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AILBE’S SPEECH TO CITHRUAD (TOCHMARC AILBE)

INTRODUCTION

Tochmarc Ailbe was edited and translated from its only witness, the miscellaneous vellum manuscript H. 3.17 (Trinity College Dublin), pp. 827-831, by Rudolf Thurneysen in his article ‘Tochmarc Ailbe “Das Werben um Ailbe”’ (1920-21). The story starts after Gráinne, eldest daughter of Cormac mac Airt, has been divorced from Finn mac Cumaill (Corthals 1997) and peace has been restored between the two men. It narrates how Ailbe Grúadbrec, Cormac’s youngest daughter, wishing to marry, was courted by Finn and, despite the warnings of her father, agreed to join with him and to lead an adventurous life among the fíana. Thurneysen’s translation did not include Ailbe’s address to the druid Cithruad, spoken in difficult rhetorical speech, concerning her marital future. For this text he gave a transcription only (1920-21: 254-6, §3).

The text of this speech given below is based on a new collation with H. 3.17, p 827, ll. 13-23. Its orthography, which agrees with that of its prose and verse context, combines features of Middle Irish orthography with reflexes of later spoken language. Thus /γ/ is mostly written d (e.g. l. 7 sluadido for sluagthogú) which indicates Middle Irish merger of /γ/ and /ð/ (Breatnach 1994: 234-5, and McManus 1994: 351-2). If I am right in reading l. 21 cuibi as a modern equivalent of Old Irish cuibde (Mod. Ir. cúi), this would reflect loss of the resulting approximant (McManus 1994: 351) after /ß/. In two cases th, which had become voiceless /h/ by the beginning of the Early Modern Irish Period (McManus 1994: 351), is not written in postconsonantal position (l. 19 cairpi for cairpthi, l. 27 coslebair [b = /f/] for coslebthair).

There is no strict metrical structure. The text is based on units of different length ending mostly, but not always, in a trisyllabic cadence that alliterates with the preceding word, but not with the first word of the following line. It ends in an imperfect dúnad (Friscomart … fri fius). For such a structure compare, among other examples, a druid’s prophecy cited by Bé Guba (Brónaid banntrochta dlíthbath fer fri ferbaib Athairni … bithbrónán ‘Womenfolk grieve at the destruction of men by the words of Athairne … lasting sorrow’) in Tochmarc Luaine (Breatnach 1980: 13-14). An early example is to be found in the rhetorical passages of Echtrae Chonnlai (McCone 2000: 121-2). Some further features are indicative of retoiric-
roscaid-style, e.g. tmesis (l. 8 Nīm ... -cæmatar, l. 27 fodom ... -cosleb[th]a(i)r); preposed attributes (l. 3 fē(i)t[h] fīrfolcsud, l. 4 tond tromt[h]ol túarustal, l. 7 sær fri sell, l. 13 Bangnīma menna, l. 19 fri cluče craisliənad, probably l. 28 all- f-b- fri fius); independent datives (probably l. 6 glaim, l. 26 daramruib, l. 27 cuirib) and instrumental relative (l. 9 lūi[h] serce sergaide); and asyndetic alliterating juxtapositions (l. 8 cūairt codlud, l. 13 fri tuind trebairi).

As to its content, Ailbe gives expression to her wish to marry (l. 3 Rom-gab fē(i)t[h] fīrfolcsud), to her corresponding aversion from the pleasures of the court (l. 8 Nīm chūairt codlud -cæmatar), and to her ability to take up the responsibility of a married woman (l. 13 Bangnīma menna fri tuind trebairi). Her final question (l. 26 Ca hairm a nE-irind) gives a hint of her foreboding that she is to lead an adventurous life among troops (l. 27 fodom c[h]uirib -cosleb[th]a(i)r).

In the following presentation of the text I have not departed from the manuscript except in the following particulars: (i) the text is divided into sense-units, mostly terminating in an alliterating trisyllabic cadence; (ii) word-division and punctuation are applied according to modern conventions; (iii) abbreviations are expanded and indicated by use of italic; (iv) additions, mainly consisting of the indication of lenition in voiceless obstruents, are marked by square brackets, omissions by round brackets, and long vowels are marked as such by use of the macron; (v) the crux is used to indicate words which I have failed to understand. It was not my intention to give a full critical text, but simply to attempt to close the gap in Thurneysen’s edition.

An earlier Dutch translation (Corthals 1999) is here modified in several respects.

Text

Do-luid-side fecht and dia fiafraidid dō cia do feraib Erenn cusa radad. Conad and as-bert in ingen:

Fris-comart¹ duid, a c[h]aɪm a C[h]it[h]ruaid:
Cid arum-t[h]ā tūaruscaib.
Rom-gab fē(i)t[h] fīrfolcsud,
tond tromt[h]ol túarustal.

5 Fri roī romanman rīdht[h]odho.
Rīg ma scorait glaim,
sær fri sell slūadt[h]odo.
On that occasion she went to ask him which of the men of Ireland she should take in marriage. Then the girl said:

‘I ask you, gentle Cithruad:
Reveal what is in store for me.
True burning of sinews (or veins) has seized me,
evidence for waves of heavy desires.

To the field of a great mind the choice of a king (is directed).
If kings desist from censure,
the choice of the crowd (is directed) to a noble glance.
Neither travelling nor sleep protect me (i.e. keep me alive?),
nor the power of love, by which people waste away,
nor the benefit of food with unceasing wonder,
nor music famously (?) … to the ears,
because of the sorrows that afflict me.
The mind of woman’s deed (i.e. the mindful deed of a woman) (is directed) to soil and farming (i.e. farming of the soil),
to providing food, hospitality and breeding noble offspring,
to a beautiful cloak (consisting) of a colourful covering,
to averting supplications of retinues,
to taking care of every kind of stock of wonderful breed,
to deeds of affection …,
to horses, chariots, mouthfilling of a company(?),
to successfully matching companions,
to concord and contemporaries (i.e. concord among contemporaries?).

Early indeed, she said, I present this to somebody of a precious race.
How might he be approached?
I am courageous, handsome, of true lordship.

Tell the words of true prophecy:
To what place in Ireland with great marvels
will I be abducted by troops?
It is to you that we used to come in order to know …’

‘The companion to whom you will be given in marriage’, said the druid, ‘will come to the meadow of Tara tomorrow before this hour.’

Notes

cusa-radad: lit. ‘to whom she would go’ (-ragad, O. Ir. -regad) in the restricted sense of entering into marriage. For this meaning see DIL T 133.13-18 (e.g. nipa ferr in ri cosa ragthar ‘one could be married to no better king’, LL vol. V, ll. 36394-5 [of spiritual marriage]).

Fris-comart: This reading, reflecting a 3 sg. preterite < fris-oirg, ‘he has injured’, makes no sense in this context. Thurneysen’s emendation to fris-comarc, which in the context I would further modify to fris-comurc, 1 sg. present < fris-comairc, is surely correct. Both fris-oirg and fris-comairc combined with either a direct or an indirect personal object, which may have favoured the misreading of this form.
3 fé(i)t[h] fírfolcsud: fírfolcsud ‘true burning’ (-folscud) with metathesis of -sc- to -cs-. The genitive plural of féith should be either féithe or, as a Middle Irish alternative, féth (Breatnach 1994: 244). I would suggest an emendation to féth on the assumption that such a form would have been more easily transformed to féith in the course of transmission than féithe. On Ailbe’s feelings compare their negative counterpart in ní follscaid féithe mo chuirp ‘the veins of my body do not kindle’ as a sign of weakness due to old age (Best 1916: 172 §2 from Tecosc Cumscaid in Cath Airtig) and conadh féithi mo curp comarda ‘so that the sinews of my body are swollen’ (Corthals 1997: 76 l. 28) as a sign of Gráinne’s aversion from Finn. Here the burning of sinews is to be taken as a symptom of Ailbe’s wish to marry.

4 tond trom[t]h[ol] tu-arustal: My translation implies that tond is a proposed gen. pl. depending on tu-arustal and trom[t]h[ol] a gen. pl. depending on tond.

5-7 Fri roí romenman … slu-adt[h]odo: These lines imply an opposition between the choice of a king (rìdt[h]odo) and the choice of the crowd or the people’s choice (slu-adt[h]odo), the second alternative being dependent on a condition, phrased in the second line (Rì-g ma scor-glaim). The context as well as the introductory prose (dia-mbeth dib ingen do-toghad feis fri Find ‘if there should be a girl amongst them who would choose to be Finn’s wife’, Thurneysen 1920-21: 254 §2) suggest that togu is meant to apply to the choice of a husband. Rìg, preceding the conjunction ma, should be a nominativus pendens and scor- a form of scuirid ‘unyoke’ and derived meanings. As the most likely condition for the application of the second alternative is the lack of a king’s choice (cf. todhodh cach a todho tochmuirc cen Chormac ‘let everyone make his choice of courting without Cormac’, ibid. 281 §13), I would expand scor- as a 3 pl. subj. (scorait) with rìg as logical subject. glaim should then be an independent dative with ablative force of glám ‘satire, censure’ (cf. Corthals 1995, 109: co tèrnither fir ‘so that the proof is escaped from’).

8 Nìm c[h]úairt codlud –cæmatar: cúairt codlud corresponds syntactically with lùt[h] serce, bùaid mbîd and cèol in the following lines. The combination of nasalisation of bîd in bùaid mbîd (nom. or acc.) with the 1 sg. object pronoun in nîm suggests that these nouns are nominatives and thus subjects relating to -cæmatar. Accordingly, this should be a 3 pl. active with deponent ending. This recalls con-oí ‘protects, preserves’ with optional deponent
endings in the present (GOI §767), which, however, should have given -comatar in the first place. I suggest that -caematar is a hybrid between con-oí with deponent conjugation and caemaid ‘is kind to’. Some examples of caemaid are semantically very close to con-oí. Thus, ro chaem in coiced-sa na / acht mad Óen in t-oll-chóeca is translated as ‘fifty kings all but one have protected this province’ by O’Brien (1955: 48-9). The phrase nomchoimmdiu cóima from St Gall Priscian (Thes. Pal. II, 290 l. 11) can be translated as ‘the Lord is kind to me’ as well as by ‘the Lord protects me’.

9 lúith[he] serce sergaidhe: The formal connection between verb and antecedent is marked by a word-play between serc ‘love’ and sergaid ‘waste away’, denominative of serg ‘sickness’. The 3 pl. should be taken as impersonal in sense.

10 mbíth[he]amru: bit[he]amru could be either an independent instrumental dat. sg. of a substantival compound bithamrae ‘permanent wonder’ (cf. l. 26 daramruib), or a nom. sg. of the corresponding adjective bithamrae ‘permanently wonderful’ (cf. l. 17 sílamra), in which case the ending -u (for O. Ir. -ae) stands for a centralized vowel /ə/ after a non-palatal consonant. The nasalisation of an attribute following a nasalised gen. sg. (here mbíd) is a feature occasionally attested in Middle Irish (Breatnach 1994: 239; e.g. Loch nEchach n-án ‘beautiful Loch nEchach’, LL vol. IV, l. 28572).

11 clot[he]dumd-: As I do not know how to expand dumd-, I cannot translate this line as a whole. Most lines end in an alliterating trisyllabic cadence. Thus, I suppose cloth- to be the first element of a trisyllabic compound (compare im Concobur clothamra ‘about Conchobar with wonderful fame’, LU l. 8404 from Fled Bricrenn).

12 Fo daí(n)gif on[g] tom-ongadar: This is the most difficult line in Ailbe’s speech. tom-ongadar should be a verbal form with infixed pronoun. This presupposes an otherwise unattested *do-ongadar, which I suggest may be an ad hoc denominative of ong. This is a poetical word, attested mainly in glossaries (e.g. Ong i. foiched 7 cosec ‘ong that is tribulation and reproof’ from Cormac’s Glossary, Meyer 1912: 86, No. 1013) and meaning ‘tribulation, sorrow’. Fo daingin on ‘under the on of the fortress’ makes no sense in this context. I follow a suggestion to read fo daí(n)gif ‘because of’ with omission of the abbreviation mark for n. The following word should then be a genitive. The line becomes perfectly clear by
effecting a slight emendation of on to on\[g\] (gen. pl.), which results in a figura etymologica meaning ‘because of the tribulations that oppress me’.

