and is written in one text block instead of in columns, as is the layout used for the preceding pages. Ed. and trans. Carney (1940), from this MS and NLI MS G 3, fol. 22va. A later recension is in TCD MS H 2. 16 (1318; Yellow Book of Lecan), col. 320.16;[89] Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Laud Misc. 615, p. 6.[90]

84a1. [On the diseases and ailments of horses] Beg. *A n-ain*m *Dé tinds-gaint*e*r an leab*u*r so do gal*u*r na n-ec*h. Ends (85b44) ⁊ *druim a*r*d .ɣc–*. Another copy is preserved in RIA MS 24 P 25 (475: Leabhar Chlainne Suibhne), fols. 71vb–72rb. Ed. and trans. from both MSS in Ó Cuív (1954).

86a1. [A glossary on *FÉLIRE ÓENGUSSO*] Beg. *Dál .i. cruin*n*ug*ud *i*d[91] est *re síl dalach doeíne*. Ends (87a26) *ut* est *Siluester sær sallan*n *.ɣc–*. Glosses on the main body of *Félire Óengusso*. Each month begins with the abbreviation *Kl–* and the name of the month written above it in the margin. Followed by one blank line. Unpublished.[92]

[86]Moran 2019: 54.

[87]Moran 2019: 27.

[88]See the scribal colophon in (v), p. 192.

[89]Ed. O'Donovan (1846: 1).

[90]Ed. from Laud in Meyer (1910b: 302–3).

[91]A later hand added a superfluous suprascript *t* above the *i*. For the abbreviation *i* + the *est*-compendium shaped like 2 for *id est* in this manuscript, see, for example, *i*d *est*, p. 3 marg. inf.; *i*d *est*, p. 25a5.

[92]For a discussion of other glossaries on the *Félire*, see Stokes (1905: xii–iv).

87a21. [Five glosses and citations from *Bretha Nemed Toísech*] Beg. *tai .i. mastr*edh. Ends (87a25) *.i. poc ut* est *a me*m *a meblug*ud. Followed by one blank line. The source is identified by the faint marginal note *br*etha *n*em*i* (see *CompCIH*, 184 for similar identifications). The citations are from two sections concerning offences against women. The first gloss, beg. *tai .i. mastr*edh, and citation corresponds to *CIH* vi, 2229.10. The following four glosses, beg. *le .i. lam*, ending (87a26) *a meblug*ud, correspond to the section in *CIH* vi, 2229.11–15.[93] They are omitted in *CIH* and *CompCIH*. Unpublished.

87a27. [A citation and commentary from *Bretha Nemed Toísech*] Beg. *Tteid*he *n*em*tigh*t*h*er *cruit goltraiges gentraiges suantraig*ius. Ends (87a31) *a*con *ti*m*panuig indiu na n-ag*uid *sin*. The citation corresponds to *CIH* vi, 2219.34–5 and Triads §122. This is omitted in *CIH* and *CompCIH*; ed. and trans. O'Curry (1873: 363); Buckley (1978: 64–5).

87a32. [A gloss and citation from *Bretha Nemed Toísech*] Beg. *buan .i. indlicc*ed *ut* est *a*r *is b*úan *berl*a *nadi .íi. a.* Remainder of the column left blank. Corresponds to *CIH* vi, 2223.16–17; *CIH* iv, 1416.27. This is omitted in *CIH* and *CompCIH*; ed. Stokes (1860: 215).

87b1. *IS arra an errdaig* 2 qq. With glosses. From the Epilogue to the *Félire Óengusso*, ll. 181–4; 197–200 (Stokes 1905: 272 and 273). Unpublished.

87b5. [An extract from *Imthúsa Alexandair*] Beg. *for-rocrad di*diu *o Pil*ip qu *irdach an inbotha ⁊ a den*am *uasom co huallach.* Ends (87b11) *In imthe*cht *Alxandai*r est *in bec so*. The first line is similar to that in the Leabhar Breac version of the source (Peters 1967: 106, n. 63). Unpublished.

87b12. [On the seven liberal arts] Beg. *Na heal*ad*a særa .i. gramatica .⁊ diletica. ratorica*. Ends (87b27) *Arsmetca as i indisis nuimir na persand .⁊c–*. Remainder of the column is left blank. This is omitted in *CIH* and *CompCIH*. Unpublished. Copies are also in TCD MS H 3. 18 (1337), vol. 8, p. 169 (= *CIH* ii, 700.14–22; see *CompCIH*, 30); NLI MS G 8, p. 134v19; TCD MS H 2. 13 (1315), p. 14*i*.[94]

87*i*. Poem written in a different hand across the bottom of the page, occupying five lines. Barely legible.

Abbreviations

See also the list of *Celtica*'s standard abbreviations at the end of the volume.

CompCIH	Liam Breatnach, *A Companion to the Corpus Iuris Hibernici* (Dublin, 2005).
Corm Y	*Sanas Cormaic*, manuscript YBL, with articles common to the short recension (ed. Meyer 1912).
Corm YAdd	*Sanas Cormaic*, manuscript YBL, additional articles in the long recension (ed. Meyer 1912).

[93]These glosses are also found in O'Davoren's Glossary, i.e. *CIH* iv, 1512.13–14; *CIH* iv, 1525.16; *CIH* iv, 1515.8–9.

[94]For further discussion of medieval medico-philosophical texts, see Shaw (1940: 146–7).

DDC	*Dúil Dromma Cetta*, ed. in Whitley Stokes, 'Irish glosses, edited by a member of the Council from a manuscript in the library of Trinity College, Dublin [H. 3. 18, p. 61, col.1]', *Transactions of the Philological Society* 6 (1860), 168–215.
ISOS	Irish Script on Screen (https://www.isos.dias.ie).
OM	Pádraic Moran (ed.), *De Origine Scoticae Linguae (O'Mulconry's Glossary): An Early Irish Linguistic Tract, Edited with a Related Glossary, Irsan* (Turnhout, 2019).
SM	*Senchas Már*.
TCD Cat.	T. K. Abbott and E. G. Gwynn, *Catalogue of the Irish Manuscripts in the Library of Trinity College, Dublin* (Dublin, 1921).
Triads	Kuno Meyer (ed.), *The Triads of Ireland* (Dublin, 1906).
YBL	TCD MS H 2. 16 (1318: Yellow Book of Lecan).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ARBUTHNOT, SHARON 2007: *Cóir Anmann: a Late Middle Irish Treatise on Personal Names, Part 2*, Irish Texts Society, vol. 60 (Dublin).

ATKINSON, ROBERT 1880: *The Book of Leinster sometime called the Book of Glendalough: A Collection of Pieces (Prose and Verse) in the Irish Language, Compiled, in Part, About the Middle of the Twelfth Century* (Dublin).

BINCHY, D. A. 1970: *Críth Gablach*, Mediaeval and Modern Irish Series, vol. xi (Dublin).

——, 1971: 'An archaic legal poem', *Celtica* 9, 152–68.

——, 1983: '*De fontibus iuris Romani*', *Celtica* 15, 13–17.

BREATNACH, LIAM 1981: 'The Caldron of Poesy', *Ériu* 32, 45–93.

——, 1984: 'Addenda and corrigenda to "The caldron of poesy"', *Ériu* 35, 189–91.

——, 1990: 'Lawyers in Early Ireland', in Daire Hogan and W. N. Osborough (eds), *Brehons, Serjeants and Attorneys: Studies in the History of the Irish Legal Profession* (Dublin), 1–13.

——, 1998: '*Cáin Ónae*: an Old-Irish law text on lending', in Jay Jasanoff, H. Craig Melchert and Lisi Olivier (eds), *Mír Curad: Studies in Honor of Calvert Watkins* (Innsbruck), 29–46.

——, 2017: 'The *Trefocal Tract*: an early Middle Irish text on poetics', in Gordon Ó Riain (ed.), *Dá dTrian Feasa Fiafraighidh: Essays on the Irish Grammatical and Metrical Tradition* (Dublin), 1–66.

——, 2017: *Córus Bésgnai: An Old-Irish Law Tract on the Church and Society* (Dublin).

BUCKLEY, ANN 1978: 'What was the *tiompán*? A problem in ethnohistorical organology: evidence in Irish literature', *Jahrbuch für musikalische Volks- und Völkerkunde* 9, 53–88.

BYRNE, F. J. 1980: 'The lament for Cummíne Foto', *Ériu* 31 (1980), 111–22.

BYRNE, MARY E. 1908: '*Airec menman Uraird maic Coisse*', in Osborn Bergin, Kuno Meyer and J. G. O'Keeffe (eds), *Anecdota from Irish Manuscripts*, 2 (Halle and Dublin, 1908), 42–76.

Calder, George 1917: *Auraicept na nÉces: The Scholars' Primer, Being the Texts of the Ogham Tract from the Book of Ballymote and the Yellow Book of Lecan, and the Text of the Trefhocul from the Book of Leinster* (Edinburgh).

Carey, John 1982: 'Where is Hell?' *Béaloideas* 50, 42–3.

——, 1984: '*Scél Tuáin Meic Chairill*', *Ériu* 35, 93–111.

——, 1996: 'Obscure styles in medieval Ireland', *Mediaevalia* 19, 23–39.

——, 2014: 'Saint Brendan on the fear of death', in John Carey, Emma Nic Cárthaigh and Caitríona Ó Dochartaigh (eds), *The End and Beyond: Medieval Irish Eschatology* (Aberystwyth), 447–51.

Carney, James 1940: '*M'aenarán dam isa sliab*', *Éigse* 2, 107–113.

——, 1969: 'The Ó Cianáin Miscellany', *Ériu* 21, 122–47.

Charles-Edwards, T. M. 2014: 'The manuscript transmission of *Bretha Comaithchesa*', in Elizabeth Boyle and Deborah Hayden (eds), *Authorities and Adaptations: The Reworking and Transmission of Textual Sources in Medieval Ireland* (Dublin), 95–120.

Charles-Edwards, T. M. and Kelly, Fergus 1983: *Bechbretha: An Old Irish Law-Tract on Bee-Keeping* (Dublin).

Cunningham, Bernadette and Gillespie, Raymond 2008–9: 'Muirgheas Ó Maoilchonaire of Cluain Plocáin: an early sixteenth-century Connacht scribe at work', *Studia Hibernica* 35, 17–43.

Culverwell, Beatrice 1913: 'Quatrains from H. 2. 12', *Hermathena* 17, 133–6.

Dillon, Myles 1963: 'Laud Misc. 610 (cont.)', *Celtica* 6, 135–55.

Etchingham, Colmán 1999: *Church Organisation in Ireland A.D. 650 to 1000* (Maynooth).

Grosjean, Paul 1937: 'Textes hagiographiques irlandais', *EC* 2, 269–303.

Gumbert, J. P. 2011: 'The tacketed quire: an exercise in comparative codicology', *Scriptorium* 65 no. 2, 299–320.

Gwynn, E. J. 1924: *The Metrical Dindsenchas*, vol. 4, Todd Lecture Series 11 (Dublin).

Gwynn, E. J. and Purton, Walter J. 1911–12: 'The monastery of Tallaght', *PRIA* 29 C, 115–79.

Hamel, A. G. van 1933: *Compert Con Culainn and Other Stories*, Mediaeval and Modern Irish Series 3 (Dublin).

Hennessy, W. M. and Kelly, D. H. 1875: *The Book of Fenagh in Irish and English*, originally compiled by St Caillín (Dublin).

Henry, P. L. 1981: 'The Caldron of Poesy', *SC* 14–15, 114–28.

——, 1995: '*Amrae Con Roí* (*ACR*): discussion, edition, translation', *EC* 31, 179–94.

Hull, Vernam 1933: 'The old woman or nun of Beare', *ZCP* 19, 174–6.

——, 1934: 'The conception of Conchobor', in J. Fraser, P. Grosjean, and J. G. O'Keeffe (eds), *Irish Texts*, iv (London), 4–12.

——, 1950: 'The text of *Baile Binnbérlach mac Buain* from MS 23.N.10 of the Royal Irish Academy', *JCS* 1, 94–7.

——, 1968: '*Apgitir Chrábaid*: The Alphabet of Piety', *Celtica* 8, 44–89.

Hyland, Catherine 1999: '*Crecha* und *tána*: Rinderraubzüge in der Geschichte und Literatur Irlands', in Erich Poppe and Hildegard Tristram (eds), *Übersetzung, Adaptation und Akkulturation im insularen Mittelalter* (Münster, 1999), 105–22.
Kelly, Fergus 1976: 'The Old Irish tree-list', *Celtica* 11, 107–24.
——, 1986: 'An Old-Irish text on court procedure', *Peritia* 5, 74–106.
Kobel, Chantal 2021 (forthcoming): 'The codicology of late medieval Irish legal manuscripts: a preliminary study of TCD MS H 3.18 (1337), pp. 1–87', *Care and Conservation of Manuscripts 17: Proceedings of the Seventeenth International Seminar Held at the University of Copenhagen 13th–15th April 2018* (Copenhagen).
Mac an Bhaird, A. 1980: 'Varia II. Tadhg mac Céin and the Badgers', *Ériu* 31, 150–5.
Mac Eoin, Gearóid 1977: 'The lament for Cuimine Fota', *Ériu* 28, 17–31.
Mac Mathúna, Séamas 1985: *Immram Brain: Bran's Journey to the Land of the Women* (Tübingen).
Macalister, R. A. S. 1933: *Lebor Gabála Érenn: The Book of the Taking of Ireland*, vol. 2, Irish Texts Society 35 (Dublin).
MacCotter, Paul 2008: *Medieval Ireland: Territorial, Political and Economic Divisions* (Dublin).
MacNeill, Eoin 1923: 'Ancient Irish Law: the Law of Status or Franchise', *PRIA* 36C, 256–316.
——, 1981: *Celtic Ireland* (Dublin 1921, repr. 1981 with introduction and notes by Donnchadh Ó Corráin).
Manning, Gerald 2004: '*Míadślechtae*: an Old Irish law tract on status', unpublished PhD thesis, Trinity College, Dublin.
McKenna, Lambert 1938: *Dioghluim Dána* (Dublin).
McManus, Damian 1988: 'Irish letter-names and their kennings', *Ériu* 39, 127–68.
——, 1997: *A Guide to Ogam* (Maynooth).
Meroney, Howard 1953: 'Studies in early Irish satire: III. "*Tréfhocal fócrai*"', *JCS* 2, 59–130.
Meyer, Kuno 1892: '*Scél Baili Binnbérlaig*', *RC* 13, 220–7.
——, 1892b: *Aislinge Meic Conglinne* (London).
——, 1892c: 'Anecdota from Irish MSS (V)', *Gaelic Journal* 4, 113–16.
——, 1894: *Hibernica Minora, Being a Fragment of an Old-Irish Treatise on the Psalter* (Oxford).
——, 1896: 'Corrigenda', *RC* 17, 319.
——, 1905: 'A poem ascribed to Suibne Geilt', *Ériu* 2, 95.
——, 1905b: 'Miscellen', *ZCP* 5, 184–8.
——, 1905c: 'Mitteilungen aus irischen Handschriften: Eine mystische Auslegung der Tonleiter', *ZCP* 5, 497–8.
——, 1905d: 'Mitteilungen aus irischen Handschriften: Vier Gründe für fleißigen Kreuzesgang', *ZCP* 5, 498.
——, 1906b: *Contributions to Irish Lexicography*, 1 (Halle).

——, 1907: ‘Fingen mac Flainn’s Gedicht auf die Fir Arddae’, in Whitley Stokes and Kuno Meyer (eds), *Archiv für celtische Lexikographie* 3 (Halle), 291–301.
——, 1907b: ‘Neue Mitteilungen aus irischen Handschriften: König Guaire und Oennu maccu Laigse’, in Whitley Stokes and Kuno Meyer (eds), *Archiv für celtische Lexikographie* 3 (Halle), 1–2.
——, 1907c: ‘Neue Mitteilungen aus irischen Handschriften: Sieben Seelenmessen befreien aus der Hölle’, in Whitley Stokes and Kuno Meyer (eds), *Archiv für celtische Lexikographie* 3 (Halle), 216.
——, 1907d: ‘A medley of Irish texts (VII)’, in Whitley Stokes and Kuno Meyer (eds), *Archiv für celtische Lexikographie* 3 (Halle), 310.
——, 1907e: ‘Sources of some Middle-Irish glossaries’, *Archiv für Celtische Lexicographie* 3 (Halle), 138–44.
——, 1908: ‘Mitteilungen aus irischen Handschriften: Ein Traum Colum Cille’s’, *ZCP* 6, 260.
——, 1908b: ‘Mitteilungen aus irischen Handschriften: Corbmac Cuilennain cecinit’, *ZCP* 6, 270–1.
——, 1908c: ‘Mitteilungen aus irischen Handschriften: Hinterlassenschaft eines Mönches’, *ZCP* 6, 271.
——, 1908d: ‘Mitteilungen aus irischen Handschriften: Die acht Horen zur Bekämpfung der Todsünden’, *ZCP* 6, 271.
——, 1908e: ‘Mitteilungen aus irischen Handschriften: Gute Ratschläge’, *ZCP* 6, 271–2.
——, 1910: ‘Altirische Reimsprüche’, *ZCP* 7, 498.
——, 1910b: ‘Mitteilungen aus irischen Handschriften: Gedichte aus Laud 615’, *ZCP* 7, 300–4.
——, 1910c: ‘*Traigshruth Firchertne*’, in Osborn Bergin, R. I. Best, Kuno Meyer, and J.G. O’Keeffe (eds), *Anecdota from Irish Manuscripts*, 3 (Halle and Dublin), 43–5.
——, 1912: ‘*Sanas Cormaic*: an Old-Irish glossary compiled by Cormac úa Cuilennáin, King-Bishop of Cashel in the ninth century’, in Osborn Bergin, R. I. Best, Kuno Meyer (eds), *Anecdota from Irish Manuscripts*, 4 (Halle and Dublin), 1–128.
——, 1912b: ‘Mitteilungen aus irischen Handschriften: Toghuil tsītha Truim inn so’, *ZCP* 8, 104.
——, 1912c: ‘Mitteilungen aus irischen Handschriften: Toghmarc Baisi bandruad ind so’, *ZCP* 8, 104.
——, 1912d: ‘Mitteilungen aus irischen Handschriften: Tāin Bō Rūanaid ind so’, *ZCP* 8, 104–5.
——, 1912e: ‘Mitteilungen aus irischen Handschriften: Cath Sléphe Cāin inso’, *ZCP* 8, 105.
——, 1912f: ‘Mitteilungen aus irischen Handschriften: Randglossen und Reimereien aus H. 3.18’, *ZCP* 8, 107.
——, 1913: ‘Mitteilungen aus irischen Handschriften: Altirische Reimsprüche’, *ZCP* 9, 167.

——, 1913b: ‘Mitteilungen aus irischen Handschriften: Verschiedenes aus Harleian 5280, fol. 57 b’, *ZCP* 9, 176.
——, 1913c: ‘Mitteilungen aus irischen Handschriften: Verschiedenes aus Egerton 1782’, *ZCP* 9, 176–7.
——, 1918: ‘Mitteilungen aus irischen Handschriften: Ein Gedicht in bérla na filed’, *ZCP* 12, 360–1.
——, 1918b: ‘Mitteilungen aus irischen Handscriften (Forsetzung): Allerlei Rechtssprüche’, *ZCP* 12, 361–5.
——, 1919: *Bruchtstücke der Älteren Lyrik Irlands* (Berlin).
——, 1921: ‘Mitteilungen aus irischen Handschriften: Slán aitiri cairddi’, *ZCP* 13, 24–5.
MEYER, KUNO and NUTT, ALFRED 1895: *The Voyage of Bran, son of Febal to the Land of the Living* (London 1895, repr. 1994).
MURPHY, GERARD 1953: ‘The lament of the old Woman of Beare’, *PRIA* 55 C 4, 83–109
MURRAY, KEVIN 2000: ‘A Middle-Irish tract on *cró* and *díbad*’, in Alfred Smyth (ed.), *Seanchas: Studies in Early and Medieval Irish Archaeology, History and Literature in Honour of Francis. J. Byrne* (Dublin), 251–60.
Ó CUÍV, BRIAN 1954: ‘Fragments of two medieval treatises on horses’, *Celtica* 2, 30–63.
——, 1985: ‘Fragments of Irish medieval treatises on horses’, *Celtica* 17, 113–22.
O DALY, MÁIRÍN 1968: ‘*Úar in lathe do Lum Laine*’, in James Carney and David Greene (eds), *Celtic Studies: Essays in Memory of Angus Matheson 1912–1962* (London), 99–108.
Ó HAODHA, DONNCHA 1989: ‘The lament of the Old Woman of Beare’, in Donnchadh Ó Corráin, Liam Breatnach and Kim McCone (eds), *Sages, Saints and Storytellers: Celtic Studies in Honour of Professor James Carney* (Maynooth), 308–11.
O’CURRY, EUGENE 1855: *Cath Mhuighe Léana or the Battle of Magh Leana, together with Tochmarc Moméra or the Courtship of Moméra* (Dublin).
——, 1861: *Lectures on the Manuscript Materials of Ancient Irish History, delivered at the Catholic University of Ireland during the sessions of 1855 and 1856* (Dublin).
——, 1873: *On the Manners and Customs of the Ancient Irish: A Series of Lectures*, 3 (London).
O’DONOGHUE, TADHG 1921–3: ‘Advice to a prince’, *Ériu* 9, 43–54.
O’DONOVAN, JOHN 1846: ‘An ancient poem attributed to St. Columbkille; with a translation and notes’, *Miscellany of the Irish Archaeological Society* (Dublin), 1.
O’GRADY, STANDISH HAYES 1892: *Silva Gadelica*, 2 vols (London).
O’SULLIVAN, ANNE and O’SULLIVAN, WILLIAM 1962: ‘Edward Lhuyd’s collection of Irish manuscripts’, *Transactions of the Honourable Society of Cymmrodorion*, 57–76.
O’SULLIVAN, WILLIAM, 2000: ‘The manuscript collection of Dubhaltach Mac Fhirbhisigh’, in Alfred Smyth (ed.), *Seanchas: Studies in Early and*

Medieval Irish Archaeology, History and Literature in Honour of Francis J. Byrne (Dublin), 439–47.

Peters, Erik 1967: 'Die irische Alexandersage', *ZCP* 30, 71–264.

Plummer, Charles 1923: 'Notes on some passages in the Brehon Laws [13–25]', *Ériu* 9, 31–42.

——, 1923b: 'Notes on some passages in the Brehon Laws III [26–27]', *Ériu* 9, 109–17.

Qiu, Fangzhe 2013: 'Wandering cows and obscure words: a rimeless poem from legal manuscripts and beyond', *Studia Celtica Fennica* 10, 91–111.

Russell, Paul 1996: '*Dúil Dromma Cetta* and Cormac's Glossary', *EC* 32, 147–74.

Shaw, Francis 1940: 'Medieval medico-philosophical treatises in the Irish language', in John Ryan (ed.), *Féil-sgríbhinn Eóin Mhic Néill: Essays and Studies Presented to Professor Eóin Mac Néill* (Dublin), 144–57.

Smith, Roland 1934: 'A tract on the *áes fíachach*', in J. Fraser, P. Grosjean, and J. G. O'Keeffe (eds), *Irish Texts*, iv (London), 13–16.

Stacey, Robin 1986: '*Berrad airechta*: an Old Irish tract on suretyship', in T. M. Charles-Edwards, Morfydd E. Owen, and D. B. Walters (eds), *Lawyers and laymen: Studies in the History of Law presented to Professor Dafydd Jenkins on his Seventy-Fifth Birthday, Gŵyl Ddewi 1986* (Cardiff), 210–33.

——, 1994: *The Road to Judgment: from Custom to Court in Medieval Ireland and Wales* (Philadelphia).

Stokes, Whitley 1860: 'Irish glosses, edited by a member of the Council from a manuscript in the library of Trinity College, Dublin [H. 3. 18, p. 61, col. 1]', *Transactions of the Philological Society* 6, 168–215.

——, 1862: *Three Irish Glossaries* (London).

——, 1880: *On the Calendar of Oengus*, Transactions of the Royal Irish Academy, Irish Manuscripts Series 1.1 (Dublin).

——, 1894: 'The prose tales in the Rennes *dindshenchas*', *RC* 15, 272–336, 418–84, 446–7.

——, 1900: '*Acallamh na senórach*', in Ernst Windisch and Whitley Stokes (eds), *Irische Texte mit Wörterbuch*, 4:1 (Leipzig), 1–438.

——, 1905: 'The eulogy of Cúrói (*Amra Chonrói*)', *Ériu* 2, 1–14.

——, 1905b: *The Martyrology of Oengus the Culdee* (London).

Thurneysen, Rudolf, 1918: '*Tochmarc Cruinn ocus Macha*,' *ZCP* 12, 251–4.

——, 1925: '*Cóic Conara Fugill*: Die fünf Wege zum Urteil', *Abhandlungen der preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Klasse*, Jahrgang 1925, Nr 7 (Berlin).

——, 1928: 'Die Bürgschaft im irischen Recht', *Abhandlungen der preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Klasse* (Berlin), 5–32.

——, 1930: 'Aus dem irischen Recht V', *ZCP* 18, 375–408.

——, 1933: 'Allerlei Nachträge', *ZCP* 19, 125–33.

——, 1936: ‘Heirat’, in D. A. Binchy et al. (eds), *Studies in Early Irish Law* (Dublin, 1936), 109–28.

VENDRYES, JOSEPH 1953: *Airne Fíngein*, Mediaeval and Modern Irish Series 15 (Dublin).

YOCUM, CHRISTOPHER Guy 2013: ‘Edition of a dialogue between Cormac and Fíthal’, *Éigse* 38, 20–40.

CHANTAL KOBEL

Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies

MAOILÍN ÓG MAC BRUAIDEADHA AND THE DECLINE OF PATRONAGE

Abstract

This paper presents an edition, with translation and notes, of a poem on the decline of patronage and on the inadvisability of pursuing poetry as a profession. It was composed *c.* 1600 by Maoilín Óg Mac Bruaideadha (†1602), and is implicitly critical of Donnchadh Ó Briain, fourth Earl of Thomond.

The poem edited here is ascribed in a single surviving witness to 'Maoilín Óg'. It is the last in a sequence of 'five poemes and epigrames' appended to a manuscript tract entitled 'An instruction for those that desire to attaine to the understanding of the irish tongue', written by John Brody in 1640 for 'mr Therlaugh o Teig', attendant to Barnaby, sixth Earl of Thomond.[1] From the context, we can be sure that the author is Maoilín Óg (mac Maoilín mheic Conchobhair) Mac Bruaideadha, of Co. Clare, who died on the last day of December 1602, according to the *Annals of the Four Masters*.[2] He was the author of a number of praise-poems and *seanchas*-poems: a list of those of the latter variety composed by him in *dán díreach* is given by the Four Masters in his obituary, some of which show his affinity with the Í Bhriain, Clann Ghormáin and Í Lochlainn. He is also noteworthy for his involvement in the first stage (*c.* 1592–5) of the translation and printing of *Tiomna Nvadh ar dTighearna* in Trinity College Dublin,[3] which would eventually be completed in 1602, the year of his death. Both the Four Masters and Bishop Uilliam Ó Domhnuill attest to Maoilín Óg's reputation for learning, the latter terming him 'duine iúlmhar sa teanguidh ghaoidheilge',[4] the former commenting, 'Ní bhaoí i nerinn i nén pearsain Seanchaidh, file, agus fear dána do bfearr inás'.[5]

[1]Oxford, Bodleian Library MS F.2.34 Linc., described in Ó Cuív (2001, 2003: I, 280–1). The poem occurs at pp [14].22 – [18].4 (scribal pagination), or fols [9]v22–[11]v4 (catalogue foliation). An edition of the tract is in preparation. Two of the five appended poems are edited in Ó Macháin (2017).

[2]*AFM* VI, 2320 (my thanks to Kenneth Nicholls for discussing with me matters of chronology within the 1602 entry); O'Rahilly (1922: §24); McGrath (1943: 61). Further commentary of relevance to Maoilín Óg and Clann Bhruaideadha will be found in Ó Murchadha (1999) and McInerney (2012).

[3]In 1596 he had returned to Clare, where, in August of that year, he served on a jury for a Commission of Enquiry at Ennis (Ainsworth 1961: §930).

[4]*Tiomna Nvadh ar dTighearna agvs ar Slanaightheora Iosa Criosd* (Baile Átha Cliath, 1602), preliminary pages, fol [3]v ('Do Chum an Leughthora').

[5]Cf. Lughaidh Ó Cléirigh's description of him: 'file foircthi fíreolach . . . saoí shenchaidh agus fir dhána' (*Beatha Aodha Ruaidh* I, 208).

 ©Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies

The decline of patronage, learning and poetry

This poem belongs to a genre that emerged during the sixteenth century and continued throughout the seventeenth. It treats of the decline of patronage due to the changing times and of the consequent decline in the practice of poetry. This was a theme that was, to an extent, already recognisable as a rhetorical element in the bardic elegiac tradition, particularly in laments composed on the death of fellow poets but also in elegies for patrons, where one of the topoi was the resulting isolation of the poet and the implicit dim prospects for poetry or patronage after the death of the individual in question.[6] Another manifestation of the theme allowed for its exploitation as a vehicle of praise in which patronage was viewed as confined exclusively in a single, superlative patron, and therefore, implicitly or explicitly, as absent or in decline elsewhere.[7]

The new realization of this theme, however, differs in its breadth and its more generalized application, in the ironic tone in which it is frequently delivered, and especially in that it occurs in the socio-political context of conquest and plantation, having a point of reference in actuality insofar as the demise of the professional learned orders was or would become a reality. There was much variety in this, and it gave rise to what is arguably one of the finest bardic poems of that era, that by Fearghal Óg Mac an Bhaird beginning *Ní maith altuighim mh'onáir*.[8] This poem by Fearghal Óg shows how the theme of the demise of learning merged with that of the conquest of Ireland and the rise of the uneducated lower orders, which, decades later, would cause Ó Bruadair to regret all that he had expended on art, and that he was not a 'dubhthuata' ('a thick ignoramus') so that at least he could enjoy the fraternity of 'daoinibh duarca'.[9] A special type of 'dubhthuata' was he who pretended to a knowledge of poetry sufficient to criticise the works of the bards and to compose poems himself. Such 'amadáin' are the subject of Fear Feasa Ó'n Cháinte's poem beginning *Mór do-ghníd daoine dhíobh féin*, where their efforts at criticism and composition are characterized as 'Briathra forránta, feidhm tim' ('violent verbiage followed by feeble effort' (O'Grady's translation)).[10] This in turn might lead bona fide practitioners to simplify their poems in order to render them more intelligible. In his poem on the decline of poetry beginning *Ionmholta malairt bhisigh*, which has been dated to 1603, Eochaidh Ó hEódhasa refers with sarcasm to the contemporary preference for 'shórt gnáthach grés robhog'[11] and the 'dán bog' or 'dán fallsa'.[12] He claims that this soft poetry is something at which he can excel:

[6]E.g. *Ir. Bardic Poetry*, Poem 38; *Aith. Dána*, Poem 12; *TDall*, Poem 25.
[7]E.g. Ó Cuív (1974: 271); Ó Cuív (1987); *Ir. Bardic Poetry*, Poem 28; *LBranach*, Poem 67.
[8]Ó Macháin (2007).
[9]Mac Erlean (1910: Poem XIII); de Brún et al. (1975: Poem 38).
[10]*BMus. Cat.* I, 555–7.
[11]Cf. 'Rabhán gnáth, briathra boga' (*A mheic ná meabhraigh éigsi*, q. 3).
[12]*Ir. Bardic Poetry*, Poem 30, qq 2, 5, 9.

Mo gheallsa ar bhuga ar mhaoile
ní bhéardaois daoithe an bheatha:
do-chuaidh mé, maith an tuicsi,
le cách fa uisge an cheatha.

'The dunces of the world would not beat me in softness and artlessness: I have gone out in the rain like the rest – a wise course.'[13]

Maoilín Óg Mac Bruaideadha's poem, edited here, takes the form of cautionary advice tendered by a father, embittered by personal experience of the changed times, to his naïve son,[14] who aspires to a career as a poet and wishes to receive training in a school of poetry. In this general theme, the poem accords with better-known poems already referenced above, and in particular with two by Maoilín Óg's contemporary, Mathghamhain Ó hIfearnáin:[15] *Ceist cia do cheinneóchadh dán*[16] and *A mheic ná meabhraigh éigsi*.[17] The present poem shares with the latter a gambit – advice to a son – which locates both poems within the larger context of a sub-group of wisdom poetry.[18]

Also at the beginning of the poem, Maoilín Óg invokes (q. 2) a millenarian prophecy, apparently concerning the demise of Gaelic civilization, one that specifically relates to the year 1600. This coincides with the record of a prophecy purveyed by the Earl of Thomond at the time of the Battle of Kinsale regarding the defeat of the Irish – as noted in q. 2*d* n. – and it also connects with a common motif in the poetry of the time. This is articulated at the opening of a similarly themed and near contemporary poem by an anonymous poet, as follows:

Mairg rug ar an aimsirsi,
aimsior gan iocht gan úaisli;
fada atá dá tairngire,
a teacht cá cás is crúaidhe?

'Unfortunate anyone overtaken by this cruel and barbarous time, long predicted but harsher still in effect!'[19]

These prophecies might be ascribed to named saints, Colum Cille especially,[20] which brings to mind Maoilín Óg's recorded invocation in 1599 of a prophecy by the same saint in his dealings with Aodh Ruadh Ó Domhnaill (see q. 12*c* n.).

[13]Ibid., q. 6, and translation p. 270.
[14]Addressed directly in qq 2, 10, 14–17. See note to q. 1*a*, below.
[15]O'Rahilly (1922: §15).
[16]*Ir. Bardic Poetry*, Poem 37.
[17]*BMus. Cat.* I, 392–3.
[18]Ó Macháin (2015: 334–7). This shared gambit is compounded by a verbal echo in q. 1 of the present poem, see q. 1b n. below.
[19]Breatnach (1989: 58, 61).
[20]Cf. 'Do thairngir Colom ar mbrón' (*Dán na mB. Mionúr*, Poem 28.7).

They might also be ascribed to a range of saints,[21] or might be referred to in a more general, unspecific way, as in the elegy on Maol Mórdha Ó Raghallaigh in 1635/6:

> Fáidhe agus naoimh cionn a ccionn
> tarfás dóibh dílgheann Éirionn
> le sluagh Danmarg leachtach lonn,
> le neartchath langharg Lonnonn.
>
> 'To the prophets and saints one by one was revealed the destruction of Ireland by the deadly, fierce Danes, by the powerful, rough-weaponed battalion of London.'[22]

Following these two introductory quatrains the focus of Maoilín Óg's poem is threefold. He firstly (qq 3–5) warns his son that, before he goes anywhere in pursuit of learning, he should consider whether gainful employment awaits him on his return: the father suggests not, and that the son would be better familiarizing himself with plough and flail. He secondly (qq 6–9) advises that, even if he were to go, the schools that existed in better times are now no more. Here the litany of the lost has obvious rhetorical affinities with the enumeration of deceased poets and patrons in similarly themed poems.[23] Maoilín Óg's third point (qq 10–15) is that the son should consider his father's – the poet's – own experience of 'síordhrud síos' ('constant demotion'), brought about by disrespect and lack of patronage; this would never have happened during the reign of earlier Kings of Thomond (qq 16–17), implying that the reign of the current Ó Briain, Donnchadh, fourth Earl of Thomond, is not what it should be with regard to patronage.

Maoilín Óg's first two points are in line with aspects of the treatment of this theme by contemporary poets. For instance, the disappearance of the bardic schools ('gan mharthain na sgol') and bardic families in the four provinces is the subject of a short poem by Fear Flatha Ó Gnímh, which attributes the cause to social inversion in the memorable couplet 'fuil chrannda dá cara i gcion / 's na fola arda ísiol' ('lowborn blood held in regard while noble blood is low').[24]

The second point on the desirability of poets seeking alternative employment is referred to in other poems also. For example, the same Fear Flatha, in a poem beginning *Mairg do-chuaidh re ceird ndúthchais*, expresses the following sentiments:

> Dursan nár mhúin oide an fhis
> riadh stéad nó stiúradh loingis,
> nó snaidhm chéacht i ndeaghaidh damh,
> d'fhearaibh na ndréacht do dhéanamh.

[21]See Ó Caithnia (1984: 169).
[22]*O'Reillys*, Poem XII.4; translation by present writer.
[23]E.g. *DDána*, Poem 115; Ó Lochlainn (1939); Breatnach (1999).
[24]*DDána*, Poem 115.10.