13 Bangnīma menma: ‘the mind of woman’s deed’, that is ‘the mindful deed of a woman’. In this construction the attributive notion is shifted towards the head-noun (GOI §250a).

fri tuind trebairi: If we take tonn in the rare sense of ‘land, soil’ (DIL T 248.36-40), this can be taken as a case of attraction of a preposed genitive to the case required by the preceding preposition thus creating hendiadys: ‘to soil (and) tillage’ = fri trebairi tonnae ‘to tillage of the soil’. See Wagner 1982 on this construction. For an example of independent occurrence in two early texts see Corthals 1995: 119-120 (di thúathaib táirghiuth ‘from the people’s supply’). It remains doubtful, however, if all such examples are genuine. They may be partly due to scribal intervention (Breathnach 1981: 75-76).

17 remchisin: If the dot over c in the manuscript really indicates lenition, the resulting remchisin for remcisín could be explained as a case of recomposition after the example of compounds with rem- (e.g. remf·ocul). But as lenition of voiceless spirants is otherwise not indicated by a suprasegmental mark in our text, I doubt if this reading is correct.

19 fri cairp[th]i: The underlying form of MS cairpi is cairptí (on the omission of th see the introduction), a Middle-Irish equivalent of O. Ir. cairptí.

fri cluræ cresaðnád: I cannot find any sense in cluræ. If the abbreviation stroke for ur should have been miswritten for a straight stroke, the abbreviated form could have been for cléiræ, gen. sg. of clíar ‘company, band’ which makes perfect sense in this context.

20 fri daiddingmáil c[h]éle: On daid- for dag- compare daidben for dagben later on in Tochmarc Ailbe (Thurneysen 1920-21: 266, 1. 17). In view of the next line (‘to concord and contemporaries’) I would understand dingbáil in its derived meaning ‘being a match for’ rather than in its original sense of ‘removing, repelling’ (DIL D 127. 68ff).

21 fri cuib[d]i 7 comæsa: Both cuilus (so Thurneysen) and cuibi are possible readings, but, whereas cuilus gives no sense, cuibi can be seen as a modern reading for older cuibdi ‘fitness, harmony’ (see my introductory remarks on the orthography). The manuscript reading comæsARom suggests that A was felt as belonging to the
next sentence. We should then read A[r] rom, which would imply a causal relation between l. 22 and the foregoing lines. If, on the other hand, we read comæsa, acc. pl. of comæs ‘contemporary, coeval’, this gives not only the expected, although not necessary, trisyllabic cadence, but somewhat better sense as well, especially if we understand the resulting phrase as a hendiadys in the sense of ‘concord among contemporaries’.

22 Rom to-mbiur: Rom ‘early, too soon’ (DIL R 95.52) seems to refer to Ailbe’s young age.

di c[h]æmc[h]in[i-]uil: We could read either di c[h]aïmc[h]in-iul (with iu for MS ui) meaning ‘from a precious race’, or (with insertion of i) di c[h]aïmc[h]in[i]uil meaning ‘to somebody of a precious race’, taking di as orthographic equivalent of do. I have preferred the second alternative as it is palaeographically more plausible, suits the verb to-biur better, and provides a subject to tárlethar in the next line.

23 tárlethar: 3 sg. pass. subj. in relative use of do-aidlea ‘approaches, visits’. I take tárlethar to refer to the cáemchinúil of the foregoing line.

26 daramruib: probably for deramruib; cf. Félire Óengusso, Epilogue 342 (Stokes 1905: 279): a n·deramrae n·daingen ‘their constant marvel’.

27 –cosleba(i)r: MS cosleb air(is), 3 sg. pass. fut. of fo-coislea ‘carries off’. On -b- for -bth- see the introductory remarks on the orthography of the manuscript. If my word division is right, then -air is due not to modern variation between -air and -ar in the endings of the passive (for which see McCone 1997: 228), but rather to wrong division in the manuscript tradition where -ar combined with following is giving airis.

28 di-recmuis: 1 pl. impf. of exceptional do-ricc (instead of normal ro-icc ‘comes, reaches’), an example of which is noted in DIL D 357.71 from the YBL text of Táin Bó Cúailnge (Strachan and O’Keeffe 1912: 28, l. 712: Doreccaid against Recait in LU 5191).

28 all-f-b-: On account of its syntactic position this should represent a genitival phrase functioning as object of the verbal noun in fri fius. But I cannot resolve the abbreviations.

ABBREVIATIONS

DIL (Contributions to a) Dictionary of the Irish Language. Dublin 1913-76.

Ailbe’s Speech to Cithruad

REFERENCES

— 1999: ‘Ailebe zoekt een man’ Kelten 4, 4-5.

Johan Corthals

University of Hamburg
IN WHAT follows I propose to venture briefly into territory explored by Joseph Nagy in a fine paper entitled ‘The rising of the river Cronn in Táin Bó Cúailnge’, which he contributed some years ago to a symposium in Helsinki.\(^1\) Here Professor Nagy examined the idea, first proposed by Rudolf Thurneysen and subsequently championed by James Carney,\(^2\) that the flooding of the river Cronn in opposition to the invading armies in the Táin is derived from a scene in the Iliad in which Achilles is attacked by the river Scamander. Nagy’s analysis did not, like some other critiques, focus on the obvious problems of transmission involved in such a scenario. Rather, he presented evidence to show that the Cronn’s rising in the Táin is no isolated foundling, for which some foreign origin must be sought: on the contrary, the story seems to be deeply rooted in the saga. Moreover, one crucial difference between the Greek and Irish accounts – the river fights against Achilles, but seems to act as an ally of Cú Chulainn – can be illuminated by a wide range of other tales in which Cú Chulainn meets deadly danger in or near the water. I am in full agreement with Nagy’s conclusion that

the purported correspondence between the rivers that run through the texts of the Iliad and the Táin is neither straightforward nor superficial. The way in which each river’s behavior and function makes even more sense intratextually when they are examined intertextually points toward a case of shared Indo-European heritage.\(^3\)

This point can, as a matter of fact, be further developed on the Greek side as well as on the Irish. As I have mentioned, a striking difference


\(^3\) Nagy, ‘The rising of the river Cronn’ 147.
between the two scenes under discussion lies in the nature of the relationship between river and hero. The Scamander, angered at the pollution of its waters by the many corpses hurled into it by Achilles, rises against him and comes close to overwhelming him. The Cronn, by contrast, acts on Cú Chulainn’s behalf and at his instigation. Faced with the hostile armies, he is made to speak as follows:

‘Adeochosa,’ or Cú Chulaind, ‘inna husci do chongnam frim. Ateoch nem 7 talmuin 7 Cruinn in tsainrethaig.

Gaibid Crón cóidech friu
nís léicfe [i] Muirthemniu
co roisce monar féne
isin tsléib túath Ochaíne.’

La sodain cotnóccaib in t-usci súas co mboí i n-indaib crand.4

‘I invoke … the waters to help me. I invoke heaven and earth, and the Cronn especially.

The … Cronn holds out against them, it will not let them into Muirthemne until the war-band’s work is ended in the mountain north of Ochaine.’

With that the water rose aloft so that it was in the tops of the trees.5

That Cú Chulainn, unlike Achilles, is the ally of the river suggests comparison with another Greek narrative, this one drawn from Plutarch’s essay ‘On the Bravery of Women’. Here we are told how the hero Bellerophon, despite the many feats which he performed in defense of Iobates king of Lycia, was treated by the latter with consistent hostility. At last, as he was returning from a victorious expedition against the Amazons, Bellerophon’s exasperation got the better of him.

4 TBC I ll 1158-64.
5 In translating I have not attempted to render the obscure word cóidech (v. ll. foitech, faoiteoch, fóitech, fóethech) which follows Cronn in the first line of the quatrain. On the difficulties associated with these forms see TBC I 245 and Frederik Otto Lindeman, ‘Notes on two biblical glosses’ Celtica 16 (1984) 59-61 (at pp 59-60).
Therefore he went into the sea and prayed against [Iobates] to Poseidon, that the land should become barren and of no account. When he departed after making that prayer, a wave rose up and flooded the earth. And it was a terrifying spectacle, how the sea flowed over the ground, covering the plain as it followed him. When the men’s entreaties to Bellerophon to hold it back were of no avail, the women confronted him, pulling up their garments to expose themselves. And indeed, when he retired out of shame, it is said that the wave retired along with him.6

That there is some connection between this scene and that in the Iliad appears probable. Thus it seems significant that the region threatened by flooding in the Bellerophon story was named the Xanthian plain, after a river Xanthos which flowed through it; while Xanthos was also the ‘divine’ name of the Scamander on the other side of Anatolia.7 But this point is not of direct relevance to the present inquiry, nor am I in any case qualified to pursue it. What I would like to underline is the fact that the anecdote recounted by Plutarch resembles the scene with Cú Chulainn and the Cronn in precisely that respect in which the latter differs from the encounter of Achilles with the Scamander: the wave acts as Bellerophon’s ally, and does so in response to a formal invocation.

This is, of course, not the only adventure of Cú Chulainn’s with which the story of Bellerophon and the Lycian women can be compared. There is a strong and obvious similarity, first pointed out by Robert Graves,8 with a famous incident in the ‘Boyhood Deeds’ section of the Táin: here the young hero, returning from his first martial expedition after being formally invested with weapons, succumbs to

6 On the bravery of women, 248AB.
8 Robert Graves, The Greek myths (first published as 2 vols, 1955; combined edition Harmondsworth 1992) 256. The parallel has also been briefly noted by W. B. Stanford, ‘Toward a history of classical influences in Ireland’ PRIA 70 C (1970) 13-91 (at p. 32 n. 66), and commented on by Raymond Cormier, ‘Pagan shame or Christian modesty?’ Celtica 14 (1981) 43-6. In Cormier’s article, it should be noted that there are not strictly speaking ‘four successive versions’ of the Bellerophon story as he asserts: rather, Plutarch follows his account of the original legend with three attempts at providing it with a rationalist explanation.
a murderous rage against his own people which can only be quelled when he is confronted with the naked women of the Ulaid. He hides his face, whereupon he is seized and hurled into three vats of cold water in rapid succession. Cooled down and restored to his senses, he takes his place in the king’s household.\footnote{TBC I II 802-21; cf. LL TBC II 1177-1207, LU II 3791-6 (Serglige Con Culainn) (naked women do not figure in this account). In a forthcoming article (‘Tara and the supernatural’) I suggest that a reference to the aggressive display of a woman’s breasts may also occur in the text De Shíl Chonairi Nóir, ed. Lucius Gwynn, Ériu 6 (1912) 130-53 (at p. 135). In the LU version of Mesca Ulad, the satirist Ríches forces Cú Chulainn to cover his face by lifting her clothing and exposing herself to him (LU II 1535-9).}

So far I have mentioned four scenes, two from Greek and two from Irish literature. If these are considered schematically, they seem to represent a sequence of variations.

I. A river attacks Achilles, who has invaded its territory.

II. After an invocation by Cú Chulainn, a river aids him in attacking an army of invaders.

III. After an invocation by Bellerophon, the sea aids him in attacking the people on whose behalf he has been fighting. Both hero and water retreat when confronted by a display of female nakedness.

IV. Cú Chulainn attacks the people on whose behalf he has been fighting. When he looks aside upon being confronted by a display of female nakedness, his frenzy is quelled by immersion in water.

Two variables are apparent in this series: the hero’s relationship with the community (attacker in I, defender in II, defender become attacker in III and IV); and water’s relationship with the hero (threatening or weakening him in I and IV, helping him in II and III). Yet another element, although present in only two of the specimens, figures there as a constant: in the instances in which women feature, their sexuality neutralises the hero’s aggression.

A natural area in which to look for further evidence of such connections is that of flood legends. In fact, Irish tales of floods repeatedly accord an important role to women. Two of the most prominent are the stories accounting for the origins of Lough Neagh and Lough
Ree (which involve elopement with a woman of the síd, and waters which burst forth due to a woman’s negligence), and of Lough Foyle (which seems to have inundated a kingdom in revenge for an attack on the supernatural women dwelling in a well). In this context, it is surely significant that Irish legendary history differs from the book of Genesis in conspicuously associating women with the biblical Deluge. The first of the settlements of Ireland is said to have been led by a granddaughter of Noah named Cesair, who came as part of a company comprising fifty (or a hundred and fifty) women, and only three men: Cesair’s own father Bith, her husband Fintan, and the steersman Ladru. The women were divided up between the men, who died one after another. At length Fintan hid himself from them in a cave. Left alone Cesair died of sorrow, whereupon the Flood engulfed Ireland.

I have suggested elsewhere that the three groups into which these women are divided correspond to – and perhaps in fact personify – three rivers. The division is made at Commar na Trí nUisce ‘The Meeting of the Three Waters’, the place where the rivers Suir, Nore and Barrow converge before flowing into Waterford harbour. It is here too that the reunited company of women confronts Fintan; and there is evidence that the original name of the leader of the settlement was not Cesair but Berba, the river Barrow incarnate. The identification of the course of a river with the path taken by a supernatural woman is also found in the legend of the origin of the Boyne;
and the Celts appear generally to have conceived of rivers as goddesses.\textsuperscript{14}

Yet another significant element in the Cesair story, rendered explicit in some of its versions, is that of the threat posed by the women’s sexuality. Ladru, the first of the men to die, is said to have succumbed to robanach ‘excessive womanising’,\textsuperscript{15} and the second recension of Lebor Gabála says that when Fintan retired to his cave he ‘escaped, fleeing before all the women.’\textsuperscript{16} The most vivid evocation of this dimension of the tale is to be found in two pages, written in an unknown hand, preserved among the manuscript notes of the Elizabethan scholar Meredith Hanmer. It must remain a matter of speculation whether the writer had access to an older source unknown to us, or whether his own imagination was stimulated by the general outlines of the story. Like Lebor Gabála, he says that Ladru was dissatisfied because he received one consort fewer than the other two men when the women were divided. For what follows, however, no close precedent can be cited.

The two others being wiser granted him leave to do his will with their own part of the women as often as he would, and by means of that he dyed shortly after wards and soone after that, the second dyed, so that at last FIONNTAIN that survived being affrayed to dye as his felowes thought with him self to eschew the sight of all the women except the chiefest onely, & calling hir aside told the secret of winde vnto hyr, which was that she should flye away privily with him self & leave the company of the rest of the women for that if it were he should be able to provide other necessarie thinges for them, it was impossible for him to satisfie the lust of their bodies, & consequently desireth hir to keepe secretely this counsell from all the women.

\textsuperscript{14} Thus Joseph Vendryes, \textit{La religion des Celtes} (1948; \textsuperscript{\textsuperscript{2}}Spézet 1997) 49-50; Bernhard Maier, \textit{Die Religion der Kelten: Götter – Mythen – Weltbild} (Munich, 2001) 81. The Rhine (< *Rēnos; cf. Irish rian ‘sea, Rhine’) is the most conspicuous example of a river to which Celts gave a masculine name.

\textsuperscript{15} This statement is already found in a poem by Gilla Coemán (fl. 1072): text in \textit{LG} V 486 l. 3856. See the explanation of Ladru’s death, as coming do fhuráil banaich ‘from too much womanising’, in the second and third recensions ibid. II 188, 204; or do dul chuca ‘from going to them’ in the poem \textit{Cethracha tráth don tur tind} (ibid. 222 l. 817).

\textsuperscript{16} \textit{LG} II 192: Élaid iarom Fintan for teched riana mnaíb uile. Cf. ibid. 206.
Cesair however told one of the others, and soon thereafter all knew what was being planned. Seeing this Fintan ‘thought the onely remedie was then, to run out of their sight, & leaue them by swiftnes of foote.’ The women chased him, but ‘dyed by the way in diuers places,’ bequeathing their names to the spots at which they fell.17

Here we have a situation which can be compared with the Bellerophon story, with a crucial difference. There the hero and the following waters were both turned back by a multitude of sexually provocative women, while here it is the women who follow, and they and the waters seem to be identified with one another. We accordingly have the same variables, and the same constant, which are present in the stories already discussed.

Something similar may be involved in a legend accounting for the placename Inber nAilbine. One Ruad mac Rigduinn, in the course of a voyage, slept with nine women dwelling beneath the sea and left one of them pregnant. When he broke his promise to visit the women on his return journey they followed him to Ireland, and the child which had been born perished when they threw it onto the rocks of the shore.18 The theme of pursuit seems implicit in the use of the verbs do-airret, do-etarrat, both meaning ‘overtakes’, in different versions of this story.19

The identification of women with water perhaps appears most clearly in the widespread Gaelic folktale known as ‘The Knife Against the Wave’. Here a man saves himself by casting his knife at a great wave of the sea as it threatens to engulf him, and subsequently

18 Compare the passage added to the third-recension copy of Lebor Gabála in the Book of Lecan which states that the first to die in Ireland was Cesair’s infant brother: in lenb ro bai cen airem sa luing leo, ro baithead i tibraid Duin na mBarc in la ro gobsad port i. Bath mac Beathad ‘the baby that was in the ship with them without being counted, who was drowned in the spring of Dún na mBárc on the day they came to harbour, i.e. Bath son of Bith’ (LG II 204).
19 The oldest version of the tale may be that which occurs as an addition to the saga Tochmarc Emire (in Compert Con Culainn and other stories, ed. A. G. van Hamel (Dublin 1933) 39-41); cf. MD II 26-32, and Stokes, ‘Rennes Dindshenchas’ RC 15 (1894) 294. There are intriguing parallels in Chapter 11 of Hrólfs saga kraka, an episode which has other suggestive similarities to Irish material: after king Helgi has slept with a woman of the elves (álfar), she tells him to meet her in a year’s time on the shore (ad naustum þjum ‘by your boat sheds’) in order to receive the child which she will by then have born to him. See The saga of King Hrolf Kraki, trans. Jesse L. Byock (Harmondsworth 1998) 22; cf. Hrólfs saga kraka, Editiones Arnamagnæanae Series B, vol. 1, ed. Desmond Slay (Copenhagen 1960) 32-3.
learns that he has struck a fairy woman, who was seeking to take him as her mate.20

In his article on Cú Chulainn and the Cronn, Nagy also discussed the implications of another scene in the Táin in which martial activity, water, and female sexuality all come together. As he seeks to protect his province from invasion, Cú Chulainn is approached and solicited by a beautiful young woman, eventually identified as the war goddess known as the Morrígain. At first he tries to excuse himself on account of the danger of the situation, and the physical strain which he is undergoing: *Ní haurussa dam-sa dano comrac fri ban-scáil céin no mbeó isind níth so* ‘It is not easy for me to come together with a woman while I am in this struggle.’21 When she offers to help him, Cú Chulainn becomes abusive: *Ní ar thóin mná dano gabus-sa inso* ‘It is not for the sake of a woman’s backside that I undertook this.’22 The Morrígain then turns against him, threatening to attack him in the shapes of various animals when he is next fighting in the waters of the ford. When she does in fact attack him in this way he puts out one of her eyes, and breaks one of her ribs and one

20 There are one hundred and fifty versions of the story in the archives of the Department of Irish Folklore, University College Dublin / National University of Ireland, Dublin. For a recent discussion, see Miceal Ross, ‘The knife against the wave: a uniquely Irish legend of the supernatural?’ *Folklore* 105 (1994) 83-8; a notable instance is discussed by Tomás Ó Con Cheanainn, ‘Seanchas ar Mhuintir Laidhe’ *Éigse* 33 (2002) 179-225 (at pp 208-9).

21 There is a play on words here, as *comrac* can designate combat as well as a sexual encounter; for comparable exploitation of the word’s ambiguities in conjunction with *níth* (and its rhyming antonym *síth*) see John Carey, ‘The rhetoric of *Echtrae Chonlai*’ *CMCS* 30 (Winter 1995) 41-65 (at pp 53-4). Jacqueline Borsje suggests to me that it may be significant in this connection that *Níth* is one of the names of the hag Cailb in *Togail Bruidne Da Derga*, a figure who shares other names with the Morrígain (*LU* l. 6980). The next in the list of Cailb’s names is *Némain*: cf. the river *Níth Némannach* (e.g. *LL* l. 2407), now the Dee in Co. Louth.

22 The phrase *tón mná* recurs in other passages which express the idea that sexual desire can induce a man to disregard or transgress political boundaries. An early account of the cattle-raid of Cuailnge states that Fergus ‘turned against the Ulaid for the sake of a woman, i.e. for the sake of Medb of Cruachu; for he waged war against his own people for the sake of a woman’s backside’ (*fecca[ī]s... for Ulta di āg mná .i. di āg Medba Críuchan, ar imegoagín ar intoin mná fria chenēl fadessin*, Kuno Meyer, ‘The Laud genealogies’ 305). In the Táin itself Conall Cernach berates Fergus for fighting against his own folk ‘for the sake of the backside of a wanton woman’ (*ar thóin mná drúithi*, *TBC* I l. 4069); and the law tract *Do Thuaslucad rudrad* speaks of the diminished status of the man *in-etet toin a mna tar crich* ‘who follows his wife’s backside across a border’ (*CIH* 427 ll 3-4).
of her legs. These injuries to a magically disguised attacking woman are reminiscent of ‘The Knife Against the Wave’.23

Cú Chulainn’s rebuff to the Morrígain implies that fighting and lovemaking are incompatible. Earlier in the Táin, he had himself provided a glaring demonstration of this incompatibility. The invading armies were able to cross into Ulster unchallenged, as Cú Chulainn was absent at the crucial time because of ‘a tryst with Fedelm Noíchride (that is, a tryst with her foster-sister [inaíilt], whom Cú Chulainn had as a concubine)’ (i ndáil Fedelmæ Noíchride .i. i ndáil a hinaílte boí i comair Con Culaind i ndormainecht).24 The additional statement that Cú Chulainn’s errand was only with the foster-sister is self-evidently secondary, as we have other evidence for Cú Chulainn’s intimacy with a woman named Fedelm.25 An anecdote preserved in British Library MS Harleian 5280 describes his victory in a combat at the Boyne over Elcmaire, lord of Bruig na Bóinne, after which he took Elcmaire’s wife Fedelm Fholtchaín as his lover for a year; thereafter Fedelm displayed herself naked to the Ulaid, inducing the mysterious affliction which left them helpless at the time of the events of the Táin.26 Again, Cú Chulainn’s liaison with Fedelm results in the defencelessness of the province, but other significant elements are present in the tale as well. The theme of the debilitating effects of female nudity reappears, this time affecting the entire male population. Associations with water are also present. Elcmaire, who appears as Fedelm’s husband here, figures in other stories as the husband or brother of Boand, the river Boyne personified.27 It does not seem far-fetched to

23 TBC I ll 1845-2054; cf. LL TBC ll 1989-2113. The two narratives are still more similar in that both Cú Chulainn and the protagonist of the folklore subsequently heal the women who have attacked them.


25 For inailt as companion of a woman going to a tryst see van Hamel, Compert Con Culainn 62 (Tochmarc Emire); also Máire Bhreathnach, ‘A new edition of Tochmarc Bechfholia’ Ériu 35 (1984) 59-91 (at pp 73, 82). For inailt as sexual substitute see LL ll 35455-70 (Fingal Rónaín), ibid. ll 36354-70 (lartaige na hIngine Colaige).