> Mairg d'ollamh dá nárbh aithnidh
> ceard nábudh cúis iomaithbhir,
> d'uaim chláraidh, do dheilbh dhabhcha,
> sul tárraidh feidhm foghlamtha.
>
> 'Alas that the fosterer in lore did not teach the breaking of steeds, or the steering of ships, or the yoking of ploughs behind oxen, to the men who compose lays.
>
> Woe to the scholar who knows not some craft that would be no cause of censure, that he might join timbers, or shape a vat, ere he attained the service of learning.'[25]

A later example is that of a poem by Cian Ó hEachaidhéin addressed to Cormac Ó Néill *c.* 1680, in which he asks his advice regarding a change of occupation ('búta ar mhalairt') that might appeal more to the newcomers to Ireland, who are now in the ascendant. In order to escape from the general odium directed towards poets ('lán gach aon d'fhuath na bhfileadh'), he requests that Cormac make arrangements with craftsmen to swap occupations with him: 'meall a cheird ón chíoradóir,[26] . . . fagh iomlaoíd ón úcoire . . . Malairt 'na thráth dénaidh dhúin . . . re lucht sírdhénta snáthod.'[27] ('entice his craft from the comb-maker . . . arrange an exchange with the fuller . . . make a timely swap with those who are forever making needles.') As has been pointed out elsewhere in reference to Tadhg Dall's expression of regret at not having being reared to cut thistles, irrespective of this being a literary motif and of its largely ironic usage in the poetry, the reality of the phenomenon of change in occupation is underlined by the well-known case of Eoin Agniw, who in 1699 had 'forsaken the Muses and betaken himself to the plow.'[28]

Bráthair don bhás an doidhbhreas

The third point of Maoilín Óg's argument – that of his personal experience of disappointment – is best considered in the light of another poem, that beginning *Bráthair don bhás an doidhbhreas*.[29] This poem is composed in *óglách*as of *Rannaigheacht Bheag.* The burden of the poem – styled a 'poem on poverty' by O'Grady[30] – is that the poet has fallen on hard times, deserted by his friends. The fact that an individual described as 'triath Fhorghais', the summit of fame of the race of Blod (ll. 42–3), does not come to his aid signifies a separation ('deadhail', l. 41) from the poet. As a consequence of this loss of patronage, the poet's accomplishments and virtues are overlooked by all, who judge him solely by his lack of means. In response to this, in one of the most

[25]*Ir. Bardic Poetry*, Poem 28.5–6, and translation p. 267.
[26]Cf. 'uaisle dul re déiniomh cíor' in Ó hIfearnáin's *Ceist cia do cheinneóchadh dán* (q. 4).
[27]*LCAB*, Poem XII, ll. 53–60.
[28]Ó Macháin (2010: 72).
[29]*Measgra Dánta* I, Poem 26.
[30]*BMus. Cat.* I, 531–3.

interesting sections of the poem (ll. 45–76), the author threatens to avenge this neglect by accusing his erstwhile patron of a number of practices that are contrary, it is implied, to what is expected of him by those in authority.

The poet will say that the patron in question is generous and – in order to supply that generosity – that he is consequently rapacious (ll. 45–8); in contravention of the royal decree (*i n-aghaidh reachta an Phrionnsa*) he honours those who should not be honoured (ll. 49–52); he worships images and frequents a (holy) well (ll. 53–6); he befriends enemies and is distant to friends (ll. 57–60); he is arrogant, unyielding, and he listens to poetry (ll. 61–4); he practises billeting and raises levies (ll. 65–8). In hope of satirising his patron, the poet will say that the Í Bhriain possess only as far as Limerick, and – anticipating the *Iomarbhágh* – that Leath Cuinn is superior to Leath Mogha (ll. 69–76). The sources of this poem are not earlier than the eighteenth century and those few that include an ascription name Maoilín Óg Mac Bruaideadha as author. As the poem clearly has to do with one of the Í Bhriain of Thomond – Maoilín Óg refuses to name him (l. 38) – O'Rahilly suggested Conchubhar, third Earl, as the unnamed subject, and narrowed the date of composition to 1576 × 1579.[31]

The poem edited here bears an internal date of 1600 (q. 2), and belongs therefore to a period closer to the poet's death in 1602 than that postulated by O'Rahilly for *Bráthair don bhás an doidhbhreas*. Irrespective of the question of date, *Bráthair don bhás* may be regarded as providing a background to the poem by Maoilín Óg edited here. The latter poem resonates with aspects of *Bráthair don bhás* in two respects: the decline in the fortunes of the poet resulting in his isolation (see notes to qq 13 and 14 below), and the implication of lack of patronage among the Í Bhriain. Because the theme is more general than a rehearsal of the poet's own situation, however, we are to understand that poetry has declined throughout all the land. While reference to religion in *Bráthair don bhás* aligns that poem with other compositions such as *Mairg rug ar an aimsirsi*, assigned by its editor to a near identical period to that suggested by O'Rahilly for *Bráthair don bhás*,[32] it would certainly not be out of place at the very end of the sixteenth century. Given the authorial and thematic connection with the poem edited here, *Bráthair don bhás* may well be contemporary with it, and, if so, Conchubhar's son, the Protestant fourth Earl (1581–1624), Donnchadh Ó Briain, may be the target of both poems. This would be consistent with the uneasy relationship between Ó Briain and other poets as articulated by Aonghus Ó Dálaigh and Tadhg mac Dáire,[33] and especially with Maoilín Óg's reported stratagem of praise in 1599 for Aodh Ruadh Ó Domhnaill, referred to above, and his invocation of the curse of Colum Cille on Dál gCais, which can scarcely have endeared him to Ó Briain.

[31] *Measgra Dánta* I, 80.

[32] Breatnach (1989).

[33] Ní Úrdail (2004); McLaughlin (2005). The close connection between Donnchadh and Tadhg (to the detriment of Maoilín Óg?) is commented on in Ó Cuív (1984: 89).

METRE AND LANGUAGE

The metre of the poem edited here is *ógláchas* of *Rannaigheacht Mhór.* The poem consists of 76 lines of seven syllables; 26 are without alliteration, and in three of the *d*-lines (qq 2, 10, 15) alliteration, though present, does not occur between the final word and the preceding stressed word as required by *dán díreach*. End-rhyme (*b* : *d*) is perfect in six of the 19 quatrains;[34] internal rhyme is absent; and *aicill* rhyme – which occurs in both the first and second half-quatrains – is perfect in 20 cases (11 in the first half-quatrain, 9 in the second) of a possible 38.[35]

The relaxed metre is complemented by some linguistic features that bear a transitional, post-classical, rather than a strictly Early Modern Irish flavour. It is not clear which if any of these may be attributed to the scribe rather than to the author, to the extent that one hesitates to restore classical forms in a number of cases where that might be an option; attention is drawn in the notes to such matters at 2*a*, 3*c*, 4*a*, 5*b*, 11*b*, 11*c*, 15*c*, and 17*b*. On the other hand, one imagines that the reading 'mac con bháird' (9*c*) must be transmissional, and accordingly it has been emended.

EDITORIAL REMARKS[36]

The poem is arranged in the manuscript in the seventeenth-century (and later) four-line style.[37] Editorial intrusion on this scribal layout is therefore confined to punctuation and to capitalisation of proper nouns. Conventional orthographical changes effected silently consist of removal of length-marks over diphthongs (*ao*(*i*), *ia*, *ua*); regularization of *éu* > *éa*; removal of unhistoric length-marks in the case of *cheárdchuibh* 6*d*, *bháird* 9*cd*, *gióll* 12*c*, *bhús* 15*b*; initial *tt*- > *dt*- and cc- > *gc*-; *as* (copula) > *is*; *a* (simple preposition 'in(to)') > *i*, and in combination with possessive pronouns *ad* > *id*, *am* > *im*.

Marks of length supplied editorially are indicated with a macron; grammatical lenition supplied editorially is indicated with italic *h*, while superfluous lenition of eclipsed initial *f*- has been removed (5*a*, 6*b*, 8*ad*). Other changes recorded in the apparatus are *gh* > *dh* 2*a*, 17*b*; *tugsat* > *tugsad* 7*a*; *mhic* > *mheic* (vocative case) 2*a*,[38] 15*a*, as the scribe otherwise writes 'meic' *plene*; supply of omitted letters *dhéuch* > *dh'fhéach* 3*c* n.; supply of eclipsis after gen. pl. (in evidence in q. 8*b* and 8*d*) following *sgol* 6*d*, 7*d*.

[34]Typical examples of imperfect rhymes are *úir* : *shúist* (q. 4), *meath* : *shean* (q. 5), *dhoit* : *gcois* (q. 9); see further the end-rhymes in qq 10–19.

[35]These data could be adjusted by emending *toghaidh* to *taghaidh* (giving internal rhyme, q. 11*c*) and *bhfuil* to *bhfoil* (giving aicill rhyme, q. 17*d*).

[36]The edition of this text was developed in the weekly poetry seminar of the Department of Modern Irish, UCC. I thank all participants for their contributions. In addition, I am very grateful to Dr Gordon Ó Riain and to the anonymous peer-reviewer for reading and commenting on a draft of this paper.

[37]Ó Macháin (2019: 40).

[38]In this case the *aicill* rhyme might be augmented by emending *sin* > *sein* in l. *b*; and, for consistency, *miste* (q. 10*c*) could be spelled *meiste*.

Text

Maoilín Óg cc

1. Neimhghlic sin a mhacáin mhaoith,
   díogha ceirde a-taoi do t*h*riall;
   dul ar sgoil más eadh dob āil,
   bun 's cionn damhsa a-tá do chiall.

2. Sé chéad déag bliadhain, a mheic,
   an uair budh aois sin mar shuim
   do Chríost mhac Dē, liaigh ar locht,
   do bhí i dtarngaire tocht ruinn.

3. Re ndul doit ō thír go tír
   do dhioghluim seanchais síl dTáil
   is mairg dhuitsi nach ē dh'fhéach
   cionnas do bhiadh céacht id láimh.

4. Dá dtigtheá, iar gcur chuarta i gcēin,
   thar th'ais fa fhréimh fhionnBhloid úir,
   i ndiaidh sgagtha do ghréas nglan,
   beag nābudh fhearr glac um shúist.

5. Léig dhíot feasta a bhfuil ar th'ūidh,
   nā bí nī is sia ag súil re meath
   ō tā ar ndeaghbhlas 'na d*h*igh sheirbh:
   tabhair cúl do cheird do shean.

Translation

1. That is unwise, tender youth – you are attempting the worst of trades; if it is [your] wish to go to school, your understanding is the opposite of mine.

2. Sixteen hundred years, son, when that in total should be the age of Christ Son of God, healer of our faults, it was prophesied to befall us.

3. Before you go from place to place assembling the traditions of the race of Tál, it is a pity for you that you have not tried how a plough would fit in your hand.

4. After making a circuit afar, should you return to the stock of fair, noble Blod, having polished your shining poems, it would nearly be better to grasp a flail.

5. Desist henceforth from what you have in mind, do not set your hopes on something that will fade, since our good draught has turned to bitter drink: turn your back on the trade of your ancestors.

Variants

2. *a* bliaghain a mhic.
3. *c* dhéuch.
4. *b* réimh.
5. *a* bhfhuil; *b* ni sia.

6. Deacraide dhuit imtheacht uam
nī bhfuighe tú – truagh an teidhm –
fiú aonbhotha nō dhā bhoth
do cheardchuibh sgol bhFōdla ar feidhm.

7. Tugsad Sacsain, sluaigh do chēin,
tar Cluain Plucáin béim re tuinn,
nach ionadh foghloma a-nois
seinteallach sgol gCruachan Cuinn.

8. Do thuit Brosnach i bhfé fia
d'éis Chlann nGearailt – cia nār chrāidh? –
nī fhuil sí acht 'na cosair chuan,
port díoghloma duan bhfear bhFāil.

9. Dā cheannphort sgoile cláir Néill –
tárrtha léan dā madh léir dhoit –
Mac Con Midhe is Mac an Bhaird,
nī chluinim fiú an bhaird re a gcois.

10. Nach faiceann tú mise féin,
a mheic neimhghlic gan chéim gcruais? –
beag nār chuir mé, miste ar ngairm,
ceann mo shaothair go a s*h*naidhm buaic.

6. It should be more difficult for you to leave me that you will not find – alas the calamity – even one or two huts of the workshops of the schools of Fódla in operation.

7. The English, hosts from afar, over-ran Cluain Plucáin, so that the ancient hearth of the schools of Conn's Cruacha is no longer a place of learning.

8. Brosnach has fallen into oblivion in the wake of the Fitzgeralds – whom has it not tormented? – it is now but a bed of dogs, the place where [once] the poems of the men of Ireland were assembled.

9. The two leaders of the school of the plain of Niall – you would come to grief if you but understood – Mac Con Midhe and Mac an Bhaird: I do not hear that they have as much as a *bard* for a retinue.

10. Do you not see me, naïve unseasoned youth? I had almost brought my finished work to its pinnacle – my situation is the worse for that.

6. *b* bhfhuighe; *d* fodla.
7. *a* Tugsat *d* chruachan.
8. *a* bhfhé; *d* bhfhear bhfhail.
9. *c* mac con bháird.

11. Is ī mh'anóir dā cheann sin
fa chloinn Luigheach, ua Fir Chorb,
deireadh toghaidh tús dom shlad:
nī fhaghaim brat glas nā gorm.

12. Gabhthar chugam tar an dtír –
annamh neach do-ní mo réir –
breith mo ghill i ngioll re cách,
gur cuireadh mē ar sgáth mo sgéith.

13. Bím im chois re cois na n-each,
bím im aonar i measg cháigh:
dar leat is mise do mharbh
ar thuit i gCluain Tarbh d'íbh Táil.

14. Dúsacht mh'fheirge, neimhní im ghruaim,
budh ionann duais dúinn, a mheic;
freagra seasmhach sīordhrud sīos,
gan mo chuimhne ag fíon nā ag fleidh.

15. A mheic nā bísi dom nós,
saothraigh foghluim bhus mō cion;
seachain Gaoidhealg, seanda a snas
do thogh Gaoidheal Glas dā shliocht.

16. Truagh nach re linn cheathrair m*h*ac
Toirdhealbhaigh Dhuinn, nār char geis,
airgtheōir Laighean na learg n-úr,
ba mac foghloma thū, a mheic.

11. My reward for that among the tribe of Lughaidh grandson of Fear Corb is that being the last to be chosen, I am the first to be plundered: I get neither a grey nor a blue cloak.

12. Throughout the territory I am confronted with the taking of my pledge in pledge for all – rare is he who does my bidding – so that I was forced to take cover.

13. I am on foot beside the horses, I am alone among everyone: you would think it is I who had killed all the descendants of Tál who fell at Clontarf.

14. Stirring my anger, ignoring my gloom: the reward for me will be the same, son; the unwavering response is [my] constant demotion, I am forgotten at wine-drinking and at feasting.

15. Son, be not like me, labour at a learning that will be better regarded; avoid Gaelic (antique its sheen) which Gaoidheal Glas chose for his posterity.

16. Alas that it was not in the time of the four sons of Toirdhealbhach Donn, who hated wrong, harrier of the Laighin of the bright slopes, that you were a student, my son.

11. *a* As si.
13. *c* dho.
15. *a* mhic *b* sáothraidh; bhús *c* seannda.

17. Truagh nach re linn Taidhg m*h*eic B*h*riain
Chatha an Aonaigh, tug ngliaidh ngairg,
do bhí tú iondolta ar sgoil,
a mheic bhúidh rē bhfuil mo spairn.

18. Measa an réimhsi ráinig dhoit –
d'éis na gcuradh ōn Chraig Léith
rug an éigsi céim ar gcúl –
measa a chách a-niú inā 'né.

19. Spiorad, naomhAthair is Mac
cuir it aigne, an mar taoi,
triar re a n-adhradh, aoinDia ar nimh.
Neimhghlic sin a mhacáin mhaoith. .n.e

17. Alas that it was not in the time of Tadhg, son of Brian Catha an Aonaigh, who gave hard battle, that you were ready for schooling, dear son with whom I am sparring.

18. The time in which you find yourself is worse, it is even worse today than yesterday: in the wake of the heroes of An Chrag Liath, the profession of poetry has declined.

19. Bear in mind the Spirit, holy Father and Son, worshipped as three, a single God in heaven, [and] stay as you are; that is unwise, tender youth.

17. *a* ré; *b* ngliaigh; *c* tú[r *cancelled*].
19. *b* ad taigne.

NOTES

1*a* The opening line recalls the *seanfhocul* referred to in the fourteenth-century poem beginning *Geabh do mhúnudh, a mheic bhaoith* (*Magauran* XIX.1; cf. 'Gabh a mhic mo mhúnadh', *Rel. Celt.* I, 127–8, and 'feirrde macámh a mhúnadh', *DDána* 67.35). If the reference is not simply rhetorical, one might suggest Conchubhar mac Maoilín Óig as the son in question, as he did indeed pursue a career in learning. Conchubhar's name appears with that of the Earl of Thomond's son Tadhg on a committee of arbitration to a dispute dated 1614 (Mac Niocaill 1970: 62–5), and he was sufficiently qualified in learning to supply an attestation to what is now known as the Louvain volume of the Annals of the Four Masters in November 1636 (OFM-UCD MS A13, p. xxvi). He was also almost certainly the author of the prose encomium and three-quatrain poem (in loose *Rannaigheacht Bheag*) in honour of Matthew de Renzy, dated January 1631 (Mac Cuarta 1993). It is of interest that John Brody, the author of the tract containing the poem edited here, may have been the John Mc Brody who succeeded to the occupancy of Conchubhar's lands in the 1640s (Ó Murchadha 1999: 128).

1*b díogha ceirde* This echoes 'Ná len do dhíogha ceirde' in q. 2 of *A mheic ná meabhraigh éigsi* (*BMus. Cat*. I, 392).

1*d bun 's cionn* See O'Rahilly's note in *Measgra Dánta* II, 241; and further examples in *DIL* B, 242.20–33.

2*a bliadhain* Gen. pl. would be expected, but cf. rhymes with 'iarraidh' (*OHara* XV.11) and 'fhiadhaibh' (*TDall* 15.10, 32.39) in similar constructions; nom. sg. for gen. pl. after *céad* is noted as a later development in *DIL* C, 152.8–10.

2*c* Cf. 'liaigh do fhaomh leigheas ar locht' and 'Mac Dé do leigheas ar locht', *DDána* 62.3 and 5.

2*d* What is being referred to is the litany of decline recounted in the quatrains that follow. The *tarngaire* in question may be that recorded by both Stafford and Moryson, which foretold the overthrow of the Irish by the English at this time, and was referred to, with apparent frequency, by Donnchadh Ó Briain at the Battle of Kinsale: 'Many times I heard the Earl of Thomond tell the Lord President that in an old book of Irish prophecies which he had seen, it was reported that towards the latter days there should be a battle fought between the English and the Irish in a place which the book nameth near Kinsale' (O'Grady 1896: II, 62). 'The same day an old written Booke was shewed to the Lord Deputy, wherein was a Prophesie, naming the foard and hill where this battell was given, and foretelling a great overthrow to befall the Irish in that place' (Moryson 1908: III, 82). For the general topic see Gillespie (1997: 137–42).

3*b* Lenition would be expected here after the dat. sg. and gen. sg. respectively, but exemption due to 'sléagar' (*BST* Appendix IV, Mac Cárthaigh 2014: 295–7) can be invoked.

síl dTáil 'In tribal names formed with *síol*, *cinéal*, e. gg. *síol gColla*; *síol nEóghain*, the eclipsis appears in some cases to have become stereotyped throughout the declension' (*TDall* I, civ). Despite reservations (ibid., II, 204) about whether or not *síol* should be read where the glide is not shown, many rhyming examples of gen. sg. *síl* exist in such cases (e.g. *Aith. D* 31.3, *DDána* 89.28, *Maguires* VIII.30).

3*c nach ē dh' fhéach* Note the non-classical form (MS 'dhéuch') for 'do fhéach/dhéach [tú]'; one could posit a corruption of 'nachar fhéach/dhéach', but this would remove the alliteration, and corruption of this degree is not in evidence elsewhere in the poem; the peer-reviewer suggests emending to *th'éacht*.

4*a* The subjunctive form *tig-* is rare in bardic verse, where forms of the *s*-subjunctive are countenanced exclusively by the tracts (*IGT* III.5); Tadhg Dall uses the forms *tísseadh* and *tigthi* in the same poem (*TDall* 26.31*a*, 52*d*).

The rule (*BST* 208.14–15) regarding the non-elision, after a word ending in long vowel, of an unstressed *iairmbéarla* that begins with a long vowel could be circumvented either by reading *ar* instead of *iar* here, or by reading short *-thea* in the preceding subjunctive ending.

4*b fhionnBhloid* Eclipsis would be regular after accusative *fhréimh* but lenition is required for alliteration, so that 'sléagar' (cf. 3*b* above) may again be invoked; or perhaps one could argue that the distinction between accusative and dative usage after *fa* (*BST* 190.29) had begun to wane.

Blod/Blad, and his father Tál (qq 3*b*, 13*d*, *alias* Cas, *a quo* Dál gCais), were distant ancestors of the Í Bhriain (*Leabhar Muimhneach*, 294–5); see also 11*b* n.

4*c sgagtha* Cf. 'grés oide d'éis a sgagtha' (*Maguires*, l. 369: 'the polished poem of a teacher'); also 'oighidh Taidhg dhuansgagtha Dhoill' in Ó Gnímh's *Tairnig éigse fhuinn Ghaoidheal* (*DDána* 115.4).

4*d glac um shúist* Cf.: 'Minic bhíos damhna flatha / soidhbhir ratha óg álainn / 's a mhac i bhfeidhm an tsúiste, – / trí glúine ó rígh go rámhainn' (*Bráthair don bhás*, q. 3).

5*b* A reading of MS 'ni sia' as 'níos sia' would also be acceptable at this period.

meath My colleague Dr Seán Ua Súilleabháin suggests emending to *meadh*, a late form of *miodh* 'mead', which, in addition to supplying perfect end-rhyme, would accord with the drinking image in line *c*.

7*b Cluain Plucáin* Seat of the Í Mhaoil Chonaire, and thought to be an earlier name for Baile Uí Mhaoil Chonaire, which encompassed a number of townlands in the civil parish of Kiltrustan, bar. and co. of Roscommon (Walsh 1947: 43–8).

béim re tuinn The general sense (as given in the translation) is clear, but the syntax is open to interpretation. Perhaps the optimal sequence would be 'Tugsad S béim tar CP re tuinn', 'The English [arriving] by sea over-ran Cluain Plucáin', accepting the glossators' equation of *béim* with *céim* (*DIL* B, 53.44–7), or simply taking it as a figurative use of 'delivered a blow'. In the latter case, *béim re tuinn* might alternatively be considered a phrase meaning 'a blow to the skin' – cf. also examples of *béin fri/re* in *DIL* B, 54.75–81 – a commonplace extended meaning of *tonn* (*DIL* T, 248.50–70), though other examples of this exact phrase are wanting.

8*a Brosnach* The school of a branch of the Í Dhálaigh, poets to the Fitzgeralds, located in Brosna, now a town and civil parish (bar. Trughanacmy), in north co. Kerry; see O'Rahilly (1922: §50) and O'Rahilly (1942: 116.6 n.).

i bhfé fia A form said to be 'lochdach' (in favour of 'fégh fía') in *IGT* II.95; see *TDall* II, 245 (q. 13 n.).

8*b* Cf. 'Mé im luing cheannaigh ar gcaill laist / d'éis Chlann nGearailt do thuill teist' (*Ceist cia do cheinneóchadh dán*, q. 7); 'Léig tar cel cuimne a nemhuilc / stór filed fuil rígGheruilt' (*A mheic ná meabhraigh éigsi*, q. 11).

9*a sgoile* 'of the school': perhaps better 'of the poets', as suggested to me by Gordon Ó Riain.

9*b tárrtha* Apparently a form of the defective verb *tárraidh*: cf. 'gé thártha riocht nuaidhe a-nocht' *DDána* 79.25 ('though tonight thou art in strange plight', *Irish Monthly* 49 (1921), 246).

9*c* The poets to the two preeminent northern families, Í Néill and Í Dhomhnaill respectively, are mentioned here.

9*d* Compare Fearghal Óg's complaint: 'mé gan fiú an bhaird de bhuidhin' (Ó Macháin 2007: 101.29).

10*cd* More literally 'I had nearly tied the final knot on the roof [*ceann*] of my work': an image from thatching. From more recent times see the

description of making the *buaic* in, for example, Verling (2012: 90); *snaidhm buaice* 'a top knot' (*Dinneen*, s.v. buaic); cf. 'fiodhbhaidh tré bhuaic tighe ac teacht' (*Maguires* XII.16).

11*b* *Luigheach*, properly *Luighdheach* (*IGT* II.122, where (ex. 1895) it rhymes with *Muimhneach* (cf. *DDána* 74.11)). The Lughaidh in question is Lughaidh Meand grandson of Fer Corb and grandfather of Tál (*Corp. Gen.* 154ab41–45) – hence an ancestor of the Í Bhriain; cf. 'síol Luighdheach Meann na míntréad' (*Bráthair don bhás an doidhbhreas*, l. 70); see also 4*b* n. above.

11*c* *toghaidh* Genitive singular of a post-classical verb noun, the classical forms being *togha* and *tagha* (*IGT* II.3, III.80).

11*d* *glas ná gorm* That is, neither plain nor coloured.

12*a* The interpretation and translation are tentative. Though 'gabhaidh chuige' (etc.) is a familiar expression in active constructions signifying acceptance or reception of something (examples in Bergin (1931: 429) and O'Rahilly (1941: 313)), in this case the impersonal, as an historical present and apparently with *breith mo ghill* as its object, seems to bear connotations of unwelcome attention and confrontation.

12*c* The poet's complaint here – that pledges are taken from him as guarantees for people unconnected to him – recalls that of Tadhg Dall concerning the plunder of his cattle, and the extortion of unjust pledges from him (Ó Macháin 2010: 64–72). The well-known case of the plundering of Maoilín Óg's cattle by Aodh Ruadh Ó Domhnaill, a year previous to the probable date of this poem, and their return following the poet's petition to and praise of Ó Domhnaill, is recorded by both Lughaidh Ó Cléirigh (*Beatha Aodha Ruaidh* I, 208–10) and the Four Masters (*AFM* VI, 2102–4). Anxiety regarding the protection of his cattle from plunder prompted Tadhg mac Dáire's threat of satire against Í Dhomhnaill and Búrcaigh and against Donnchadh Ó Briain in separate poems (McLaughlin 2005: 42).

12*d* *ar sgáth sgéith* is a relatively common phrase, usually translated literally 'shelter/protection of a shield': e.g. *Magauran* XI.43, *Aith. Dána* 5.17, *Aonghus Fionn* XXXII.10; perhaps 'the last line of defence'.

13*a* The *each* was one of the coveted rewards of the poets, and overt requests for this form of payment survive in the bardic corpus: the opening line of one such poem 'Olc beatha na gcoisidheadh' (*Magauran*, Poem VI) is probably representative of the view of the poets, who disdained to go unmounted. To be without a horse therefore becomes one of the tokens of lack of patronage and reversal in fortune of the poets at the end of the bardic era. Írial Ó hUiginn says that he will be 'feasda choidhche dom chois' until Cormac Ó hEadhra supplies him with a horse for a poem (*OHara* XV.3); and following the death of Seaán mac Briain Í Néill in 1617, Cormac Mac Con Midhe declares that a patron cannot be found to give him a horse: 'Ní bhfuair misi, acht me dom chois, / ón ló teasta flaith Fionnrois, / éineach i bhfódmhuigh na bhFionn / ó éinneach d'ógbhaidh Éirionn' (*LCAB*, Poem XXVI, ll. 14–17). Towards the end of the century Ó Bruadair completes the picture with the well-known image of his reduction in circumstances: 'd'aithle mo cheana

is marcach mé dom chois' (Mac Erlean (1913: VII.9); de Brún et al. (1975: Poem 39, l. 36)).

13*b* Cf. 'Aonar dhamhsa eidir dhaoinibh' (*Ir. Bardic Poetry*, 42.1). With Maoilín Óg's statement of his isolation compare his remarks in *Bráthair don bhás an doidhbhreas* (ll. 35–6): 'iniu ní fhaghaim éisteacht / do thréigsead mé mo charaid'.

14*a* The poet's point is that it makes no difference whether he is angry or remains sanguine, the response he elicits is the same.

14*d* Maoilín Óg's complaint of his neglect at feasting is generalised in *Bráthair don bhás an doidhbhreas* (ll. 13–16): 'Mar bhíd ag ól 's ag aoibhneas / fóir Ghaoidheal na ngleó neamhlag, / bídh tús suidhte ag an soidhbhir, / 's bídh an doidhbhir ar dearmad'.

15*c* Accusative 'Ghaoidheilg' would be expected here, perhaps justifying emendation. The sentiment – the loss of respect for the Irish language and for compositions in Irish (cf. 'ná cum do ghrés Gaoidheilge' (*A mheic ná meabhraigh éigsi*, q. 2)) – is another token of the changed times, epitomised by Brian Mac Giolla Phádraig: ''s gan scot ag neach le fear don dáimh éigsi / acht hob-amach is beir leat do shár-Ghaelg-sa' (Mhág Craith (1958: 106)). It formed a theme of broad concern that extended beyond the immediate bardic sphere, being reflected in works as diverse as *Pairlement Chloinne Tomáis* and Stapleton's *Catechismvs*, and it continued well into the eighteenth century.

16*ab* The genealogy of Toirdhealbhach Donn (†1528, *AFM* V, 1392), King of Thomond, is given in *Leabhar Muimhneach*, 377–8 and 393 (ll. 137–52 of *Tug damh h'aire, a Inse an Laoigh* by Eóghan Mac Craith); his four sons are enumerated ibid., 345–6. They were: Tadhg, who was killed in Tipperary in 1523 (*AFM* V, 1364); Conchubhar (†1539, *AFM* V, 1450), King of Thomond; Donnchadh (†1531, *AFM* V, 1402), 'tánaisi Tuadhmumhan'; and Murchadh (†1551, *AFM* V, 1518), first Earl of Thomond. During the reign of Conchubhar, he and his two remaining brothers, Donnchadh and Murchadh, were the subject of an *óglách*as praise-poem beginning *Maith re sírleanmhain síol mBriain* (McManus and Ó Raghallaigh 2010: Poem 318).

16*c* Perhaps a reference to the defeat by Ó Briain in 1510 of a force under the Earl of Kildare near Limerick (*AFM* V, 1304–6).

17*ab* Tadhg Ó Briain (†1444, *AFM* IV, 938) had been King of Thomond until deposed in 1438. He and his wife Gráinne are the subjects of an elegy by Tadhg Óg Ó hUiginn, beginning *Dá bhrághaid uaim i nInis* (*Aith. Dána*, Poem 14). The origin of the name of his father – Brian Chatha an Aonaigh – is given in *Leabhar Muimhneach*, 234 and 344. This Brian was regarded as the progenitor of the main Thomond line (ibid., 346–7).

17*b ngliaidh* The unexpected eclipsis is due, presumably, to the influence of following *ngairg*, and possibly should be removed.

18*a Measa* That is, worse in comparison to the eras mentioned in qq 16 and 17.

réimhsi Examples of this word are cited in *DIL* s.v. 'reimse', none of which are conclusive as to the length of the first vowel; the rhyme *eing-si* : *reimhsi*

occurs in a poem by Tadhg mac Dáire (McManus and Ó Raghallaigh 2010: 462.18*cd*, example provided by peer-reviewer), perhaps indicating variation as in 'treimhse/tréimhse' (*TDall* II, 192 §21n.).

18*b Chraig Léith* Craglea (par. Killaloe, bar. Tulla Lower, co. Clare), ancient centre of the Dál gCais – 'Agus is ann bhaoí longphort Dhál gCais an tan sin do leathtaoibh na Craige Léithe idir an Chraig Léith agus an Bhórumha' (*Leabhar Muimhneach*, 98) – and home to their goddess Aoibheall.

18*d* For this common use of the comparative with *(s)a chách* see *DIL* C, 5.65–6.2. The end of this line provides the first *dúnadh* of the poem.

Abbreviations

See also the standard *Celtica* abbreviations, pp. 309–11 below.

Aith. Dána	Lambert McKenna (ed.), *Aithdioghluinm Dána: A Miscellany of Irish Bardic Poetry*, 2 vols, ITS 37, 40 (Dublin, 1939, 1940).
Aonghus Fionn	L. M'Kenna (ed.), *Dánta do chum Aonghus Fionn Ó Dálaigh* (Dublin, 1919).
Beatha Aodha Ruaidh	Paul Walsh (ed.), *Beatha Aodha Ruaidh Uí Dhomhnaill as Leabhar Lughaidh Uí Chléirigh*, 2 vols, ITS 42, 45 (Dublin 1948, 1957).
BMus. Cat.	Standish Hayes O'Grady and Robin Flower, *Catalogue of Irish Manuscripts in the British Museum*, 3 vols (London, 1926 and 1953).
BST	Lambert McKenna, *Bardic Syntactical Tracts* (Dublin, 1944).
Corpas	Corpas Stairiúil na Gaeilge: Historical Irish Corpus 1600–1926 (*http://corpas.ria.ie/*)
Corp. Gen.	M. A. O'Brien (ed.), *Corpus Genealogiarum Hiberniae* (Dublin, 1962).
Dán na mB. Mionúr	Cuthbert Mhág Craith (ed.), *Dán na mBráthar Mionúr*, 2 vols (Dublin 1967, 1980).
DDána	Láimhbheartach Mac Cionnaith (ed.), *Dioghluim Dána* (Baile Átha Cliath, 1938).
Dinneen	Patrick S. Dinneen, *Foclóir Gaedhilge agus Béarla* (Dublin, 1927).
Ir. Bardic Poetry	Osborn Bergin, *Irish Bardic Poetry: Texts and Translations together with an Introductory Lecture*, ed. David Greene and Fergus Kelly (Dublin, 1970).

LBranach	Seán Mac Airt (ed.), *Leabhar Branach: The Book of the O'Byrnes* (Dublin, 1944).
LCAB	Tadhg Ó Donnchadha (ed.), *Leabhar Cloinne Aodha Buidhe* (Baile Átha Cliath, 1931).
Leabhar Muimhneach	Tadhg Ó Donnchadha (ed.), *An Leabhar Muimhneach maraon le Suim Aguisíní* (Baile Átha Cliath, [1940]).
Maguires	David Greene (ed.), *Duanaire Mhéig Uidhir*: *The Poem Book of Cú Chonnacht Mág Uidhir, Lord of Fermanagh 1566–1589* (Dublin, 1972).
Magauran	Lambert McKenna (ed.), *The Book of Magauran: Leabhar Méig Shamhradháin* (Dublin, 1947).
Measgra Dánta	Thomas F. O'Rahilly (ed.), *Measgra Dánta*: *Miscellaneous Irish* poems, 2 vols (Dublin and Cork, 1927).
O'Hara	Lambert McKenna (ed.), *The Book of O'Hara*: *Leabhar Í Eadhra* (Dublin, 1951).
O'Reillys	James Carney (ed.), *Poems on the O'Reillys* (Dublin, 1950).
Rel. Celt.	Alexander Macbain and John Kennedy (ed.), *Reliquiae Celticae: Texts, Papers and Studies in Gaelic Literature and Philology Left by the Late Rev. Alexander Cameron,* 2 vols (Inverness, 1892, 1894).
TDall	Eleanor Knott (ed.), *The Bardic Poems of Tadhg Dall Ó hUiginn (1550–1591)*, 2 vols, ITS 22, 23 (London, 1922, 1926).

REFERENCES

AINSWORTH, JOHN 1961: *The Inchiquin Manuscripts* (Dublin).

BERGIN, OSBORN 1931: *Trí Bior-Ghaoithe an Bháis, Séathrún Céitinn do sgríobh* (Dublin).

BREATNACH, PÁDRAIG A. 1999: 'A poem on the end of patronage', *Éigse* 31, 79–88.

BREATNACH, R.A. 1989: 'Anarchy in West Munster', *Éigse* 23, 57–66.

DE BRÚN, PÁDRAIG et al. 1975: *Nua-Dhuanaire*, Cuid I (Baile Átha Cliath).

GILLESPIE, RAYMOND 1997: *Devoted People: Belief and Religion in Early Modern Ireland* (Manchester).

MAC CÁRTHAIGH, EOIN 2014: *The Art of Bardic Poetry*: *A New Edition of Irish Grammatical Tracts I* (Dublin).

MAC CUARTA, BRIAN 1993: 'Conchubhar Mac Bruaideadha and Sir Matthew de Renzy (1577–1634)', *Éigse* 27, 122–6.

Mac Erlean, John C. 1910: *Duanaire Dháibhidh Uí Bhruadair* I, ITS 11 (London).

——, 1913: *Duanaire Dháibhidh Uí Bhruadair* II, ITS 13 (London).

McGrath, Cuthbert 1943: 'Materials for a history of Clann Bhruaideadha', *Éigse* 4.1, 48–66.

——, 1958: see Mhág Craith.

McInerney, Luke 2012: 'Lettermoylan of Clann Bhruaideadha: a résumé of their landholding, topography & history', *North Munster Antiquarian Journal* 52, 81–113.

McLaughlin, Róisín 2005: 'A threat of satire by Tadhg (Mac Dáire) Mac Bruaideadha', *Ériu* 55, 37–57.

Mac Niocaill, Gearóid 1970: 'Seven Irish documents from the Inchiquin archives', *Analecta Hibernica* 26, 45–69.