27 The oldest text to attest to this doctrine is Tochmarc Étaine, ed. Osborn Bergin and R. I. Best, in Ériu 12 (1934-8) 137-96 (at pp 142-7); cf. LL ll 29451-554 and MD III 36-7.
speculate that Fedelm Fholtchaín too personifies the river: one reach of the stream was named ‘the Marrow of the Woman Fedelm’ (*Smiur Mná Fedelmai*).²⁸

There are, then, many stories in which sexually active or demanding women, associated or identified with the waters of rivers or the sea, pose a threat to men in general and to the heroic warrior in particular. But it would be an oversimplification simply to equate water with ‘the feminine’, and to oppose it to the world of men. We have seen both Cú Chulainn and Bellerophon calling up floods to assist them; and in the Bellerophon story the raised skirts of the Lycian women disconcert the advancing wave as much as the indignant hero. In other accounts of sexual confrontation, moreover, it is the man rather than the woman who appears to be identified with the waters.

To illustrate this point, I would like to consider one of the charms edited by R. I. Best from TCD MS H.3.17. The heading, *Eolas do lemad fhír*, could be translated either as ‘a charm for rendering a man impotent’, or as ‘a charm for [healing] a man’s impotence’. The directions for the charm’s use (‘let the cross of God be made over the man’s thighs’) suggest the latter interpretation; but the jingling lines at the heart of the charm itself clearly have hostile magic as their intention:

![Charms Image]

²⁸ van Hamel, *Compert Con Culainn* 37-8 (*Tochmarc Emire*).
²⁹ R. I. Best, ‘Some Irish charms’ *Ériu* 16 (1952) 27-32 (at p. 32). If I am correct in taking *fonriug* to be an error for *fo-rriuig*, this would be evidence for copying from a majuscule exemplar – an indication of relatively early date.
The charm has other uses which seem, in various ways, analogous to that of rendering a man impotent: halting the flow of blood, delaying childbirth, and – especially significant – partially paralysing an antagonist in combat.

The phrase *dam tuli* ‘stag/ox of flood’ is presumably equivalent to the synonymous expressions *dam dílenn* or *dam díli* found elsewhere. These designate a creature notable for its size, strength and ferocity; by extension, a warrior can also be referred to as a *dam dílenn*. In some cases the ‘stag of flood’ is, more or less explicitly, said to have its dwelling under water.30

It is commonplace for charms to contain miniature stories, whose paradigmatic significance is such that their recitation is believed to have a magical efficacy.31 This is evidently one such, in which a sexually aggressive woman overpowers a formidable male animal in an aquatic setting. It is surely also significant that the ‘stag of flood’ can represent a human warrior in other sources;32 and that the context here is a charm which can be used both to render a man sexually incapable and to deprive a fighter of the power of movement.

An intriguingly similar scenario appears in the tale of the death of Fergus mac Roich. Once, as Fergus was exhibiting his strength in the lough in Mag nAí, Medb was overcome with desire for him and joined him in the water.

Luid Medb didiu co raibi for a bruindi-sium 7 a gabla ime 7 co taircell-som in loch annsin 7 ro gab ét Ailill. Doluid didiu súas Medb.

30 Further discussion in John Carey, ‘*A Tuath Dé miscellany*’ *Bulletin of the Board of Celtic Studies* 39 (1992) 24-45 (at p. 31); for an intriguing range of comparanda, see Bernhard Maier, ‘Beasts from the deep: the water-bull in Celtic, Germanic and Balto-Slavonic traditions’ *ZCP* 51 (1999) 4-16.


32 To the references given in note 30 may be added examples in *Caithréim Cellaig*, ed. Kathleen Mulchrone (Dublin 1933) l. 881, *Echtra Airt meic Cuind*, ed. R. I. Best, *Ériu* 3 (1907) 149-73 (at p. 170 §28), *Forbuis Droma Damhghaire*, ed. Marie Sjoestedt Jonval, *RC* 43 (1926) 1-123 (at p. 40 §38), and the Book of Ballymote (RIA MS 23 P 12) copy of *Togail Troí* (p. 435 a 26); the list is not exhaustive.
Then Medb went so that she was upon his chest with her thighs around him, and so that the lough hid [them] then; and jealousy seized Ailill. Then Medb came [back] up.

Also present is Ailill’s brother, Lugaid the Blind Poet, and it is to him that Ailill now speaks.

‘Is álaidn a ndogní an dam, a Lugaid, 7 an eilit isin loch,’ ar Ailill. ‘Cid nach gontar?’ or Lugaid 7 ní tuc urcor n-imraill ríam. ‘Teilg-siú dúrn orchest foru!’ ar Ailill. ‘Impó m’agaid cuc-tha,’ or Lugaid, ‘7 tabrad gaí dam.’

‘It is beautiful, Lugaid, what the stag (dam) and the doe are doing in the lough,’ said Ailill. ‘Why should they not be killed?’ said Lugaid. And he never missed. ‘Make a cast at them for us!’ said Ailill. ‘Turn my face toward them,’ said Lugaid, ‘and let a spear be given to me.’

Lugaid then casts the spear, striking Fergus with a deadly blow as he is still washing himself in the lough. Not only is Fergus’s doom due to a sexual encounter in the water, therefore: his dalliance with Medb leads to his being identified as a dam, like the dam tuli bound by the ‘wanton woman’ in the impotence charm.

The risky conjunction of warriors, women and water appears in yet another way in the literature. By entering into sexual relations with a woman in a watery setting, it may be possible for a hero to

33 I differ here from Meyer, who translates co taircell-som in loch annsin as ‘then he swam around the lake’: we should perhaps postulate haplography of earlier conda taircell-som. The verb do-aircheil, do-airchella has two meanings, reflecting the two stems which lie behind it: ‘hides, withdraws, takes away’; and ‘encompasses, contains; hems in, confines’. Of these, only the first will readily yield sense in the present context. For the second, DIL proposes an extended usage ‘goes round, makes a circuit of’, but gives only two examples viz. the passage here under discussion, and an instance from an anecdote in the Book of Leinster where co tairchellsatar relic 7 martra Petuir 7 Phóil is taken to refer to the circumambulation of relics in Rome (LL ll 36489-90). While this parallel supports Meyer’s interpretation, it also seems legitimate to take the verb in a better-attested meaning.

34 Aided Fergus mac Roich, ed. Kuno Meyer in idem, The death-tales of the Ulster heroes (Dublin 1906) 32-4 (my translation). There is an obvious similarity between this story and the Norse legend in which the spiteful Loki prevails upon the blind Hoðr to make a fatal cast at Baldr: Snorri Sturluson, Edda: Prologue and Gylfaginning, ed. Anthony Faulkes (Oxford 1982) 45-6.

35 As Ranke de Vries has pointed out to me, something similar may be involved in Acallam na Senórach (ed. Whitley Stokes, Irische Texte 4/1 (Leipzig 1900) 91-2): here the water-woman Lí Ban massacres a herd of deer (fiada) who have run into the sea.
deflect the danger which she represents onto his enemies. This at any
rate is what the Dagda achieves in Cath Maige Tuired:

Báí dano bandál forsin Dagdae dia blíadhnae imon Samain an
catha oc Glind Edind … Có n-acu an mnaí a n-Unnes a Corand
og nide, indarna cos di fri Alld Echae .i. Echuinech fri husci
andes alole fri Loscondoib fri husce antúaith. Nó trillsi tait-
bechtai fora ciond. Agoillis an Dagdae hi 7 dogniad óentaich.
Lige ina Lánomhnou a ainm an baile ó sin. Is hi an Morrígan
an uhen-sin isberur sunn. Itbert-si íarum frisin Dagdae … no-
ragad-si hi Scétne do admillid [ríg] na Fomore .i. Indech mac
Déi Domnann a ainm, 7 douhérudh-si córu a cride 7 áirned a
gailie úadh. Dobert-si diúi a dói bois den cré-sin deno slúagaib
bátar ocon inaindehhe for Ádh Unsen. Báí Áth Admillte íarum a
ainm ónd admillid-sin an ríog.

The Dagda had a tryst with a woman a year from that day, near
the Samain of the battle, at Glenn Edin. … He saw the woman
washing in [the river] Uinnius in Corann. One of her feet was
at Allod Echae (i.e. Echainech) on the south of the water, the
other at Losconna on the north of the water: nine tresses were
loosened upon her head. The Dagda spoke with her, and they
lay together.36 Hence ‘Bed of the Couple’ is the name of that
place. The woman spoken of here is the Morrígain.37 Then she
said to the Dagda … that she would go to Scétne to destroy the
[king of the] Fomoiri (Indech mac Dé Domnann was his name),
and that she would bring away from him the blood of his heart
and the kidneys of his ardour. And she gave her two hands full
of that blood to the hosts who were waiting at the ford of the
Uinnius. Its name was ‘Ford of Destruction’ after that, because
of the destruction of the king.38

36 It may be noted that this sentence, in its present form, belongs to the latest stra-
tum of the text. The phrase agoillis an Dagdae hi exhibits univerbation and use of
the independent pronoun to designate the object; and none of the other instances of
oentu in the sense ‘sexual union’ which are cited by DIL appears to antedate the late
Middle Irish period.

37 This statement, isolated within the episode as a whole, is very possibly an inter-
polation.

38 Cath Maige Tuired, ed. E. A. Gray (London 1982) 44. This passage is immediately
followed in the text by a more circumstantial account of the Dagda’s seduction of
Indech’s own daughter, who then turns her malevolent powers against her people
because they are the enemies of her new lover. Her threats when the Dagda leaves her
to go into battle are reminiscent of the Morrígain’s threats to Cú Chulainn (ibid. 48-50).
Here we are only a step removed from tales in which the hero is the victim of such a sexual encounter rather than its beneficiary. The woman displays Indech’s blood at the ford of the same river beside which she has coupled with the Dagda. I am grateful to Morten Warmind for calling my attention to a Norse parallel, in which a female figure similarly described is presented in a purely negative light. Thor, almost overwhelmed by the rising waters as he is trying to cross the river Vimur, recites a verse exhorting them to subside; he then sees that this flooding is being caused by the giantess Gjálp, who is standing upstream with one foot on each of the river’s banks. He brings the water under control by throwing a stone at her, remarking that a river must be stopped at its source.39

The anxieties which have been examined in this paper may also be reflected in strategies for avoiding women entirely. There are traces of an ancient Irish custom whereby one man indicated his fealty to another by sucking the latter’s nipples. Here, in a male group in which the leader is symbolically regarded as ‘mother’, a ritual reality is created in which women – with all the dangers which they pose for warriors – are no longer necessary. Interestingly, both of the primary items of evidence for this behaviour are associated with water. When Patrick was escaping from slavery in Ireland, the men with whom he was seeking to take ship expected him ‘to suck their breasts’ (sugere mammellas eorum): when he declined to do so ‘because of the fear of God’, they relented and allowed him to ‘make friendship with us in whatever way you wish’ (fac nobiscum amicitiam quo modo volueris).40 James Carney has plausibly suggested that these sailors were ‘a band of roving adventurers, otherwise a fian, bound together in mutual loyalty under a leader, and admission to whose company involved the Irish pagan rite of breast-sucking’.41

And in the Old Irish account of his adventures, the warrior king Fergus mac Léti is said to have received submission in this form from a diminutive water-spirit (luchorpán, abacc). This being had attempted to drag him into the sea, and subsequently gave him the ability to travel underwater.42

40 *Confessio* §18 (*Libri epistolarum Sancti Patricii Episcopi*, ed. Ludwig Bieler, 2 vols (Dublin 1952)).
42 *dide a cichesom Fergusa ‘who sucked his, Fergus’s, breasts’*: D. A. Binchy, ‘The saga of Fergus mac Léti’ *Ériu* 16 (1952) 33-48 (at pp 38 (§5), 42). This is in fact said to have been the occasion when the custom was first instituted: ‘Thence there is
Water, a fluid realm which exists beyond established boundaries, provides a setting both for physical violence and for unlicensed sexuality. The warrior is the embodiment of the former, and may accordingly be imagined as being himself a water-creature, or the ally of the waters. But he can be profoundly threatened by the latter, to the extent that the water-woman may deprive him of his fighting strength, of his masculinity, or of his very existence. Both men and women were thought to contain perilous depths which could erupt as an annihilating deluge.\textsuperscript{43}
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\footnote{today the seizing of men’s breasts, and of their cheeks’ (Is de ata inniu gabail ciche fér 7 a ngruaide). For an illuminating discussion along somewhat different lines see Bernhard Maier, ‘Sugere mammellas (Confessio Patricii 18): a pagan Irish custom and its affinities’ in \textit{Celtic connections. Proceedings of the Tenth International Congress of Celtic Studies}, ed. Ronald Black \textit{et al.} (East Linton 1999) 152-61.}

\footnote{\textsuperscript{43} This is a version of a paper presented at the Twelfth International Congress of Celtic Studies, Aberystwyth (August 2003). I am grateful for the helpful suggestions of those who attended; and also to Jacqueline Borsje for comments on the text thereafter.}
It is now widely accepted that ringforts, the dominant form of habitation in the Early Christian period, had started to fall into decline by the tenth century, and it has been suggested that they were replaced by some form of open settlement which, by its nature, is virtually invisible in the archaeological record. The later medieval place-name landscape is dominated by *baile*-names – about a sixth of all townland names begin with *Bally* – but a link with the archaeological record has proved elusive. Attempts to contrast the distribution of supposed *baile*-settlements to the ringfort distribution have achieved only very limited success, not least because such efforts have been based on the erroneous assumption that *baile* in placenames must refer to a settlement. In fact *baile* is frequently applied to a variety of land units and postdates the main period of ringfort habitation. Charles Doherty has recently linked the emergence of *baile*-names to the demise of the ringfort, the appearance of settlement and rectangular houses c. 1000 A.D., and the emergence of ‘unenclosed agricultural clusters organised in townships working an infield-outfield system and ploughing in common’. However, despite advances made by historical geographers, the precise meaning and chronology of *baile*, and its relation to emergent townlands, remain poorly understood.

---


I will argue here that *baile* as a habitation term refers primarily to settlements, although not to any single settlement type. As early as the twelfth century it becomes attached to farms and larger landholdings, and I suggest that its predominance in Irish townland names must be understood in this context. Finally, I draw attention to the economic role of the *baile* within early Irish society.\(^5\)

Liam Price established the broad semantic range of the word in a valuable article published in 1963, but he unfortunately also introduced some unnecessary errors which have been perpetuated by the entry in the Royal Irish Academy’s *Dictionary of the Irish Language* (Dublin 1913-76) (*DIL*).\(^6\) The original sense was ‘place’, but Price argues that it had developed the meaning ‘territory’ by the twelfth century from which it later developed the more usual meanings of ‘farmstead’ and ‘town’:

… when *baile* was first used as a place-name element it meant the territory which was known to be in the occupation of a small tribal or family group. This seems to be the usual sense up to the end of the twelfth century. After that more names are recorded in which it is combined with the name of a person, and denotes the manor of a feudal tenant … or, if the holding is small, an individual farmstead. By the fourteenth century if not earlier it has also come to mean ‘town’, a sense which may be derived from the manor house or court.\(^7\)

Price presents this stratigraphy with considerable conviction but, as we shall see, most or all of these meanings were already well established by the twelfth century. In another important contribution, Deirdre Flanagan demonstrated that *baile* referred primarily to settlements rather than land divisions as suggested by Price, and she


\(^5\) The following analysis of the semantic range of *baile* is based on a wide reading of early Irish texts coupled with searches of the texts published online by the CELT project at University College Cork.

\(^6\) Price, ‘A note on *baile*’.

\(^7\) ibid. 122.
attempted, unsuccessfully in my opinion, to push the emergence of the element back as far as the ninth or tenth century.8  

*Baile* is extremely rare in placenames before the twelfth century. The earliest datable examples I have found come from the eleventh-century version of *Táin Bó Cúailnge* in Lebor na hUidre.9 One of the itineraries written in hand M in that manuscript mentions a place called *Baile*, and in later manuscripts of the same version we find a *Baile* and a *Baile in Bili*.10 *Baile in Bili* occurs in a poem which, as it stands, is hardly any older than the eleventh century. There is no context to determine a meaning for *baile* here, but a translation ‘place of the great tree’ is certainly plausible. The two occurrences of *Baile* probably refer to a single place.11 This is a peculiar name regardless of whether we take it as meaning ‘place’ or some kind of settlement: there is no qualifier as is invariably the case with *baile*-names, and it lacks the definite article.12 This irregularity and doubt as to its meaning must exclude it from further consideration in the present discussion.

A number of eleventh- or early twelfth-century texts contain references to *baile*-settlements. For example, the Irish Life of St Patrick, *Bethu Pátraic*, which may have been compiled as late as c. 1100 A.D. from earlier materials, recounts that a certain Victor slipped out of Domnach Maigen (Donaghmoyne) and concealed himself in a thorn bush beside the *baile* (*hitaeb inbaili*) so as to avoid an encounter with St Patrick.13 *Baile* here is apparently used with specific reference to a settlement, but no details are included. In all

9 But note also the name *Tráig Baile* the second element of which, however, is traditionally explained as the personal name *Baile mac Buain* (*The Book of Leinster* formerly *Lebor na Núachongbála*, ed. R. I. Best, Osborn Bergin, and M. A. O’Brien, 6 vols (Dublin 1954–83), ll 4029, 34610). The name is attested in the Annals of the Four Masters under the year 1104 (*Annála Ríoghachta Éireann: annals of the kingdom of Ireland by the Four Masters [AFM]*, ed. John O’Donovan, 7 vols (Dublin 1848–51) II 978).
probability, the author had the medieval monastic settlement of Donaghmoyne in mind. A further notable occurrence appears in the eleventh-century version of *Tochmarc Emire* in the portion of *Lebor na hUidre* transcribed by hand M which can be no later than 1106. The men of Ulster became concerned that Cú Chulainn had left no heir who might continue to bear arms for Ulster, so a suitable bride was sought in every fort (dúnad) and in every chief *baile* (prímbaile) in Ireland. The use of *baile* here in conjunction with *dúnad* indicates that it is unlikely to refer to a land unit, much less ‘place’ in the general sense, and it must refer to a habitation or settlement. Unfortunately the text gives no description of the *baile*, but the use of the prefix *prím-* suggests that *baile* could have been applied to high-status sites such as would produce a suitable bride for Cú Chulainn.

It is clear that *baile* was applied to walled towns as early as the twelfth century, long before the date ventured by Price. In *Caithréim Cellacháin Caisil*, a text dated to the first half of the twelfth century, it is used of various substantial settlements, such as Armagh, Limerick, Cork, Waterford, Dundalk and Dublin. The author of this text envisaged the *baile* of Limerick as a large settlement consisting of many houses (*tighib*) and defended by gates (*doirrsi*) and towers (*toraibh*). Similarly, Waterford was a substantial settlement (*morbaili, cathair*) defended by gates (*doirsí*) which were closed against...
attacking forces. A similar usage appears with reference to Dublin in *Cogadh Gaedhel re Gallaibh*. Brian attacked and plundered the fort (dún) of Dublin, and then camped in the town (baile) from Christmas until Epiphany, before completely destroying the fort. Many medieval Irish monasteries were bustling settlements, and we find baile applied to a variety of ecclesiastical sites in texts of the late Middle Irish period. Clonmacnoise is so described in *Caithréim Cellaiig*, a text of the late twelfth century. In the largely eleventh- and twelfth-century Irish Lives of the saints, we find baile used of church sites such as Saighir, Lann Eala (Lynn in Co. Meath), Durrow, Tech Munna, and Rathen. In all these cases, baile appears to be applied to the whole site, including churches, monastic accommodation, and probably ancillary buildings and housing. A substantial nucleated settlement is also suggested by the emergence of the compound sráidbaile, literally ‘street-baile’, which is first attested under the year 1210 in the annals in the fifteenth-century manuscript known as Mac Carthaigh’s Book.

It is equally clear that most baile-settlements, certainly in rural areas, must have consisted of just a small number of dwellings belonging to related families or even single houses. Indeed, sean-bhaile is frequently used of a farmer’s established home in contrast to the hut used for booleying or summer pasturage. A homestead or small settlement is suggested by the reference in the Life of Colmán Eala to Duinecha mac Donnchadha’s baile where St Mochuda
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18 Todd, *Cogadh Gaedhel re Gallaibh* 112 §68.
20 *Caithréim Cellaiig*, ed. Kathleen Mulchrone, Medieval and Modern Irish Series 24 (Dublin 1971) l. 149.
arrives in search of food. The baile at Temair Lúachra described in the Book of Leinster version of Mesca Ulad is obviously retrospective, and therefore at least partly imagined, but its description as a small settlement consisting of a number of houses is probably a reasonable reflection of a typical chieftain’s residence of the eleventh century. There is a green (fathchi) in front of the fort which has a surrounding wall (múr), and there are several houses. When the Ulstermen are invited into the fort, Cú Chulainn immediately seeks out the biggest house (tech) in the baile for himself. Interestingly, although the Ulstermen are outside the wall, the druid who observes their arrival reports that they had come ‘into the baile’, so that the green was clearly considered part of the baile. As we shall see later, this probably reflects an intimate association between a settlement or farmstead and its associated land that leads to the same term being employed indiscriminately for both. The later annals provide strong evidence for the application of baile to the residences of native chieftains. For example, Tomás mac Cathail Ó Fergail, lord of Anghaile, is murdered in his own baile in Coillín Crúbach in 1398, and Ruaidhri Ó Dubhda dies in his own baile in 1417. It is likely that these were small house clusters such as those associated with Gaelic chieftains in some bardic poems. Keating applies the term to a temporary structure built by the herdsman Buicead, but he seems to be uneasy about the use, adding both ‘hut, shack’ by way of an alternative.

It is clear from the above that baile was being used of nucleated settlements from as early as the eleventh century, but Flanagan seeks

25 no go rainic go baile Duinecha meic Domnchadha d’ iarraidh bídh ar Duinecha, Plummer, Bethada náem nÉrenn I 180; see also baile Brandaibh mic Eachach .i. rí Laighen, ibid. 230.
26 Mesca Ulad, ed. J. Carmichael Watson, Medieval and Modern Irish Series 13 (Dublin 1941) ll 492ff.
27 in tech is mó ro baí sin baili (ibid. l. 860); see also Mar ná rísad acht dám nón-bair in bali [= Dún da Bend] (ibid. l. 199).
28 Tuarascbáil in chétna braini tání is sin mbali (ibid. l. 523).
29 AFM IV 762, 830. Ó Dubhda’s death is said elsewhere to have occurred at Dún Néill, a castle in the parish of Kilmacshalgan, Co. Sligo (ibid. n. s).
to push it back as far as the ninth century. The earliest precisely date-
able occurrence is found in the Annals of Ulster for the year 1011. According to this entry, Fliathbertach Úa Néill attacked Dún Echdach, now Duneight in Co. Down, burnt the fort (dún) and destroyed its baile. As Flanagan notes, baile here appears to represent some kind of settlement, and indeed the verb brissid ‘breaks’ can hardly be used in relation to a unit of land. However, the remaining examples cited by Flanagan cannot be safely dated any earlier than this. In the glossary attributed to Cormac mac Cuílennáin (d. 908), baile glosses ráth. However, this particular gloss occurs in a block of entries which is found only in the longer versions and appears to be later than the original. Indeed, the term ráth would hardly have required any explanation even in the twelfth century when it frequently appears in the literature with reference to ancient settlements, so the gloss can scarcely be any earlier than the thir-
teenth or fourteenth century. Flanagan also cites an instance from the poem beginning A Marbán, a díthrubaig. Murphy dates the poem to the ninth century, although previous editors had placed it in
the tenth century. The poem takes the form of a dialogue in which
the hermit, Marbán, describes his hut (both) in the woods as a ‘baile
with familiar paths’. Murphy, and later Carney, renders baile as
‘homestead’, but there is no compelling reason for doing so. Indeed,
we are reminded of Keating’s uncertainty when confronted with an
apparent equation between baile and Buicead’s both. Jackson translates it without any loss of meaning as ‘place’, and this accords well
with what I would argue is a better translation of sét in the metaphorical sense ‘way (of life)’ rather than the purely literal ‘path’ of previous translations.