Mhág Craith [= McGrath], Cuthbert 1958: 'Brian Mac Giolla Phádraig', *Celtica* 4, 103–205.

Moryson, Fynes 1908: *An Itinerary Containing his Ten yeeres travell through the Twelve Dominions of Germany, Bohmerland, Sweitzerland, Netherland, Denmarke, Poland, Italy, Turky, France, England, Scotland & Ireland,* 4 vols (Glasgow).

Ní Úrdail, Meidhbhín 2004: 'A poem addressed to Donnchadh Ó Briain, fourth Earl of Thomond', in John Carey et al. (ed.), *Cín Chille Cúile: Texts, Saints and Places, Essays in Honour of Pádraig Ó Riain* (Aberystwyth), 193–207.

Ó Caithnia, Liam P. 1984: *Apalóga na bhfilí 1200–1600* (Baile Átha Cliath).

Ó Cuív, Brian 1974: 'A sixteenth-century political poem', *Éigse* 15, 261–76.

——, 1984: 'An elegy on Donnchadh Ó Briain, fourth Earl of Thomond', *Celtica* 16, 87–105.

——, 1987: 'On the decline of poesy', *Celtica* 19, 126–7.

——, 2001, 2003: *Catalogue of Irish Language Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library at Oxford and Oxford College Libraries*, 2 vols (Dublin).

O'Grady, Standish 1896: *Pacata Hibernia or a History of the Wars in Ireland during the Reign of Queen Elizabeth*, 2 vols (London).

Ó Lochlainn, Colm 1939: 'A poem by Tadhg mac Dáire Mhic Bhruaideadha', *Éigse* 1.1, 1–6.

Ó Macháin, Pádraig 2007: 'The iconography of exile: Fearghal Óg Mac an Bhaird in Louvain', in Pádraig A. Breatnach et al. (ed.), *Léann Lámhscríbhinní Lobháin: The Louvain Manuscript Heritage* (Dublin), 76–111.

——, 2010: 'The poetry of Tadhg Dall Ó hUiginn: themes and sources', in Pádraigín Riggs (ed.), *Tadhg Dall Ó hUiginn: His Historical and Literary Context* (London), 55–87.

——, 2015: 'Ceasta Fhíthil: buaine agus ilghnéitheacht na gaoise i litríocht na Gaeilge', in John Carey et al. (ed.), *Sacred Histories: A Festschrift for Máire Herbert* (Dublin), 333–54.

——, 2017: 'Two poems by William Nugent', *Ríocht na Midhe* 28, 36–52.

——, 2019: 'The emergence of the Gaelic paper manuscript: a preliminary investigation', in idem (ed.), *Paper and the Paper Manuscript: A Context for the Transmission of Gaelic Literature* (Cork), 21–43

Ó MURCHADHA, DIARMUID 1999: 'The origins of Clann Bhruaideadha', *Éigse* 31, 121–30.

O'RAHILLY, THOMAS F. 1922: 'Irish poets, historians and judges in English documents, 1538–1615', *PRIA* 36 C, 86–120.

——, 1941: *Desiderius by Flaithrí Ó Maolchonaire* (Dublin).

——, 1942: 'A poem by Piaras Feiritéar', *Ériu* 13, 113–18.

VERLING, MÁIRTÍN 2012: *Leabhar Mhaidhc Dháith: Scéalta agus Seanchas ón Rinn* (An Daingean).

WALSH, PAUL 1947: *Irish Men of Learning*, ed. Colm O Lochlainn (Dublin).

PÁDRAIG Ó MACHÁIN

University College Cork

CORRACH DO CHODLAS A-RÉIR REVISITED

Abstract

This paper provides a new edition of the poem *Corrach do chodlas a-réir* which is attributed to Tadhg Ó Cobhthaigh. A translation into English is provided together with notes, some of which provide extended commentary on aspects of the poem.

Introduction

When Thomas F. O'Rahilly [Tomás Ó Rathile] published the second edition of *Dánta Grádha* (henceforth *DG*) in 1926, the title page carried the information that this volume, containing the texts of the poems, was 'Part I' of a two-part work. In his introduction the author promised a second part which would contain notes on the poems and a glossary.[1] This second volume was never published, so that, apart from a general statement on the five manuscripts which contained many of the poems in O'Rahilly's book, information on the manuscript sources which he used for most of the poems and his commentary on their texts has never been made available.[2] However, in the case of *DG*, no. 69, *Corrach do chodlas a-réir*, Douglas Hyde had already in 1916 provided the information that the poem was to be found in the Book of O'Conor Don, where it was ascribed to Tadhg Ó Cobhthaigh, and that [due to part of folio 25 of the manuscript having been cut away] eight of its twenty quatrains, viz. qq. 11–18, were defective.[3] This manuscript is the sole source of the complete poem. Though it is now known that parts of the poem, including most of the defective quatrains, are found in other manuscripts, it is evident that O'Rahilly was unaware of this and used only the Book of O'Conor Don as his source, marking with a line of dots the absence of the defective quatrains from his edition. Since most of the missing quatrains can now be supplied and given that they and other aspects of the rich text of the poem deserve commentary, I offer here a new edition of the poem.

[1] *DG*, *Reumhrá*, ix: *Má bhíon éileamh ar an leabhar*, *beid sin le fáil i leabhar fé leith gan ró-mhuill* 'If there is a demand for th[is] book, they [i.e. notes and glossary] will be available in a separate book without much delay.' All translations in this article are my own unless otherwise indicated.

[2] See *DG*, viii. O'Rahilly's earlier collections of *dánta grádha* (*Dánta Grádha* (Dublin *etc*., 1916), and *Laoithe Cumainn* (Baile Átha Cliath agus Corcaigh, 1925)) also lack information on the manuscript sources. In a recent essay, Síle Ní Mhurchú lists the manuscripts in which each of the poems in *DG* is now to be found: 'Observations on the manuscript sources for the *Dánta Grá*', *Celtica* 29 (2017), 199–250, at 239–45.

[3] Douglas Hyde, 'The Book of the O'Conor Don', *Ériu* 8 (1916), 78–99, at 85.

 ©Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies

Sources

B Castlerea, Clonalis House, The Book of O'Conor Don, fol. 25r–v: qq. 1–20.[4] Written at Ostend in 1631 by Aodh Ó Dochartaigh. Read on ISOS.

A UCD-OFM MS A 25, p. 129: qq. 14, 15, 17–20; p. 216: q. 15*a*.[5] Perhaps written by Brian Mac Niallghuis, it 'may be dated to the second decade of the seventeenth century'.[6] Read on ISOS.

C NUIM MS C 74 (g) (5), fol. 1rb: q. 1*a*; fol. 1ra: qq. 4, 7, 6, 10, 11, 14–20. A single leaf bearing the date 17 January 1763, written by Diarmaid Ó Drisceoil.[7]

H TCD MS H. 4.15 (1356), pp. 506–7: qq. 1*abd*, 2*a–d*, 5*a*, 5*b*+10*b*, 10*c–d*, 10*a*, 8*b–d*, 15, 20. Written by Stiabhna Ríghis, 1727–8.[8]

This edition is based on **B**, as was O'Rahilly's. However, **C** is a good copy of parts of the poem and, in particular, of most of the quatrains which are defective in **B** and which O'Rahilly omitted; readings from **C** have been given where **B** is defective. Due to a tear in p. 129, **A** suffers from several defects in qq. 15, 17, 18 and 19; however, alternative readings from it have been listed in the relevant section below. Some alternative readings from **H** have also been listed.

B and **A** may be nearly contemporaneous. However, they would appear to be independent copies: see, for example, q. 14*a* where **B** has *fá dheirdre*, whereas **A** has *tre deirde*; q. 15*a* where **B** has *farbhl*aidh *fuair an mh*n*aoí* whereas **A** has *farbhloidhe fua*ir *gnaoi*, and q. 20*c* where **B** has *ní faght*ar whereas **A** has *ni fhaghoibh*.

C would appear to be independent of both **B** and **A**. See, for example, q. 6*a* where **B** has *mh'aighneadh*, whereas **C** has *m'aire*; q. 10 where **B** has *san c*r*oidhe cúan*, whereas **C** has *san croidhe ó chúan*; q. 15*a* where **B** has *far*b*hl*aidh (: *samhl*aidh*thi*) whereas **C** has *farbhl*adh*a* (: *samhl*adh*a*); q. 17*b* where **B** has *ó chaтuidh*, whereas **C** has *ó c*r*oidhe*; and q. 18*b* where **B** has *an ts*ear*c* whereas **C** has *an bheart*. So also see q. 15*a* where **A** has *farbhloidhe fua*ir *gnaoi* whereas **C** has *farbhl*adh*a fúar mhnaoi*; q. 18*b* where **A** has *sea…* whereas **C** has *bheart*; and q. 20*c* where **A** has *ni fhaghoibh* whereas **C** has *ní factha*r.

It is clear that the garbled text in **H** is the product of a very poor memory.

[4]Ibid., 78–9.

[5]A note on p. 216 provides the best reading of q. 15a.

[6]See Myles Dillon, Canice Mooney and Pádraig de Brún, *Catalogue of Irish Manuscripts in the Franciscan Library Killiney* (Dublin, 1969), 50.

[7]See Pádraig Ó Fiannachta, *Lámhscríbhinní Gaeilge Choláiste Phádraig, Má Nuad*: *Clár*, fasc. 6 (Má Nuad, 1969), 5.

[8]See T. K. Abbott and E. J. Gwynn, *Catalogue of the Irish Manuscripts in the Library of Trinity College, Dublin* (Dublin and London, 1921), 180.

AUTHOR

In the fifteenth century the family of which Tadhg Ó Cobhthaigh was a member emerged as a bardic dynasty in the Westmeath area, holding lands in the barony of Rathconrath. When An Clasach Ó Cobhthaigh died in 1415 he was described in the Annals of the Four Masters as *saoi ré dán agus ré daonnacht* 'a man eminent for poetry and humanity'. Three of his sons, who were also poets, lived and died in the Westmeath area: Maoileachlainn who was killed by Éamann Dalatún (*AFM* s.a. 1429.13) of Rathconrath; Domhnall, *saoi lé dán* 'a learned poet', who together with his two sons was killed by members of the Ó Maoileachlainn and Mág Eochagáin families on *Cró-inis* in Lough Ennell (*AFM* s.a. 1446.14 and *AU* s.a. 1446.10);[9] and Aodh, *saoi lé dán*, who died of the plague in *Feara Tulach* (Fartullagh) (*AFM* s.a. 1452.21).

In the middle of the sixteenth century three sons of Aodh Ó Cobhthaigh, Diarmaid, Eoghan and Tadhg, were poets. Diarmaid composed a number of religious poems (*AithDD* nos. 63–7) and also an elegy, *Dá néall orchra ós iath Uisnigh* 'Two clouds of grief cover the land of Uisneach', on the deaths of Eoghan and his wife, Aibhilín, at some date between 1560 and 1577.[10] Eoghan is described in that elegy as *ceann ar gcinidh* 'head of our family', and was the author of two eulogies, *Mairidh teine a dteallach Ghaoidheal* 'Fire still burns in Ireland's hearth', for Rudhraighe Caoch Ó Mórdha,[11] and the incomplete *Failghigh chosnas clú Laighean* 'The men of Í Fhailghe uphold Laighin's fame', for Brian Ó Conchobhair Failghe.[12]

According to *AFM* Tadhg, *oide scol Ē*[*i*]*reann lé dán* 'teacher of the schools of Ireland in poetry', was imprisoned in Dublin Castle for three months in 1546 and though an attempt was made to murder him (*ro fōbradh* [*a*] *oidheadh*) he survived and died in 1554, under which date *AFM* described him as *prīomhoide Ē*[*i*]*reann ⁊ Alban lé dán* 'principal teacher of Ireland and Scotland in poetry'.

In addition to *Corrach do chodlas a-réir*, two other poems which are attributed to Tadhg survive: *Folamh Éire d'easbhaidh Bhriain* (*ABM*, no. 246, 'Ireland is empty without Brian') in which he expresses his disquiet at the imprisonment in the Marshalsea of London in 1548 of Brian son of Cathaoir Ó Conchobhair,[13] and a religious poem, *Crann seóil na cruinne an chroch naomh* (*ABM*, no. 118, 'The holy cross is the mast of the world').[14]

[9]Domhnall's father's name is recorded in RIA MS 23 D 14 (1), p. 59.25: see Thomas F. O'Rahilly, *Catalogue of Irish Manuscripts in the Royal Irish Academy* (Dublin, 1926), 3.

[10]Ed. in Eoghan Ó Raghallaigh, 'Poems from the Nugent Manuscript', unpublished PhD thesis, Trinity College, Dublin, poem 7.

[11]Ed. Eoghan Ó Raghallaigh, 'A poem to Rudhraighe Caoch Ó Mórdha, lord of Laois 1542–7', *Ossory, Laois and Leinster* 2 (2006), 44–64.

[12]Ed. Lambert McKenna, 'Some Irish bardic poems, 89', *Studies* 38 (1949), 57–62.

[13]See Fiona Fitzsimons, 'The lordship of O'Connor Faly', in William Nolan and Timothy P. O'Neill (eds), *Offaly*: *History and Society* (Dublin, 1998), 117–43, at 118–19.

[14]The latter poem lacks closure and may be incomplete. However, the scribe of the earliest manuscript in which it is found, RIA MS 23 D 14 (1), written in 1673, penned the following note after the end of his copy of the poem: *Finit don dán sin más fíor dá lucht eólais ⁊ munab eadh ní rachadsa do chruthughadh a aithearrach orra* 'That is the end of that poem if those who are

In Osborn Bergin's edition of the *Irish Grammatical Tracts,* citation 1485 is *Ní bhíadh ó cheart nar ccinn-ne / an dearc do íarr Aithirne* 'The eye which Aithirne demanded would not be by right in our head.'[15] This citation does not occur in the copy of that tract in RIA MS C ii 3 (1218), Section C; however, a marginal note in faded ink at the top of fol. 12r of that copy has that citation and states that it is taken from a poem by Tadhg Ó Cobhthaigh: *Ag so dān ō T*[*h*]ad[h]g *Ō Chob*[*h*]*t*[*h*]aigh …[16] Furthermore, in the same copy of the tract a marginal note at the top of fol. 15v quotes a quatrain which it attributes to Tadhg Ó Cobhthaigh: *Tig t*re *fhuil tTāil 'na tendál / do d*[*h*]*āil do c*[*h*]ru*idh fa gcoimmia*n */ seoid ōn fhuil duitsi is dimbua*n / *cuisli i*nn*fhua*r *d'fhuil Oill*iam. T*ad*[h]*g Ō Cobhth*aigh *.cc.* 'A refreshing gush of the blood of William comes as a fury through the family of Tál; because of bestowing your wealth due to their common desire, resulting from this blood your treasures are short-lived.' This quatrain is given as citation 1815 in Bergin's edition.[17] The hand of the marginal note seems to be that of Muircheartach Ó Cionga, the scribe of the main text, which he wrote in 1552, when Tadhg was still alive. The poem or poems from which those two quotations were taken do not appear to have survived.[18]

Following a suggestion of Edward O'Reilly's, Pádraig A. Breatnach has expressed the belief that Tadhg Ó Cobhthaigh and Tadhg Mór Ó Cobhthaigh, author of the poem for Maghnas Ó Domhnaill, *Cia ré gcuirfinn séd suirghe* 'Whom should I send with a love token', were the same person.[19] The stylistic device of pervasive and varied repetition, which is a significant feature of all three of Tadhg's poems, is also found in Tadhg Mór's poem for Maghnas Ó Domhnaill, which suggests that all four poems are by the same author.[20]

knowledgeable about it are right, and if it is not, I shall not attempt to convince them that the opposite is true': see *ABM*, 704–5. On another similar scribal note in the same manuscript, see Dáibhí I. Ó Cróinín, 'A poem to Toirdhealbhach Luinneach', *Éigse* 16 (1975–6), 50–66, at 51–2.

[15] *IGT* II, 114. The reference here is to the opening topographical episode of the tale *Talland Étair* (ed. Caoimhín Ó Dónaill, *Talland Étair*: A Critical Edition with Introduction, Translation, Textual Notes and Vocabulary (Maynooth, 2005)), in which the origin of the name of Lough Derg, *Dergderc* (*sic*), is explained. The king of south Connacht, Echu Luchtai, had only one eye. When the Ulster poet Aithirne demanded that he give it to him, he plucked it from its socket and handed it to him. The king's servant who brought him to wash his face in water informed him that the cavity (i.e. referring both to the eye-socket and to the water-hole) was red with his blood, to which the king replied: *Bid ed a ainm co bráth or in rí .i. Dergderc* 'It will be its name forever said the king i.e. Dergderc [trans. Red eye]' (reading from the Book of Leinster, Ó Dónaill, *Talland Étair*, 70).

[16] See Kathleen Mulchrone, *Catalogue of Irish Manuscripts in the Royal Irish Academy*, fasc. 26 (Dublin, 1942), 3271.

[17] *IGT* II, 137.

[18] See the file 'Citations from the *Irish Grammatical Tracts* and the *Bardic Syntactical Tracts*' available on www.tcd.ie/Irish/research/database.php, nos. 2916 and 3788 (=*IGT* II, 1485 and 1815). Accessed November 2018.

[19] See Pádraig A. Breatnach, 'In praise of Maghnas Ó Domhnaill', *Celtica* 16 (1984), 63–72, at 63.

[20] See the discussion of this feature below. The triple repetition of the word *fuil* in *IGT* II citations, ll. 1815–16, is also worth noticing.

METRE

The metre of *Corrach do chodlas a-réir* is *rannaigheacht mhór*. Though there are two internal rhymes of the 'broken' variety (*comhardadh briste*)[21] in the opening couplet (*seóladh*) of half of the quatrains, a 'broken' rhyme (*comhardadh briste*) is accompanied by a 'perfect' rhyme in seven quatrains, with two 'perfect' rhymes being accompanied by a 'broken' rhyme in two quatrains (8*ab* and 17*ab*) and one 'perfect' rhyme being accompanied by two 'broken' rhymes in q. 18. This pattern (to which that of Tadhg's other *rannaigheacht mhór* poem, *Crann seóil na cruinne an chroch naomh*, is similar) would seem to be normal for the period after a transition had occurred from an earlier 'perfect rhyme only' rule to a later relaxed rule in which 'broken' rhyme was acceptable.[22]

According to Eleanor Knott's formulation, in a quatrain in *rannaigheacht mhór*, '[the final words of lines] *b* and *d* rime, and *ac* consonate with them … and the final word of *c* rimes with a word in the interior of *d* [the term for this device being *aicill*].'[23] In qq. 16 and 17 of this poem the final words of lines *a* and *c* rhyme perfectly with each other: *ngrādh* : *lán*, *meadh* : *bean*, while in q. 18 *Traoi* rhymes with itself. In each case there is *aicill* rhyme between the final word of line *c* and a word in the interior of *d*. Having noted that this combination of features 'has the effect of producing multiple/superfluous rime (known as *breacadh*) in the overall quatrain', Pádraig Breatnach has provided a substantial list of instances of its occurrence in initial quatrains.[24] However, as is the case in this poem, it also occurs frequently elsewhere in poems: e.g. *AithDD* 17 q. 39; 62 q. 15; 63 q. 19; 84 q. 24; 86 q. 14; 95 qq. 15, 27 and 31; 100 q. 35, with a word rhyming with itself in nos 17.39*ac*; 62.15*ad*; 84.24*cd*; 95.27*ad*.

EDITION

Matter taken from C where B is defective is enclosed in chain brackets. With one exception (1*b*), forms of *codail* and *codladh* are spelled in B with *–dh–* ; the aspiration is omitted here. Tall *e* is used for *e* and *ea* in B: it is represented here by whichever form is appropriate. I have not italicised subscript *i*. I have read *i* (preposition), *im* (preposition + possessive pronoun, first person singular) and *is* (copula) for *a*, *am* and *as* respectively, *gc-* and *sc-* for *cc-* and *sg* respectively, *mar* for *mur* and *ua* for *úa*.

[21] For the use of the term 'broken rhyme' to include both *comhardadh briste* 'broken rhyme' and *amus* 'assonance' see Pádraig A. Breatnach, 'Ornamentation in *rannaigheacht*', in Gordon Ó Riain (ed.), *Dá dTrian Feasa Fiafraighidh* (Dublin, 2017), 293–337, at 300 n. 33.

[22] See ibid., 295–9.

[23] Eleanor Knott, *Irish Syllabic Poetry* (Dublin, 1957), 13–14 (for the metre), 9 (for *aicill*).

[24] Breatnach, 'Ornamentation in *rannaigheacht*', 297 n. 21 and Appendix B.

Text

Tadhg Ó Cobhthaigh c*ecini*t

1. Corrach do chodl*as* a-réir:
codl*adh* do b*adh* docair dhūin*n*;
ag so an c*ri*thear buan n*ach* báidh,
gual an g[h]*rá*idh ag fich*eadh* fūinn.

2. Mo chodl*adh* fa codl*adh* saobh:
t*re* chodl*adh* corr*ach* do-chia*m*
bean b[h]*ru*it uaine is si[o]n*n a*r suan,
sduagh fhi[o]n*n* do ba nuaidhe nia*m*h.

3. Tre*m* chadl*adh* do-*con*nc*as* dūin*n* –
níor c[h]omth*ach* rer g[h]abhtha g*rá*in –
stuagh m[h]*ēir*sheang fa m*eadh* do rīgh,
bean 'ga mbím i ngēib[h]*eann* g*rā*idh.

4. Nī hionan*n* g*rā*dh oile is í,
mo thoil-si m*ar* tá do*n* mhnaoi;
t*ru*agh gan mo g[h]*rā*dh dhoid, a Dhé,
's mē 'gum ghoid a*r* lár an laoi.

5. Doigh s[h]*eir*ce do*m* tholl*adh* t*rī*om
a*r* chodladh ní leigt[h]*ear* luadh;
ón g[h]*ru*aidhg[h]il is tin*n* a-tá*m*;
buaidhr*idh* a g*rā*dh s*i*n*n* 'na*r* suan.

Translation

1. My sleep was disturbed last night: it was a sleep which was hard for me. The coal of love seething under me is the constant spark which is not pleasant.

2. My sleep was an unnatural sleep: through a disturbed sleep I see while asleep a green-cloaked woman, a fair and stately woman of freshest beauty.

3. Through my sleep there appeared to me a stately woman with slender fingers who was worthy of a king, a woman who holds me in a love-prison – she was not a companion to be despised.

4. No other love is like my love for the woman as I am being taken off in the middle of the day. It is a pity that my love is not for you, God.

5. While a love-pang is piercing through me, mention of sleep is not permitted. I am ill because of the bright-cheeked one, my love for whom disturbs me when I am asleep.

Variants

1. *c* B c*ri*thir.
2. *b* H ad chiam; *d* B sdúaigh, fhin*n*.
3. *a* B chadl*adh*; B co*mtach*; *c* sdúaigh m*ear*sheang.
4. *a* B ele; *c* B dhuid; *d* B g*um*.

6. Ar gcur m'aign*idh* 'na g*ru*aidh ghil
suan a*r* a*r* n-aire nī uil;
toirc[h]eas na heirce is sí s[o]i*n*:
doigh sheirce trem c[h]lí do chu*ir*.

7. Rug m'a*ir*e d'im*ir*t is d'ól
an ain*n*ir is gile g*ru*adh;
rug a t*ro*mg[h]*rá*dh sin*n* dar seól;
ceól m*ar* org[h]án lin*n* a luadh.

8. Searc mná ón dod[h]olta dhūinn
lán robharta ag teacht i dtír;
ma*r* b*adh* moir i gco*m*[h]*dhá*il chuain
do ch*uaidh* doigh a tr*om*g[h]*rā*idh t*rī*nn.

9. An tolsai*n* – gā tine is teó? –
im c[h]ridhe 'na cosa*ir* chró
'go*m* shíorghoin as-toigh a-tá:
toil mná gá mīorbhail is mó?

10. 'Na lán mara do mhoigh t*rī*om
an toil n*ach* lam[h]*ar* a luadh;
cosg n*a* toile is ar gan fhál;
lān do g[h]*abh* san ch*ro*idhe cuan.

6. Sleep is of no interest to me since I have turned my attention to her bright cheek. She is the offspring of the lizard: she has sent a pang of love through my heart.

7. The maiden with the brightest cheek has taken my attention from sport and drink. (My) great love for her has taken me off my course; to hear her mentioned is music like an organ for me.

8. The love of a woman which I cannot escape is (like) a full spring-tide coming ashore. The pang of love for her went through me as if it were a sea meeting a harbour.

9. What miracle is greater than love for a woman? That love which is bleeding in my heart is ever wounding me within. What fire is hotter?

10. The love that one does not dare to mention has burst through me as a full tide. It is a fruitless endeavour to (try to) check the love which has fully established a harbour in the heart.

6. *a* B maighn*eadh*, maire.
7. *d* B lin*n*e.
8. *a* B óna; *b* B to*ch*t, H teacht; *c* BH muir; *d* B trim, H thr*ío*m.
9. *a* B toilsi*n*, teine; *c* B gu*m*.
10. *a* B mhuigh.

11. Do s[h]*eir*c mnā na mal*ach* seang,
dā gr*ā*dh mar do gad*adh* si[o]n*n*,
im rio*cht* f{éin ní f[h]uileam a[nn]:
call ta*r* cuileann nī léir liom.}

12. Do-ch*uaidh* m'aithne i n-éinf hea*cht* uai*m*;
rem aign*eadh* ní héidear srian;
beith ciall*mhar* ní ……..
……

13. A s[h]earc do Bhláthnaid do bhí
is-teach go dtánaig a ré;
tug tol a m[h]eanman don mhnaoi
m… [Con Raoi] ……..

14. Dāl Naoise fá Dheird*re* a*r* ndál
n*ach* feir[r]de faoilte n[á] fíon;
ní reabhr*adh* re n*each* do-nia*m*,
eac[h] g{*an* srian go nd*ear*n*adh* dío*m*.}

15. Cea*r*bhall Farbhlaidh fua*ir* mar mh*n*aoi:
re*m* uaill ní samhl*aidh*te a*cht* sé;
do b[h]í i dtarng[a]ire a theacht dī
's do s[h]ní s*ear*c F{h*ar*bhlaidhe é.}

11. Due to (my) love for the woman of the narrow eyebrows (and) as I have been taken off by love for her, I am not myself (and) the difference between a hazel and a holly is not apparent to me.

12. I am completely bereft of my (power of) cognition; it is not possible to control my mind; to be sensible … not …

13. [Cú Raoi's] love was for Bláthnaid until his life came to an end; [he] gave the love of his heart to the woman …

14. My circumstance is the same as Naoise's with regard to Deirdre as a result of which rejoicing or wine is not better. I do not play with anyone, so that I have been turned into an unbridled horse.

15. Cearbhall got Farbhlaidh as (his) wife: no pride except his is comparable to mine. It was prophesied that he would come to Farbhlaidh and his love for her caused him grief.

11. *c* C bhfuil*ea*m; *c* C as*s*.
12. *a* B aoínfhe*acht*; *b* B héidir.
13. *a* B Bhláthnuid; *b* astteagh, ttainic.
14. *a* A tre; *b* C n*a,* AB no; *c* A le; B nia*mh*, AC niam.
15. *a* B Cea*r*bholl, A Cearball, C Cea*r*bhall; B Farbhladh, A Farbhloidhe, C Farbhladha; B an m*n*aoí, A gnaoi, C mhnaoi; on p. 216 of A is the following note: *Jesus Maria* Cea*r*ball Far*b*l*adh* fua*ir* m*ur* mnaoi; *b* B samhl*aigh*thi, A samhl*adh*i, C samhl*adh*; *c* C ttairrngire, A ttairngire, C ta*r*anga*r*e, H ta*rr*ngaire; *d* B do sní, A s do shní, g*ur* sní; A fharbl…, C farbhl*adh*a.

16. Ō Duibhne fā G[h]*rá*inne a*r* ng*rādh*:
nī suirghe tāinig do t[h]aom;
mo sh*ear*c f[h]al*aigh* fa lin*n* lán;
samhail {dā ngrádh in*n* ar-aon}.

17. Mac Coise is Maol M[h]eadha ar meadh:
Maol M[h]eadha ó chroidhe do cha*r*.
Dá huaill nír bharamh*ail* bean:
fua*ir* f*ear* fa d{aghshamhail dam[h]}.

18. Sluagh na G*rē*ige is-teach san T*ra*oi
buan an ts*ear*c fā*r* lēig*eadh* lé
an bhean do thairbhir an Traoi;
do[n] m[h]*n*aoi ar aird[h]ibh {is meadh mé.}

19. Nī aithni*m* umha ta*r* ór,
ní aithni*m* uisce ta*r* fhíon;
mo c[h]*ro*idhe gonta *dá* g*rá*dh
lán moire ara doc*ra* díon.

20. Nó go bhfé[a]ch[th]a*r* an folt fann
agus réalta na rosg gcorr,
ní fagh*ar* glói*r* a*cht* glóir g[h]earr;
's dóigh leam g*ur* cadhan an chorr.

16. My love is as (the love of) ó Duibhne for Gráinne: it is not love-making that came suddenly. My hidden love was a vast sea; (the love of) both of us is comparable to their love.

17. Mac Coise and Maol Mheadha are a match for us: he loved Maol Mheadha with [all] his heart. No woman's pride was comparable with hers: she got a husband who was very like me.

18. Lasting was the love because of which the Greek host was admittted to Troy by the woman who surrendered (that city). I am a match for the woman as regards characteristics.

19. I cannot distinguish bronze from gold; I cannot distinguish water from wine. My heart (is) wounded by love for her (which is) a high tide against which it is a hardship to protect.

20. Until the soft-haired woman and the star of the round eyes is observed, no glory is attained but a brief one. I think that the heron is a barnacle goose.

16. *a* B g*radh*, C ng*ra*dh; *b* B a tao*mh*, C do thaom; *d* B a*r* g*ra*dh, C da ng*rá*dh; B rin, C in*n*.
17. *b* B cha*r*uidh, A croi…e, C c*ro*idhe; C deighshamhuil.
18. *a* B asttig*h*, AC asteach; *b* C bheart; *c* B thoirbhir, C thoirbh*ir*, A tairbhir; *d* B do m*n*aoi, A don mhnaoi; *d* B a*ir*gibh, A *airrgnibh*, C argibh; B fa m…, C as.
19. *d* BAC ma*r*a.
20. *a* B bfhécha*r*, A bfeghtha*r*, C bhfé*a*chta*r*, H bhfaic*ear*; BA a, CH an; *c* B faght*ar*, A fhaghoibh, C factha*r*, H faghthar; *d* as, ACH *deest*; BAH g*ur*, C g*ur*ab.

Commentary

Though this love poem begins with a series of three quatrains which refer to the speaker's sleep being disturbed by the sight of a beautiful woman, it would appear that it is not an *aisling* (*reverdie*, vision) in which an unknown woman appears to the speaker, but rather an expression of his love for his mistress which is so intense that it makes it impossible for him to sleep peacefully. This is one of the tropes of *amour courtois* in which love is represented as an illness which causes pain and upset. So for the speaker in this poem love is a prison (q. 3*d*). It is like burning coal seething under him and creating an unpleasant sensation (q. 1*cd*); no fire is hotter (q. 9*a*). It is a piercing pang (qq. 5*a*, 6*d*, 8*d*) which wounds him (qq. 9*c*, 19*c*). It makes him unable to relax and enjoy life (qq. 7*a*, 14*c*) and confuses his senses so that he cannot distinguish a hazel from a holly (q. 11*cd*) nor bronze from gold nor water from wine (q. 19*ab*) nor a barnacle goose from a heron (q. 20*d*).

Together with the influence of the foreign tradition the native voice is clearly heard in this poem. It is mediated through the use of the standard lexicon of bardic praise poetry such as the references to the woman as *stuagh fhionn do ba nuaidhe niamh*, *stuagh mhéirsheang*, *an ghruaidhgheal*, *an ainnir is gile gruadh*, *bean na malach seang*, *an folt fann*, *réalta na rosg gcorr* (qq. 2*d*, 3*c*, 5*c*, 7*b*, 11*a*, 20*ab*) and through the use of phrases such as *bean bhruit uaine*, *toirrcheas na heirce*, *ar gan fhál* (qq. 2*c*, 6*c*, 10*c*). So too, through its series of references to salient figures of tales of love (qq. 13–18), the poem is seen to belong to the same native tradition of love poems as *DG* nos. 7[25] and 71, which consist almost entirely of such references, *DG* 70, qq. 4–7, and Tadhg Dall Ó hUiginn's two aislings, *Néall mná síthe sunn a-réir* 'There was a vision of a fairy woman here last night', qq. 15–19, and *An tusa an bhean do bhí sunn* 'Are you the woman who was here', qq. 9–17.[26] While four of the tales (qq. 13–16) referred to by Ó Cobhthaigh end in tragedy, the last two (qq. 17–18) do not seem to fit this pattern. However, all six tales are concerned with the tribulations of love, and, though the speaker does not overtly refer to that in every case, the poet may have expected that the hearer/reader of the poem would be sufficiently conversant with those tales to be able to appreciate

[25]It is perhaps worth noting that a partial copy of this poem, with the quatrains in the order 1, 5, 3, 2, 7, 10, 6, 4, 8, occurs in UCD-OFM MS A 25, 126–7, though not in the hand of the main scribe. This, taken together with the poem under discussion here, may be taken to suggest that the interest of the scribes was not in the love poems *per se*, but in their references to tales, one of which, *Tochmharc Farbhlaidhe* 'The wooing of Farbhlaidh' = *Bás Cearbhaill agus Farbhlaidhe* (see note on q. 15 below), occurs at 217–30, prefaced by q. 15*a* of Tadhg Ó Cobhthaigh's poem. Indeed some of the manuscript's notes, in hands other than that of the principal scribe, express a negative attitude to love. On p. 210 occurs the following Latin couplet (the first half-line of which is also found on p. 124): *Nescio quid sit amor*: *nec amo*, *nec amor*, *nec amavi*. / *Sed scio*, *si quis amat*, *uritur igne gravi* 'I do not know what love is: I neither love, nor am loved, nor have loved. But I know, if someone loves, he is burned by a great fire.' Also on p. 210 occurs a line and a half in Irish which, with a reference to *grádh baoth*, 'foolish love', would seem to chime with the negativity of poems such as *DG* nos. 22 and 63.

[26]Ed. Eleanor Knott, *The Bardic Poems of Tadhg Dall Ó Huiginn*, ITS 22 and 23, 2 vols (London, 1922 and 1926), nos. 39 and 40.

that the impact of the speaker's description of his own difficulties is heightened by his references to those tales.

More personal to Tadhg Ó Cobhthaigh is the device of varied and pervasive repetition of words and phrases which is a salient feature of all four of his poems and to which I have already referred. The bardic poets frequently repeat, as an intensifying feature, a key word or phrase in successive quatrains of their poems.[27] However, Ó Cobhthaigh's practice is much more varied and as a result his diction is highly insistent. Thus *codladh* occurs in qq. 1*ab*, 2*a* (x2), 2*b*, 3*a*, 5*b*, and its synonym *suan* in q. 5*d*, 6*b*; *doigh* in qq. 5*a*, 6*d*, 8*d* and from the same semantic range *goinidh* in q. 9*c*; *grádh* in qq. 1*d*, 3*d*, 4*ac*, 5*d*, 7*c*, 8*d*, 11*b*, 16*ad*, 19*c*, its synonym *searc* in qq. 5*a*, 6*d*, 8*a*, 11*a*, 13*a*, 15*d*, 16*c*, 18*b*, and from the same semantic range *caraidh* in q. 17*b*; *gruadh* in qq. 5*c*, 6*a*, 7*b*; *lán* in qq. 8*b*, 10*ad*, 16*c* and 19*d*, associated in each of five cases with a term for a body of water (*robharta*, *moir* (twice), *cuan* and *linn*); *meadh* in qq. 3*c*, 17*a*, 18*d*; *moir* in qq. 8*c*, 10*a*, 19*d*, and from the same semantic range *robhorta* in q. 8*b*, *cuan* in qq. 8*c*, 10*d* and *linn* in q. 16*c*; *tol* in qq. 4*b*, 9*ad*, 10*bc*, 13*c*. Some of those occcur as part of a phrase (*doigh sheirce* in qq. 5*a*, 6*d*; *lán robharta / mara / moire* in qq. 8*b*, 10*a*, 19*d*) or of a compound word (*grūaidhgheal* in q. 5*c*, *tromghrādh* in qq. 7*c*, 8*d*, *síorghoin* in q. 9*c*).

NOTES

Q.2*c* *bean bhruit uaine*: This phrase is common in the literature, the sense being that the green cloak of the woman signifies either that she is of noble birth or that she is of the *aos sídhe* (fairy folk).

In *ABM* 102.12a, *Bé Bhinn bhratuaine*, and in *PB* l. 2147, *bean b*[*h*]*roit uaine*, nobility is implied (see also *PB* l. 2141, *Bean shrōill deirg*, a woman dressed in red satin). So too in 'The songs of Buchet's house',[28] *in ben brat-thūaine*, the green-cloaked woman (268, q. 48*b*), *Eithne thóebfhata*, is the daughter of the provincial king, Cathair, and foster-child of the nobleman, Buchet. The use of the colour of an individual's cloak as a marker of identity or function is seen here also in that Eithne's foster-father is *Buchet brattdeirg* (262, q. 62*c*, q. 11*d*), that fifty warriors in Buchet's house are properly (clad) in crimson cloaks, *i mbrattaib corcra co ccert* (272, q. 62*c*) and that fifty noble maidens there are also dressed in green cloaks (273, q. 63). In *Aided Con Rói*

[27]In *Téamaí Taighde Nua-Ghaeilge* (Baile Átha Cliath, 1997), 21, Pádraig A. Breatnach suggests that this is a distinctive feature (*ciúta sainiúil*) of the poetry of Maoil Eachlainn na nUirsgéal Ó hUiginn. This is hardly the case, for it is found in the work of many of the poets: e.g. *folt* in q. 1*a* of Muireadhach Albanach Ó Dálaigh's *An foltsa dhuit, a Dhé athar* 'This hair I offer thee, O God the Father' (*AithDD*, no. 43) is repeated in qq. 1*d*, 2*d*, 3*c*, 4*ac* (x 2), 5*bd*, 8*d*, 9*d* (and the synonymous *cúl* in q. 6*c*, *ciabh* in q. 18*c* and *barr* in q. 9*ac*); *léine* in q. 1*a* of Seaán Ó Clumháin's *Leasaighthear libh léine an ríogh* 'Repair ye the Prince's tunic' (*AithDD*, no. 4) is repeated in qq. 1*c*, 2*a*, 3*a*, 4*bd*, 6*a*, 8*c*, 9*c*, 10*c*, 11*c*, 12*c*, 13*a* and 23*d* (and the synonymous *truaill* in qq. 7*c* and 10*a*); *saoghalta* in q. 1a, of Donnchadh Mór Ó Dálaigh's *Saoghalta sin, a shaoghail* 'That is worldly, O world' (*DiD*, no. 53) is repeated in qq. 1*cd*, 2*d*, 3*d*, 15*d*, 17*d*, and *saoghal* in q. 1*a* is repeated in 2*d*, 4*c*, 5*b*, 6*a*, 7*ad*, 8*d*, 9*c*, 10*d*, 11*a*, 12*d*, 14*a*, 16*d*, 18*a*, 19*c*, 20*d*, 21*b*, 22*b*, 23*d*, 24*d*, 25*b*, 26*d*, and its synonyms *bioth* and *domhnán* in 13*d* and 27*d*.

[28]Ed. Mary Hayden,'The song of Buchet's house,' *ZCP* 8 (1912), 261–73.

mac Dáire Cú Rói, who practises magic, is referred to as *fer broit lachtna*, a man in a grey cloak,[29] while in the Early Modern *Eachtra Bhodaigh an Chóta Lachtna* the eponymous churl in the grey cloak is a deity in disguise.[30]

However, in *Seirgligi Con Culaind* 'The wasting sickness of Cú Chulainn',[31] one of the two women who visit Cú Chulainn in a dream wears a green cloak while the other wears a purple one, the woman in the green cloak being Lí Ban who came as a messenger from Fand, the wife of Manannán mac Lir (ll. 73–4, 127–33). So too, in *IGT* II, p. 121, citation 1587 *Bean bhroit úaine* would appear to be a member of the fairy folk since she is able to be *i n-ilreachduibh*, 'in many shapes', while in *ABM*, no. 215, q. 33 the *cumhal bruit uaine*, 'green-cloaked servant', who is sent from *síth Bóinne* to seduce Maoileachlainn Ó Ceallaigh is certainly a fairy woman, and the giantess wearing a green cloak (*Bratt ūaine impe*) whom mac Coise met at Lough Lene, Co. Westmeath, was also an otherworldly figure.[32]

Given that I have suggested above that this poem is not an *aisling*, I take it that Tadhg Ó Cobhthaigh intended the reference here to be to a noble woman, or at least, as the speaker suggests, to a woman who was beautiful enough to be a worthy partner for a king (q. 3*c*: *stuagh m*[*h*]*ēirsheang fa meadh do rīgh*).

Q.6*c toirrcheas na heirce*: This phrase also occurs in the Irish translation of *Visio Tnugdali*.[33] The author of the *Visio* was an Irish monk of the twelfth century, Marcus, who went to Regensburg where he was either a visitor or a member of the Irish Benedictine community.[34] While there he composed in Latin, about 1149, an account which he claims had been narrated to him in Irish by Tnugdalus of the latter's experiences when brought by an angel to visit purgatory, hell and heaven.[35] The work, which Marcus dedicated to Giesela, abbess of the Benedictine convent in Regensburg, contains descriptions of the punishments which Tnugdalus saw meted out in purgatory and hell to various categories of sinners, among which is that suffered by members of religious orders who in life had committed sexual and other sins. The souls of these, both men and women, were impregnated by a horrible beast and then descended into an icy swamp to await their time to give birth. There they were

[29]Ed. R.I. Best, 'The tragic death of Cú Rói mac Dári', *Ériu* 2 (1905), 20, §2; see also *FFÉ* ii, 222, l. 3456; see note on q. 13 below.

[30]Gerard Murphy has suggested that this tale is 'certainly as late as the sixteenth century' (see G. Murphy, *The Ossianic Lore and Romantic Tales of Medieval Ireland* (Dublin, 1955), 50). Deirdre Nic Chárthaigh has provided evidence that the surviving version of it was composed between 1543 and 1731 in her new edition of it (see Deirdre Nic Chárthaigh, '*Bodach an Chóta Lachtna*: eagrán nua', unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Trinity College Dublin (2019), 149), in which she has discussed the motif of the grey-coated man at pp. 14–18.

[31]Ed. Myles Dillon, *Seirgligi Con Culaind*, Medieval and Modern Irish Series 14 (Dublin, 1953).

[32]Ed. Kuno Meyer, 'Mitteilungen aus irischen Handschriften: Elfenbegräbnis', *ZCP* 8 (1912), 559–60.

[33]See also *Toirrches eirci d'órbhlaoscaib*, ed. Osborn Bergin, *IGT* II, citation 1078.

[34]See Nigel F. Palmer, '*Visio Tnugdali*': *The German and Dutch Translations and their Circulation in the Later Middle Ages* (München, 1982), 11.

[35]See Albert Wagner (ed.), *Visio Tnugdali* (Erlangen 1882, reprinted 1989), 4.

bitten in the bowels by the foetuses as occurred, the author states, in the case of the viper.[36] This is probably an allusion to the ancient belief that the female viper was killed by her young ripping their way out of their mother's body.[37] This belief survived, at least in metaphorical usage, down to the seventeenth century.[38]

An Irish translation of the *Visio*, *Aisling Tundail*, was made by Muirgheas mac Pháidín Ó Maolchonaire (d. 1543) in the second decade of the sixteenth century.[39] An early seventeenth-century copy of his translation 'made by a careful scribe ... probably from the original itself' is found in TCD MS H. 3. 18 (1337).[40] The text, which is in archaised Early Modern Irish, 'often abridges considerably [but] is on the whole accurate and spirited.'[41] The relevant passage in the original reads as follows:

> … viderunt bestiam omnibus, quas ante viderant, bestiis valde dissimilem … Que bestia sedebat super stagnum glacie condensum. Devorabat … bestia quascumque invenire poterat animas, et dum in ventre ejus per supplicia redigentur ad nihilum, pariebat eas in stagnum glacie coagulatum, ibique renovabantur iterum ad tormentum. Impregnabantur vero omnes anime tam virorum quam mulierum, que descendebant in stagnum, et ita gravide prestolabantur tempus, quod eis conveniebat ad partum. Intus vero mordebantur in visceribus more viperino a prole concepta. (Wagner, *Visio*, 27.17–28.6)

> '... they saw a beast which was quite unlike all beasts that they had previously seen… That beast used to sit upon a swamp which was thick with ice… The beast used to devour what souls it could find, and while in its stomach they were reduced to nothing by sufferings, it gave birth to them into the swamp which was thick with ice, and there they were renewed to be tormented. In fact all the souls, both of men and of women, which descended into the swamp were impregnated, and thus pregnant they awaited the time which was proper for them to give birth. Indeed in the manner of a viper they were bitten inside in their intestines by the offspring that they had conceived.'

[36]Ibid., 27–8.

[37]Cf. Pliny, *Naturalis Historia*, book 10, ch. 62.82, composed AD 77–9; Konrad von Megenberg, *Das Buch der Natur*, of AD 1475, ed. Franz Pfeiffer (Stuttgart 1861), 285.

[38]See the following citations in *OED*, *s.v.* viper, 3 (a): 1602, Ben Jonson, *Poetaster* 5.3. sig M., 'Out Viper, thou that eatest thy parents, hence'; 1609, William Shakespeare, *Pericles*, act 1, scene 1, 107–8: 'I am no Viper yet I feed / On mother's flesh which did me breed'.

[39]See V.-H. Friedel and Kuno Meyer, *Aisling Tundail* (Paris 1907), 89 n. 3.

[40]Ibid., 89 n. 2.

[41]Ibid., 91.

Ó Maolchonaire rendered this as follows:

> [A]t*con*n*airc* ... T*undal* an mbesd n-angb*aid* … Is aml*aidh ro buí* ina suide f*or* loch oigre … No sluig*ed* sí na han*m*ann*a* ainbfeachdn*ach*a et do*no* no díleagodh iad go madh uillide a piana, acc*us* no doth*ad* is*in* loch oig*r*e iad *con* athnúaidhighthi iad af*r*itisi .i. dia pianodh. Ba torrach in b*eist* si*n* o uiliph anmon*n*aibh co hinb*aid* a t*us*m*ed*o, et siad aga cna*mh* acc*us* ag a cogna*m* am*ail* toirrchi*us* na h*er*ci sl*eb*i. (V.-H. Friedel and Kuno Meyer, *Aisling*, 103–4)
>
> 'Tundal saw the fierce beast… It was sitting on an icy lake… It used to swallow the unfortunate souls and indeed used to digest them so that their pains were complete, and it used to bring them forth into the icy lake so that they [viz. their pains] were renewed again i.e. causing them pain. That beast was pregnant with all the souls until the time of their delivery while they were gnawing and biting her in the manner of the offspring of the lizard.'

Ó Maolchonaire's translation is inaccurate in that it has the beast pregnant with and giving birth to the souls, whereas in the original it is the souls of the damned which are impregnated and give birth. Furthermore, he translates 'viper' as *earc sléibhe*, 'lizard', presumably because the Irish language had no word for 'viper', since there were no vipers in Ireland.

In the sixteenth-century vellum RIA MS C ii 2 (1235) there is a copy of *Aisling Tundail* which Kuno Meyer believed is 'based upon' Ó Maolchonaire's translation.[42] However, the text is fairly heavily edited. In the passage with which I have been concerned *angbhaidh* is replaced with *adhuathmhar* 'terrible', *na hanmanna ainfheachtnacha* with *anmanna na bpeacthach* 'the souls of the sinners', *no dothadh* with *do thumadh* 'plunge, immerse' and *cnámh* with *sgoltadh* 'split, cleave'. The most important change is one of substance as it refers to the time at which the foetuses injured their mother. The text in TCD MS H. 3. 18 (1337) seems to follow the original Latin text in having this occur during the pregnancy. However, in RIA MS C ii 2 (1235) it occurs at the time of birth, as is highlighted by the phrase *gā mbreith*:

> Ba torrach an peist an tan sin co haimsir a mbreithi dona hanmannuibh ⁊ iad ag a cognam ⁊ ag a sgoltad ga mbreith mur bis toirrces na herci slebhe. (V.-H. Friedel and Kuno Meyer, *Aisling*, 129).
>
> 'The beast was pregnant then until the time when the souls were born chewing and splitting her [viz. the beast] as they were born as does the foetus of the lizard.'

[42]Ibid., 119.

This version is quite appropriate in the context of the comparison with the lizard and may be based on the scribe-editor's awareness of what could actually happen at the birth of a lizard.

The common lizard (*Zootoca vivipara*, formerly (until 1906) *Lacerta vivipara*) is Ireland's only native terrestrial reptile. After a gestation period of about three months the viviparous (live-bearing) female gives birth to an average of five live young, each enclosed in the shell-less membrane in which it developed inside the mother's body. The young break free of the membranes usually during birth or a few seconds afterwards.[43] If a foetus were observed ripping open the membrane during birth, it could appear that it was in fact tearing out some of its mother's insides. This could be understood to be extremely painful, so that the pain of love being endured by the speaker in Tadhg Ó Cobhthaigh's poem can be described as comparable to it. In view of the number of literary references in his poem, it is probable that this reference is also to a literary source, in all likelihood *Aisling Tundail*.[44]

Q.7*d* *org*[*h*]*án*: While it is likely that the word refers here to the specific instrument, this is not necessarily so, as the word was often used to refer to any musical instrument and indeed even to melody: see *DIL* s.v. *orgán*.

Q.10*c* *ar gan fhál*: Literally 'an unfenced field'. In his poem *Do bháidh teine Tír Chonaill* (*DiD* no. 81, 'Fire has overwhelmed Tír Chonaill') Fearghal Óg Mac an Bhaird points out that an unfenced field is ever a reproach (q. 33*c*, *gnáth éagnach ar ar gan fhál*) and, according to Tadhg Óg Ó Dálaigh in *Ní cluain ghabhála grás Dé* (*AithDD* no. 71, 'No fenced field is God's grace'), the human race would be an *ar gan fhál* (q. 12*c*) if we had not been saved by Christ. A highly amusing take on *gort gan fhál* is the logical impossibility *fál gan ghort* which is an anonymous composer's metaphorical description in *DG* no. 94, l. 12, of the attempts of a jealous husband to protect his uncomely morose wife from the approaches of other men.

[43]See the website of the Herpetological Society of Ireland at hhttps://the hsi.org/nativereptiles-and-amphibians/common-lizard. Accessed November 2018.

[44]After I submitted this essay, including the note on q. 6*c*, for publication in *Celtica*, the editor, Ruairí Ó hUiginn, brought to my attention Pádraig Ó Macháin's essay 'Two poems by William Nugent', *Ríocht na Midhe* 28 (2017), 36–52, in which (at pp. 45–6) he has discussed how Nugent, who was a near-contemporary of Tadhg Ó Cobhthaigh, used in the second of the poems (p. 43, q. 7*cd*) as an analogy for love the phrase *toircheas na heirce sléibhe*, which Pádraig has translated as 'the pregnancy of the viper', and in which (at p. 51 n. 37) he has referred to a line from a fifteenth-century poem (transcribed in *ABM* 264.24*a*) which is the citation from *IGT* II given above in n. 33. Pádraig has also discussed an interpolated sentence in Flaithrí Ó Maolchonaire's translation (Louvain, 1616) of the Spanish *El Desseoso* which reads in part: *gu samhlaighthear an duine feargach ris an nathair neimhe dá ngoirthear* uipera, *dá ttugann a toirrcheas féin bás*, 'so that the angry person is likened to the snake which is called *vipera*, which its own foetus kills' (see F. Ó Maolchonaire, *Desiderius*, ed. Thomas F. O'Rahilly (Dublin, 1955), ll. 1493–5). I believe that Ó Maolchonaire's use of the Latin name for the viper means that he had no Irish name for it and that, *pace* Pádraig, this would suggest that the earlier authors' *earc* (*sléibhe*) was not their name for the viper.

Tadhg Ó Cobhthaigh was fond of this metaphorical phrase and of versions of it. As well as using it here, in his poem *Folamh Éire d'easbhaidh Bhriain* (*ABM*, no. 246) he refers to Ireland and the Irish as *gort gan fhál* and *ar gan fhál* (qq. 6*d*, 25*d*) and quotes what seems to be a proverb, *beag toradh abhla gan fhál* (q. 4*c*, 'an unfenced apple tree produces little fruit').

Q.11 Line ***c*** is defective in B and line ***d*** is missing: the readings are based on NUIM MS C 74 (g).

Q.12 Line **c** is defective in B and line ***d*** is missing. No other MS has this quatrain.

Q.13 Apart from the initial letter which appears to be *m*, line ***d*** is missing in B and none of the other MSS has this quatrain.

The name *Bláthnaid* in line ***a*** indicates that the reference is to *Aided Con Rói mac Dáire*.[45] The name *Cú Raoi* is required in line ***d***: the genitive of *Cú*, *Con* would provide internal rhyme with *tol* in line ***c*** and *Raoi* would provide *aicill* with the final word in line ***c***, *mhnaoi*. Some elements of the various versions of the *Aided* are mutually incompatible. However, the following narrative can be extracted to provide a context for Ó Cobhthaigh's reference. Cú Chulainn loved Bláthnaid, the daughter of the king of the Fir Falga. The men of Ulster pillaged the land of the Fir Falga with the vital support of Cú Raoi, to whom Cú Chulainn promised his choice of the booty which they would take as a reward. They carried off Bláthnaid and the valuables of the fort of the king, and when Cú Raoi demanded Bláthnaid as his reward, Cú Chulainn refused to let him have her. However, Cú Raoi took her away in secret; Cú Chulainn pursued him; they engaged in combat and Cú Raoi, having felled Cú Chulainn, shamed him by cutting off his hair with his sword,[46] and then brought Bláthnaid to his home in west Munster. A year later Cú Chulainn came to west Munster and met Bláthnaid who informed him that she loved him, asked him to come at Samhain to carry her away and promised to arrange that Cú Raoi would be almost completely alone. When Cú Chulainn came with his army, Bláthnaid sent him a message saying that she would steal Cú Raoi's sword and would then pour milk into the stream which ran through the wood in which Cú Chulainn was encamped. When Cú Chulainn saw the milk in the stream he attacked Cú Raoi's fort, found Cú Raoi alone and killed

[45]Ed. R.I. Best, 'The tragic death of Cúrói Mac Dári,' *Ériu* 2 (1905), 18–35.

[46]This *mebal* (shame) is described thus in an early version of the *Aided*: *roberr máil fair cosin chloduib 7 ... rochomail cacc ina mbō inna chend*, 'he cropped his hair on him with his sword, and rubbed cow-dung into his head' (Best, 'The tragic death', 22, ll. 10 and 2–3) and it is frequently referred to in the literature as *bearradh geóin* (*na Con*) 'the mocking shearing of Cú Chulainn': *DG* no. 70, ll. 17–20; Gearóid Mac Niocaill, 'Duanaire Ghearóid Iarla', *Studia Hibernica* 3 (1963), 7–59, at 28 no. 11 q. 3, and p. 55 n. 387; Kuno Meyer, 'Mitteilungen aus irischen Handschriften', *ZCP* 13 (1921), 166–84, at 11, q. 16, the reference to which in *DIL s.v. gén* is incorrect. In *DG* no. 70, ll. 21–2, it is stated that it was in retribution for that insult that Cú Chulainn killed Cú Rói: *Mac Dáire i ndíol a mhasla / ciorrbhas an Cú éachtach-sa*.

him, and took Bláthnaid to Ulster where she was subsequently killed by Cú Raoi's poet, Feircheirtne.[47]

Q.14 The reference is to the story of the tragic love of Deirdre and Naoise, the early (late ninth or early tenth century)[48] version of which is *Longes mac nUislenn* 'The exile of the sons of Uisliu'[49] and the later (fourteenth or fifteenth century) *Oidheadh Chloinne Uisnigh* 'The violent death of the children of Uisneach'.[50] Deirdre was only unwittingly and indirectly responsible for Naoise's death: it was the jealous king of the Ulstermen, Conchobhar, who had him slaughtered so that he might have Deirdre for himself.

Q.15 The reference is to another story of tragic love, *Bás Cearbhaill agus Farbhlaidhe* 'The death(s) of Cearbhall and Farbhlaidh'.[51] Proinsias Mac Cana's synopsis of the story runs as follows: 'It tells of the love that Cearbhall [Ó Dálaigh] and [Farbhlaidh] the daughter of the king of Scotland bore each other and how it was finally frustrated in a Tristan-style dénouement.'[52] The prose and poetic versions of the Tristan legend offer different accounts of his death. It appears that Mac Cana's characterisation of the ending of *Bás Cearbhaill agus Farbhlaidhe* refers to the poetic version by Thomas of Britain in which Tristan has been wounded by a poisoned lance and can only be healed by Isolde, but is tricked by his wife into believing that Isolde will not come to heal him and dies of grief; whereupon, when Isolde comes to him, she swoons over his corpse and dies. So too, Farbhlaidh's father tricks his daughter into believing that Cearbhall has died, and when she dies of grief, he sends messengers to tell Cearbhall of her death, so that he too dies.

Q.15*b* There would seem to be an anacoluthon in this line, in that a word such as *duine* is required by the grammar of the sentence after *samhlaighthe*. Thus the literal translation of the sentence is: '(no-one) except him can be compared to my pride.' There are other examples of similarly constructed sentences (without anacoluthon) in qq. 16*a* and *d* and 17*c*. I have given the sense in each case in the translation above.[53]

[47]See Best, 'The tragic death', 18–35; *FFÉ* ii, 222–6; R. Thurneysen, 'Der Sage von Curoi', *ZCP* 9 (1913), 189–234.

[48]See Máire Herbert, 'The universe of male and female: a reading of the Deirdre story', in Cyril J. Byrne, Margaret Harry and Pádraig Ó Siadhail (eds), *Celtic Languages and Celtic Peoples* (Halifax, Nova Scotia, 1989) 53–64, at 53.

[49]Ed. Vernam Hull, *Longes mac nUislenn: The Exile of the sons of Uisliu* (New York and London, 1949).

[50]Ed. Caoimhín Mac Giolla Léith, *Oidheadh Chloinne Uisnigh*, ITS 56 (London, 1993).

[51]Versions of this tale have been edited by Siobhán Ní Laoire, *Bás Cearbhaill agus Farbhlaidhe* (Baile Átha Cliath, 1986).

[52]P. Mac Cana, 'The sinless otherworld of *Immram Brain*', *Ériu* 27 (1976), 95–115, at 105.

[53]See Mícheál Hoyne's discussion of further examples of *comparatio compendiaria* in 'Early Modern Irish miscellanea', *Ériu* 67 (2017), 169–86, at 172–3.

Q.16 The suggestion in line ***a*** that Diarmaid (Ó Duibhne) loved Gráinne (daughter of Cormac mac Airt) misrepresents *Tóruigheacht Dhiarmada agus Ghráinne* 'The pursuit of Diarmaid and Gráinne',[54] to which it presumably refers. However, like the stories referred to in qq. 13–15, that tale ultimately ends in tragedy. When Cormac agreed to give Gráinne as wife to Fionn mac Cumhaill, a banquet was held during which Gráinne placed Diarmaid under an injunction (*geis*) to elope with her. Since he could not ignore her injunction, he agreed reluctantly to do so. Fionn, eaten by jealousy (*éad*) and furious at the insult (*masla*), pursued the couple, threatening to kill Diarmaid. Eventually peace was made between Fionn and Diarmaid. Later, however, Diarmaid was mortally wounded by a magical boar that he was hunting and Fionn, who could have cured him, failed to do so, because he was still smarting from the insult of the elopement, and Diarmaid died.

Q.17 Since each of the other quatrains in the series (13–16 and 18), makes reference to a story which contained an account of a love relationship, it seems reasonable to take it that in this case also reference is made to a story of love between a man who is only identified by the patronymic, mac Coise, and a woman called Maol Mheadha. As far as I am aware, no such story exists now. There are two, and perhaps three, individuals named mac Coise of whom a tradition exists. The poet, Airbheartach mac Coise Dobhráin, *fear léighinn* and later *airchinneach* of Ros Ailithir, whose death is recorded in *AU* s.a. 1016.8 and the Annals of Loch Cé s.a. 1016.7 is believed to have been a historical figure. Iorard mac Coise, *prīmēces Ērend* 'principal poet of Ireland', whose death at Clonmacnois is recorded in *AU* s.a. 990.2, in the Annals of Tigernach s.a. 990.1, in the Chronicon Scottorum at 990, but in Conall Mac Eochagáin's translation of the Annals of Clonmacnois (1627) at 983 and in *AFM* at 1023.10, may also have been a historical figure, but, due to the problems of dating relating to the year of his death and due to the language of the poems attributed to him, this is not universally accepted as true.[55]

An individual identified only by the patronymic *mac Coise*, may have been fictional, but the name would seem to refer to Iorard in many instances. What is clear, however, is that several prose and verse texts exist which relate to a character called mac Coise and these, or at least some of them, may be parts of a longer tale or pseudo-biography.

In the poem '*Abair damhsa re Dearbháil*' '"Tell Dearbháil for me"',[56] the poet sends a messenger to Dearbháil, daughter of Tadhg (q. 1*b*), to advise her that the death of her son, Aodh (q. 4*b*), should not cause her to be at variance with God (q. 2*a*), since he was not her possession, but was a gift (q. 1*d*) from

[54]Ed. Nessa Ní Sheaghdha, *Tóruigheacht Dhiarmada agus Ghráinne*, ITS 48 (Dublin, 1967).

[55]See Osborn Bergin, 'A dialogue between Donnchad son of Brian and mac Coisse', *Ériu* 9 (1921–5), 175–80, at 175; Colm Ó Lochlainn, 'Poets on the battle of Clontarf, *Éigse* 3 (1941–2), *passim*; Aideen M. O'Leary, 'The identities of the poet(s) Mac Coisi: a reinvestigation', *CMCS* 38 (Winter 1999), 53–71, at 69.

[56]Ed. Kuno Meyer, 'Mitteilungen aus irischen Handschriften: Mac Coissi cecinit', *ZCP* 6 (1908), 269–70.

God which he was free to take back (q. 3*d*).[57] So too, Tadhg Óg Ó hUiginn (d. 1478) composed a poem, '*Cia do-ghéabhainn go Gráinne*' (*AithDD* no. 13, '"Whom can I get (to send) to Gráinne?"'), imparting the same advice to Gráinne (d. 1440), daughter of Maoilsheachlainn Ó Ceallaigh and wife of Tadhg Ó Briain, on the death of her son, Ruaidhrí. Tadhg Óg's poem is highly intertextual. In an apologue in his poem (qq. 8–15), he refers to the earlier poem which he attributes to mac Coise (q. 13*b*), paraphrasing its first line (q. 13*c*, 15*c*) and others (qq. 13*d*, 15).[58] Mac Coise did not specifically identify Dearbháil, apart from giving her father's name as Tadhg (qq. 1*b*, 4*a*) and her son's as Aodh (q. 4*b*). Tadhg Óg did, naming her father as Tadhg an Eich (q. 11*b*), i.e. 'Tadhg an Eich Ghil Ó Conchobhair (d. 1009)',[59] and her husband as Domhnall Dúin Monaidh (q. 12*a*), *rí Oiligh* (q. 11*c*, 'king of Aileach') i.e. Domhnall Ó Néill; and in the final quatrains of the apologue (qq. 16–17) he states that though Dearbháil initially found mac Coise's advice bitter, his words eventually caused her grief to ease, so that she promised God that she would grieve no more (qq. 16–17*ab*). It is possible that those identifications were made independently by Tadhg Óg and that his account of the effect of mac Coise's advice was his own creation. It is also possible, however, that the poem attributed to mac Coise was part of a fictional biography of him or of a tale based on his life such as 'Eachtra Mhuireadhaigh Uí Dhálaigh' which may have been based on the life of Muireadhach Albanach Ó Dálaigh.[60] In that case the fuller identifications of Dearbháil and the remark on the effect on her of mac Coise's advice could have been made in the prose preceding and following the poem.

It would seem that the poet to whom Tadhg Óg Ó hUiginn refers as mac Coise (qq. 9*b*, 13*b*) was Iorard mac Coise, for he calls him *ceann na n-éigeas* (q. 9*b*, 'chief poet') just as the Annals of Ulster, when recording Iorard mac Coise's death at 989 (990), refer to him as *prīmēces Ērend* ('principal poet of Ireland') and as the Annals of Clonmacnois do at the year 983.[61] Tadhg Óg also refers later in his poem (q. 22) to the High-king Maoilsheachlainn giving

[57]In q. 3*d*, *antí dorat as ē ruc*, the poet paraphrases the biblical words of the patient Job (Book of Job 1.20): 'Yahweh gave, Yahweh has taken back' (which are translated by Fearghal Óg Mac an Bhaird in *DiD* no. 46, q. 10*b*: *Dia thug, Dia rug a-ríse*).

[58]Tadhg Óg's engagement with the earlier poem is not confined to the apologue. The wordplay in q. 1*b*, where Tadhg Óg echoes the name *Dearbháil* (which has not yet occurred in his poem) in *dearbháile* ('grief') is note-worthy. He also paraphrases mac Coise's q. 3*d* (see preceding note) in his q. 7: referring to Ruaidhrí as a gift which was given to Gráinne (q. 7*a*, *torchuirthe tugadh dhí*), he says: *an té rug é as a haithle / is é thug an torchairthe* (q. 7*cd*, 'he who took the gift away afterwards was he who gave it). And later in the poem (q. 22) he refers to the story of mac Coise having received the kingship of Ireland for a year from Maoilsheachlainn (see below).

[59]For this version of his name see *AithDD*, p. 47 (introduction to poem 13). See Nollaig Ó Muraíle, 'Uí Ainlí Taoisigh Chineál Dofa, sna Ginealaigh agus sna hAnnála', in Eoin Mac Cárthaigh and Jürgen Uhlich (eds), *Féilscríbhinn do Chathal Ó Háinle* (Indreabhán, 2012), 807–62, at 816.4*a*, 817.4*d*.

[60]For detailed discussion of arguments for and against the existence of such an account of (part of) Muireadhach's life see Damian McManus, 'In defence of manslaughter: two poems by Muireadhach Leasa an Doill / Albanach Ó Dálaigh for Domhnall Mór (mac Éigneacháin) Ó Domhnaill († 1241)', *Ériu* 64 (2014) 145–203, at 145–56.

[61]*AU* s.a. 990.1, see above; Denis Murphy (ed.), *The Annals of Clonmacnoise, being annals of Ireland from the earliest period to A.D.1408, translated into English, A.D.1627 by Conell Mageoghagan* (Dublin, 1896), s.a. 983.

the gift of the kingship of Tara for a year to a poet whom Tadhg Óg does not name. In a poem lamenting the death of Maoilsheachlainn, '*Dursan mar tái*, *a Dhúin na Sciath*' '"You are sorrowful, Dún na Sciath"',[62] the putative author refers to himself as *mac Coise ceann na gcliar* (q. 8*b*, 'mac Coise, chief of the poets') and tells of the gift of the high-kingship that he received from Maoilsheachlainn (q. 5). Two other sources specify Iorard mac Coise as the poet to whom Maoilsheachlainn gave that gift. One is an anonymous poem, '*Freccair meisi*, *a meic Coisi*' ('"Answer me, mac Coise"') the first part of which is in the form of a conversation between Donnchadh mac Briain and Iorard mac Coise (q. 1*ac*) during which Iorard gives an account of how Maoilsheachlainn gave him the high-kingship for a year and of how the poet refused to give it back at the end of the year, only to have Maoilsheachlainn take it from him by force (qq. 8–13).[63] The other is a more detailed account of the same transaction in Conall Mac Eochagáin's translation of the Annals of Clonmacnois following the record of the death of Iorard mac Coise at the year 983.

In the seventeenth-century manuscript NLI MS G 131, the main scribe of which was Cú Choigcríche Ó Cléirigh,[64] a group of six poems lacking scribal attribution occurs on pp. 215–26.[65] As already noted, '*Abair damhsa re Dearbháil*' (NLI MS G 131, pp. 225–6) has been attributed to mac Coise, and the putative author of '*Dursan mar tái*, *a Dhúin na Sciath*' (ibid., p. 222) refers to himself as mac Coise, while the putative author of a third (ibid., pp. 222–3) *Gol mnā sīdhe sunn re gaoith* 'The weeping of a fairy woman (comes) here on the wind' refers to himself as *mac Coise ó C*[*h*]*luain* (q. 11*a*, 'mac Coise from Clonmacnois').[66] Two other poems, '*Marthain duit*, *a Ioraird fhēil*' (ibid., pp. 215–18, '"Long life to you, noble Iorard"') and '*Freccair meisi*, *a Meic Coisi*' (ibid., p. 219), consist of conversations, in the case of

[62]Ed. Kuno Meyer, 'A medley of Irish texts', *Archiv für celtische Lexikographie* 3 (1905–7), 302–26, at 305.

[63]Osborn Bergin edited the first fourteen quatrains of the poem in 'A dialogue', omitting silently the remaining twenty-two. Though closure is marked at the end of q. 14 by repetition of the opening word of the poem, and though this first section occurs without the second in at least two late manuscripts, NUIM MS M 13, p. 264 and RIA MS 23 M 18 (154), p. 298, it is not so in Bergin's source, RIA MS B iv 2 (1080), fol. 30, nor in NLI MS G 131, where the second part of the poem repeats the structure of the first part, viz. a query in a single quatrain from Donnchadh, followed by the poet's description of an astounding act of generosity on the part of Aonghus m*ac* Carr*aidh*, which parallels Maoilsheachlainn's, with closure again marked at the end of q. 36 by the repetition of the opening word of the poem.

[64]See Nessa Ní Shéaghdha, *Catalogue of Irish Manuscripts in the National Library of Ireland*, fasc. 4 (Dublin, 1977), 51.

[65]Another poem *Moelseachlainn sinnsear Goidheal* which is attributed by the scribe to mac Coise occurs at pp. 181–3.

[66]The author of an elegy for Fearghal Ó Ruairc, *Brónach ollamh d'éis a rígh* 'Sad is a master poet after his king', ed. John O'Donovan, 'Elegy of Erard Mac Coise …', *Journal of the Kilkenny and South-East of Ireland Archaeological Society* 1.2 (1857), 341–56, at 348 q. 13*a*, refers to himself in precisely the same terms. So too in the poem '*A úa Fhiacrach dar dhiall goil*' '"Ó Fiacrach to whom conflicts submit"' in the late fourteenth-century manuscript, The Book of Hy Many, fol. 118rb, the author refers to himself as mac Coise: *As mē* m*ac Coise go* [*g*]*céill* (q. 34*a*, 'I am intelligent mac Coise'): see Kathleen Mulchrone, *Catalogue of Irish Manuscripts in the Royal Irish Academy*, fasc. 26 (Dublin, 1942), 3352.

the first between two poets, mac Liag and Iorard mac Coise, and of the second between Donnchadh mac Briain and Iorard mac Coise. Given its context at ibid., pp. 223–5, it is entirely plausible to attribute to mac Coise the fifth poem in this group, '*Dubhach sin*, *a Mhaol Mheadha*' '"That is sad, Maol Mheadha"'.[67]

I believe that it is not fanciful to suggest that some, if not all, of those poems could have formed part of a pseudo-biography of the poet Iorard mac Coise or of a tale about him,[68] as could prose narratives, such as the narrative about Iorard in the Annals of Clonmacnois mentioned above and the narrative which precedes it which is quoted below, and two brief anecdotes, one of which recounts mac Coise's meeting with a giantess and his helping her to take her dead husband to be buried in Clonmacnois,[69] and the other which narrates his shooting a swan which then becomes a woman.[70]

In the part of '*Freccair meisi*' which Bergin did not edit, mac Coise describes how he first met and fell in love with Maol Mheadha, *inghean* Cong*al*aigh … *dalta sin … do re*acht*aire ríogh Éireann* (q. 29*bcd*, 'the daughter of Congalach who was a fosterson of the steward of the king of Ireland'): *mar do* chon*acsa a cucht cōir / rom līon a grādh i gcēad*óir (q. 32*cd*, 'when I saw her beautiful form I was filled with love for her at once'). She was Aonghus mac Carraidh's lover, but when he saw that mac Coise had fallen for her he gave her to him. Mac Coise then escorted her to *dūnadh Cluana Creamha* (q. 35*ab*, 'the encampment of Cluain Creamha'), where presumably he was living.

The Annals of Tigernach at 989 and the Annals of Clonmacnois at 983 record that mac Coise died at Clonmacnois *in penitentia* or 'penitently'.

[67]It is perhaps significant that, as well as '*Freccair meisi*', three of the other poems attributed to mac Coise which are found in NLI MS G 1, viz. '*Dursan mar tái*, *Moelsechlainn sinnsear Goidheal*' and '*Marthain duit*', also occur in RIA MS B iv 2 (1080) which was written by Micheál Ó Cléirigh: see Elizabeth Fitzpatrick, *Catalogue of Irish Manuscripts in the Royal Irish Academy*, fasc. 24 (Dublin, 1938), 3022 and 3024–5. At least it suggests that poems attributed to Iorard mac Coise were of particular interest to Cú Choigcríche and Micheál Ó Cléirigh.

[68]It is not unusual that poems, which originally formed part of a prose text, would occur independently in manuscripts. Thomas F. O'Rahilly published a poem in *Measgra Dánta* 1 (Dublin and Cork, 1927), no. 11, '*Gabh*, *a mhic*, *mo mhúnadh-sa*' '"Son, accept my instruction"', to which he attached the following prescient note: 'It seems very probable that the poem originally formed part of some prose romance' (ibid., 70). In fact it consists of seven of the eight quatrains of a poem from the sixteenth-century translation of 'William of Palermo', see Cecile O'Rahilly (ed.), *Eachtra Uilliam* (Dublin, 1949), from which he had already published three poems in *DG* (nos. 15, 56 and 64).