Baile is conspicuously used in late medieval and modern sources
for large units of land. Keating employs both baile and baile biataigh (angl. ballybetagh) to describe these large units, and he enumerates twelve, or exceptionally fourteen, seisreacha or ploughlands in each one. Similarly, a poem beginning Cá lín trícha a n-Éirinn áin, the earliest copy of which is found in Trinity College Dublin MS H.3.18, asserts that there were twelve seisreacha in a baile biataigh and that there are 5,520 bailedha in Ireland. Clearly baile and baile biataigh are synonymous for both Keating and the anonymous poet. An O’Brien rental, possibly from the mid-fourteenth century, incorporates a number of distinct land divisions that must have been current in Thomond at the time of composition, including a quarter (ceathramha) and a half-baile (leathbhaile). A half-baile is evidently equivalent to two quarters, and so the baile must have been a large unit similar to the ballybetagh. Large units called ballys or ballybetaghs are commonly attested in English

39 See above p. 30.
40 Jackson, Studies 6, and see also note at p. 37.
41 Marbán is, after all, concerned with demonstrating the joys of his chosen way of life. Thus, I would translate the line ‘a place of familiar ways’.
42 FFÉ I 111-23.
44 James Hardiman, ‘Ancient Irish deeds and writings chiefly relating to landed property from the twelfth to the seventeenth century’, Transactions of the Royal Irish Academy 15 [Antiquitates] (1825-8) 2-95 (at pp 36-43). It also employs sixths (seiseadh) which Hardiman incorrectly translates as ‘ploughland’ under the influence of seisreach, although the word is written in full on a number of occasions.
sources, and McErlean has demonstrated that they have a wide distribution.45

The annals record a number of endowments of *bailedha biataigh* to Irish monasteries in the period immediately before and after the Anglo-Norman invasion. For example, Donnchadh Úa Cairelláin, chief of Clann Diarmada, granted a *baile biataigh* near Domnach Mór to the monks of Derry in 1177.46 A *baile biataigh* called Baile Tuama Achadh was similarly granted to St Berach’s church in Connacht.47 In other cases the grant uses the term *baile*, but even in these cases it often denotes a land unit larger than the modern townland. The Annals of Four Masters record that Muirchertach Mac Lochlainn endowed the abbey of Mellifont in 1157 with a *baile* at Drogheda called Finnabhair na nIngen, 140 cows and sixty ounces of gold.48 A sizeable tract of land is suggested by the size of the other gifts: sixty ounces of gold would have been equivalent to approximately 1,020 acres.49 This is astonishingly close to the 1,047 acres of the townland of Fennor in the parish of the same name in Co. Meath with which it has been tentatively identified.50 The Annals of Tigernach record the purchase by the community of Roscommon of the *baile* between Loch Í Birnn and Clúain Í Birnn and between Loch na nÉn and the river to the east.51 Loch na nÉn is a dried-up lake in the townland of Loughnaneane in the parish of Roscommon, and Clúain Í Birnn is now the townland of Cloonybeirne in the same parish.52 Loch Í Birnn has not been identified, but the river to the east is undoubtedly the river that skirts around the east of the town of Roscommon and the townland of Cloonybeirne. While we cannot determine the exact size of this *baile* because of the uncertainty of

47 *AFM* III 26 (s.a. 1176).
48 *AFM* III 1124.
49 Following Kelly, *Early Irish farming* 594, an ounce of gold was worth approximately twelve milch cows; the best arable land was valued at 24 cows per *cumal* which we can estimate at about 34 acres (see below p. 35). This gives us 12 $\times$ 60 oz. = 20200 cows; 720/24 $\times$ 34 = 1020 acres.
50 Price, ‘A note on *baile*’ 120.
51 *an baile etir Loch 7 Cluain I Birnn 7 itir Loch na n-én 7 an abaind sair* (RC 18 (1897) 163).
the location of Loch Í Birnn, we are clearly dealing with a unit somewhat larger than the modern townlands that mark its boundary. A similar conclusion can be drawn from an examination of the history of individual placenames. For example, the earliest name for the parish of Ballynascreen in Co. Derry is *Scrín*, but by the early fourteenth century we find it called *Baile na Scríne*. In Sir Thomas Phillips’s survey of the county of 1622, a large tract of land called ‘Ballene Skren’ is depicted surrounding the church of ‘Skren’. A comparison with modern maps indicates that this is the area now known as the Sixtowns, which in the seventeenth century comprised six balliboes and was described as ‘termon or erenagh land’. *Baile* in this name, therefore, denotes a large land unit equivalent to six townlands.

There are occasional references that show that *baile* was being applied to small land units, probably farms, as early as the first half of the twelfth century. The Life of St Colmán, which was probably written soon after the discovery of the saint’s relics in 1122, is probably the single most informative source on *baile* for this period. In it, *baile* is frequently used to denote units of land granted to the Church. For example, the Ó Dubáin families are said to have endowed their land (*ferann*) to Colmán in perpetuity, the divisions of which are called *baileda* (plural of *baile*). The story of how several of these *baileda* were acquired by Colmán is described in what is clearly a variant tradition but, usefully, values are placed on two of them. One of these, Gortín Grogín, was given in recompense to the owner of a bull that broke its leg there while being chased out of the field by the owner of the property, Mac Coisemnaig. In early Irish law, when someone inflicted an injury such as a broken leg on an animal which required it to be slaughtered, the guilty party probably had to pay the full penalty-fine (*díre*) as well as restitution for the animal. The penalty-fine for a domestic animal was generally
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54 ibid. 9.
55 ibid. 6, 9.
58 ibid. §41.
59 Kelly, *Early Irish farming* 162
fifteen to twenty times its normal commercial value. According to a Middle Irish text, a bull was generally worth two-thirds the value of a cow of the same age but could eventually attain the maximum value of a milch cow, although a variant tradition in the same text holds that a bull was only ever half the value of a female of the same age. Therefore the bull in the Life of Colmán, assuming the maximum value, could not have been worth more than a milch cow, and so the land of Gortín Grogín can be valued at fifteen to twenty milch cows in *díre* + a milch cow in restitution, that is, twenty-one cows. Mac Coisemnaig had been growing corn in Gortín Grogín, so it probably was classed as best arable land, one *cumal* of which was worth twenty-four milch cows according to a probably eighth-century tract. Therefore the maximum extent of the land given to Colmán, assuming the maximum value for a bull, would have been just under a *cumal*. Unfortunately there is considerable confusion as to the actual size of a *cumal* of land. Earlier methods of calculation put it at 144 feet × 72 feet or thereabouts, i.e. the size of a fair-sized field, while Middle Irish commentators use different measurements giving a much larger area of 1728 × 864 feet or just over 34 statute acres. Gortín Grogín would have been slightly smaller than that and so was either the size of a field (using the older method of measurement) or a farm of just under 30 acres (following the Middle Irish dimensions). A consideration of Ráith Speláin leads us to a similar conclusion. Mac Coisemnaig gives Ráith Speláin to the goldsmith Anniaraid in recompense for a gold and silver bridle that Anniaraid had used to redeem Mac Coisemnaig’s life (§39). Anniaraid had previously been offered twelve cows for the bridle, so the land of Ráith Speláin seems to have been worth a minimum of twelve cows. Of course, the quality of the land is unknown here, and it is unclear how the presence of an oak thicket would have affected the value. However, given its location in Co. Westmeath and obviously near or adjacent to Gortín Grogín, it can hardly be classed as non-arable land. A *cumal* of the worst arable land requiring clearing is valued at sixteen milch cows, so Ráith Speláin must have occupied either one
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60 ibid. 161.
61 ibid. 533-4.
62 ibid. 394.
63 ibid. 575. The figure appears to be accepted by Gearóid Mac Niocaill, ‘Tír cumaile’ Ériu 22 (1971) 81-6 (at p. 84 n. 10).
sixth of an acre or 25½ acres, again depending upon the method of calculation.\textsuperscript{64}

Fortunately, there is a different way of estimating the size of the land units discussed above. According to \textit{Críth Gablach}, the very lowest grade of freeman (the ócaire) was expected to own land worth seven cumala (the cumal here being a unit of value rather than measurement), or half that of a bóaire.\textsuperscript{65} The value of the cumal varies in different documents from three to ten cows, although three seems to be the norm.\textsuperscript{66} Seven cumala, therefore, was probably equivalent to twenty-one milch cows, so Gortín Grogín, with a maximum value of twenty-one milch cows, can have been no larger than this, and Ráith Speláin, valued at approximately twelve cows, would have been just over half its size. Even if we allow for a cumal worth six cows, Gortín Grogín would not have been larger than a bóaire’s farm. Although the size of an ócaire’s farm is uncertain, and this, in any case, must have varied according to the quality of the land, the comparison indicates that we should dismiss the calculations of the size of Gortín Grogín and Ráith Speláin based on the smaller Old Irish cumal. Evidently the baileda in the Life of Colmán were farms in the region of 25-30 acres each.

These endowments are somewhat smaller than we tend to find in later charters and grants where units of land often appear to be as large as townlands, but ecclesiastical endowments were often of this magnitude if not smaller. According to the Additamenta in the Book of Armagh, Patrick received two separate grants of three half-indlí each.\textsuperscript{67} It has been suggested that an indle is the amount of land that could be ploughed in a single day, that is, about an acre, so the total grant comprised only three acres.\textsuperscript{68} The eleventh- and twelfth-century charters edited by Gearóid Mac Niocaill provide several examples of small endowments, including one of two fields, a meadow

\textsuperscript{64} It might be argued that the legendary nature of these accounts means we cannot attach too much credence to the values placed on land. However, neither account contains anything fabulous or incredible. Indeed, both are very ordinary and plausible and in all aspects of the application of the law they remain within the bounds of normal practice. It should also be noted that neither of the transactions directly involves St Colmán, so there is no compelling narrative reason for Mac Coisemnaig to be unduly generous.

\textsuperscript{65} Kelly, \textit{Early Irish farming} 421.


\textsuperscript{67} Ludwig Bieler, \textit{The Patrician texts in the Book of Armagh} (Dublin 1979) 172. 33-6.