[69]Ed. Kuno Meyer, 'Mitteilungen aus irischen Handschriften: Elfenbegräbnis', *ZCP* 8 (1912), 559–60, and Colm Ó Lochlainn (trans.), 'Poets on the battle of Clontarf 2', *Éigse* 5 (1943–4), 33–47, at 33–4.

[70]Quoted and translated by Colm Ó Lochlainn, ibid., at 34. The tale *Airec Menman Uraird maic Coisse* ('The mental invention of Iorard mac Coise', ed. Mary E. Byrne in *Anecdota from Irish Manuscripts* 2 (Halle, 1908), 42–76 is not relevant here since it is little more than a device to provide for a listing of the tales which should be known to a *fili*.

However, the Annals of Clonmacnois also seem to suggest that he had lived at Clonmacnois or in its vicinity for some part of his life:

> Erard mcCoyssie cheef poet of Moyleseachlin and all Ireland … for his devotion to God and St. Queran had his residence in Clonvicknois, to the end he might be near the church dayly to hear mass, and upon a night there appeared an Angle unto him that reprehended him for dwelling soe neere the place, and told him that the paces of his journey comeing and goeing to heare mass dayly would be measured by God, and accordingly yeelded him recompence for his paines, & from thence foorth mcCoysee removed his house a good distance from Clonvicknois to a place among boggs to this day called the place of mcCossyes house, from which hee did use daily to repaire to Clonvicknois to heare mass as he was wardned before by the angle. (Murphy, Annals of Clonmacnois, 161)

The place of mac Coise's house may well have been in Cluain Creamha, lit. 'meadow of garlic', in English 'Cloncraff'.[71] The townland of that name is on the east of the Shannon north-east of Clonmacnois. Originally the name applied to a topographical feature which was a green island in the middle of a boggy area. It lay roughly at a distance of about 3.5km from Clonmacnois, surely 'a good distance' from the monastery. If mac Coise's house was indeed there, it could well be described as being in 'a place among boggs'.[72]

At the end of '*Freccair meisi*', the poet says that Maol Mheadha is still with him (in Cluain Creamha ?) and is old (*go b*[*h*]*fuil sunna ina seanōir* (q. 35*d*, 'so that she is here as an old woman'), which would mean that he himself is also elderly. However, according to the poem '*Dubhach sin*, *a Mhaol Mheadha*' their relationship was not without instances of tension. The poet recalls a night when they were drinking and they had an argument which led to a falling out which lasted for six months and almost led to a separation:

6. Do b[h]āmar adh*aigh* ag ól,
   mé, *agus* tú, a Mhaol Mheadha mhór,
   …
   tarla ead*ra*inn imreasain.

7. Dā rāithe dhūinn i ndeabhaidh:
   suaill nār áille dhūinn deadhail …

[71]Also known as 'Bloomhill'. This name, which has no basis in Irish and is the only one now used locally, dates from at least the early nineteenth century (see William Larkin's map of King's County 1809 in Arnold Horner, *Mapping Offaly in the Early Nineteenth Century* (Bray, 2006), appendix C2).

[72]Cloncraff was linked to the surrounding dry land by toghers on all sides, and one of these crossed the bog and joined the Pilgrims' Road to Clonmacnois, having passed by three rocks which were associated with a folk legend about the theft of St. Ciarán's famous cow: see John Feehan, *The Landscape of Clonmacnoise* (Offaly, 2014), 47, 13. The existence of this pathway could explain the existence of the narrative about mac Coise's transfer from Clonmacnois to Cloncraff after his vision of the angel.

> ‘You and I, tall Maol Mheadha, were drinking one night and we had a dispute.
>
> For six months we were at variance; it was almost the case that it would have been better for us to separate.’

It is clear that in the poem it is posited that a reconciliation had been effected, for the poet speaks quite lovingly to Maol Mheadha, referring to her as c*olan*n *ma*r *chlúimh n-eala* (q. 3*b*, ‘(you whose) body is as the plumage of a swan’) and sympathetically speaking of her sorrow: *a Mhaol Mheadha*, *a Mhaol b*[*h*]*rōnach* (q. 4, ‘sorrowful Maol Mheadha’).

These two poems, ‘*Freccair meisi*’ and ‘*Dubhach sin*’, either as independent poems or as parts of a biography of mac Coise or of a story about him, reflect a tradition about mac Coise’s love for Maol Mheadha which was available to Tadhg Ó Cobhthaigh in the sixteenth century, just as the poem ‘*Abair damhsa re Dearbháil*’ was available, perhaps as part of a longer text, to Tadhg Óg Ó hUiginn in the fifteenth.

Q.18 The reference is to Helen, daughter of Zeus and Leda. She married Menelaus and together they ruled Sparta. Paris, a prince of Troy, came to Sparta and abducted Helen; according to another version she eloped with him. Menelaus came with his army to Troy to recover Helen and he laid siege to the city. There are conflicting accounts of Helen’s behaviour during the siege. In Virgil’s *Aeneid*, according to Deiphobus when the Trojan horse was admitted into the city, she feigned Bacchic rites, leading a chorus of Trojan women, and, holding a torch among them, she signalled to the Greeks from the city’s central tower:

> [C]um fatalis equus saltu super ardua venit
> Pergama et armatum peditem gravis attulit alvo,
> illa chorum simulans euhantis orgia circum
> ducebat Phrygias; flammam media ipsa tenebat
> ingentem et sua Danaeos ex arce vocabat …
> intra tecta vocat Menelaum et limina pandit,
> scilicet id magnum sperans fore munus amanti,
> et famam extingui veterum sic posse malorum.
>
> ‘When the fatal horse came with a leap above high
> Pergamon, and heavy in its womb it brought armed infantry,
> that woman, pretending a dance, led around the Trojan women
> singing ‘euhoe’ in Bacchic revels; she herself in their midst was holding
> a huge torch and was calling the Greeks from the top of the citadel …
> She called Menelaus in[to] the house and opened the door
> surely hoping that this would be a great gift for her lover,
> and thus she could extinguish the renown of her longstanding evils.’[73]

[73]Text and translation from Meredith Prince, ‘Helen of Rome?: Helen in Virgil’s *Aeneid*’, *Helios* 41, no. 2 (Fall 2014), 200–1.

This version of events would seem to be the basis for Ó Cobhthaigh's narrrative here.

Q.18*d* *ar aird*[*h*]*ibh* The mss readings are **B** *airgib*, **A** *airrg*n*ibh*, **C** *argibh*. The noun *airdhe* is occasionally spelled with *-gh-* and though its nominative plural form is normally *airrdheana*, the nominative form *airdhi* and dative *airdhibh* (and *airghibh*) also occur (see *DIL* s.v. 1. *airde*).

In another reference to the siege of Troy in his poem *Folamh Éire d'easbhaidh Bhriain* Tadhg Ó Cobhthaigh used this same phrase as he compared Brian Ó Conchobhair to Hector: *Eacd*air *na Traoi* ar airg[*h*]*ibh é* (*ABM* no. 246, q.18*d*).

Q.20*cd* The perfect rhyme between the two instances of *glóir* in line *c* and *dóigh* in line *d* is an example of the ornament *breacadh taibhse*.[74]

Q. 20*d* This final example of the trope of the mental confusion caused by love is quite awkward here, and would appear to have been introduced simply to provide the word *corr* as closure, corresponding to the first syllable of the opening word *corrach*.[75]

Abbreviations

AithDD Lambert McKenna, *Aithdioghluim Dána*, 2 vols (Dublin 1939, 1940).

DG Thomas F. O'Rahilly [Tomás Ó Rathile], *Dánta Grádha*: *Cnósach de sna Dánta Grádha is Fearr san Ghaeilge (1350–1750)*, second ed. (Dublin and Cork, 1926).

DiD Láimhbheartach Mac Cionnaith, *Dioghluim Dána* (Baile Átha Cliath, 1938).

FFÉ David Comyn, Patrick S. Dinneen (eds), *Foras Feasa ar Éirinn*, ITS 4, 8, 9, 15, 4 vols (London, 1902, 1908, 1914).

OED *Oxford English Dictionary*

PB James Carney, *Poems on the Butlers* (Dublin, 1945).

Cathal Ó Háinle

Trinity College Dublin

[74]See Cáit Ní Dhomhnaill, *Duanaireacht* (Baile Átha Cliath, 1975), 55 §95.

[75]I am extremely grateful to Eoin Mac Cárthaigh, Ruairí Ó hUiginn and the anonymous reader for their helpful comments on this essay and to Mr. Colm Ennis, Trinity College, Dublin, for sharing his expertise in herpetology with me.

PARGYS CAILLIT AND JOHN KELLY'S MANX DICTIONARY

A note on the textual history of *Pargys Caillit*, the eighteenth-century Manx version of John Milton's *Paradise Lost*, arguing that the manuscript copy in Manx Museum MS 188A is in the hand of the lexicographer John Kelly and derives from another, lost copy lent to him by Philip Moore in 1776.

In the corpus of Manx religious literature, there is little than can be said to stand out on its literary merit alone. An exception is the eighteenth-century Manx retelling of John Milton's seventeenth-century English epic, *Paradise Lost*. This Manx reworking of Milton's narrative has traditionally been attributed to the Rev. Thomas Christian (1754–1828), the controversial Manx vicar whose serial 'fornication' scandalised the island's clerical authorities.[1] The 4,000-line Manx text, in rhymed verse, appeared in print as *Pargys Caillit* in the late eighteenth century. A more recent scholarly edition by the late R. L. Thomson has made the text accessible to scholars.[2] The earliest textual sources for *Pargys Caillit* are:

i. an undated manuscript, Manx Museum MS 188A;
ii. a printed volume, printed 'by and for C Briscoe' but without a date.

Briscoe had certainly printed the text by the time of John Feltham's tour of the Isle of Man in 1797 and 1798, as Feltham notes that, although undated, the volume was 'probably [printed] 1796'.[3] In textual terms, there are some significant divergences between the printed text and the manuscript text in 188A, sufficient to conclude that they are independent of each other.

R. L. Thomson has demonstrated that the Manx scholar John Kelly (1750–1809) made copious use of *Pargys Caillit* in the compilation of his Manx-English dictionary; the poem 'is the largest source of quotations in the dictionary'.[4] Identifying over a hundred quotations taken from *Pargys Caillit*

[1]William Cubbon, 'Notes on Marown Church', *Proceedings of the Isle of Man Natural History and Antiquarian Society* 3 (1925), 13–22; C. I. Paton, *On Pargys Caillit: The Revd. Thomas Christian's Manks Paraphrase of Paradise Lost* (Douglas, 1947). The identification of Rev. Thomas Christian (1754–1828) as author of *Pargys Caillit* is cast into serious doubt by Max Wheeler, see note 10 below.

[2]R. L. Thomson, *Pargys Caillit: An Abridgment of John Milton's Paradise Lost by Thomas Christian with the Anonymous Translation of Thomas Parnell's The Hermit*, Centre for Manx Studies Research Report 3 (Douglas, 1995). This edition replaces an earlier edition published by the Manx Society, *Paradise Lost: A Poem by John Milton, Translated into the Manks Language by the Rev. Mr. Thomas Christian* (Douglas, 1874), which was based on a later manuscript deriving from the earliest printing. See Thomson, *Pargys Caillit*, 2, for discussion.

[3]John Feltham, *A Tour through the Island of Mann in 1797 and 1798; Comprising Sketches of its Ancient and Modern History* (Bath, 1798), 68, 72.

[4]Thomson, *Pargys Caillit*, 3. For discussion of John Kelly's work on a Manx-English dictionary, see R. L. Thomson, 'The Revd Dr John Kelly as lexicographer', *Isle of Man Natural History and Antiquarian Society* 9.4 (1987–89), 443–58.

 ©Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies

in Kelly's dictionary, Thomson noted that where there was variation between the two sources of *Pargys Caillit*, Kelly's dictionary invariably agreed with the undated manuscript 188A. The implication of Thomson's observation is that John Kelly had access to this manuscript copy of *Pargys Caillit* rather than the printed text when compiling his dictionary. Given the similarity, as observed by Thomson, between John Kelly's hand and the hand which made the manuscript copy in 188A, it seems safe to assume that John Kelly was the scribe of 188A and that this manuscript or a closely related manuscript was the source of the quotations from *Pargys Caillit* used in Kelly's dictionary.

Questions remain, however, on the date of the Manx text, the circumstances under which Kelly gained access to it, and its use as a source in Kelly's dictionary.[5] In the preface to his grammar, Kelly states that both the grammar and dictionary were begun in 1766.[6] For practical reasons to do with Kelly's time on the island, however, Thomson extrapolates that Kelly was likely to have completed the dictionary between 1776 and 1779.[7]

A hitherto unknown piece of evidence indicates that Kelly came to possess a copy of *Pargys Caillit* in 1776. That evidence is contained in a small notebook once belonging to Rev. Philip Moore (1705–1783), the general editor of the Manx Bible. The notebook is now preserved in the Manx Museum as MS 00178A. A very close associate of John Kelly, Rev. Philip Moore had been his teacher in Douglas Grammar School. Moore subsequently employed his pupil and *protégé* as an amanuensis and assistant in the final stages of the translation and production of the Manx Bible.[8] In this unpaginated notebook, Moore kept a record of his extensive personal library and noted loans of books he made to friends and acquaintances. Many of the recorded loans are to 'J. Kelly' or 'Jack Kelly', including one entry, 'Lent Mr Kelly French Dictionary', which occurs under the heading 'Books Lent 1776', the period during which Kelly was likely to have been working on the compilation of his Manx dictionary. On the facing page, still under the list of books loaned during 1776, occurs the note 'Mem J Kelly has my Manks Milton'. Moore's brief but important note confirms that *Pargys Caillit* was circulated in manuscript form in the Isle of Man long before its eventual publication. It also confirms that John Kelly did have access to a manuscript version of the poem and that he obtained this from Rev. Philip Moore while working on the Manx dictionary in 1776. It therefore seems safe to assume that the sole surviving eighteenth-century manuscript of *Pargys Caillit* was made by John Kelly from an exemplar in the possession of Philip Moore in the year 1776.

The date of the Manx text can be pushed back further still, however. Thomson points to a marginal manuscript note by the translator of a surviving

[5]R. L. Thomson, 'The study of Manx Gaelic', Sir John Rhŷs Memorial Lecture 1969, *Proceedings of the British Academy* 55 (1969 [1971]), 177–210, at 187.

[6]*A Practical Grammar of the Ancient Gaelic; or, Language of the Isle of Mann, Usually Called Manks* (London, 1804). The volume is more usually referred to by its running title, *A Grammar of the Manks Language*.

[7]Thomson, *Pargys Caillit*, 3.

[8]Thomson, 'The study of Manx Gaelic', 185.

draft of the Book of Exodus, Rev. Henry Corlett, Vicar of German, in which Corlett notes, 'this word *Haart* I have borrowed from Mr Xtian's Translation of Paradise Lost …'[9] The first volume of the Old Testament in Manx was published by John Ware and Son of Whitehaven in 1771; this remains the *terminus ante quem* for the Manx text, *Pargys Caillit*. The Thomas Christian traditionally accepted as the author of the Manx reworking was only seventeen in 1771.[10]

Besides its author, at least three people had access to manuscript copies of *Pargys Caillit* prior to its printing: Henry Corlett in 1771, Philip Moore prior to 1776 and John Kelly in 1776. How many manuscript copies circulated on the island before the text's printing is not clear. John Kelly clearly copied out his own version of the text from that in Moore's possession. There is no way to know whether all the 'improvements' evident in Kelly's manuscript were made by him, or if some had already been made in his exemplar, i.e. Moore's copy. Moore also records loans of his books to 'Harry Corlet [sic]' in his catalogue of books so that it is possible that Corlett, in 1771, also obtained access to *Pargys Caillit* through Moore, or vice versa.[11] At the very least, there were two physical manuscript copies of the poem on the island before it was printed: Moore's copy (assuming this was the basis for Briscoe's printing of *circa* 1796) and Kelly's revised copy.[12] A maximalist interpretation, however, would leave us with up to four manuscript copies of the text prior to its printing: Moore's copy, Kelly's derivative copy, a copy of unverifiable origin in Corlett's possession, and an independent, authorial version which was to form the basis of the printed text. However many of these eighteenth century manuscript copies there may once have been, John Kelly's alone survives.[13]

Peadar Ó Muircheartaigh

Aberystwyth University

[9]Thomson, *Pargys Caillit*, 4. The word occurs at line 718 of Thomson's edition in the phrase *dy chur Satan haart* 'to vanquish Satan'.

[10]Max Wheeler, '*Pargys Caillit*: Which Thomas Christian?', forthcoming, argues cogently against the traditional identification of the text's author, suggesting instead that the text may have been composed by Christian's paternal grandfather, also Thomas Christian, who was Vicar of Marown from 1734 until his death in 1752.

[11]A note in Manx Museum MS 00178A reads as follows: 'To Harry Corlet 1st Vol. of Life of K. David – June 15 – 1773'. I have not come across any reference to Moore's 'Manks Milton' being loaned to Corlett, however.

[12]Wheeler, '*Pargys Caillit*: Which Thomas Christian?', draws attention to a marginal note, in an unidentified hand, found in MS 188A: 'The original MS comm[ences] here – the past portion being destroyed'. The note is followed by an unidentified monogram and is to be found at what corresponds to line 302 of Thomson's edition. Written in graphite pencil, the note is not earlier than the nineteenth century. It clearly indicates that the writer had access to both MS 188A and a manuscript they thought to be the original.

[13]I am grateful to Prof. Max Wheeler and Dr Christopher Lewin for useful discussion in the preparation of this short note. I am responsible for any errors it contains.

Language and Chronology: Text Dating by Machine Learning. Gregory Toner and Xiwu Han. Language and Computers 84. Brill: Leiden/Boston, 2019. xii + 183 pp. €88. ISBN 978-90-04-41003-9.

In 2015, two grants were awarded for projects using computational and statistical methods to date medieval Irish texts: one is provided by the European Research Council, which funds the project *Chronologicon Hibernicum* in Maynooth; the other is awarded by the Leverhulme Trust to fund Gregory Toner's project 'Dating of medieval texts through regressive analysis of the lexicon' in QUB. The present book is the outcome of the latter project, in which the two co-authors explore computational methods previously unknown to the field of medieval Irish studies and demonstrate the huge potential such methods embody for the discipline. When one compares the title of the project to that of the book, it is apparent that Toner and Han have pushed the methodological boundary much further by progressing from regression analysis in the initial project idea to advanced machine learning techniques in the outcome.

As the title of the series suggests, the book stands at the intersection of linguistics and computer science. Its main goal, as stated in the Introduction (pp. 2–3), is to achieve linguistic dating of medieval Irish texts by means of machine learning methods. In particular, the project adopts the supervised approach of machine learning, namely, a human being provides certain labels for the training data for the computer algorithm, which then learns a function that describes the patterns (linguistic features of a text) associated with each label (date). After cycles of training, evaluating and calibrating the algorithm, the computer programme can gradually improve its accuracy in performance (pp. 3–4), and thus 'learns' to do its task. Compared to a human, the computer is capable of processing a large amount of data in a significantly shorter period of time, so that it is possible to reveal associations of patterns and labels that are hidden from human eyes.

The problem arising from using machine learning techniques is that the actual programme that runs the algorithm is constantly shifting shape and often opaque even to humanities scholars with digital skills (pp. 7–8). What is more, such a 'black boxing' mechanism means that the actual patterns which the algorithm finally chooses to date a text are not visible (p. 8), so it is almost impossible to say how exactly two texts are similar or dissimilar linguistically. On the face of it, it seems as if the role of a linguist or a philologist has been reduced to one that passively accepts the date dictated by the machine, but this is actually not the case. In supervised learning, an algorithm performs as well as the training data that are fed to it, and only humanities scholars can prepare clean, accurate data for the task. Expertise in linguistics, palaeography,

 ©Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies

history and other 'conventional' humanities domains is also indispensable for evaluating and interpreting the results (pp. 8–9). Therefore, close collaboration between humanities and computer science is necessary to engage in such an enterprise.

Accordingly, the book combines both the humanities and computational perspectives: on the one hand, there are discussions related to the nature of the medieval Irish texts, the challenge of dating them and the significance of the predicted dates, from the humanities scholars' perspective; on the other, detailed statistical and computational analyses of the data are also given, especially in chapters 2–4. Celtic linguists may be tempted to follow the advice on p. 9 to read only the introduction and conclusion of some of the chapters, but it will be beneficial to get oneself familiar with the basic methods (FTI, SVM, etc.) and parameters (n, t, δ, etc.) introduced in these chapters and mentioned throughout the book. Appendix B (pp. 162–4), which explains some fundamental concepts of machine learning, may be consulted before readers venture into the main chapters.

Chapter 1 'Dating texts: principles and methods' (pp. 11–40) offers a welcome reflection on conventional dating methods well known to scholars of medieval Irish texts, complementary to Stifter (2013) which focuses on conventional linguistic dating parameters. These methods include dating by known authors, by internal evidence such as references to historical persons and incidents, by the date of the manuscript, by intertextual relationship (e.g. citation or borrowing between texts), by metrics and by linguistic features. All these methods, though they are useful to some extent and have yielded meaningful results, are beset with their particular problems. In my opinion, an ideal dating method should satisfy each of three qualities: 1) granularity, that is, the date assigned should be as specific as possible; 2) applicability, that the method should be applicable to all targeted texts; and 3) credibility, that confidence in the assigned date should be high enough. However, for texts written in historical, under-resourced languages, such an ideal method tries to assemble an impossible trinity, as is shown by the authors. For instance, while dating by known authors is granular enough, it is only applicable to a very small amount of medieval Irish texts, if we require a reasonable level of credibility (e.g. discrediting such things as the many poems that 'Colum Cille recited') (pp. 11–13). Dating by manuscript provides a credible *terminus ante quem*, and is widely applicable, but the granularity is so low that it often tells us next to nothing about the text, especially for early medieval Irish texts that are preserved in late medieval or early modern manuscripts (pp. 16–17).

While the limitations of other methods are mostly due to historical circumstances or the nature of the method itself, and therefore leave little chance for making further ground-breaking discoveries, there is still room for developing the method of linguistic dating, as is explained further on in the book. In this chapter the authors focus rather on identifying the possible pitfalls faced by the conventional linguistic dating method. The authors define the method as 'the dating of a document or text based on the chronological stage of the language within it' (p. 21). The authors' description of this method

on p. 23 and p. 38, however, is somewhat confusing. For instance, on p. 38 they observe that '[d]ating by linguistic means is normally approached in two ways. One is to observe the profile of linguistic features of known or accepted date…this directly provides an absolute date … The second approach is to sort texts chronologically through a comparison of their language overall.' In fact, these are but one approach, as no such 'absolute date' for certain linguistic features exists independently, at least for medieval Ireland. The period in which a linguistic feature exists, such as the neuter gender, is defined by the texts in which such a feature is found or is used correctly, so after all it is the texts that are compared to each other.

It seems to me that the conventional dating method is best illustrated by the introductions to editions of early Irish texts. These usually compare the linguistic profile of the edited text to some landmark texts in different periods, explicitly or implicitly. The linguistic profile in comparison consists mostly of phonological and morphological features, but orthographical, syntactic and lexical features are also examined. The landmark texts are texts that can be more or less precisely dated, such as the Old Irish glosses in contemporary manuscripts, but previous scholarly opinions on the dates of other texts are also often quoted. Given a series of discrete landmark texts (T_1, T_2 … T_n), their respective periods (t_1, t_2 … t_n) and linguistic profiles (P_1, P_2 … P_n), the presumption is that linguistic changes are linear and proceed at a constant rate (cf. Kroch 1989), so that if the linguistic profile of a text P_i lies 'between' P_m and P_n, one can assume that T_i dates between T_m and T_n. Scholars, however, sometimes make a further estimate and propose a more precise t_i within half a century or less without giving specific reasons.

Obviously, there can be a lot of loopholes in this method, not the least because it has rarely been quantified and therefore relies heavily on learned guessing. The authors point out other problems such as reliance on relative chronology (p. 23), linguistic strata and scribal revision (pp. 23–6), possible dialectal variation (pp. 26–7), register (pp. 27–9), deliberate archaism or obscurity (pp. 29–33). The discussions in these sections remind us that more typological studies are still needed on the interaction between texts, scribes and manuscripts, in order to use the correct dating methods for different circumstances. The 'methodology' section (pp. 36–9) reiterates the complexity arising from the typical transmission of early medieval Irish texts, and raises two principles in conventional linguistic dating (though ones not always followed in editions): 1) innovative features are more telling than conservative ones; 2) the proportions of features must be considered, in other words, quantitative measures must be taken. In general, the discussions offered in this chapter are valuable contributions to the topic, but not quite adequate. The chapter may benefit from recent scholarly literature on linguistic variation and change (e.g. Jenset and McGillivray 2017). However, since the aim of this book is to employ a different approach to the dating problem, this may not be necessary and I believe that a general reader will have a relatively clear idea of the status quo and challenges of dating early medieval Irish texts after reading this chapter.

Chapter 2 'Computational approaches to text dating' (pp. 41–66) embarks on the more technical aspect of the project. The efforts described in this chapter exemplify nicely how to translate a research question from the humanities, viz. dating of texts, to a statistical and computational one. Text-dating belongs to the larger domain of Natural Language Processing, a branch in vogue in computer science these days which underlies a number of day-to-day technologies around us. For a computer scientist, text-dating can be translated as finding the most likely timestamp for a text based on the information provided by the text, which is regarded as a classification task that tries to categorise texts into classes defined as time intervals, or a regression task that ranks the texts according to temporal parameters (pp. 41–3). The selection of features to train the computer programme on is essential, as it informs the computer what features are relevant to the timestamp and how (p. 43). Most of the studies conducted so far are based on lexical, semantic or topical features (p. 44), especially Named Entities, which are intuitively also how humans usually recognise the period of a text (e.g. the mentioning of President Reagan or of Facebook). The following section ('The Problem Stated', pp. 44–7) translates the dating and evaluation task into mathematical language of functions and probabilities, on which I will not go into details here. The authors then explain the three major types of solution for automatic text dating. The first is language modelling, which involves building a model of what the language looks like in each of the interval, mapping a text to the model, and training the programme to compute the function by which a new text can be dated (p. 48). This is basically a simulation of how linguists traditionally date a text by comparing selected features in the target text to those in the dated landmark texts, only augmented by the help of a machine. While this solution demands a huge amount of input from linguists, it offers 'qualitative explanations about why a text is dated to a certain time, which is the most compelling aspect of the language modelling approach' (p. 48) Such an approach is in fact employed by the ChronHib project in Maynooth. The second solution is the ranking approach, namely, to order a set of texts with respect to some measure (p. 49). The classification method regards timestamps as labels and, with suitable allowance of tolerance (labelled δ), the question becomes to which time interval of $2\delta+1$ the text most likely belongs (p. 50). In practice, these methods are sometimes combined to achieve the best performance, but the authors find that the multi-class classification can outperform the ranking approach (p. 51). The problem that remains for medieval Irish texts, of course, is whether and how the real temporal distribution underlying the training corpus can be modelled (p. 52). We will see this issue reflected in a later chapter. For the moment, the authors suggest five new solutions based on multi-class classification to improve the performance: a) Flexible time intervals (FTI), b) Sliding time interval (STI), c) Greedy grouping (GG), d) Temporal landmark selection (TLS) and e) FTI combined with TLS (pp. 52–64). These methods seek to find the best segmentation of time intervals.

One point to bear in mind for readers not familiar with Natural Language Processing is that in order to carry out these tasks, the texts have been treated

as string vectors that consist of individual characters aligned in a one–way direction. These vectors are then analysed using character n-grams that pick up 1, 2 or 3 characters at a time (p. 54). By doing so, the conventional control over feature selection, such as the division into phonological, syntactic or metrical features, is lost, and the algorithm cannot directly tell whether it is morphology, orthography or topic that triggers the classification. As the authors admit, the algorithm 'is simply finding the most straightforward route to achieving maximum accuracy in the training texts' (p. 133), and therefore all the 'linguistic' dating tasks referred to from this chapter on should be understood in the broadest sense of the word, that is, anything conveyed by language (in its written form). The algorithm, therefore, understands nothing of the content and is indiscriminate to any natural language. While this approach, again, creates a 'black box' that may displease philologists, it has the advantage of being strictly quantitative and unbiased towards a specific type of temporal feature, such as phonology, favoured in the traditional editing and dating of early Irish texts.

Chapter 3 ('Trials in English and medieval Irish texts') (pp. 67–93) reports the testing results of the methods proposed in Chapter 2. The English texts tested here include historical newspaper excerpts between 1700 and 2010, and 180 days' length of contemporary public posts from England. Each of the methods mentioned above has been used on these texts, with the reports attached. The medieval Irish texts tested are the Annals of Inisfallen (AI) 1092–1309 AD, the Annals of Ulster (AU) 1092–1378 AD, and the Annals of Loch Cé (ALC) 1014–1348 AD, harvested from the CELT digital editions. The reason of choosing the annals is that they provide a fine-grained periodisation down to a single calendar year, and a large part of the AI data are contemporary records that supposedly reflect the real-time change in language (pp. 77–80). The datability test (pp. 90–2) also substantiates that AI is more datable, that is, the evolution process of the text is more regular, thus indirectly confirming the contemporaneity of AI 1092–1309. The result shows that the STI and FTI&TLS models perform the best in the trials, with the accuracy of over 60% for the annals.

While the predictive dating model built out of annalistic texts works well for the post-eleventh-century annals, does it perform as well for other, longer Irish texts? In Chapter 4 ('Dating long documents', pp. 94–131), the authors set out to test the model again, firstly, on other sections of the annals, namely AU 500–1588 and ALC 1000–1652. The authors incrementally choose these annalistic texts that could be dated correctly by using the learned dating model, add them to the training corpus, and train new dating models on the extended corpus (pp. 95–96). By doing so with the FTI method, they achieve a dating performance from 36.43% when δ=3 (tolerating a margin of error of 3 years), up to 84.76% when δ=50 (p. 97). Within this extended corpus, the model is ineffective in predicting the date of annals before 750 and only reaches reasonable accuracy (above 65%) after 1000 AD when δ=25, that is, dating an annalistic entry to within 50 years. The reason for this may be due to the low number of syntactically continuous Irish texts before 750, and to the

higher probability of contemporaneity in late medieval entries (pp. 96–98). The result is impressive, but, as the authors remind us with regard to the high accuracy of annals 750–849, the model may be overfitted (p. 98).

The term 'overfitting' basically means that a model that fits a particular set of data very well may actually perform poorly on new data, because it depends too much on the noise of that dataset and contains too many parameters (Cohen and Jensen 1997). In order to test whether the model built upon annals is overfitted, the authors apply it to the dating of longer texts. They have selected 22 medieval Irish texts from the CELT corpus that cover the period *c*. 700–*c*. 1500. Each of the texts has a given date or range of date based on traditional methods (p. 99), and the authors run the algorithm on chunks of 20+ words in each text and take the most frequent estimated date as the final estimation. When the estimated dates are compared to the traditionally estimated dates, at a dating tolerance of 50 years, the accuracy is still at a poor 31.82% (pp. 100–1). In order to improve the performance, they select the top-three most frequent predictions, and add in reinforcement and adaptive learning technique. The accuracy rate is boosted to 40.63% as a result. The improvement, however, is uneven, giving more accurate dates mostly for texts before 900 but creating larger margins of error for texts after that (pp. 102–9). The high accuracy achieved for the years 750–849 in the annals is not transferable to longer, non-annalistic texts, and all such texts traditionally dated to before 850 are now given the estimated date of 914 by the machine (p. 111). The training model is obviously overfitted. Meanwhile, however, the model can successfully distinguish Early Modern Irish texts from Early Irish texts, and Middle Irish texts belonging to the twelfth century are relatively well dated (p. 111–12). The different extents of robustness of the model in different periods reflect the quality of the training data: the period 850–999 has fewer entries in average and lower accuracy in dating the annals, leading to fewer diagnostic features to enable correct dating, whereas the twelfth-century annals quite loyally reflect the contemporary language. The same test is then extended to more texts that may have multiple strata due to their complex history of transmission. The accuracy rate reaches 42.86%, and the model again performs better within the period *c*. 900–*c*. 1300 than the other periods (p. 113). The possible influence exerted by the manuscript date is also measured (pp. 118–19). The authors subsequently run the algorithm with a 10-year tolerance instead of 50, but only permitting the predicted dates within the 101-year period (± 50 years) determined by the previous test (pp. 119–21). This 'focussing' measure has generally shifted the proposed dates closer to those established traditionally, but, as shown by Figure 4.8 on p. 122, the dates given to Old Irish and Early Modern Irish texts still mismatch the traditional dates. After bias reduction, the focussed method is able to achieve a 50% accuracy rate, and generally succeeds in placing texts in the correct linguistic periods of Old Irish, Middle Irish and Early Modern Irish (pp. 123–5). For certain texts such as *Mescad Ulad*, where strata from different periods are juxtaposed in discrete chunks, the algorithm can even detect the strata by assigning different dates to the chunks. This will have interesting bearing on

the study of the textual history of some 'composite' texts, and I would be very eager to see if it works well in detecting layers in legal texts.

It has to be said that in this part, the numbered lists of texts on p. 101 and p. 113 have been merged and each text is given a new number, which could easily confuse readers. For instance, 'Text 14' on p. 123 refers to *Saltair na Rann*, the date (872) assigned to which by the algorithm 'is almost certainly too early'; the same tag, however, refers to *Cogadh Gaedel re nGallaib* on p. 112, which is dated by the algorithm 'squarely within the range suggested by scholars'. *Saltair na Rann*, on the other hand, is given the number A.1.30 in Appendix A 'Conventional dating of texts used in this study' (p. 156), which is arranged alphabetically. It would have been much clearer if the authors had adhered to a single system of reference to texts.

The 'Conclusion' chapter (pp. 132–41) provides an overview of the contents of the book. In particular, the authors reflect on the important question of whether the model they develop is actually 'linguistic' (pp. 133–7). The algorithm probably relies on non-linguistic criteria such as topic, genre and Name Entities, as I have remarked above. The difference in the accuracy rate of dating the annals and the longer texts may, at least partly, be attributed to such non–linguistic factors. In the light of this, the authors call their model a 'temporal model', since the algorithm was fed with date labels and character vectors, and it is exactly the association between certain patterns in the character vectors and the date labels that it is predicting for us. In this way, the algorithm serves as a tool in computational chronometrics: it works very well in periodisation; it may help us detect strata in composite texts; and it has huge potential in dating medieval Irish texts with reasonable granularity, if we could use more data to boost and refine the capacity of the algorithm (pp. 137–40).

Appendix A details the conventionally assigned dates for the texts tested in the book, 36 in total plus three eleventh- or twelfth-century manuscripts (*Lebor na hUidre*, Rawlinson B.502 and the Book of Leinster). This review is no place for examining all the arguments presented in this Appendix or the dates accepted and used by the authors in their tests. I wish only to say that not infrequently a text has been assigned different and sometimes quite diverse dates by scholars, and the dates used by the authors should be regarded as tentative. Therefore, if the algorithm predicts a date that does not match the conventional date, the error may have rather occurred on the human side. For instance, although *Betha Adomnáin* is generally regarded as encoding political messages only relevant to the late tenth century and thus likely to have been composed then (Herbert and Ó Riain 1988: 4–8), the algorithm assigns a date of 1120 (p. 120) which comes closer to the lifetime of Máel Ísa Ó Brolcháin (†1086), proposed by Mac Donncha (1976) as the author. The accuracy of the algorithm could indeed be higher than the authors think. The book concludes with another appendix on Machine Learning (pp. 162–4), a bibliography (pp. 165–80) and a subject index (pp. 181–3).

This book is the first to systematically apply machine learning method to the study of linguistic and literary history of medieval Ireland, and it opens

up many possibilities and raise new questions. The algorithm, of course, is still at its initial stage and the accuracy cannot be compared to that achieved by commercial programmes run by Google or Facebook, but the methodology is sound and given more time and data, it could develop into a powerful tool that can significantly advance our understanding of the evolution of the Irish language and its textual tradition. The authors have done a beautiful job by combining humanities with computer science, in an accessible and informative way.

REFERENCES

COHEN, P. R. and JENSEN, D. 1997: 'Overfitting explained', *Preliminary Papers of the Sixth International Workshop on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, 115–22.

HERBERT, MÁIRE and Ó RIAIN, PÁDRAIG (eds) 1988: *Betha Adomnáin: The Irish Life of Adomnán* (London).

JENSET, GARD B., and MCGILLIVRAY, BARBARA 2017: *Quantitative Historical Linguistics: A Corpus Framework* (Oxford).

KROCH, ANTHONY 1989: 'Reflexes of grammar in patterns of language change', *Language Variation and Change* 1 (3), 199–244.