\textsuperscript{68} Kelly, \textit{Early Irish farming} 573.
and an area of bog.\textsuperscript{69} One such endowment, that of Ráth Drumand and its territory and land, which is dated between 1134 and 1154, is valued at two ounces of gold and one of silver.\textsuperscript{70} As an ounce of silver is worth a milch cow and gold about twelve times that, Ráth Drumann was worth approximately the same as Gortín Grogín.\textsuperscript{71} Other endowments in the Life of Colmán also appear to be small. At one point the saint seeks only the site for a house (\textit{inat tighi}) on which he might build a church, and in another episode he is granted a fort (\textit{dún}) with a mill and stream.\textsuperscript{72} Of course, these grants might include an amount of associated land, but some of the terminology used also suggests that we are dealing with very small units: Less Dubáin is said to be behind (\textit{ar cúl}) Less Grúccáin, a description of its location surely unsuited to a large unit.\textsuperscript{73} At another point in the story, the cows of a \textit{baile} escape and run towards their calves, an event that almost certainly relates to a single farm.\textsuperscript{74}

There is a naturally close physical and conceptual relationship between a farmstead and its land, and we should expect to find this reflected in the associated terminology. Not surprisingly, then, the \textit{baileda} in the Life of Colmán often bear the name of a settlement type (\textit{less} ‘enclosure’, \textit{ráith} ‘ringfort’, \textit{dún} ‘fort’), and there can be hardly any doubt that the name of the settlement/farmstead usually also served as the name of the farm as a whole. Many charters and related documents present land transfers in terms of a named place plus a formulaic phrase that emphasises that land, and occasionally other appurtenances, are included in the deal. The charter concerning Ráth Drumand referred to above also includes ‘its territory and land’ (\textit{cona crích ocus cona ferand}).\textsuperscript{75} The Life of St Colmán records the grant to Colmán of a place called Dronn Faeichnig with its land (\textit{cona ferann}).\textsuperscript{76} We also find this formula being employed with

\textsuperscript{69} Gearóid Mac Niocaill, \textit{Notitiae as Leabhar Cheanannais, 1033-1161} (Dublin 1961) 16.
\textsuperscript{70} ibid. 28.
\textsuperscript{71} Kelly, \textit{Early Irish farming} 593-4; compare also the tract of land in a charter of similar date valued at 20 pence + 3 oz. of gold chain and 20 pence of silver (Mac Niocaill, \textit{Notitiae} 30).
\textsuperscript{72} Meyer, \textit{Betha Colmáin} §§54, 59.
\textsuperscript{73} ibid. §39.
\textsuperscript{74} ibid. §46.
\textsuperscript{75} Mac Niocaill, \textit{Notitiae} 28.
\textsuperscript{76} Meyer, \textit{Betha Colmáin} §79. See also: \textit{in baile cona crích 7 gona ferann} (Plummer, \textit{Bethada náem nÉrenn} I 28); \textit{an baile … gona fherann a m-bith-dilsi} (ibid. 106).
baile. A charter drawn up in 1133 concerning the endowment of the monastery of Kells mentions baile Í Uidhrín ‘with its mill and all its land’ and baile Uí Comgáin ‘with all its land and mill’. The charter of Newry, which was written c. 1157, lists a number of places granted to the monastery with their ‘lands, woods and waters’ (cum terris suis, silvis et aquis).

In all these cases the rubrics emphasise that the attached land is included in the endowment. It is likely that the given name in each of these cases also adhered to the land unit, but the use of the rubric betrays an unspoken anxiety that the name could be understood as a smaller unit, either a farm or a settlement within the land unit. The purpose of the formula is to eliminate any possibility of such a misunderstanding. Nevertheless, these rubrics are often omitted and, as Price notes, ‘it would be clear to everyone from the name what was the piece of ground that was being given as an endowment’. Unfortunately it is then often not clear that the given name was also the name of a settlement. However, on rare occasions land transfers are explicitly presented in terms of the settlement. In the Life of Colmán, Conall offers Colmán seventeen baileda. Baile cannot be understood here solely in terms of settlements, as some of those that are named (Tír Fráech, Tír Mór) are clearly land units. However, the author does not list all the baileda in the endowment, but simply that the grant included ‘other raths up to seventeen’. In doing so, he moves easily between conceptualising the endowment both in terms of land units (baileda) and of settlements (ráthanna): it is both farm (land unit) and farmstead (habitation) at one and the same time.

The relationship between baile and townlands has been a matter of some debate, and the issue has never been fully resolved. Price held that baile never meant townland in the modern sense, pointing out that it is frequently applied to subtownland units. This assertion

77 Ard Camma i. baile Í Uidrín cona muiliund ocus cona [f]herund uili ocus baile U(i) Cömgin cona [f]herund uili ocus cona muiliund ... Ro edpeirthea dano na dá baile (sen i Luigne) Connac[h]t i. dístir Cennanna do deoradaib cráibdechaib do grèis (Mac Niocaill, Notitia 28).


80 7 ráthanna ele cona secht déc lèo-som (Meyer, Betha Colmáin §62). On the use and meaning of ráth see Toner, ‘Settlement and settlement terms’ 5-6.

81 An interesting parallel is provided by the use of the word ait in Co. Donegal with reference both to the farmstead and its lands (Dónall P. Ó Baoill, An teanga bheo: Gaeilge Uladh (Dublin 1996) 123).

is rejected out of hand by Flanagan, who points to the meaning ‘townland’ in Donegal Irish. Of greatest force in her argument is the observation that townlands called Ballybeg (An Baile Beag) are often small, and that a number of Ballykeels (An Baile Caol) are narrow. This surely points to the use of baile in the sense ‘townland’, although it is not clear from this how early this sense develops. Nevertheless, we should not be dazzled by the predominance of baile in townland names. The vast majority of townlands and similar land units are self-evidently named from features lying within their borders, whether they be man-made (ráth, lios, dún, caisleal, caisleán, achadh, gort etc.) or naturally occurring (cnoc, corr, tulach, cabhán, móin, loch). Where the generic in a townland name is a habitation feature, we logically assume that the name has been transferred from the name of a settlement within its boundaries. Where the generic is an agricultural term or a word describing a natural feature, we must assume that the name of that feature has generally been transferred first to a settlement within the townland and ultimately to the townland itself. Gort an Choirce (Gortahork, Co. Donegal) must originally have been the name of a field which was then transferred to a farm or settlement associated with it, from which it was transferred to the townland of the name and ultimately to the village. Given that baile appears to have arisen in the eleventh and twelfth centuries as a common, if not the most common, settlement term, it would hardly be surprising to find it emerging as the most common element in townland names. In short, the predominance of baile in townland names does not necessitate the assumption so often made that it means townland. While it is hardly to be doubted that baile was also applied to units of land which we now know as townlands, we must conclude that the connection between baile-names and townlands may have been considerably overemphasised.

Townlands, of course, have emerged from a variety of native and non-native divisions, and as such there can be no direct correlation with baile. Indeed, it is noteworthy that while English sources use a large range of native and non-native terms to refer to land units that later emerge as townlands, baile never does so with the sole exception of the derivative ballyboe in parts of Ulster (< baile bó). It may be significant that Keating, when discussing land divisions, uses it only with respect to ballybetags and uses the term seisreach for the
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83 Flanagan, ‘Common elements: baile’ 11.
84 ibid. 10-11.
equivalent of a townland. The same terminology is used in the poem beginning *Cálín trícha a n-Éirinn áin*. The *seisreach* in these texts is obviously the equivalent of the most common term applied in English documents to townlands in the provinces of Munster and Leinster, the ploughland.

Price observes that Irish *baile*, English *tún* (later *town*) and Latin *villa* tend to be used interchangeably in medieval documents of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, and most significantly that *baile* was often used to render Anglo-Norman names in *tún* into Irish. Indeed, the concentration of *baile*-names in areas conquered by the Anglo-Normans but subsequently regaelicised may be explained, at least in part, by this mechanism. Early English settlers used the word *tún* for their holdings in Ireland, a practice they appear to have adopted from their original homelands in south-west England where the element was commonly used after the Norman conquest. In the majority of pre-Norman English placenames *tún* probably meant ‘farmstead’, but in the post-Conquest south-west, from where many Anglo-Norman settlers came, it was usually used in the sense ‘manor’.

Irish *baile* is uncannily close to these two usages, having been applied to farmsteads on the one hand and larger conglomerations on the other. Even though it is applied to land units, *baile* is evidently not a direct equivalent of semantically related words such as *ferann*, *crích* or *tír* that are applied to landholdings. One obvious difference is that the *baile* embraces the notion of habitation, and this may well have been extended to include the inhabitants as well. In the Life of Colmán, the inhabitants of certain *baileda* offer themselves in perpetual service to the saint along with the land. An area of land (*terra*) called Balidubgaill ‘with its men’ was granted to the priory of All Hallows c. 1166. Another important difference seems to be that the *baile* is often a subdenomination of an estate. Colmán’s grandfather’s brothers offer him a single *baile* of their land (*ferann*) as

---

86 *FFÉ* I 111-23. Of course, *baile* more frequently signifies some kind of settlement, for example, *ibid.* II 302, III 102, 184, 240, 328, 336.
87 See above p. 32.
88 McErlean, ‘The Irish townland system’ 317.
89 Price, ‘A note on *baile*’ 123.
90 But this is rejected by Doherty, ‘Settlement in early Ireland’ 67.
Lasairfhíona, daughter of Cathal Croibhdhearg, donated half of a baile from her marriage estate (fearond posta) to the canons of Oilén na Trinóide in Loch Cé in 1239. Whether we understand the meaning of baile as farm, townland or ballybetagh, this notion of subdivision seems to be important.

The term bíatach is applied to the typical commoner in Gaelic society in the twelfth century and later, the successor of the ócaire and the bóaire of the Old Irish law texts. It means ‘food-provider’ and the bíatach must have been a farmer paying a food-rent to a lord. There is ample evidence for the existence of free bíataig who were undoubtedly landowning farmers. Indeed, there is some evidence that would place him on the same economic level as the owner of a baile. We have seen, for example, that the baileda in the Life of Colmán are almost exactly equivalent in value to the holdings of the ócaire as described in early Irish law, and other facts point in the same direction. According to the Annals of the Four Masters, the comarba of St Patrick made a circuit (cúairt) of Tír Eoghain in 1150 and levied a tax of a cow from the house of every bíatach while Colum Cille’s successor obtained one cow from every two bíataig. This is directly analogous to the cow collected in tribute (cíoscháin) from every baile in Uí Briúin and Bréifne in the Life of Máedócc of Ferns. This tends to confirm that the baile is comparable in size to the area of land held by a bíatach, and we may reasonably conclude that the free bíatach was the owner of a farm which was commonly called a baile.

The picture that emerges here is of a network of farms (baileda), many of which would have been owned by small farmers (bíataig) who received a fief from a lord and paid food-rent in return. These farms would have usually been inherited from the family territory, and would have been worked by the farmer and his immediate family, possibly with the assistance of labourers. Each farm appears to have had its own farmstead, and in many cases this must have
attracted other buildings, particularly if the occupier was wealthy. The size of farm found in the sources analysed here is more or less equivalent to that of the ócaire found in the Old Irish law tracts, but others were probably larger. The practice of partible inheritance would have produced farms of roughly equal size within a family estate, but bigger estates or fewer heirs would have created larger farms. Conversely, with the passage of time estates may have been divided up into smaller and smaller farms unless the family was able to secure more lands elsewhere. Where an individual owned more land than he could farm himself, he probably rented farms out to lower-ranking farmers such as those classed as daerbiataig ‘unfree bíataig’.

It has been suggested that the bíataig of the twelfth century and later were under considerable pressure from their social and economic superiors, and there is ample evidence for the purchase of lands and loss of land through disputes and bad debt. The situation at this level must have been fluid, therefore, and circumstances could have altered significantly within a single generation.

Each baile or farm was obviously integrated into larger networks. There is substantial evidence to suggest that larger units belonging to individuals or ecclesiastical institutions were also sometimes called baile daíl, although an estate was more frequently denoted by a term such as ferann. This dual usage is confusing, but the larger unit also functioned like a farm on a grander scale, supplying food (and revenue) to the owner. Also, like the farm, the large baile denoted an area of heritable property whose boundaries would have been well established by local knowledge and tradition. Common sense would suggest that the size of these units, both large and small, was determined almost entirely by local conditions such as the size of a kin-group and the area of land in its possession. However, for the purposes of taxation local lords must have divided their lands up into units of more or less equal value. McErlean has shown that large units such as the baile bíataig were once in use across the country.

Although there is considerable variation in the size of these units, they are notable for the frequency with which they are found to be comprised of regular numbers of townlands. In Monaghan, for

102 In early Irish law, one of the distinguishing features of base clientship (dóer-chéilsine) was that the client might receive a fief of land or other valuables rather than livestock (Fergus Kelly, A guide to early Irish law (Dublin 1988) 29-30).