MAC DONNCHA, FREDERIC 1976: 'Medieval Irish homilies', in Mairtín McNamara (ed.), *Biblical Studies: The Medieval Irish Contribution* (Dublin), 59–71.

STIFTER, DAVID 2013: 'Towards the linguistic dating of Early Irish law texts', in Anders Ahlqvist and Pamela O'Neill (eds), *Medieval Irish Law: Texts and Contexts* (Sydney), 163–208.

FANGZHE QIU

University College Dublin

De Origine Scoticae Linguae (O'Mulconry's Glossary): An Early Irish Linguistic Tract, with a Related Glossary, Irsan [= *Corpus Christianorum, Continuatio Mediaevalis: Lexica Latina Medii Aevi VII*]. Edited by Pádraic Moran. Brepols, Turnhout 2019. 592 pp. €230. ISBN 978-2-503-58179-8.

Ever since 1932 when Eoin Mac Neill argued in *Ériu* that this glossary, originally edited by Whitley Stokes in 1898 and generally known 'O' Mulconry's Glossary,' should have a pre-Norman date – he argued for two strata with the earliest coming from the seventh or eighth centuries – a new edition has been something to be desired. Now Moran, on the basis of more than a decade's work (his paper on Hebrew in this and other glossaries appeared in *CMCS* in 2010) has given us a splendid new edition, excellent introductory material, and a copious commentary. We are in his debt!

So what has Moran given us? First, a new edition of the text that should be known as *De Origine Scoticae Linguae*, which is text no. 890 in the *Clavis Litterarum Hibernensium*. Moran explains (p. 13) how, via Stokes, it came

to have the name of John O'Mulconry, who lived in the sixteenth century, because that was the name given it by Eugene O'Curry. He is aware that by now that name is so embedded in the literature it will not probably not be displaced by the early medieval name, and so he refers to it throughout using the siglum 'OM' and, more importantly, he has retained the numbering found in Stokes' edition so that older references to the glossary work conveniently with this edition. Second, it was known that there was a related glossary (from which much material was lost: it now begins with the word *irsan* – hence the name) which now contains 232 entries, and this too has been edited. This text, *Irsan*, is no. 891 in the *Clavis Litterarum Hibernensium*. He has provided a fulsome introduction these texts (pp. 11–124), which is *de facto* an introduction to this medieval genre, and a commentary on virtually every entry in the two glossaries (pp. 275–551) which not only examines the entries linguistically but points out how they fill in our wider historical picture of the world in which the glossary was created. In addition, he has provided an English translation of both glossaries. This is no mean feat given the complex moves between languages and sounds, but it makes these texts available to a much wider range of scholars than those with a working competence in Irish of a variety of dates.

The introduction – really an introductory handbook to glossaries – is well worth careful study for several reasons. First, it deliberately moves away from the view that the academic (or perhaps sole) value of glossaries is as a quarry for those studying the evolution of language. They appeared because the study of the origin of languages was, within their creators' historical vision, linked to the origins of nations. As they viewed their past, the scattering of the nations was coincident with the confusion of languages and words. These medieval collectors of words believed they knew of a time of 'a single tongue and set of words' (Genesis 11:1: *erat autem terra labii unius et sermonum eorundem*), and so in relating the words of the post-Babel situation to one another they were uncovering links between nations and so uncovering their own identity among the multiple descendants of Japhet (Genesis 10:2–5). In this they were following in the footsteps of Isidore of Seville – whose work they systematically plundered – but as Moran shows (p. 45), they were not just readers and adaptors of Isidore but imitators: they took up his agenda and then applied it to their own language. Second, Moran, following on from other scholars, sets out a clear pattern of stages which we need to assume if we are to explain how glossaries came to be formed. His own analysis of O'Mulconry then becomes a test study of this hypothesis and, on this evidence, we can speculate on the nature of the work of Irish scholars which must have been taking place in the sixth and early seventh centuries. Along the same lines, Moran looks in detail at how the actual compilers of these glossaries did their work, and the various reasons they gave for how they linked words, and so brings before us, I suspect for the first time, a detailed insight into one more group of scholars working between the seventh to the ninth centuries. Moran, rightly in my view, leans towards seeing the lack of a named author combined with the

layered nature of the work as pointing to these glossaries as being the work of groups, and so he uses 'author' as a reference to the point of composition rather than implying an single individual (p. 15). Moreover, while no one can work her/his way through a glossary without an occasional good laugh at some of the links made, Moran respects their endeavour and shows just how close they were in method to modern etymologists (pp. 35–43). Third, Moran has done his work as an editor, and a palaeographer, meticulously. This has allowed him to see that our four extant manuscripts represent two textual families – and he has nailed his colours to the mast by producing a stemma (p. 24). One family is represented by a single manuscript (TCD 1317, pp. 41–2 = Moran's OM^2), to which the second glossary, *Irsan*, is 'closely' related (pp. 12, 23, 51–3) – and this conclusion about the relationships marks a departure from the received position. The other family is represented by three manuscripts (one of which has no independent value as a witness); and when all are taken together we have an indication of just how popular were such glossaries. Lastly, it is fascinating to see how Moran's far more extensive investigation has vindicated the arguments put forward by MacNeill in a 16-page article. The more detailed work allows Moran to date the first stratum of O'Mulconry to the seventh century and the second stratum to the ninth (p. 97).

Pádraic Moran is to be congratulated on an excellent piece of work. This new edition with its copious notes will, I hope, lead medievalists other than those working on history of the Irish language to discover the value of O'Mulconry. It is pleasing also to see that it is published in an international series which will bring it to the notice of a wider circle of scholars than Celticists: O'Mulconry's compliers were engaged in their particular part of a Europe-wide endeavour. The one drawback is the price! At €230 it will rely on libraries to make it available to all but a handful of scholars; but it deserves a place in every library which makes a claim to support Celtic studies or medieval studies.

THOMAS O'LOUGHLIN

University of Nottingham

The Case of the Abbot of Drimnagh: A Medieval Irish Story of Sex-Change. Tadhg Ó Síocháin. Cork Studies in Celtic Literatures, Cork, 2017. iii + 73 pp. ISBN 978-0-9955469-1-2. €12.00.

This volume, the second in the Cork Studies in Celtic Literatures series, is a semi-diplomatic edition, translation, and discussion of the text edited by Kuno Meyer in 1907 under the title 'Story of the Abbot of Druimenaig who was changed into a Woman'. The story is about an abbot of Drimnagh who falls asleep on a hill, wakes up to discover he has become a woman, marries a man and has seven children over seven years, falls asleep on the same hill and wakes up to find he is in his original body, and finally returns to Drimnagh on

the same day he first left it, proving his experiences with the presence of his seven children.[1] In addition to the text and translation, Ó Síocháin provides discussion on a number of the themes in the story, including gender and gendered bodies, femininity, clothing, Otherworldly time and figures, and marriage. In his preface, Ó Síocháin states that the 'main aim of this publication is to present an analysis' of the tale (p. ii), and that 'if my opinions help to create an interest in this unusual tale, even for those who cannot accept my analysis, I will consider the enterprise to have been worthwhile' (p. iii).

Following the text and translation, there are five chapters of analysis. Chapter 2 endeavours to contextualise the tale with reference to two pre-modern, non-Irish stories which feature a change in gender from man to woman and back to man, as well as discussing the role of the 'author'. Chapter 3 discusses some historical aspects of the story, including the particular roles of the abbot and the erenagh, and what these might have meant to medieval readers of the tale. It also considers the Otherworld aspects of the story. In chapter 4, Ó Síocháin considers the abbot's metamorphosis and femininity in the context of the tale. He discusses how the abbot's internal identity interacts with his social identity when transformed into a woman, concluding that there seems to be a sustained internal sense of identity – excluding gender – for the abbot across the metamorphoses. Chapter 5 includes the greater part of the discussion about the abbot's sexuality and how that interacts with gender and the abbot's two marriages. Finally, chapter 6 is a discussion of medieval reading practices and the relation of the story to the oral folklore tradition. The book ends with a short conclusion in which Ó Síocháin reasserts a thesis that the tale is, at its heart, concerned with 'shifting perspectives, ambivalence and confusion' (p. 62).

The text, Ó Síocháin tells us, has four manuscript witnesses. However, as Erich Poppe has pointed out (2018: 121), there are, in fact, two further witnesses: Dublin, Royal Irish Academy B.iv.1, a paper manuscript from the seventeenth century; and Edinburgh, National Library of Scotland Advocates 72.1.6, a late-sixteenth-century manuscript, which contains a mostly illegible copy of the text.[2] The semi-diplomatic edition and translation that comprises the first chapter is based on the text also used by Meyer, London, BL Additional 30512, fols 10v10–11r35. Ó Síocháin states his intention to publish a volume with semi-diplomatic editions of 'all four manuscript witnesses' (p. 5). The volume at hand has no glossary or translation notes, with only one instance of variant manuscript readings. This might be taken to suggest that the other manuscripts give readings fairly similar to Add. 30512; however, this is not the case. The text in Add. 30512 is longer than the others, and

[1]I use he/him pronouns for the abbot throughout, for consistency, clarity, and brevity, although I would have welcomed a more nuanced discussion in the volume about the pronouns used for the abbot at various points in the tale – Ó Síocháin's own use is inconsistent, and he makes no comments about the text's use of pronouns.

[2]For the dates of the manuscripts see respectively Mulchrone, O'Rahilly, Fitzpatrick, and Pearson 1926: 586 and Mackinnon 1912: 110. I have also consulted Sarah Lackner's unpublished PhD (2016) for transcriptions of five of the witnesses.

contains more descriptive passages: for example, of the abbot's clothes prior to his transformation, and of the hag who appears to the abbot after his transformation (for further discussion, see Lackner 2016: 149, and her transcriptions 52–9). Ó Síocháin highlights the significance of the abbot's clothes in the text (pp. 25; 49), so the fact that most of the witnesses depict these clothes differently seems relevant to his argument.

In as far as his intent is to 'create an interest' (iii) in the tale, Ó Síocháin has been successful. Unfortunately, there are several points in the volume in which his analysis falls short. Ó Síocháin attempts to prove, through comparison with two other stories, that the story under discussion 'has ancient roots external to Ireland' (p. 42), which influence the tale. The stories used for comparison are the Classical Greek story of Tiresias, and a portion of 'The Rose of Bakáwalî', 'a short episode from a summary in French … of a ninth-century Urdish [*sic*] work … based on an earlier story' (p. 15). Both stories are mediated by summaries, rather than direct quotations; and the episode from 'The Rose of Bakáwalî' is not contextualised in its place in the larger work.[3] As Ó Síocháin reads them, these stories each contain a narrative of a man changing into a woman, who, while in this changed form, has sex with a man, and is later changed back into his original shape. Ó Síocháin adds a fourth criterion for comparison: that 'a supernatural force is involved' (p. 14). Outside of these criteria, the stories are quite different: in the Tiresias story, the transformation occurs as retribution for a particular action, and in some variants of it, explicit comparison is made between the two gendered bodies Tiresias has inhabited.[4] Nowhere in the abbot story does the abbot reflect on the differences in his gendered bodies, and the reason for his transformation is unclear. In 'The Rose of Bakáwalî', the protagonist undergoes transformation into two different bodies, not just one, with the principal character changing first into a woman, and then into a man of a different race. In view of these differences, the claim that these three stories share an ancient common source seems unlikely: the question of what it is like to inhabit a different body – particularly when that body is associated with a different social role or status – is a point of fascination in many contexts. I am unconvinced that the stories are related, as the common elements are not specific enough to prove their connection. However, Ó Síocháin returns to the idea of the linked stories repeatedly across the volume and attempts to use it to prove further points, meaning that these points, in turn, are unconvincing.

In particular, Ó Síocháin's treatment of the hag who appears to the abbot after his transformation into a woman leaves something to be desired. Citing Robin Flower and Henri Gaidoz, he compares her to a hideous woman in 'The Rose of Bakáwalî', who also appears to the changed person after his

[3]For a French summary of the story, see de Tassy 1835; he in turn is drawing on an eighteenth-century Urdu source.

[4]Ó Síocháin describes several of the major variants of the Tiresias story; further discussion may be found in Brisson 1976. Tiresias is referenced across eighteen classical Greek and Roman sources, from a variety of dates.

transformation, but who otherwise has a very different role.[5] From there, Ó Síocháin suggests that the hideous woman is 'a later manifestation of the pre-Christian goddess' who 'directs all that happens' (p. 29). While it seems possible that the hag is supernatural, granted her similarity to supernatural hags in other medieval Irish texts, the claim that she is a goddess is both unsupported and unlikely. Discussing another hideous hag in *Echtra mac nEchach Muigmedóin*, Amy Mulligan states that the hag – who in this case is acting as a personification of Sovereignty – exists in a source 'composed within a highly learned and self-consciously literary Christian milieu' and that the hag's 'significance is most clearly understood when she is read in that context' (2006: 1015). Similarly, the tale in question in this volume – which Ó Síocháin dates to the late twelfth or early thirteenth century, over a hundred years later than the one discussed in Mulligan's article (p. 4) – was produced in this Christian literary environment, and features two ecclesiastical figures as main characters. Both of the abbot's transformations occur in advance of an Easter celebration. It is in this context that the hag's appearance must be read. There may be an argument that this text, like *Echtra mac nEchach Muigmedóin*, manipulates the idea of a pre-Christian goddess in order to achieve a particular point, but this argument is not present in the volume.

Ó Síocháin rightly sees 'identity' as one of the major themes of this story, asking 'can essence persist where a major transformation takes place?' (p. 34). This identity seems to have multiple aspects to it, encompassing the abbot's internal sense of personhood as well as external markers like gender and family. The volume discusses both how the abbot 'seems to retain his original identity and consciousness' (p. 34) and how the abbot has 'fear for the loss of identity' (p. 35), which is bound up with his new status as a woman without family. Distinction is not made between these senses of identity, which at times leads to difficulties in the argument. It is true that the abbot lives in the social role of a woman for seven years, but it does not necessarily follow that because he does so, he 'assume[s] enthusiastically' (p. 26) this role. Ó Síocháin makes a point of showing how for the erenagh, marriage contains both 'romance and practicality' (p. 27), but he does not discuss how the abbot's decision to marry the erenagh might be motivated by practical concerns deriving from his new appearance as a woman, such as his sudden loss of legal status or his subjection to compulsory heterosexuality.[6] This text raises a number of questions about embodied gender in medieval Ireland – for example, if we agree with Ó Síocháin that the abbot identifies with womanhood after his transformation, while also maintaining his initial internal identity, what might this suggest about gendered bodies and the possibility of gender non-conformity? Alternatively, if the abbot does not have an internal sense of womanhood after his transformation,

[5]Where the hideous woman in 'The Abbot of Drimnagh' questions the transformed abbot and then disappears, the woman in 'The Rose of Bakáwalí' makes the transforming character her husband and forces him to work for her and her family.

[6]This term was coined by Adrienne Rich (1980: 632) to describe how the possibility of lesbianism is structurally denied to women by the heteropatriarchy.

what might this suggest about gendered identity-formation? Questions such as these are not explored, because of unsupported assumptions made about the abbot's internal sense of self.

Likewise, there are issues in the treatment of gender and sexuality as a whole, particularly in chapters 4 and 5 of the volume. One problem is that Ó Síocháin spends more time comparing views of marriage in the text to Greek and Latin sources (pp. 42–4) than he does to Irish sources, again relying on the analogy with other tales, in this case the Tiresias legend. The volume might have benefited from a fuller discussion of how marriage is presented in Irish legal and literary texts, and what that means for the erenagh and abbot. Ó Síocháin points out, for example, that both aforementioned ecclesiastical roles could be hereditary, but does not elaborate on the impact of hereditary roles on the children of the abbot and the erenagh. There is also an extended comparison between the abbot's discovery of his new body and Vivienne C. Cass's explanation of the psychological process of coming to terms with one's own sexuality (pp. 45–8). While there are some interesting similarities between the two, the association of the abbot with homosexuality – which is repeatedly asserted throughout the chapter – is confusing. If, as Ó Síocháin suggests, the abbot 'has the affective life … of a woman' (p. 26) after his transformation, then his potential attraction to the erenagh is not a homosexual desire (again, it is unclear whether the sex and marriage between the abbot and erenagh has an 'affective' element (p. 26) on the abbot's part, or whether it is driven primarily by practicality); rather, the abbot's change in sexuality is a movement from heterosexual to heterosexual. There is some discussion of bisexuality in the volume, which of course may be the case for the abbot, who does marry both a man and a woman, but it receives far less attention from Ó Síocháin than does homosexuality. As the primary expression of sexuality is between two couples of different genders, the insistence on discussing homosexuality is, at times, disruptive to the argument, especially granted the lack of consideration given to the practical reasons for which the abbot marries the erenagh.

Likewise, Ó Síocháin contextualises the abbot's gender change with medieval and modern instances of 'cross-dressing', and while examples of historical gender non-conforming behaviour and clothing might illuminate new aspects of this story, the justification provided for the focus on cross-dressing is 'because of the emphasis on male and female clothing' (p. 49). As in the case of the abbot's sexuality, at no point does the abbot, in fact, dress in clothes that are variant to his gendered social role. His clothes change as spontaneously as his body, and there is no intention on the abbot's part to participate in gender or sexual non-conforming behaviour. This is, again, particularly true if the abbot's sense of gender changes with his body and clothes.

Furthermore, Ó Síocháin's discussion of gender and sexuality is couched in outdated language. He quotes from Richard F. Docter (1988) 'five heterosexual behaviour patterns with which … cross-dressing is associated', and 'four homosexual behaviour patterns' (p. 49). Almost all of these 'behaviour patterns' may be read as drawing on homophobic/transphobic stereotypes, and

while I understand the point Ó Síocháin is hoping to make – that mainstream culture struggles to differentiate between gender non-conformity and queer sexuality – the inclusion of this language is jarring and distracts from his argument. The use of the terms 'transvestite' (p. 49), along with 'transgenderism' (p. 49), 'transsexualism' (p. 49), and, indeed, 'sex-change' – although I read no malice in these usages – is deeply uncomfortable. The GLAAD Transgender Glossary of Terms states that 'transgenderism' and 'sex-change' are terms to avoid, and that 'transvestite' should not be used 'at all' (see GLAAD). These terms, although they were once more commonly used, reduce gender and/or sex to a concrete and binary system. Besides being inaccurate, and potentially offensive to trans and intersex individuals, this reduction of gender and sex to a binary undercuts Ó Síocháin's own argument, namely that there is a 'central image of liminality' (p. 51) in the tale, including in regards to the abbot's gender. Updating this language and citing trans scholars in analysis would vastly improve this section's discussion of gender.[7] Similarly, the author uncritically quotes Flower's comments and translation of a German summary of 'The Rose of Bakáwalî', which refers to the woman who forces the protagonist to be her husband as a 'Negress' (14–15). This is language which, when it is repeated unchallenged, reinforces racist paradigms.

Despite my criticisms of some of the arguments presented in this volume, I appreciated Ó Síocháin's justification for using modern critical theory to examine medieval texts. His discussion of authorship highlights the uncertainty in discussing an anonymous text like this, and the use of Foucault in differentiating the author from the narrative voice(s) that may be represented in the text helps to bring nuance to contradictory elements in the tale. Ó Síocháin's assertion that 'we need to draw … on our historical understanding of the writer and of the age s/he lived in without attempting to set aside our modern mindset' (p. 22) is a helpful one, especially for those hoping to use more recent theoretical perspectives. Ó Síocháin is right, as well, to locate 'liminality' (p. 51) and 'uncertainty' (p. 62) as central themes of this story, and draws discussion back to these repeatedly, even if his exploration of the themes is lacking.

As stated above, if Ó Síocháin's intent is to draw attention to this story, he has succeeded. The volume highlights a number of interesting themes within the text, as well as providing a good theoretical framework for using modern criticism. In its discussion of gender, sexuality, and the supernatural, it relies too heavily on comparison with non-Irish stories which share the feature of a man becoming a woman, while not proving substantially that these stories are connected. There is also some confusion in the semi-diplomatic edition and translation, particularly where the author seems to conflate manuscript witnesses. However, I look forward to Ó Síocháin's forthcoming edition of the text, as this story is certainly one that deserves more attention from scholars.

[7]For a more recent glossary of terms, which is specifically designed for academic medievalists, see Spencer-Hall and Gutt, forthcoming.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BRISSON, LUC 1976: *Le myth de Tirésias: essai d'analyse structurale* (Leiden).

GLAAD: 'Glossary of Terms - Transgender', *GLAAD Media Reference Guide*. <https://www.glaad.org/reference/transgender> [accessed 10 January 2020].

LACKNER, SARA MICHELLE 2006: '*Tochmarc Becfhola*: text, context, and associated texts', unpublished PhD thesis, University of Cambridge.

MACKINNON, DONALD 1912: *A Descriptive Catalogue of Gaelic Manuscripts in the Advocates' Library, Edinburgh, and elsewhere in Scotland* (Edinburgh).

MEYER, KUNO 1907: 'Story of the Abbot of Druimenaig, who was changed into a woman', in Osborn Bergin, R. I. Best, Kuno Meyer, and J. G. O'Keefe (eds), *Anecdota from Irish Manuscripts*, vol. 1 (Halle and Dublin), 76–79.

MULCHRONE, KATHLEEN; O'RAHILLY, THOMAS; FITZPATRICK, ELIZABETH; and PEARSON, A. I. 1926: *Catalogue of Irish Manuscripts in the Royal Irish Academy* 8 vols (Dublin) I.

POPPE, ERICH 2018: rev. '*The Case of the Abbot of Drimnagh. A Medieval Irish Story of Sex-Change*', *CMCS* 76, 120–2.

RICH, ADRIENNE 1980: 'Compulsory sexuality and Lesbian existence', *Signs* 5.4, 631–660.

SPENCER-HALL, ALICIA, and BLAKE GUTT forthcoming 2021: 'Trans & Genderqueer Studies guide' in Alicia Spencer-Hall and Blake Gutt (eds), *Trans and Genderqueer Subjects in Medieval Hagiography* (Amsterdam); available pre-print online at <https://drive.google.com/file/d/1sJzShBNhWzBKF6zJUX7noFHyEt9FReln/view> [accessed January 10, 2020].

DE TASSY, GARCIN 1835: *Abrégé du roman Hindoustani intitulé: La Rose de Bakawali* (Paris).

ROAN RUNGE

University of Cambridge

Arthur in Early Welsh Poetry. Edited by Nerys Ann Jones. MHRA Library of Medieval Welsh Literature 4. Cambridge: Modern Humanities Research Association. 2019. 248 pp. ISBN: 978-1-781889-08-4 (hardback), 978-1-781889-09-1 (paperback). £24.99 (hardback), £12.99 (paperback).

This new volume, published by the MHRA, is an excellent contribution to Arthurian studies and to the study of early Welsh poetry. This is a book which, above all, foregrounds the sources in their surviving manuscript contexts, and in doing so, provides an up-to-date, reliable introduction to the Welsh poems containing references to Arthur dated before 1300.

The format is somewhat different from that found in other books in the same series. Rather than a discrete introduction, edition, glossary, and notes, this book mixes editions and discussions of texts or extracts from texts. Manuscript images are generously and comprehensively provided and are in almost all cases legible (except on p. 187 where the poor condition of

Wynnstay MS 1 is to blame). These images are accompanied by transcriptions of the relevant section of the text, an edition, a translation (in most instances), copious notes and a glossary. The careful transcriptions and translations do not shy away from the difficulties and ambiguities of the text in question. Certain poems, such as *Pa gur*, are split up into short sections so that text and manuscript image can be viewed together. While this layout initially feels unfamiliar, it is a useful way of looking in great detail at a small section of text. This edition is the closest readers can get to the poems without consulting the manuscripts themselves.

The manuscript context of the poems is given great prominence and provides the basis for the book's division into five chapters as follows: 'The Black Book of Carmarthen'; 'The Book of Aneirin'; 'The Hendregadredd Manuscript' (also comparing related witnesses); 'The Book of Taliesin'; 'Poems in Other Manuscripts'. The generally late manuscript dates are foregrounded and this provides a useful corrective to the traditional focus on the earliness of these Welsh Arthurian references. This manuscript-based structure highlights how references to Arthur in *hengerdd* (traditionally viewed as earlier) and in the work of *Beirdd y Tywysogion* to some extent overlap in codices like the Black Book of Carmarthen. The chapter on 'Poems in Other Manuscripts' provides a particularly valuable discussion of often neglected texts and should open avenues for even-handed and sympathetic treatments of the development of the poems in question in later manuscripts.

Jones rightly takes the poems themselves as the focus of inquiry rather than attempting to map them on to a vision of who Arthur may have been. It is successfully highlighted that Arthur himself is more commonly not the main focus in the early Welsh poems in which his name is invoked. The volume includes an up-to-date bibliography and engages carefully with the complex issue of dating. The contested question of whether the texts pre-date Geoffrey of Monmouth's *Historia Regum Britanniae* (1138) could still be pursued further. Detailed and useful footnotes throughout highlight relevant critical discussion.

This edition enables engagement with a wide range of issues, particularly in its admirable presentation of the manuscript evidence on which it is based. The following mostly minor corrections and suggestions could also be noted. As indicated elsewhere in the book, remnants of Old Welsh spelling are not proof of a date before 1100, and thus the date-range of *c*. 900–1100 suggested for *Mi a wum* on p. 15 appears uncertain. On pp. 21–2 in discussing the Geraint *englynion*, *a chin rillethid-ve* is better translated as 'and although they were killed / should be killed' than 'and although they had been killed' to avoid suggesting that the warriors continued to fight after death. Perhaps *ry* is more suggestive of possibility than perfective here, given the imperfect subjunctive form. The scribe of the Black Book of Carmarthen was himself responsible for the manuscript's rubrics, rather than a separate rubricator as stated on p. 29 (I am grateful to Dr Myriah Williams of the University of California, Berkeley, for confirming this to me). The rubricated title in question (fol. 52r) is for a poem attributed to Cynddelw Brydydd Mawr. There *p*^{i}*dit*

should probably be expanded to *pridit* rather than *prydit* as in the transcription here (compare *p*ⁱ*wieith* on fol. 52v). Some inconsistencies in the notes are an inevitable result of an edition compiled over a period of time. On p. 66 *trigant* is described (perhaps questionably) simply as a 'hapax' but on p. 68 the term is again used and here defined: 'The form *guernor* is a hapax legomenon (a form which occurs only once) in the Welsh language.' Another possible interpretation of *Ymddidan Arthur a'r Eryr*, l. 23 (p. 174) would be to emend *lit* to *llit* and translate 'anger is no deliverance', which would cohere with the focus on the inevitability of death found in the final four *englynion* extant in later manuscripts and would represent a smaller emendation than those suggested, although the line is still short. It is perhaps worth noting in this context the use of <l> to represent /ɬ/ in Old Welsh orthography. Although there are again metrical difficulties, *ar ben meint* (*Dialogue between Melwas and Gwenhwyfar*, *englyn* 7, p. 195) works well semantically as a mocking reference by Gwenhwyfar to Melwas's diminutive stature. The images of Llanstephan MS 122 on pp. 199–200 appear to be in the wrong order. The volume contains a number of intriguing suggestions that could be pursued further, such as the possibility that Geoffrey may have sourced Arthur's patronym from a collocation of 'Arthur' and the Welsh adjective *uthr* (p. 16, n. 40).

The aim of this book is not to provide a synthesis of how Arthur was presented in early Welsh poetry and how this compares with other traditions. Rather, the detailed textual work and notes here will enable Arthurianists to push such research further. In its admirable detail, the book also provides a useful and current introduction to the manuscripts of early Welsh poetry and how the scribes organized the material we have surviving. Future scholars will thus find themselves deeply in Nerys Ann Jones's debt.

DAVID CALLANDER

Cardiff University

Medieval Wales, c. *1050–1332: Centuries of Ambiguity*. David Stephenson. Rethinking the History of Wales series. Cardiff, University of Wales Press, 2019. pp. xxx + 210. £16.99. ISBN 978-1-78683-386-0.

Medieval Powys: Kingdom, Principality and Lordships, 1132–1293. David Stephenson. Studies in Celtic History, 35. Woodbridge, Boydell Press, 2016. pp. xxii + 339. €70. ISBN 978-1-78327-140-5.

David Stephenson is perhaps the most prolific historian currently working on medieval Welsh history. He is the undisputed master of narrative history, but 'kings and battles' do not exhaust his repertoire, for one of his seminal early works was a monograph on the administration of the kingdom of Gwynedd in the thirteenth century (recently updated and reissued as Stephenson 2014), while in recent years he has also done fundamental work on source-criticism (the Welsh chronicles) and is not afraid to venture into the field of material

objects, both large (castles) and small (the Meifod cross-slab). Of the two works under review here, one is a major exercise in rebalancing medieval Welsh history away from an excessive focus on Gwynedd and towards a less-studied part of the country, the kingdom of Powys, while the other is an extended essay and survey, evidently aimed at a general audience as well as professional historians. Both chart dramatic moves away from the view of Welsh history that was propagated in the pioneering work of J. E. Lloyd in the early twentieth century (Lloyd 1911).

Medieval Wales c. *1050–1332: Centuries of Ambiguity* seems to be the first volume in a new series by UWP, 'Rethinking Welsh History', aiming for 'concise and selective surveys that highlight areas of debate rather than attempting to achieve comprehensive coverage' (p. ii). It is suitably short and succinct, and the chapters are of very manageable size. Furthermore, the 'rethinking' promised in the series title is delivered. Stephenson has provided an excellent brief account of how medieval Welsh historiography has gradually diverged from the model based on the work of J. E. Lloyd that dominated early and mid-twentieth-century writing. Lloyd, following the natural preoccupations of his time and place, wrote an account that maximized the importance – not to mention the degree – of state-formation. That naturally led him to a focus on Gwynedd and on the development of the thirteenth-century Principality of Wales, which was seen as a nation-state in embryo, but one that was cruelly destroyed by the overwhelming power of the English crown. Forces and individuals whose contribution seemed to further that state-formation received positive coverage, while these that tended in a centrifugal direction met with disapproval. More recently this model has been nuanced or indeed challenged. Much more sympathetic analysis has been given to people and institutions that were not in sympathy with Gwynedd's aggrandizement. This includes other Welsh dynasties, especially the rulers of the neighbouring lands of Powys, whose disinclination to be absorbed into a Gwynedd-focused polity was a major factor in the ultimate failure of that polity, as well as people within Gwynedd who resisted the pressures of princely power and taxation. The parts of Wales under Anglo-Norman dominion, the so-called 'March', have also received far more attention in recent decades (here the work of Rees Davies comes to mind). The result is a more complex story in which individual actors are understood to respond to the various pressures and opportunities that they faced, rather than being heroes or villains in a national story. Stephenson's subtitle, 'centuries of ambiguity', sums up the new understanding nicely. Gaining and retaining any kind of power in medieval Wales meant engaging in a constant balancing act between competing loyalties. The period covered in the book has been chosen in order to emphasize this issue, as it covers both the last years of pre-Norman Wales and the first couple of generations after the final conquest. Thus we are presented with Welsh people making a range of political choices in very different circumstances.

Stephenson presents his case without engaging in long arguments with older scholarship, rightly so as these have been conducted elsewhere and the brevity of the book excludes them anyway. This book partakes of two natures.

On the one hand, it is an extended essay putting forward a particular argument on a particular theme, but on the other, its title suggests that it is also to serve as a broader survey of its field. Inevitably this causes tensions. Not all aspects could be covered fully, and some are subordinated to others. The book strongly reflects Stephenson's concern with Welsh princely politics and power structures. Economic, social, religious and cultural history are discussed largely within the framework of the questions, 'who governed?', 'how did they do so?' and 'how successful were they?', so that they appear as factors influencing the development of the political narrative rather than narrative threads in their own right. This tilts the book towards the category of essay and away from that of survey. Furthermore it is written from a strongly Welsh perspective. The March receives less coverage than the Wales of the princes, and – in an interesting experiment – is seen primarily from the viewpoint of Welsh rulers looking at it from the outside, rather than that of the marcher lords or the inhabitants of the lordships themselves. Throughout the book, the emphasis is on choices made by Welsh rulers and the higher ranks of society. Little is said about the less powerful, though admittedly the sources make it very difficult to deal with them before the late Middle Ages.

These points apart, this is a very valuable contribution to the range of introductory books on medieval Welsh history. Much value is added by the annotated bibliography at the end of the book and the recommendations for further reading in the notes. Both these provisions enlarge the book's coverage beyond the aspects on which the author has focused. There are also some helpful maps (though Map 3, showing diocesan boundaries, might have labelled the dioceses) and genealogical tables. For such a short book, the density of notes is rather high. UWP sticks doggedly to its policy of insisting on endnotes, however exasperating they are; I suppose nothing any reviewer can say will persuade them to switch to footnotes. In particular, the endnotes attached to the maps could, with little effort, have been included on the same pages. Nevertheless, this is an excellent short summary of the *status quaestionis* in medieval Welsh history and instantly becomes the first book to recommend to students, historians of other regions or periods, and the general public.

Medieval Powys is a much longer work aimed at a specialist audience, but its perspective is recognizably similar to that of the shorter book. This is a detailed study of the rulers of Powys in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries that emphasizes that they were autonomous political actors who made choices from among the range of options open to them and within the constraints imposed upon them. The idea that Powys or its ruling families ought to have subordinated their interests to the supposed nation-building programme of the Gwynedd rulers is dismissed as anachronistic nineteenth- and twentieth-century thinking. Medieval people did not think in such terms, and such ideas are absent from the sources of the time, except sources from Gwynedd (and then only sporadically). From both a contemporary perspective, and even from a modern point of view, Gwynedd's expansion could be seen as aggressive imperialism rather than the natural consolidation of a nation that already existed in embryo. This is an important corrective.

The book is divided into a narrative half (really two-thirds) and an analytical half. In spite of the date-range in the title, coverage begins with the late eleventh and early twelfth centuries, the time of the 're-emergence of Powys' after a supposed hiatus of nearly three centuries in which its territory was ruled by Gwynedd. The subsequent chapters cover Madog ap Maredudd (d. 1160), the later twelfth-century rulers, the age of Gwenwynwyn (d. 1216), the supremacy of Gwynedd under Llywelyn ab Iorwerth (d. 1240), and the separate trajectories of northern and southern Powys as far as the fall of Llywelyn ap Gruffudd of Gwynedd in 1282. The final narrative chapter covers the generation after the conquest, when Owain ap Gruffudd of southern Powys was among the few Welsh rulers left in control of a substantial patrimony. These narrative chapters are the culmination of years, in fact decades, of previous work by Stephenson. Most of the material has been the subject of his series of formidably documented articles on the political history of Powys, beginning with his survey of Powys Wenwynwyn in the thirteenth century, published in 1984. The articles are not wholly superseded by this book. Some detailed arguments are presented more succinctly here, and some views have changed, and Stephenson himself refers the reader to the articles on occasion. Readers interested in a particular topic will therefore need to compare the treatments.

The 're-emergence' of Powys is worth some reconsideration ('resurgence' is the term which Stephenson chose in the corresponding article; I am not sure if the change has any significance). The absence of rulers of Powys from tenth- and eleventh-century records has led to the view that there were none because the kingdom fell under the dominance of Gwynedd late in the ninth century. It is implausible, given all that we know of the fragility and lack of institutional underpinning of early medieval Welsh kingships, that the lands of the Dee, Vyrnwy and Severn basins were left without rulers on the spot even if they did acknowledge Gwynedd's supremacy, which is not certain. Nor is it plausible that these areas remained supine whenever the kingship of Gwynedd was weak or disputed, which was often. That is not the picture that emerges in the better documented twelfth century, so why should it have been true earlier? Poor chronicle evidence for Powys is the likeliest explanation for the apparent political vacuum. It seems, therefore, unnecessary to doubt the evidence of the *Vita Griffini filii Conani* that rulers of Powys were operating in the 1070s and could be powerful enough to intervene within a debilitated Gwynedd (p. 24). Geographical indefiniteness is a characteristic of eleventh-century Welsh political units, and the indefiniteness of early Powys is perhaps only different in degree from that of Gwynedd or Deheubarth, reflecting its nature as a border region consisting of a series of river valleys aligned east-west and divided by difficult terrain from the rest of Wales and from each other. The tenth- and eleventh-century evidence is simply not detailed enough to let us know who ruled here, but somebody did.

The second, analytical part of the book could not avoid a certain degree of repetition since much of the raw material had already been presented in chronological order in the narrative section. This makes for some demanding reading, which could have been made a bit easier by the provision of subtitles,

the use of which varies a lot between chapters. More subdivisions would have been especially useful in the long chapter 10 on internal politics. These minor points aside, this section of the book is crucial to its impact, for it brings together ideas that are scattered through the narrative section. I suspect that readers will find themselves revisiting these chapters repeatedly for precisely that reason.

In this section, Stephenson discusses governance, secular politics, the church and finally, in an innovative turn, 'perspectives', 'fears' and 'aspirations' – Powysian identity, in other words, a difficult but interesting subject. A question that is addressed from time to time in the book is where exactly Powys was. This is not straightforward at all. There are two famous maximalist definitions, one by the poet Gwalchmai and the other in the tale, *Breuddwyd Rhonabwy*. Both relate to the time of Madog ap Maredudd, but only one is contemporary, and it is far from clear that these definitions were universally accepted or even commonly so, let alone that they held any weight over time. Areas such as Iâl and Maelor are particularly difficult. What was 'Powysian' about them in, say, the later thirteenth century? Later medieval poets, looking back from a fifteenth-century perspective, regularly use 'Powys' of Swydd y Waun, but it is difficult if not impossible to find unambiguous examples of Iâl or Maelor being so described, while Penllyn and Edeirnion appear if anything to have been seen as part of Gwynedd by that time (Lewis 2013). When were such perspectives crystallized? Do they reflect political loyalties in the last generation or so of native rule? It is conceivable that the idea of medieval Powys may need to be dissected in the way that the idea of medieval Wales already has been, and that local loyalties may have been more important than any 'Powysian' identity, especially in outlying areas; there is good material on this in Chapter 10.

Chapter 11, on the church, is a particularly interesting contribution, as studies of the medieval Welsh church have generally been 'national' rather than regional in their focus, and very few have taken a political unit as their parameter. True to Stephenson's emphasis on secular rulers, there is more here about the relationships of Powysian rulers to individual churches than on those churches themselves as political actors, though Stephenson does acknowledge that churches could be powerful enough to have their own interests and policies. The sources are not really detailed enough to allow us to measure this balance in the period in question, and there is even more uncertainty regarding what went before. It cannot be doubted that changing patterns of secular lordship were important in the fortunes of churches, but were they of exclusive importance or could major churches pursue their own longer-term interests across boundaries? It is hard to think of a political framework that would account for the geography of the cult of St Beuno, for instance, or St Tysilio, both of whom have dedications across Powys and Gwynedd and even further afield, and there are other peculiar supra-regional distributions (Padarn, Cybi). It seems to have been a common assumption among high-medieval hagiographers that churches dedicated to a saint formed some kind of institutional association, and they must have had some grounds for thinking

this, though the nature of these networks is hard to pin down. Observing the immense complexity of the political affiliations of churches in early medieval Ireland, where the evidence is much fuller, should instill a sense that there are many possibilities. We do not know anything like enough about the power of pre-Norman Welsh churches, but if the claims made in hagiography approximate in any way to reality, they would suggest that the largest ones were political players in their own right.

Another issue is the relationship between the entrenched mother churches and the new religious orders who arrived late in the twelfth century. It is worth asking how much direct evidence there actually is for an antagonistic relationship between the established churches and the incoming Cistercians. The answer must be, 'not much if any', and a lot of argument has been based on an assumption that there ought to have been such antagonism. Stephenson regards the lack of grants made to Strata Marcella within the region of Mechain as a sign that the mother-church of Meifod successfully manoeuvred to keep the monks out of its backyard. This may be correct but it need not imply hostility so much as the establishment of a modus vivendi. The foundation charter of the abbey was, after all, witnessed by Meifod's archdeacon, Sulien ap Caradog. The appropriation of churches by the Cistercian abbeys was a slow and piecemeal development, part of a reorientation of ecclesiastical patronage over several generations, not a sudden, sharp confrontation between different interest groups. If power did pass from one to the other it is likely that the powerful went with it: it is quite plausible that some of the Cistercians' recruits came from the entrenched ecclesiastical families, families like that of Sulien ap Caradog (whose father had the job of archdeacon before him). I do not know whether the evidence survives to pursue this idea, but some such explanation could lie behind the obvious Welshness of the cultural orientation of the Cistercians in Gwynedd, Powys and Deheubarth alike. Cynddelw's great poem in honour of St Tysilio and Meifod was preserved in a Cistercian manuscript, the Hendregadredd collection (it is damaged there but the complete copy in the Red Book of Hergest likely derives from the Strata Florida archive anyway). Incidentally, the view of Nerys Ann Jones and Morfydd Owen that this poem represents a Gwynedd perspective after the death of Madog ap Maredudd, a view which is accepted by Stephenson (pp. 66–7), should now be compared with Ann Parry Owen's response on the www.seintiaucymru.ac.uk website, reasserting the traditional date and place of composition in the time of Madog ap Maredudd (d. 1160), and in Powys, intuitively a much easier proposal. In general, though, the full and intelligent use of the poetic evidence is a great strength of this book and a model for future Welsh historians to follow.

Apart from a major body of poetry, medieval Powys also produced one of the narrative tales conventionally gathered together as the 'Mabinogi', *Breuddwyd Rhonabwy*, and there is an appendix (pp. 306–10) in which Stephenson ventures into the vexed territory of the date and meaning of this tale. It must be admitted frankly that *Breuddwyd Rhonabwy* is so strange and enigmatic that it may be impossible to date or contextualize, but Stephenson

makes some good points in favour of a date towards the very end of the thirteenth century, though none of them are really decisive: the tale's pointed references to the borders of Powys and (possible) implicit criticism of Powys's rulers are not precise enough to rule out other contexts. Moreover, if the tale were so critical of the ruling elite, that raises the question of who its intended audience was, a consideration that needs to be addressed in any solution to the problem of the tale's context.

Many other points for debate could be picked out from a book as rich as this one, but the overall achievement is huge. As a native of southern Powys, this reviewer is bound to sympathize with David Stephenson's rehabilitation of Powys as a land with its own identity. The place of Powys in the medieval Welsh world has now been triumphantly asserted.

REFERENCES

LEWIS, B. J. (2013), 'Bardd yn y Tirlun: Cymru a'i Rhanbarthau drwy Lygaid Guto'r Glyn', in Dylan Foster Evans, Barry James Lewis and Ann Parry Owen (eds), *'Gwalch cywyddau gwŷr: Essays on Guto'r Glyn and Fifteenth-Century Wales* (Cardiff), 149–76

LLOYD, J. E. (1911) *A History of Wales from the Earliest Times to the Edwardian Conquest*, 2 vols (London)

STEPHENSON, D. (2014), *Political Power in Medieval Gwynedd: Governance and the Welsh Princes* (Cardiff).

BARRY J. LEWIS

Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies

Gerald of Wales: New Perspectives on a Medieval Writer and Critic. Edited by Georgia A. Henley and A. Joseph McMullen. Cardiff: University of Wales Press. 2018. Hardback ISBN 978-1-78683-163-7. £90. Paperback ISBN 978-1-78683-164-4. £29.99.

For such a well-known writer, Gerald of Wales is surprisingly underrepresented in scholarship. The re-editing of his works has been so sporadic that most of them, including some of the most famous ones, still have to be read in the antiquated and unwieldy Rolls volumes. Translations have been quite scarce too. The Welsh works, *Itinerarium Kambriae* and *Descriptio Kambriae*, can be read in Lewis Thorpe's Penguin translation, though for readers who know Welsh, Thomas Jones's *Gerallt Gymro* (Cardiff, 1938) is a good alternative. For the *Topographia Hibernica* J. J. O'Meara's translation is still in use. Of Gerald's Welsh and Irish works, only the *Expugnatio Hibernica* has a modern edition and translation. The state of his less-well-known works is correspondingly worse, though the *Speculum Duorum*, *Vita S. Hugonis* and, very recently, the *De principis instructione*, have been made available. Editing and translating are specialist and time-consuming tasks, and there are many other medieval Latin texts deserving of attention, so the slow progress here is not

wholly surprising. However, the modest size of the secondary literature is striking. The only full scholarly study in English of Gerald as a writer remains Robert Bartlett's, published in 1982. Journal articles appear at a rate of a handful a year, as the notes in this volume attest, but Gerald tends to appear in discussions of particular topics, such as the conquest of Ireland or the St Davids dispute, and his works are rarely considered in the round.

That makes this new volume all the more welcome. The contributors have set out to cover a wide range of Gerald's writings, and not just the Irish and Welsh works. Thus there are essays here on the *Gemma ecclesiastica*, the *Vita S. Hugonis* and a work newly confirmed to be by Gerald, the *History of Llanthony Priory*. They cover also a range of topics, from Gerald's use of sources to later writers' use of Gerald, and passing (in the case of Bartlett's contribution) via Gerald's use of Gerald as well. The chapters are based on presentations from a conference held at Harvard in 2015. The authors seem to have been kept on a tight leash, for all the chapters are quite short. Naturally, in these circumstances, coverage is uneven, and some of Gerald's works receive little or no attention. The book is not, however, conceived as an introduction to Gerald but rather as an invitation to further research, in which role it succeeds well.

The first section is devoted to 'Appropriating the past'. Huw Pryce, a longtime commentator on Gerald, explores both the general question of Gerald's interest in the Welsh past and some specific material bearing on the history of St Davids. The survey of Gerald's sources is valuable and highlights the importance of oral testimony, for instance memory of miracles that took place in particular churches or testimony about events deriving from members of Gerald's prominent and far-flung lineage, as well as written sources like Gildas, Bede and Geoffrey of Monmouth. The specific material from St Davids is full of problems, as Pryce's treatment shows. Pryce offers a perceptive account of the differing emphases between Gerald's early works, the *Itinerarium* and *Descriptio Kambriae*, and his later tracts focused on the metropolitan dispute, the *De invectionibus* and the *De iure et statu Menevensis Ecclesiae*. More problematic is the question of the lists of archbishops and bishops of St Davids in the *Itinerarium*, and especially the differences between the list in the first two editions of the work from the 1190s and the list in the third edition, which was made long after the end of the metropolitan dispute and Gerald's retirement from the fray. Pryce treats the lists as separate documents discovered by Gerald on different occasions, but the differences between them do not seem to me to overstep the bounds of the kind of tinkering to which Gerald was, as is well-known, exceedingly prone, and it cannot be ruled out that there was only one original list. Note in particular that one addition in the later list concerns Bishop Morgenau's sin of eating meat, and compare the remarks of Bartlett in this volume, pp. 90–1, on monastic strictures against meat as a Giraldian theme. Nor am I completely confident that Gerald found such a list ready-made rather than that he himself was the compiler; as Pryce notes (p. 31), apparent references to such lists outside of Gerald's works are far from certain. The textual cruces of these lists need to be resolved, if possible, in a

new critical edition of the *Itinerarium*. Furthermore, all versions of the list incorporate the doctrine that St Davids lost its pallium when Bishop Samson took it to Dol in Brittany. This is a very important theme in all Gerald's writing on the St Davids question and it is troubling that the only mentions of it earlier than Gerald are in two letters that are themselves only preserved in Gerald's own *De invectionibus*. Pryce is well-aware that these letters are not above suspicion (cf. p. 29) but they continue to be crucial to reconstructions of the St Davids case before Gerald. This is a long-noted, nagging problem that needs more work.

In the second chapter in this section, Ben Guy tackles Gerald's Welsh sources. His incisive analysis shows that Gerald had access to two written documents, one a version of the Latin origin legend and genealogical tract, *De situ Brecheniauc*, the other a genealogy of the rulers of Gwynedd and (implicitly) in Welsh. Furthermore, both were relatively recent creations in Guy's view, especially the Gwynedd genealogy, for which he provides solid arguments that it could only belong to the period 1138 × 1170. The chapter contains important criticism of the idea of 'Welsh tradition', as least when that phrase is used in a vague sense without reference to specific textual manifestations. Gerald did not follow 'Welsh tradition': rather, he used two documents whose nature we can discern in some detail, and like all documents these were composed in a particular time and place for a particular purpose. What is more, the information which they contained had been reshaped and updated for contemporary needs. I am reminded of David Dumville's famous complaints about the term ('What is "tradition"? Whose tradition? Monastic, legal, craft tradition? And once we begin to ask questions of this sort, we are forced to ask ourselves about the processes of transmission, with all the further questions and critical judgments which that implies' ('Sub-Roman Britain: history and legend', *History* 62 (1977), 173–192, at 192)). The third paper in this section takes us to the border region, as Joshua Byron Smith discusses Gerald's account of the 'Anglo-Saxon history of Lydbury North', an estate of the bishop of Hereford, the story of whose acquisition by the bishops was also told by Walter Map. Smith has published an important study of Map, and the thrust of his essay is to insist that Gerald's account was not taken from Map, but was substantially his own version of a pre-existing outline, and this argument is broadened into a defence of other passages in Gerald's works which look similar to parts of Map. In Smith's view, the two men shared a close association and similar outlooks, and this is sufficient to account for the similarities; in any case the concept of plagiarism needs to be problematized in a medieval context.

Section 2, 'Gerald the writer: manuscripts and authorship' is rather disparate. Robert Bartlett makes a convincing case that Gerald wrote the *History of Llanthony Priory*, a little-known and not fully published work that Bartlett attributes to Gerald's final years. His case has the great merit of being much simpler than other hypotheses that rely on the premise that an anonymous author plundered Gerald's works. Catherine Rooney, author of an important PhD thesis on the manuscripts of Gerald's works, focuses on a number of

manuscripts which she argues, again convincingly, were produced in close proximity to Gerald himself. It would be satisfying if, in future, one of the hands could be identified as that of Gerald himself. The remaining two papers in this section, Michael Faletra on the various versions of Gerald's account of the habits of the beaver, and Simon Meecham-Jones on 'Style, truth and irony', are more speculative. Faletra rightly identifies the beaver passage as one which Gerald tinkered with on numerous occasions, and speculates further that the animals' behaviour was meant as a negative foil to Gerald's presentation of the Irish and a positive comment on the Welsh. As Faletra acknowledges, there is no explicit signposting of this in any of the works in question. Meecham-Jones has interesting things to say about our modern difficulties in reading Gerald, beyond the simple requirement that we master medieval Latin, but it is not entirely clear why the differences between Gerald and 'Goliardic' poets are surprising, given the huge difference in their genres of writing, while the discussion of Ciceronian and Quintilian paradigms of rhetoric is not as textually anchored as it might have been. The idea that Gerald's infamous suggestion of ethnic cleansing in *Descriptio Kambriae* was meant ironically is, like Faletra's interpretation of the beaver passages, a reminder of how difficult it is to pin down Gerald's thought.

Section 3 covers 'Gerald the thinker: religion and worldview'. The first essay, by Peter Jones, analyses Gerald's sense of humour. Gerald's lifetime, in Jones's account, coincided with a reassessment of humour in courtly and church circles: humour moved from being a marginally acceptable or even morally problematic force to a 'powerful political and saintly virtue' (p. 148). This was perhaps a shift in literary and theological attitudes rather than in the behaviour of kings and aristocratics, but undoubtedly Gerald is an important exponent of the joke and Jones's careful analysis explores both the targets of Gerald's wit and its limits. Like other contemporaries, so it is argued, Gerald saw humour as a powerful moral weapon against turpitude in the church. Peter Raleigh's chapter discusses Gerald's opposition of royal and episcopal power in his *Vita S. Hugonis*. Rejecting previous views of the Life as a thin and cursory work, Raleigh shows how Gerald constructed an uncompromisingly negative view of the Angevin kings with whom Hugh had to deal, and that his portrait of Hugh brings the saint as close to the pattern of Thomas Becket as was possible given that Hugh was not himself martyred. The Life emerges as a highly partisan view of the relationship between the kings and the English bishops that reflects similar concerns to Gerald's other works. Suzanne LaVere surveys Gerald's *Gemma ecclesiastica* and locates it within discourses of the time on the importance of the clerical role, and especially of clerical continence. She outlines also how Gerald's vision of the ideal priest reflects a contemporary restructuring of masculinity (among some clerical authors) that privileged bodily self-control over sexual performance. It becomes clear that the intended audience of the tract was wider than the Welsh clergy for whom Gerald claimed to be writing, although the direct impact of the *Gemma* on the clerical reform movement remains uncertain. Finally in this section, Owain Nash investigates Gerald's scientific views on the nature

of the human body, arguing that they were more strongly and systematically held than has been understood in the past; in particular, Gerald's understanding of the bodily humours and the effects of different climates on human temperaments and behaviours was a pervasive influence on his ethnographical writing. Interesting differences between his views of the Welsh and the Irish come to the fore in this approach, among other things.

The final section covers 'reception'. Georgia Henley, a co-editor of the volume, surveys *Claddedigaeth Arthur*, an account of the discovery of Arthur's grave at Glastonbury derived from Gerald's *Speculum Ecclesiae* and *De principis instructione*. As the only passage from any of Gerald's works ever translated into Middle Welsh, *Claddedigaeth Arthur* is of interest for Welsh reception of Gerald, and it is significant that it is a work that speaks to particular needs – specifically interest in the figure of Arthur and in prophecy – that are not otherwise much served by Gerald's writings. Henley argues, justifiably, that the absence of any other translations of his works, notably the *Itinerarium* and *Descriptio Kambriae*, into Welsh reflects their irrelevance for medieval Welsh audiences, as a biased 'outsider's look' (p. 234). It is also worth considering the absence of any place for these genres within medieval Welsh writing. The *Itinerarium* and the *Descriptio* are not narrative, romance or history, nor are they devotional works, which are the main spheres within which Welsh translation prose was produced. They are texts that offer entertaining information, or informative entertainment, depending on one's perspective. Translation of such texts – *Imago Mundi*, or the *Travels of Brother Odoric* – did occur, but it was much more sporadic and ad hoc than the translation of historical and would-be-historical narratives, and those that were translated tend towards exoticism, bringing the world beyond Wales into Welsh rather than treating local topics. It is hard to think of a prospective audience for Gerald in later medieval Wales who could not read him in Latin – if they wanted to read him at all.

The last two chapters turn their attention to the afterlife of Gerald's Irish works in Ireland. Caoimhe Whelan examines the fifteenth-century Hiberno-English translation of the *Expugnatio Hibernica*. Some of its popularity can be gauged by the fact that there are eight manuscripts of the work. Whelan explores the meaning for the work in its context, pointing to the troubled status of the English colony and its defensive posture in the fifteenth century. She also finds evidence in other sources of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries for authors resorting to Gerald's authority, and argues that the English version of the *Expugnatio* was an important conduit for this influence. This links naturally with the last paper in the volume. Brendan Kane here poses the problem of the influence of Gerald on early-modern colonial discourse about Ireland. While acknowledging well-known instances of Gerald's influence and continuing reception, Kane points to the remarkable absence of obvious references to or echoes of Gerald in treatises on the governance of Ireland from the Tudor and early Stuart periods, posing the question of how influential Gerald was, or indeed how easily available his works were in the period before they were printed in 1602. Furthermore he raises questions

about how relevant some of Gerald's vision would have been for writers of this period, notably his interest in the marvellous and his religious standpoint. This is an intriguing chapter that raises more questions than it answers, and by design.

The volume ends with a brief 'afterword' expressing the hope that research on Gerald of Wales will continue. Judging by the contributions here, there is plenty more to be done, and it is heartening that moves appear to be afoot to make a serious inroad into the lack of proper, up-to-date editions and translations of his works (see now the announcement of a major project at https://www.history.ox.ac.uk/the-writings-of-gerald-of-wales). One question that obtruded from more than one chapter here is is how popular an author Gerald actually was. His prolific output tends to survive in small numbers of manuscripts and often in single copies, which moreover show signs of close association with Gerald himself, as Rooney argues convincingly. The number of extant manuscripts is not a completely reliable guide to the popularity of medieval works, but it cannot be safely ignored either. In his efforts at self-promotion, which were prodigious by his own account, Gerald was battling not merely against philistine or personally unsympathetic recipients but against the inertia imposed by medieval technology. The manuscript book, laboriously compiled by hand, and the difficulty of communication over long distances, did not lend themselves to making any author a 'best-seller'. Today's scholars can cast their eyes over a great range of textual material (even if it is only a small proportion of what was produced), but pre-modern readers had little chance of encountering more than a fragment of what might have been available to them in theory. It remains to be clarified how successful Gerald was within these constraints, that is, in comparison with other Latin writers of his time in the Anglo-Norman realms. Undoubtedly, however, the essays in this volume support the assessment of its editors, that Gerald was 'a thoroughly self-conscious and careful crafter of argument, deliberate in his use of sources and intended impact' (p. 6).

Barry J. Lewis

Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies

Lorg na Leabhar: A Festschrift *for Pádraig A. Breatnach*. Edited by Caoimhín Breatnach, Meidhbhín Ní Úrdail and Gordon Ó Riain. National University of Ireland, Dublin, 2019. xiv + 520pp. 65€. ISBN 978-0-901510-77-8.

This substantial volume contains some 22 articles (one in German, five in Irish, and the remainder in English) arranged broadly in chronological order of subject treated. Only a brief summary of the contents can be attempted here.

After some preliminaries and Alexandre Guilarte's list of the honorand's publications, the Festschrift proper begins with Jürgen Uhlich's paper '*Loch nEchach n-án*: Nasalierungsübertragung in den altirischen Glossen und

späteren Quellen' (pp. 13–38). Uhlich examines Old and Middle Irish examples like *dliged rechto nDáe* 'of the rules of the law of God' and the *Loch nEchach n-án* of the paper's title, in which a noun or adjective modifying a headword is nasalised not by the immediately preceding word but by the headword of the noun-phrase: the nasalisation of *Dáe* is caused not by gen. sg. *rechto* but by gen. pl. *dliged*; *án* is nasalised not by gen. sg. *Echach* but by neuter *Loch*. Uhlich argues that this is not the result of a sort of chain-reaction in which the regular nasalisation of *Echach* is simply duplicated on the next element in a connected string of words (this would leave unexplained examples like *dliged rechto nDáe*, where *rechto* is neither phonologically nor orthographically marked as nasalised). Instead he proposes that the unexpected mutation is a product of the well-attested rightward shift of stress in noun-phrases in Irish, a shift which means that the second element of bipartite names like *Máel Rúanaid*, for example, is more fully stressed than the headword. The nasalisation in *dliged rechto nDáe* is thus similar to the nasalisation seen after *a nda n-athair* 'their two fathers', where the mutation caused by the 3 pl. possessive pronoun is found both on the permanently unstressed numeral and the fully stressed word to which *da* is proclitic, or *a da nduma* 'their two mounds', where the mutation bypasses the unstressed element altogether and affects only the stressed element.

Uáitéar Mac Gearailt's densely argued paper concerns the transmission of *Mesca Ulad* (pp. 39–73). This Early Irish tale survives in two versions: the Middle Irish Version B is found in LL and lacks the ending; the fragmentary 'largely Old Irish' Version A is found in LU and covers the conclusion of the story. B and A are found stitched together as a single text in the Yellow Book of Lecan proper (specifically NLI G4, labelled 'Y') and in NLS 72.1.40 (designated 'E'). Through linguistic and textual analysis, Mac Gearailt comes to the conclusion that the texts of Y and E are not as close as has sometimes been claimed. He suggests that E may even preserve older readings of the B text than LL. A comparison of E and LL is, of course, only possible for the B-part of the tale. The possibility is mooted, however, that the LL text might originally have concluded with the A version as well; in that scenario, the common ancestor of E and LL was a partial Middle Irish redaction of the earlier text underlying both B and A. The other possibility explored by Mac Gearailt is that E does indeed descend, as normally assumed, from a composite text formed from LL and a text like LU, but that the LL-derived text was subjected to sensitive, expert editing and revision at an early point in transmission (perhaps the late twelfth or early thirteenth centuries).

Máirín Ní Dhonnchadha clarifies the setting of the eighth-century poem attributed to Suibne found in the St Paul Codex, which begins *M'airiuclán i Túaim Inbir* (pp. 75–94). Ní Dhonnchadha argues that the *airiuclán* of the title is indeed a kind of prayer-house and not a metaphorical tree-top abode and that the Suibne Geilt of the poem is a pious hermit now in the care of Mo-Ling having recovered from his famous *geltacht*. The discussion of ecclesiastical management of woodland and the use of hollow trees makes for interesting reading.

In 'St Abbán's Charm' (pp. 95–111), Pádraig P. Ó Néill discusses an Irish verse in an Anglo-Norman hand and Middle English spelling and accompanied by Latin glosses found in a manuscript (now part of Cambridge Corpus Christi 405) written by a member of the Knights Hospitallers of St John of Jerusalem with connections to Waterford and Wexford between 1325 and 1327. The Irish charm to protect travellers by sea is also found in the *Vita Abbani* and is shown to be part of a wider effort to develop the cult of Abbán as a marine saint who would appeal to the Anglo-Normans. Anyone not reading this volume from cover to cover may wish to note that the relevant manuscript page is reproduced on the verso after the end of Ó Néill's article.

Neil Buttimer's 'The Book of Leinster and the Book of the O'Byrnes' (pp. 113–38) suggests that the author of the late-sixteenth century poem *Mór cóir cháich ar chrích Laighean* (Fearghal Óg Mac an Bhaird or Niall Ó Ruanadha), which formed part of the O'Bryne poem-book, may have drawn on some texts now preserved in LL in composing his poem, perhaps even by direct consultation of that manuscript. There is discussion also of intertextuality within the *Leabhar Branach*. The florid style of this paper will not appeal to every reader.

In 'A praise-poem from eleventh-century Armagh' (pp. 139–48), Máire Herbert offers a close reading of a poem composed in the 1040s for the bishop Áed Úa Forréid, rightly insisting that it be taken on its own terms rather than compared teleologically to later bardic panegyric. This is followed by Tomás Ó Cathasaigh's detailed quatrain-by-quatrain analysis of Dubthach Dóel Ulad's prophetic *laíd* in Recension I of *TBC* (pp. 149–65). Ó Cathasaigh explicates the poem's allusions and narrative function and suggests some improvements to Cecile O'Rahilly's text and translation.

The evidence for dance in Early Christian Ireland is surveyed by Fergus Kelly (pp. 167–73). This includes a discussion of the activities of the *fuirsire*/*fuirseóir*, *braigetóir* and *crosán*.

Róisín McLaughlin edits a Latin-Irish commentary on Psalm 68.10 found in RIA 3 B 23 (Cat. 227, 'The Tallaght Codex'). Though most of the text is in late Middle Irish (the Latin may once have been more extensive), there are several citations from the Bible, Bede, Jerome and another unidentified source or sources.

Caoimhín Breatnach examines manuscripts of the earlier recension of *Acallam na Senórach*, highlighting deficiencies in Stokes's edition of 1900 and raising questions about the date and formation of the text (pp. 197–219). Stokes consulted four manuscripts for his edition in *Irische Texte* (Laud 610, the Book of Lismore, UCD-OFM A4 and Rawlinson B 487) but gave priority to Laud and supplied passages missing in that manuscript from the Book of Lismore. Breatnach's analysis of the first three of these manuscripts (Rawlinson is not discussed in depth on this occasion) reveals that Lismore presents a more laconic text, and, while Laud and A4 are similar, the latter has material not found in any other witness. Either Lismore represents a pared back text or the other witnesses show later accretions. Breatnach also confirms that a fifth copy of the text, UCD-OFM A40, which was not used by

Stokes, is a copy of UCD-OFM A4. The paper concludes with some observations on linguistic dating; the possibility is mooted that the *Acallam* may have been composed at a point later than the accepted date on the threshold of the Middle/Early Modern Irish periods.

There follow three editions of Classical Modern Irish verse, all with translations into English. In 'Apalóg ón bhFiannaíocht' (pp. 221–33), Cathal Ó Háinle edits part of Eochaidh Ó hEódhasa's poem *Cathaigh réd mheanma, a mheic Bhriain*, viz. the fifteen quatrains devoted to the tale of the division of the kingship of Ireland between the two sons of Fearadhach Fachtnach after his death. Margo Griffin-Wilson edits and offers a literary analysis of *Ná tréig, a Thomáis, mheise*, a poem in which Fear Feasa Ó'n Cháinte seeks reconciliation with an estranged patron (pp. 235–69). In 'Dán le Tadhg Dall Ó hUiginn' (pp. 271–86), Pádraig Ó Macháin re-visits an acephalous poem (probably beginning with the word *Fuigheall*) found in NLS Adv. 71.1.44. The Classical Modern Irish theme continues with Gordon Ó Riain's detail-rich article 'Aistí meadarachta in *Irish Grammatical Tracts* V' (pp. 287–329), in which he surveys the metres attested in that fascinating treatise (many of which are rare) and compares the distribution to *Mittelirische Verslehren* and to contemporary corpora (including prosimetra).

Froinsias Ó Maolmhuaidh's *Lucerna Fidelium*/*Lóchrann na gCreidmheach*, published in Rome in 1676, is the subject of an essay by the late Richard Sharpe (pp. 331–42). *Lucerna Fidelium* has 'the distinction', to quote Colm Ó Lochlainn, 'of having remained in print for 234 years in its first edition'. By examining the information to be gleaned from marks of ownership, particularly in nine of the thirteen copies of the book formerly held in the Franciscan House of Studies at Killiney and now secure in UCD Special Collections, Sharpe sheds light on the distribution and circulation of this book among Irish Franciscans in the decades after it was printed and the effect of the discovery of hundreds of unsold copies in Rome in 1842. Sharpe's article is also an unsettling reminder that the future of some important collections of Irish-language early printed books, such as that which remains in Killiney, is uncertain. Happily, the four UCD-OFM volumes that were unaccounted for at the time of writing have since been found safe and sound by Eugene Roche of UCD Special Collections, who, together with his colleague Evelyn Flanagan, did so much to facilitate Prof. Sharpe's research in recent years. Those not reading this book from cover to cover should note that the reproduction of one of the relevant title-pages is found on the verso after this paper rather than on the blank facing page at the beginning of the article.

There follow two editions of seventeenth-century verse. In '*Fuaras fríth is misde mhé*: aisling ghrá' (pp. 343–60), Síle Ní Mhurchú edits and translates a love poem of alternating syllabic and accentual stanzas, which she tentatively dates no later than the first half of the seventeenth century because the syllabic verse fulfils the requirements of *dán díreach*. The introduction includes a discussion of the metrical feature *conchlann*. Liam P. Ó Murchú ('*Is tórmach ceatha*: Dáibhí Ó Bruadair a chum, 1693', pp. 361–80) edits and translates a poem of welcome for Eóin Mac Sleighne after his appointment as

Roman Catholic bishop of Cork and Cloyne in 1693 (pp. 361–80). The unique copy of the poem is in Boston College Gaelic Manuscript 5, which also contains nine other items on Bishop Sleyne.

Meidhbhín Ní Úrdail (*'An t-ár agus an t-ocras*: a Clare scribe's response to the Great Famine', pp. 381–409) tells the moving story of the poet and scholar Mícheál Ó Raghallaigh (1785/6–1856). Through an examination of his manuscripts and poetry, Ní Úrdail reveals how Ó Raghallaigh responded to the trauma of the Famine and the decline of the Irish language and native learning to which he was witness. As well as the subject's comments on the Famine and other notable events, Ní Úrdail prints and translates his bitter criticism in verse of the Roman Catholic clergy and an elegy he composed with Séamas Mac Cruitín on Peadar Mór Ó Lochlainn, last prince of the Burren. This paper also touches upon the coming to Ireland in the nineteenth century of Irish manuscripts written on the European mainland in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

Proinsias Ó Drisceoil makes use of a wide range of sources – from scholarly literature, newspapers and census data to the reminiscences of the writer Francis MacManus and the testimony of Dónall Mac Amhlaigh's satirical novel *Schnitzer Ó Sé* (1974) – to recover something of the extent of Irish spoken in part of the barony of Gowran, Co. Kilkenny in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries (pp. 411–33). This is followed by Seán Ua Súilleabháin's clarification of the historical circumstances of an incident memorialised in the folklore of Baile Mhuirne, viz. the arson-attack in October 1791 on a house in Baile Mhic Íre where soldiers sent to collect the hearth tax were staying ('Scéal an Tí Dhóite', pp. 435–45).

The final two contributions to the volume bring in a wider Gaelic dimension. In 'A pan-Gaelic perspective on the oral lament' (pp. 447–80), Sorcha Nic Lochlainn surveys the evidence for the oral lament in Gaelic Ireland, Scotland and even the Isle of Man (though the evidence for the last-mentioned is scarce). Nic Lochlainn explores the social and psychological functions of the lament as well as its connection with panegyric and brings out both the subversive and conservative aspects of this remarkable female-dominated genre. Finally, Seosamh Watson's wide-ranging 'Boats, bibles and boyans: Gaelic language and lore in Easter Ross' (pp. 481–520) presents information on the economic and social life, belief and customs, history and language of the Seaboard Villages acquired over three decades of fieldwork (begun in 1967 as 'rescue dialectology').

Details of works cited are found either in footnotes or in bibliographies at the end of the individual papers; there is no combined bibliography nor are there any indexes. The outline of contents above will no doubt have whetted scholarly appetites.

Mícheál Hoyne

Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies

Súgán an Dúchais: Aistí ar Ghnéithe de Thraidisiún Liteartha Chúige Uladh i gCuimhne ar Dhiarmaid Ó Doibhlin. Sraith Adhamhnáin 1. Edited by Nioclás Mac Cathmhaoil, Máire Nic Cathmhaoil and Conal Mac Seáin. Éigse Cholm Cille, Doire, 2018. 551pp. £25/30€. ISBN 978-0-9565136-8-7.

This volume inaugurates a new series devoted to Irish and Celtic Studies. It presents 24 papers (all but one in Irish) relating to the Irish-language literary tradition in Ulster from the Middle Ages down to the modern period. Most of these were invited contributions in honour of Diarmaid Ó Doibhlin (1942–2017), while others originate in papers given at one of three different conferences (pp. 4, 11). In only one case is the length of time between the paper's first being written up and its publication particularly noticeable – the strange, sermon-like contribution of Tadhg Ó Dúshláine ('Beannacht ar Nama Éireann: Scáthán Mhic Aingil mar leigheas ANAMA nó Ceannaireacht nó Langaracht? Féach sa Scáthán', pp. 57–68), obviously written in 2011 (see in particular the reference to 'anuraidh' at p. 63), in which the author seeks to draw lessons from Aodh Mac Aingil's *Scáthán Shacramainte na hAithrighe* (1618) to guide the nation out of a political, spiritual and cultural crisis, which the author believed it was experiencing at that time (p. 58). All of the papers in this volume were subjected to peer-review (pp. 6, 12).

After some preliminaries and Séamus Mac Mathúna's tribute to the honorand ('Dúchas Doibhlineach: An Dr Diarmaid Ó Doibhlin 1942–2017', pp. 15–20), Katharine Simms provides a masterful survey article in English on 'The literary tradition of Ulster to the sixteenth century' (pp. 23–41). Mícheál Mac Craith's paper, 'Donnchadh Ó Maonaigh: *De provincia Hiberniae S. Francisci*' (pp. 43–55) provides a summary in Irish of an account of the Franciscans in Ireland written in 1617. After Tadhg Ó Dúshláine's contribution, to which reference has already been made, comes Máire Nic Cathmhaoil's account of Féilim Ó Néill/Sir Phelim O'Neill (1604–1653) (pp. 71–91), before Nollaig Ó Muraíle's useful overview of Ulster genealogical collections from the period 1600–1850 (pp. 93–105).

Several of the contributions present detailed historical and literary analyses together with editions. The first of these is Nioclás Mac Cathmhaoil's study, 'Uaisle agus aos dána ag deireadh ré na bairdne: cás mhuintir Mhéig Uidhir' (pp. 107–42), which not only provides a detailed account of Mág Uidhir patronage of poetry in the period 1560–1730, its background and broader context, but also contains editions of two poems on Brian 'Cnoc Ninne' Mág Uidhir (*Cnoc os cnocaibh Cnoc Ninne* and *Tarla lá le sliabhradh sinn*). Peadar Mac Gabhann (*alias* Peter Smith, when writing in English) edits a text on the prerogatives and dues of Ó Domhnaill prior to 1609 from an eighteenth-century manuscript in Cambridge and discusses similar texts (pp. 145–76). In a wide-ranging paper A. J. Hughes sheds light on 'post-Classical' literature in Monaghan (pp. 179–237). Hughes edits *Trom na gártha-so do Leith Chuinn*, an elegy for Brian Mág Mathghamhna (d. 1689), studies the role played by Mág Mathghamhna as a patron of literature, looks at the career of Diarmaid Mac an Bhaird and his literary networks, and

examines some of the characteristics of poetry in the transitional period between Classical and more modern verse.

Four papers concentrate on eighteenth-century verse. Meidhbhín Ní Úrdail ('Pádraig Mac a Liondain: bard a bhí i stát ins an chrích seo', pp. 239–59) gives an account of the life and work of Patrick Linden and his contested place in the literary canon. Gearóid Trimble's essay focuses on the poet Raghnall Dall Mac Domhnaill (pp. 261–86). Seosamh Watson surveys various types of satirical verse produced by Oriel poets and discusses the interaction of love poetry and satire (pp. 289–309). Seán Mac Labhraí provides an overview of lewd or bawdy Ulster poetry in the eighteenth century as well as the attitudes of later collectors and editors towards such material (pp. 311–27).

Ciarán Dawson ('Seachtain i gcuideachta Pheadair Uí Ghealacáin, scríobhaí') edits four poems and a prose text copied out by a single prolific scribe (born 1792/3) as a sample of his work (pp. 329–52). Seosamh Ó Labhraí prints a sermon on penance by Fr John Healy (1759–1831) (pp. 355–69). Séamas Mac Annaidh ('Dhá lámhscríbhinn ó Fhear Manach i 1798', pp. 371–80) examines NLS Adv. MSS 72.3.1 and 23.3.2 and their background at the interface of traditional scribal culture and antiquarianism. Conal Mac Seáin edits the song *Gráinne Fhánada*, attributed to Tadhg Ó Tiomanaidhe, and in the process sheds light on the *modus operandi* of Énrí Ó Muirgheasa/Henry Morris, a pioneering editor of such verse (pp. 383–99).

Ríona Nic Congáil ('Banscoláirí Ultacha na hAthbheochana') looks at some of the leading female figures in the Gaelic revival movement in or associated with Ulster (pp. 401–15). Brian Lacey discusses the historical work of Séamus Ó Ceallaigh, in particular his *Gleanings from Ulster History* (1951), with a digression on historiography in Ulster from the medieval annals onwards (pp. 417–28). Ó Ceallaigh is also the subject of Antain Mac Lochlainn's contribution (pp. 431–40), a study of *Lucht Pící a's Sleagh*, Ó Ceallaigh's translation of Samuel Robert Knightley's *The Pikemen*. The remaining contributions are all concerned with the history of scholarship: Pádraig Ó Tiarnaigh discusses Seán Ó hEochaidh as a collector of folklore (pp. 431–60); Pádraig Breatnach gives a biography of Gerard Murphy (pp. 463–85); and Séamus Mac Mathúna pays tribute to Proinsias Mac Cana (pp. 487–98).

This is a weighty book both literally and figuratively. It is colourful and spaciously laid out on glossy paper between hard covers. The recto page is left blank on several occasions when a contribution finishes on the verso, something which detracts from the appearance of the volume. It is a pity that the book as a whole was not subjected to more rigorous proofing. Some contributions abound in typographical errors. Ignoring trivial slips and inconsistencies, the bibliography and index exhibit some oddities too. On the first page of the bibliography, for example, David Greene is transformed into Gerard Murphy (p. 509), while in the index, one of the references to Clann Aodha Buidhe will be found (or not!) under the letter G ('gCloinn Aodha Buidhe', p. 542). The index only covers proper names with no listing of first lines of poetry, tale titles or the like – a real pity in a volume such as this, which

presents not only detailed literary and historical analyses of texts but whole editions and translations. These criticisms aside, the above summary of contents will have made clear that *Súgán an Dúchais* is an important publication with material of interest to anyone in the field.

MÍCHEÁL HOYNE

Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies

Life, Lore and Song: Essays in Irish Tradition in Honour of Ríonach uí Ógáin/'Binneas an tSiansa': Aistí in Onóir do Ríonach uí Ógáin, Edited by Kelly Fitzgerald, Bairbre Ní Fhloinn, Méidhbhín Ní Úrdail and Anne O'Connor. Four Courts Press, Dublin, 2019. xiv + 322 pp. €55. ISBN 978-1-84682-810-2.

The title under review is a collection of twenty-seven essays/contributions in honour of Ríonach uí Ógáin, Professor Emeritus in Irish Folklore at University College Dublin and former Director of the National Folklore Collection.

Part One ('Ríonach uí Ógáin's Folklore Recordings in the National Folklore Collection') begins with a contribution in Irish by her former colleague Anna Bale, 'Saibhriú na Cartlainne: liosta taifeadtaí obair pháirce Ríonach uí Ógáin' (pp. 1–8). This contains a list of Ríonach's field and studio recordings along with a short introduction. The second contribution in this section, by Kelly Fitzgerald, consists of a list of Ríonach's publications, '"The landscape of tradition is constantly changing": five decades of contributions to the understanding of Irish vernacular culture' (pp. 9–16). The third and final contribution in this section, by Críostóir Mac Cárthaigh, titled 'The visual context of tradition: Ríonach uí Ógáin's photographic work' (pp. 17–18), consists of a short introduction and a selection of 25 photographs, the majority taken by Ríonach herself. Mac Cárthaigh's short one-and-a-half-page introduction is very informative in respect of Ríonach's field work and should be read in conjunction with Anna Bale's introduction to her contribution to this volume.

Part two ('Historical Collecting, Manuscript and Literary Sources, and the History of Tradition Archives') is very wide-ranging. Tugann aiste Angela Bourke, dar teideal 'Alma agus Jeremiah Curtin i gConamara' (lgh 19–27), léargas nua ar mhodhanna oibre sa ghort an bhailitheora béaloidis Jeremiah Curtin agus an ról tábhachtach a bhí ag a bhean Alma san obair seo, ról nár tugadh aird air go dtí seo, agus nár aithin a fear céile de réir dealraimh. Tá cuid mhaith den tráchtaireacht san aiste seo bunaithe ar dhialanna Alma Curtin, inar choimeád sí cuntas ar a gcuid oibre le scéalaithe ar fud Ghaeltacht na hÉireann. Pléann aiste Shíle de Cléir, 'An táilliúracht trí shúile na bprintíseach: dhá chuntas ón naoú haois déag' (lgh 28–39), le cuntais a d'fhág beirt tháilliúr ina ndiaidh ar a ngairm, agus díríonn go háirithe ar a dtréimhse oiliúna. Tá sean-aithne ag léitheoirí ar dhuine díobh, Tadhg Ó Buachalla, ar scríobh Eric Cross leabhar mar gheall air agus a bhean chéile (*The Taylor and Ansty*

(London, 1942)), a rugadh i gCill Gharbháin, oir-dheisceart Chontae Chiarraí sa bhliain 1863 ach a chaith cuid mhaith dá shaol i nGarraí na Péice, Béal Átha an Ghaorthaidh, iarthar Chontae Chorcaí. An té eile atá faoi chaibidil, Pádraig Mac Gíontaigh, rugadh agus tógadh é i gCnoc Maoilín, Baile Chruaich, iarthar Chontae Mhaigh Eo. Saolaíodh Mac Gíontaigh thart ar dheich mbliana roimh Ó Buachalla, *c*. 1854. Ní ar leabhar Cross a tharrraingíonn an t-údar san aiste seo ach ar ábhar ilghnéitheach a bhailigh Seán Ó Cróinín ón táilliúr Ó Buachalla le linn an Dara Cogadh Domhanda do Choimisiún Béaloideasa Éireann agus a foilsíodh sa bhlian 1978 faoin dteideal *Seanchas an Táilliúra* (curtha in eagar ag Aindrias Ó Muimhneacháin). Is le linn an chogaidh chéanna a bhailigh Tomás de Búrca, bailitheoir lán-aimseartha (dála Uí Chróinín) de chuid Choimisiún Béaloideasa Éireann an t-ábhar beathaisnéiseach fíorspéisiúil a bhfuil cuid de faoi chaibidil anseo ag de Cléir. Tá eolas fíorspéisiúil i dtaobh chéad-iarrachtaí Dhubhglais de h-Íde ar bhéaloideas a bailíu in aiste Liam Mhic Mhathúna dar teideal 'An Craoibhín Aoibhinn ina bhailitheoir óg béaloidis: fianaise a nótaí i Lámhscríbhinn G 1070, i Leabharlann Náisiúnta na hÉireann' (lgh 40–53). Tá 178 leathanach téacs sa lámhscríbinn seo, a bhaineann leis an tréimhse 1876 go dtí 1896. Amhráin is mó atá ann agus a bhformhór i nGaeilge. I gcás gach míre, soláthraíonn An Craoibhín óg de ghnáth ainm an fhaisnéiseora, log a bailithe, agus an mhí agus an bhliain a bailíodh an t-ábhar. Bhailigh sé ábhar ó mhná chomh maith le fir, agus níor leasc leis ábhar gáirsiúil a bhailiú ach oiread, agus bhain leas as an aibítir Ghréagach chun focail gháirsiúla a scríobh. Is díol spéise go soláthródh bailitheoir óg mionsonraí a chuid faisnéiseoirí chomh luath leis na 1870idí. Seans go bhfaca sé a mhacasamhail i gcolún Gaeilge an *Tuam News*. Sa bhliain 1873 chomhairligh John Molloy (Seán Ó Maéildhia) do Sheán Mac Fhlainn (eagarthóir an cholúin) gur cheart ainm agus seoladh faisnéiseoirí ábhar béil a thabhairt (Ó Macháin agus Ní Shéaghdha 1996: 107) .

The first section of Margaret A. Mackay's essay, 'Friendship at the core: Ireland, Sweden and the School of Scottish Studies' (pp. 54–66), deals with Séamus Ó Duilearga's working honeymoon and is based on the journal he and his wife (Maud) kept of their stay in Edinburgh. It appears much of their short honeymoon was spent meeting with various scholars and officials (particularly member of the Scottish Anthropological Society, later renamed the Scottish Anthropological and Folklore Society – SA(F)S) in an effort to promote folklore collecting. Each evening Ó Duilearga would dictate the events of the day, which his young wife wrote down. The second section of the essay deals with the follow-up to Ó Duilearga's visit, namely efforts to get folklore collecting organized in Scotland and to forge contacts between Scotland and Scandinavia. The final section of this essay discusses the genesis of the School of Scottish Studies. This is a very informative essay. However, the author's assertion that '[t]he SA(F)S papers for 1934 show that JHD [Séamus Ó Duilearga] kept in close correspondence with the Society after his return to Dublin and [that] it is possible to see his influence on and participation in its activities throughout the 1930s' (p. 60) has to be qualified. Ó Duilearga's correspondence with Carl Wilhelm von Sydow of the University of Lund gives a somewhat different picture and reveals that he

was hugely frustrated with Scottish efforts (or procrastination, as he saw it) to promote folklore collecting and quite dismissive of their motives as well as their actions (particularly those of Lowlanders).[8] The fourth contribution in this Part, by Maureen Murphy, is titled 'Neilí O'Brien and the Gaelic League' (pp. 67–76). This interesting essay on a prominent Protestant Gaelic Leaguer, which draws on many primary sources as well as secondary sources, is welcome, and highlights the need for more full-length biographies of prominent Gaelic Leaguers. Neilí O'Brien was instrumental in the founding of Coláiste Eoghain Uí Chomhraidhe in Carraig an Chabhaltaigh in south-west Clare. The college, established in 1912, still survives, but the Gaeltacht/Breac-Ghaeltacht its founding was hoped to buttress does not. This is not discussed, which is to be regretted, as it surely has a bearing on the subject (see Seoighe 1995: 103).

Baineann aiste Mheidhbhín Ní Úrdail, 'Deascán ó Chorca Dhuibhne agus ó Chairbre i mbailiúchán lámhscríbhinní an Fheirtéaraigh' (lgh 77–99), le roinnt ábhair ó fhoinsí béil a bhailigh Pádraig Feirtéar, Baile Uachtarach, Corca Dhuibhne in Éirinn agus thall i Meiriceá ag deireadh an naoú haois déag. Seanchas filíochta is mó atá faoi chaibidil san aiste seo, agus tugtar go leor sleachta as na lámhscríbhinní. Le tamall de bhlianta anuas tá scoláirí ag tarraingt ar an bhfoinse luachmhar lámhscríbhinní seo (údar na haiste seo thar éinne) agus is mithid, mar ar feadh ró-fhada bhí an cnuasach seo ag bailiú smúite i Leabharlann Choláiste na hOllscoile, Baile Átha Cliath. Cuireann Éamonn Ó hÓgáin eagar ar dhán le Eoghan Caomhánach ina aiste 'Moladh aráin Thaidhg Uí Choileáin' (lgh 100–108). Deir Ó hÓgáin: 'Rud neamhchoitianta sa Ghaeilge sa ré sin, nó i ré ar bith eile, go gcumfaí moladh ar earra bia chomh gnáthúil comónta leis an arán' (p. 100). Níor éirigh le Ó hÓgáin a fháil amach cérbh é an báicéar seo, Taidhg Ó Coileáin, a raibh cónaí air, de réir an dáin, i mBaile Hiobaird, oirthear Chontae Luimnigh, ach deir sé: 'Pé léamh atá le déanamh ar an moladh ar an arán, is deacair gan a cheapadh sa deireadh thiar ná gur mar mhagadh ar chúis éigin nach bhfuil ar eolas a bhí an moladh go léir á dhéanamh ag an gCaomhánach ar arán Thaidhg Uí Choileáin' (p. 101). Ó eolas inmheánach sa dán, tuairimíonn Ó hÓgáin gur cumadh an dán seo 'ar a dhéanaí sa bhliain 1810' (p. 100); is é sin le rá, tráth go raibh borradh mór faoi dhaonra na hÉireann, agus thart ar thrian den phobal ag brath ar an bpráta mar phríomhbhia, agus i go leor cásanna ar phrátaí amháin (Clarkson agus Crawford 2002: 32–3). Sa dán seo is daoine gustalacha a luaitear mar chustaiméaraí ag an gCoileánach. Ní haon ionadh é sin ar bhealach, mar ag an am níor bhia 'gnáthúil comónta' é an t-arán ag cuid mhaith de phobal na hÉireann, agus ní dócha go mbeadh ar chumas bhochtáin na tuaithe arán giosta báicéara a cheannach. B'fhéidir gur ansin atá bunbhrí an dáin: gur aor sóisialta é.

Seosamh Watson's contribution, 'The Feast days of the Blessed Virgin: Séamas Mac Cuarta's forgotten "decade"' (pp. 109–30) deals with 'a series of eleven devotional poems', in the *trí rainn agus amhrán* genre, 'on a single

[8]Lund University Library/Universitetsbiblioteket, Lund (C.W. von Sydow papers): see letter dated 31/12/1934, and in particular, letters dated 30/8/1935, 4/12/1936, and 4/1/1937.

theme' (p. 109), the significance of which has largely been overlooked until now. As well as providing an English translation and copious textual notes for each of the edited poems, Watson discusses the possible objectives and context of composition for these poems and argues that indirectly, at least, the poet was possibly influenced by Continental Counter-Reformation sources, as 'he was a familiar of some of the Old English [Catholic] families and scribal circles of Leinster that had ongoing contact with the clerical and learned circles of Dublin in his day' (p. 110). He also suggests that the poet chose a style of language that would have facilitated the oral recitation and dissemination of these poems.

Part Three ('Irish Traditional Song and Music') involves a subject that Ríonach uí Ógáin herself has done much to elucidate. Nicholas Carolan's contribution, '"A unique and very curious book": Irish Song manuscript RIA 23 F 22' (pp. 131–41), describes and discusses the history of the first known 'collection of Irish-language traditional songs to include the music as well as the words' (p. 131). This substantial manuscript, containing 248 pages and 122 'unsourced songs and poems' (p. 131), dates from the early nineteenth century. Carolan suggests that it would appear to be 'a fair copy' compiled 'from earlier transcriptions' (p. 132). It contains many well know traditional songs, and 'comprises an essentially eighteenth-century repertory' (p. 132). Carolan maintains 'that it is an original collection, seemingly drawn for the most part from oral tradition' (p. 132) rather than copied from other collections. It also contains many songs not found elsewhere, which adds greatly to its value and interest. The author discusses the use made of this manuscript by scholars in the nineteenth century and argues that the compiler of the manuscript was the scribe and scholar Edward O'Reilly (Éadbhard Ó Raghallaigh). While O'Reilly may well have been the scribe/collector, this scholar is thought to have had an imperfect knowledge of spoken Irish (p. 134). One could ask, did he collect these songs from oral tradition on his own, or had he an assistant?

Baineann aiste Chathail Goan, 'Róisín Dubh: Athchuairt' (lgh 142–52), le leagan den amhrán cáiliúil seo a bhailigh Mícheál Ó Domhnaill óna aintín, Neilí Ní Dhomhnaill (1906–84), Rann na Feirste. Pléitear bun-éirim an amhráin: ar amhrán polaitiúil nó amhrán grá é? Is dóigh leis an údar gur amhrán i dtaobh grá thoirmeasctha (idir sagart óg agus bean) go bunúsach é. Scrúdaíonn Goan leaganacha éagsúla den amhráin seo, amhrán a théann siar go dtí an ochtú haois déag, agus tuairimíonn sé go bhfuil macallaí as *Tiomna Nuadh* Uilliam Uí Dhomhnaill (1602) le brath ar véarsa amháin de leagan Neilí. Is rispéisiúil an aiste í seo agus b'fhiú go mór a mhacasamhail de ghrinnscrúdú a dhéanamh ar an tsraith is sine d'amhráin thraidisiúnta na Gaeilge, a shíolraíonn ó am a raibh an Ghaeilge fós á labhairt ar fud Éireann, agus taca mór daonra agus cumas ealaíona ar a cúl. Pléann aiste Shéamais Uí Chatháin, dar teideal 'Mórsheisear scéilíní faoi chúrsaí ceoil' (lgh 153–59), leis an mbaint a bhí aige féin le cúrsaí ceoil i gcaitheamh a shaoil. Tá réimse tíreolaíochta leathan ag an aiste seo: Na Cruacha i nDún nan Gall, Ceathrú Thaidhg in Iorras (iar-thuaisceart Mhaigh Eo), Varangar na hIorua, Ramallah ar an mBruach Thiar (An Phailistín), agus an Bhlaic, tuaisceart an Chabháin. Is díol spéise

na scéilíní seo ar fad a d'eascair as an tionscnamh atá idir lámha aige, a chuimhní cinn a bhreacadh (féach Ó Catháin 2018). Ní nach ionadh, tá níos mó tathaig i gcuid de na cuntais seo ná a chéile. Is é teideal aiste Lillis Uí Laoire, 'Peannphictiúir: ceathrar banamhránaithe i ndialanna Sheáin Uí Eochaidh' (lgh 160–77). Bhí Seán Ó hEochaidh ar dhuine de bhailitheoirí lán-aimseartha Choimisiúin Béaloideasa Éireann ab fhearr ag breacadh dialainne, ceann dá dhualgais laethúla. Bhí sé in ann beo-phictiúir dá bhfaca sé agus ar bhain dó i mbun bailitheoireachta a chur ar phár. San aiste seo, ní hamháin go dtugann Lilis sleachta iomadúla as dialanna Uí Eochaidh, chomh maith cuireann sé iad i gcomhthéacs a dhomhain-eolais ar cheol traidisiúnta Thír Chonaill. Siod iad an ceathrar banamhránaithe a chlúdaíonn an aiste seo: Péigí Mhór Ní Ghadhra, Gleann Cholm Cille; Máire agus Róise Nic a' Ghoill, an Áighe, Ard a' Ratha; agus Ciot Tom Ní Mhianáin, an Ceann Thoir, Oileán Thoraí.

Finbar Boyle (1951–2017) spent some years working in the sound archive of the then Department of Irish Folklore in University College Dublin in the 1980s, but availed of a voluntary retirement package in 1988 although still a relatively young man. Tom Sherlock's contribution in this section, 'From Ladywell to the Liberties: conversations with Finbar Boyle' (pp. 178–87), paints a picture of a larger than life character who spent a lifetime working with Irish traditional music. Fionnuala Carson Williams's essay, 'A musicscape from the early nineteenth century' (pp. 188–201), utilizes the ethnographic data found in the memoirs of fieldworkers of the Ordnance Survey for County Antrim, which date mainly from the 1830s. The data collected and discussed covers a far wider range of music than would be generally encompassed by 'folk' music, and deals, for example, with 'singing schools for … learning sacred music' (p. 197). Speaking of those who compiled these Memoirs, Williams says: 'These fieldworkers were disciplined, diligent and well-prepared as we can tell from the painstaking detail of their work. They were a mixture of full-time workers, both soldiers and civilians, while local people also wrote sections of memoirs about aspects of their locality' (p. 200). There is no doubt that the compilers of these memoirs did Trojan work (as is evidenced by this very interesting essay), but one could question how well-prepared they were in certain respects. For example, how many of them had a knowledge of Irish or Ulster Scots and what was the extent of that knowledge; and of those who knew Irish, how many could write the language? In any event, though the Ordnance Survey's memoir scheme was full of good intent in respect of collecting oral traditions, few actual texts were collected, although much invaluable data on traditions was.

Part Four ('Aspects of Irish Folklore and Ethnology') opens with a contribution by Barbara Hillers, titled 'The Emancipator in the mirror of folk narrative: projection and prejudice in an anecdote about Daniel O'Connell' (pp. 202–13). This mainly deals with an antisemitic legend told about Daniel O'Connell and Hillers argues that this international legend may have become associated with O'Connell because of two well-publicised incidents in his career, where O'Connell, who was generally known for his pro-Jewish views, nevertheless revealed a deep-lying prejudice against Jews. The article also

discusses the humorous nature of much of the lore that survived in Irish folk tradition about O'Connell, which often casts him in a bad light. Bairbre Ní Fhloinn's essay, 'Wise men and little women: 6 January in Irish popular tradition' (pp. 214–23), is a timely discussion of aspects of the celebration of the feast of the Epiphany in Ireland. Ní Fhloinn notes that the holdings of the National Folklore Collection are less complete than they might otherwise be in respect of traditions about January 6, because the Commission never sent out a follow-up questionnaire to its questionnaire on Christmas traditions (circulated December 1944), although it intended to do so. Fortunately, the 1944 questionnaire on Christmas did garner a certain amount of lore about the feast of the Epiphany, which has been utilized in this essay. Ní Fhloinn notes, in respect of the 'Little Women's Christmas' (p. 221) tradition still vibrant in Cork city, that the failure of the Irish Folklore Commission to collect in urban areas also meant that much valuable data was not recorded on this subject. The essay also deals with renewed media and societal interest in Nollaig na mBan (one of the designations in Irish for the feast of the Epiphany), which appears to have been mainly a Munster tradition. Stiofán Ó Cadhla's contribution, '*Pisreoga a bhaineas leis an mbás*: superstition and effective human behaviour' (pp. 224–37), as the title indicates, deals with superstitions related to death. This essay contains much of interest, but the author's writing style and tendency to overburden his text with excessive detail makes it a difficult read. It would benefit greatly from more focus. Anne O'Dowd's contribution to this section, 'The Colours we wore' (pp. 238–53), is a fascinating treatment of the colours ordinary Irish people wore in the past, with the focus on the years 1830 to 1930. She uses three main sources to elucidate her subject: 1) travel writings by native and foreign writers; 2) the paintings of various artists of the period; and 3) a Dress Questionnaire sent out to correspondents by the Irish Folklore Commission in the early 1940s. She stresses that what tourists and artists usually saw was people dressed on the way to fair or market or Mass/Church, and not the colours of their everyday working clothes. The data collected via the Dress Questionnaire, which reaches back to the late nineteenth century, is in general agreement with earlier sources. Interestingly, all these three sources testify to the persistence of red, and to a lesser extent blue as 'favorite colours for women's clothing' (p. 253) throughout the period. It might be interesting to contrast her findings with the evidence for the colours of people's dress, such as it is, in eighteenth-century Irish-language poetry. Diarmuid Ó Giolláin's contribution, '"Echoes out of the vast silence"? Ancient traditions and folklore' (pp. 254–62), discusses the belief of certain folklorists of the Old School, with the main focus on Séamus Ó Duilearga, that folklore contains survivals from very ancient times. The bulk of the essay examines something that has always intrigued, and indeed awed our ancestors, namely the moon, and more particularly 'the man in the moon' legend. Ó Giolláin shows that rather than being an ancient survival from time immemorial, this legend is mainly rooted in the societies where it was collected in more recent times, and in which it performed a particular function, although certain Irish versions of the legend, he says, 'suggest a more archaic tradition' (p. 262).

Pléann aiste Phádraig Uí Héalaí, 'Snátha i seanchas na mallacht' (lgh 263–70), le cumhacht/éifeacht agus feidhm shóisialta mallachtaí, go háirithe mallachtaí baintreach. Is díol spéise an leas a bhaineann sé as an mBíobla agus as an traidisiún Giúdach-Críostaí d'fhonn an t-ómós a thugtaí do bhaintrigh i dtraidisiún béil na Éireann a rianú agus a shoiléiriú, agus chun an sceon a chuireadh mallacht bhaintrí ar dhaoine sa seanam in Éirinn a chur i gcomhthéacs níos leithne.

Part Five ('Folklore Collecting – Personal Perspectives') begins with Éilís Ní Dhuibhne Almqvist's contribution, '"Joy's soul lies in the doing": the pleasure of fieldwork' (pp. 271–7), celebrates the joys of collecting as experienced by the author. It is an interesting and, naturally, subjective essay, though the long quote from her memoir of her husband, the late folklorist Bo Almqvist (Ní Dhuibhne 2018), more than a page in length, is perhaps excessive in a short piece such as this. The information therein could surely have been better paraphrased and incorporated into the essay. One might add that folklore collecting may not always be so pleasurable. This was certainly sometimes the case with the full-time collectors of the Irish Folklore Commission, who often worked under immense pressure, and had poor working conditions. William Nolan's essay, 'The contribution of Séamus Ó Cinnéide to the Schools' Folklore Collection, 1937–38' (pp. 278–91), deals with material sent to the Irish Folklore Commission under this scheme from Lisnamrock (Lios na mBroc) National School, Ballingarry, Co. Tipperary. In contrast to most schools who participated in the scheme, it was the schoolteacher, Séamus Ó Cinnéide (James/Jim Kennedy), rather than the pupils, who collected the material submitted. Ó Cinnéide was a native of the place, and formerly a pupil of the same school. Nolan writes: 'Whether through design or accident, Séamus Ó Cinnéide decided to take sole responsibility for the compilation for Lisnamrock School and it was a fortunate decision for the material now reposing in MS 562, pp 159–326, may be one of the richest seams in the whole collection' (p. 280). This essay only deals with a small selection of the material Ó Cinnéide collected, concentrating on historical lore, and benefits from the author's in-depth historical and geographical knowledge of the area, of which he is a native. The reason why Ó Cinnéide chose to do the collecting himself, I suggest, probably lies in the abortive schools folklore scheme organized by the Department of Education in 1934, before the setting up of the Irish Folklore Commission, a scheme that envisaged the teacher as the collector rather than the pupils. Only a small number of teachers sent in material under this scheme, and Séamus Ó Cinnéide was not among them. He would, however, have received a large copybook under this earlier scheme and may well have begun collecting and filling it before the scheme was resurrected in 1937 in a new format (utilizing the same large copybooks) under the aegis of the Irish Folkore Commission, with the onus for collecting folklore taken off the teachers' shoulders and placed on those of their pupils (see Briody 2006). Anne O'Connor's contribution, 'Stories my mother told me: collecting folklore from a woman of Clonmel, Co. Tipperary' (pp. 292–302) deals with some of the lore the author collected from her mother, Ethel (née O'Brien) after

commencing her studies in folklore in University College Dublin. This essay covers rites of passage such as childbirth and death, among other matters. Long before Anne formally recorded her mother she had heard stories, etc. from her growing up. The writer says: 'All her life, my mother was a great storyteller, as well as a beautiful singer', adding '[s]he often sang Irish traditional songs and ballads' (292). It would appear, although it is not explicitly stated, that it was mainly within the family (home) circle that her mother told stories, as was the case with many women of her generation. Growing up in the 1920s and 1930's before radio became pervasive (and intrusive) and long before television came on the scene, and when house-visiting would have been common in town and countryside, she would have been exposed to a great deal of traditional lore around the fire, at play, and elsewhere. Folklore would appear to have infused Ethel's everyday life, giving meaning to many aspects of it and underpinning her belief as well as those of her parents, relatives and neighbours. Small-scale studies of this sort are of great value, and help us to understand the role folklore played in ordinary people's everyday lives. The final contribution to the volume is that of broadcaster and writer Vincent Woods, titled '"What will we be?" – A spirit of hope distilled' (pp. 303–12). Essentially, this quite wide-ranging essay is about 'the hidden layers of Irish in the landscape' (p. 310) of the author's home locality. Vestiges of spoken Irish survived in his home area, Tarmon, north Leitrim, until *c.* 1940. It is a very personal story of the author and his family, and how the ancestral language cast a shadow over their lives. As is to be expected from the pen of a creative writer, it is very well written. On pp. 310–11 the author gives in full a letter written in Irish sent to him by his nephew John Woods. This is an interesting letter and gives greater depth to the essay, but it is not clear why it is left untranslated. Various Irish words and phrases throughout the essay are also not translated or glossed (though some are), but such omissions would not take from a reader's appreciation of the essay overall even if she/he had no Irish. However, omitting to translate this substantive letter certainly leaves readers with no Irish at a loss.

The volume also contains a 'List of Illustrations', 'Notes on the Contributors' and a 'Tabula Gratulatoria' as well as a many interesting photographs in both colour and black and white, in addition to those in Críostóir Mac Cárthaigh's above contribution.

All in all, this is a fine, attractively produced collection of essays, with few typing or factual errors, and is certainly worthy of the scholar it honours. I last met Ríonach uí Ógáin in the beautiful medieval city of Visby on the island of Gotland, Sweden in early June 2015 at a conference titled 'Why Folkloristics', which dealt with the future of folklore studies and scholarship. It was Ríonach's last international conference before she retired. I gave a paper, titled 'Not a safe haven: the fate of the Irish Folklore Commission', but Ríonach did not. She was there only to listen, and, I am certain, to ponder over the future of the discipline and collections to which she devoted her working life. Guím fad saoil di agus rath ar cibé obair a thógfaidh sí idir lámha sna blianta atá roimpi amach. Tá a fhios agam nach mbeidh sí díomhaoin, ach tá

súil agam go mbeidh deis aice sos a ghlacadh ó am go chéile tar éis an éacht oibre atá curtha aice dhi thar leathchéad bliain beagnach.

REFERENCES/TAGAIRTÍ

BRIODY, M. (2006) 'Énrí Ó Muirgheasa agus Scéim na Scol 1934', *Béascna/ Journal of Folklore and Ethnology* 3, 1–22.

CLARKSON, L.A. and CRAWFORD, E.M. (2002): 'A Non-Famine History of Ireland', *History Ireland* 10/2 (Summer), 31–5.

NÍ DHUIBHNE. É. (2018): *Twelve Thousand Days. A Memoir of Love and Loss* (Belfast).

Ó CATHÁIN, S. (2018) *Jumping the Border* (Dublin).

Ó MACHÁIN, P, and NÍ SHÉAGHDHA, N. 1996: *Catalogue of Irish Manuscripts in the National Library of Ireland, Fasciculus XII MSS G 700–G773* (Baile Átha Cliath).

SEOIGHE, M. (1995): 'Bunú Choláiste Uí Chomhraí', in P. Ó Fiannachta (ed.), *Eoghan Ó Comhraí, Saol agus Saothar* (An Daingean), 96–115.

MÍCHEÁL BRIODY

Helsinki

ABBREVIATIONS

The following abbreviations are accepted for general use in *Celtica*, along with such universally known ones as p., ibid., etc. Any other abbreviations should be defined on first use.

ABM	D. McManus and E. Ó Raghallaigh (eds), *A Bardic Miscellany: Five Hundred Bardic Poems from Manuscripts in Irish and British Libraries*, Léann na Tríonóide/Trinity Irish Studies 2 (Dublin, 2010).
ACL	Whitley Stokes and Kuno Meyer (eds), *Archiv für celtische Lexicographie*, 3 vols (Halle a.S., 1898–1907).
AFM	John O'Donovan (ed.), *Annála Ríogachta Éireann: Annals of the Kingdom of Ireland by the Four Masters*, 7 vols (Dublin, 1848–51).
AI	Seán Mac Airt (ed.), *The Annals of Inisfallen* (Dublin, 1951).
AL	R. Atkinson, W. N. Hancock, W. M. Hennessy, T. O'Mahony and A. G. Richey (eds), *Ancient Laws of Ireland*, 6 vols (Dublin, 1865–1901).
Anecdota	O. J. Bergin, R. I. Best, Kuno Meyer and J. G. O'Keefe (eds), *Anecdota from Irish Manuscripts*, 5 vols (Halle a.S., 1907–13).
AU	Seán Mac Airt and Gearóid Mac Niocaill (eds), *The Annals of Ulster (to A.D. 1131)* (Dublin, 1983).
BBCS	*Bulletin of the Board of Celtic Studies*.
BL	British Library.
Br	Breton.
CIH	D. A. Binchy (ed.), *Corpus Iuris Hibernici*, 6 vols (Dublin, 1978).
CMCS	*Cambridge Medieval Celtic Studies*; from number 25 onwards *Cambrian Medieval Celtic Studies*.
CModIr	Classical Modern Irish.
Co.	Cornish.
CSANA	Celtic Studies Association of North America
DIAS	Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies
DIL	*Dictionary of the Irish Language* and *Contributions to a Dictionary of the Irish Language* (Dublin, 1913–76; compact edition 1983).
EC	*Études Celtiques*.

 ©Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies

eDIL	*Electronic Dictionary of the Irish Language* (www.dil.ie).
EMod	Early Modern (in combinations EModIr etc).
GPC	*Geiriadur Prifysgol Cymru* (Cardiff, 1950–2002).
*GPC*²	*Geiriadur Prifysgol Cymru*, second ed. (Cardiff, 2003–).
GPC Online	*Geiriadur Prifysgol Cymru*, online ed. (www.geiriadur.ac.uk).
GMW	D. Simon Evans, *A Grammar of Middle Welsh* (Dublin, 1964).
GOI	Rudolf Thurneysen, *A Grammar of Old Irish* (Dublin, 1946).
IEW	Julius Pokorny, *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, 2 vols (Bern, 1959–69).
IGT	Osborn Bergin (ed.), 'Irish Grammatical Tracts', supplements to *Ériu* 8 (1916), 9 (1921–3), 10 (1926–8), 14 (1946) and 17 (1955).
Ir.	Irish.
ISOS	*Irish Script on Screen* (www.isos.dias.ie).
ITS	Irish Texts Society.
JCHAS	*Journal of the Cork Historical and Archaeological Society* (1892–).
JCS	*Journal of Celtic Studies*.
JRSAI	*Journal of the Royal Society of Antiquaries of Ireland*.
LEIA	*Lexique étymologique de l'irlandais ancien* (Dublin and Paris, 1959–).
LL	R. I. Best, O. Bergin, M. A. O'Brien and A. O'Sullivan (eds), *The Book of Leinster*, 6 vols (Dublin, 1954–83).
LModIr	Late Modern Irish.
LU	R. I. Best and O. Bergin (eds), *Lebor na hUidre/Book of the Dun Cow* (Dublin, 1929). Where necessary, the hands of the three scribes may be distinguished as *LU*(*A*), *LU*(*M*) and *LU*(*H*).
M	Middle (in combinations MIr, MW, MBr, MCo etc.).
MD	Edward Gwynn (ed.), *The Metrical Dindshenchas*, Todd Lecture Series 8–12 (Dublin, 1903–35).
Ml.	The Milan Glosses on the Psalms, Bibl. Ambr. C. 301, in Whitley Stokes and John Strachan (eds), *Thesaurus Palaeohibernicus*, 2 vols (Cambridge, 1901–3; reprinted Dublin, 1975), i, 7–483.
Mod.	Modern (in combinations ModIr, ModW, ModBr, ModCo etc.).
MV	Rudolf Thurneysen (ed.), 'Mittelirische Verlehren', *Irische Texte* III.1 (1891), 1–182.
NLI	National Library of Ireland.
NLS	National Library of Scotland.
NLW	National Library of Wales.
O	Old (in combinations OIr, OW, OBr, OCo etc.).

PBA	*Proceedings of the British Academy*.
PRIA	*Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy*.
QUB	Queen's University Belfast.
RIA	Royal Irish Academy.
RC	*Revue Celtique*.
SC	*Studia Celtica*.
Sg.	Glosses on Priscian, Codex Sangallensis no. 904, in Whitley Stokes and John Strachan (eds), *Thesaurus Palaeohibernicus*, 2 vols (Cambridge, 1901–3; reprinted Dublin, 1975), ii, 49–224.
SGc	Scottish Gaelic.
SGS	*Scottish Gaelic Studies*.
SnaG	Kim McCone, Damian McManus, Cathal Ó hÁinle, Nicholas Williams and Liam Breatnach (eds), *Stair na Gaeilge in Ómós do Phádraig Ó Fiannachta* (Maynooth, 1994).
TBC 1	Cecile O'Rahilly (ed.), *Táin Bó Cúailgne: Recension I* (Dublin, 1976).
TBC LL	Cecile O'Rahilly (ed.), *Táin Bó Cúailgne from the Book of Leinster* (Dublin, 1967).
TBC St.	Cecile O'Rahilly (ed.), *The Stowe Version of Táin Bó Cúailgne* (Dublin, 1961).
TCD	Trinity College Dublin.
Thes	Whitley Stokes and John Strachan (eds), *Thesaurus Palaeohibernicus*, 2 vols (Cambridge, 1901–3; reprinted Dublin, 1975).
THSC	*Transactions of the Honourable Society of Cymmrodorion*.
Tur.	The Turin Glosses on St Mark, in Whitley Stokes and John Strachan (eds), *Thesaurus Palaeohibernicus*, 2 vols (Cambridge, 1901–3; reprinted Dublin, 1975), i, 484–94.
UCD	University College Dublin.
VKG	Holger Pedersen, *Vergleichende Grammatik der keltischen Sprachen*, 2 vols (Göttingen, 1909–13).
W.	Welsh.
Wb.	Glosses on the Pauline Epistles, Codex Paulinus Wirzibirgensis, in Whitley Stokes and John Strachan (eds), *Thesaurus Palaeohibernicus*, 2 vols (Cambridge, 1901–3; reprinted Dublin, 1975), i, 499–712.
ZCP	*Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie*.