103 For example, Mac Niocaill, Notitiae 18, 20, 30. See also Kenneth Nicholls, Gaelic and gaelicised Ireland in the Middle Ages (Dublin 1972) 10-11; Mac Niocaill, ‘Origins of the betagh’ 297.

example, Duffy shows that the vast majority of ballybetaghs comprise sixteen tates.\textsuperscript{105} This is echoed in Keating’s description of twelve, or exceptionally fourteen, \textit{seisreacha} to the \textit{baile biataigh}. Although this schema is certainly excessively prescriptive for Keating’s own time, it probably illustrates reasonably accurately the basic principle of the system as it once existed. McErlean is undoubtedly correct in seeing in the ballybetaghs and similar units the structure within which the Gaelic taxation system operated.\textsuperscript{106}

The packaging of equal numbers of medium-sized land units of equivalent economic capacity (tates in Monaghan, for example) into large units (ballybetaghs) is a simple and elegant solution for ensuring the easy administration of the assessment of taxes and dues. It also had repercussions for the system of landholding. As Duffy demonstrates, the ballybetagh and its subdivisions were also a device for the lord to allocate his lands among branches of client septs or followers, although this must be seen as secondary to the primary function of these divisions in tax evaluation.\textsuperscript{107}

The various applications of the term \textit{baile} appear bewildering, even contradictory, at times. It is a homestead and a farm; a village and a city; a house cluster and a ballybetagh. However, these apparently disparate entities share common features that are expressed in this single term. The defining characteristic of the \textit{baile} is occupied space, whether by a habitation (farmstead, village, town, etc.) or by agricultural land (farm, townland, ballybetagh). Each place is important by virtue of the presence of people who imbue it with an economic and social function in relation to the provision of food and raising of revenue. The town facilitates trade and commerce and pays taxes. The farm sustains its inhabitants and produces a surplus so that tax can be paid to the king and food-rent to the lord. It is part of a larger tax-assessment unit (the forerunner of the modern townland), which in turn is part of a larger unit of assessment (ballybetagh). The \textit{baile}, therefore, is fundamentally concerned with the organisation of people, land and resources for the sustenance of the inhabitants and the generation of material goods.

\textit{University of Ulster at Coleraine}

\textsuperscript{105} Patrick J. Duffy, ‘Social and spatial order in the Mac Mahon lordship of Airghialla in the late sixteenth century’ in Duffy \textit{et al.}, \textit{Gaelic Ireland} 115-37 (at pp 126-9).

\textsuperscript{106} McErlean, ‘The Irish townland system’ 326-8.

\textsuperscript{107} Duffy, ‘Social and spatial order’ 130.
IT HAS generally been accepted that the tale *Eachtra Mhacaoimh an Iolair* (EMI) was written by Brian Ó Corcráin. The tale was first edited by Macalister,¹ whose edition was based on the British Library manuscript Egerton 128 written in 1748-9 by Muiris Ó Gormáin.² In a short review of this edition attention was drawn to the earliest extant witness to the tale, viz. RIA 739 (24 P 9), written by Dáibhí Ó Duibhgeannáin in 1651.³ It was also pointed out that this contains a scribal note with important information concerning the composition of EMI. The note was transcribed in the review as follows:

Bíodh a fhios agat, a léightheóir an sceóilsi gurab amhla do fuair misi .i. Brian O Corcráin cnámha an scéilsi ag duine uasal adubhairt gurab as Frainncis do chualaidh sé féin dá innsin é; agus mar do fuair mise sbéis ann do dheasuigh mar so é; agus do chuirim na laoithe beagasa mar chumaoin air; agus ní raibh an scéal féin i nGaedhilg ariamh gonuige sin.⁴

This transcription has formed the basis for several subsequent interpretations. It was referred to and partially translated by Alan Bruford as follows:

I, Brian Ó Corcráin, got the framework of this story from a gentleman who said that he had heard it told from the French; and since I enjoyed it, I worked it up in this way; and I have put in these little poems to grace it (*mar chumaoín air*); and this story was never in Gaelic before.⁵

Bruford, quoting Osborn Bergin as his authority, states that ‘Brian Ó Corcráin is fairly certainly to be identified with the poet and scribe who addressed poems to Cú Chonnacht Maguire of Fermanagh

---

¹ *Two Irish Arthurian romances (Eachtra an Mhadra Mhaoil agus Eachtra Mhacaoimh an Iolair)*, ed. R. A. S. Macalister, ITS vol. 10 (London 1908).
² ibid. p. v.
³ *Irisleabhar na Gaedhilge* 19 (1909) 191-2 (the review is signed s. ó b.).
⁴ ibid. 191.
Influenced, no doubt, by this identification, he then goes on to say that ‘the verses in the story seem rather more carefully put together than most of the poems in romances.’ There would seem to be little support for the latter statement. As is the case with other romances, all the poems in EMI are in ógláchas. The poems themselves, therefore, cannot be advanced as evidence that EMI was written by a professional poet such as Brian Ó Corcráin. It may also be observed that Bruford does not comment on some of the linguistic difficulties in the transcription of the scribal note, especially in the light of his translation. In particular, one would have welcomed some comment on the form do chuirim. Bruford translates this as ‘I have put’, but the form as it stands is impossible in the past tense. The note was subsequently translated in full by William Gillies as follows:

You should know, reader of this tale, that I, Brian Ó Corcráin, received the bones of this tale from a gentleman who said that he had heard it told in French; and since I enjoyed it I have worked it up in this way, and add these little poems as my compliment to it; and the tale itself was never in Gaelic until now.

This translation is again based on the transcription cited above. While there is no comment on any of the linguistic forms, the translation indicates that do chuirim is taken as 1 sing. present.

EMI was also edited by Iorard de Teiltiún (E. W. Digby) and Seosamh Laoide (J. H. Lloyd). This edition is based on the earliest manuscript witness mentioned above, viz. 24 P 9. The editors reproduce the scribal note pertaining to Ó Corcráin. Significantly, previous errors have been corrected. Their transcription is as follows:

Bíodh a fhios agad, a léughthoir an sgeóil-si, gurab amhlaidh do fuair misi .i. Brían Ó Corcrán cnámha an sgéil so ag duine

---

7 Bruford, *Gaelic folktales and medieval romances* 46.
9 *Eachtra Mhacacoinmh an Iolair mhic Riogh na Sorcha*, ed. Iorard de Teiltiún and Seosamh Laoide (Dublin 1912). The introduction (pp v-x) was written (in Irish) by Laoide.
úasal a dubhaint gurab as Fraincis do chúalaidh sé féin dá innisín é, agus mur do fúair misi sbéis ann do dheachtaigh mur so é 7 do chuirsim na laothe beaga-sa mur chumáoin air, 7 ní raibhe an sgél féin a nGáoidheilg ariamh conuige sin.10

Instead of do dheasuigh we find do dheachtaigh (the acht compendium had been previously misread as s). A more important reading is do chuirsim instead of do chuirim (-s having been omitted in the earlier transcription).

According to Laoide the Brian Ó Corcrá(i)n mentioned in the scribal note was not the professional poet mentioned above, but rather the vicar of Claoininis (Cleenish), an island on Lough Erne in Co. Fermanagh, who died in 1487.11 Laoide also interpreted the note to mean that Brian Ó Corcráin was the author of EMI. If this is correct, some explanation must be given for the sequence of verbal forms do fúair misi sbéis … do dheachtaigh … do chuirsim. Laoide was of opinion that the scribal note was produced in haste and that it exhibits dialect features. The use of 3 sing. past do dheachtaigh instead of 1 sing. is explained as an Ulster dialect feature.12 The use of do chuirsim is regarded as adding what is termed a very nice touch (fíor-dheas) and is evidently taken as 1 plur. past (for 1 sing.).13

Before discussing these forms, attention should first be drawn to a new introduction to Macalister’s edition of EMI by Professor J. F. Nagy.14 Nagy reproduces de Teiltiún and Laoide’s transcription of the scribal note and gives the following translation:

Know, O reader of this tale, that I, Brian Ó Corcráin, got the outline of this story from a gentleman who said that he himself had heard it told in French; and, as I found interest in it, I composed it thus, inserting these little poems to complement it. Until now the story itself has never been available in Irish.15

Nagy does not discuss any of the linguistic forms cited above. As his translation indicates, he also took do chuirsim to be 1 plur. past (for 1 sing.).

10 ibid. p. xix.
11 ibid. p. v; see AFM s.a. 1487.
12 ibid. pp v-vi.
13 ibid. p. v.
15 ibid. 3.
The matter of the sequence of verbal forms *do fúair misi sbéis* … *do dheachtaigh* … *do chuirsim* may now be discussed. It has been assumed that in the case of the last two forms the author of the note is referring to himself. This assumption has entailed a certain degree of special pleading on the part of Laoide as noted above. Whereas one could justify the use of 3 sing. for 1 sing. in the case of *do dheachtaigh*, it is not immediately obvious why this should then be followed by a sudden switch to a 1 plur. form in the case of *do chuirsim*. I would suggest that previous interpretations of *do dheachtaigh* and *do chuirsim* are based on the long-held assumption that the Brian Ó Corcráin mentioned in the note is the author of EMI. The mis-reading of *do chuirsim* as *do chuirim* in the earlier transcription and its acceptance as a legitimate 1 sing. form has played a significant role in this assumption. If, however, allowance is made for the possibility that the Brian Ó Corcráin mentioned is not in fact the author of the tale but rather the person for whom it was written, the linguistic forms referred to above are open to an alternative interpretation. The form *do dheachtaigh* can simply be taken as 3 sing. past. While *do chuirsim* could be read as 1 plur. past, it can also be read as 3 sing. with emphatic suffix -*sim*.\(^\text{16}\) In addition, *conuige sin* is to be translated ‘until then’ and not ‘until now’ as in previous translations. I would interpret the note as follows:

\begin{quote}
Know, O reader of this story, that it is the case that I, Brian Ó Corcráin, got the bones of this story from a noble person who said that he heard it being told in French, and when I became interested in it he composed it like this and added these little lays to it, and the story had never been in Irish until then.
\end{quote}

It is evident from the first part of the note that Ó Corcráin heard a summary of the story from a certain *duíne uasal* and expressed an interest in the tale. I would argue that what then happened is that the unnamed *duíne uasal* decided to provide Ó Corcráin with a full written version of the tale. He also added a number of poems to the text. The scribal note is therefore to be read as an expression of gratitude on the part of the person for whom the tale was written.

This interpretation is supported by evidence which goes against the view held by certain scholars that the composition of EMI represents an imaginative and thoroughly Gaelic rendering of an oral

---

\(^\text{16}\) See *Dictionary of the Irish language (DIL)* (Dublin 1913-76), s.v. *som*. 
outline of a French narrative. One would naturally come to such a conclusion if one accepted that Brian Ó Corcráin was the author of EMI and that he had nothing more than the outline of the tale on which to base his narrative. EMI, however, would seem to be a carefully constructed narrative in which written sources, both foreign and native, played a prominent part. Furthermore, examination of the earliest extant manuscript witness to EMI indicates dependence on an English source. We find, for example, the use of *sior* and *cing* in titles. There is even one example of *king*. Other indications of English influence in the vocabulary of the text are *eximnation* and *ré rópáidhíbh undáis*. From the fact that the tale is clearly not based on a French summary alone, and also that the reader is not informed in the note of any other details in relation to its composition, apart from the poems, it would seem that EMI was not written by Brian Ó Corcráin.

The discussion above brings into question again the identity of Brian Ó Corcráin. If the latter is not the author of EMI it naturally follows that he need not necessarily have been a professional poet. This raises the possibility that he may indeed have been the Brian Ó Corcráin mentioned by Laoide. This, however, must remain a matter of speculation.

University College Dublin

Caoimhín Breathnach

17 See Gillies, ‘Arthur in Gaelic tradition’ 56. See also Nagy, A new introduction 3-4, 8, and cf. a review of Macalister’s edition by T. F. O’Rahilly, Irisleabhar na Gaedhilge 19 (1909) 355-64 (at p. 356). O’Rahilly’s review can be found as an appendix to Nagy’s new introduction (pp 10-18). The reader should note, however, that certain phrases in the original review have been omitted in the appendix.

18 RIA 24 P 9, p. 243. This has been editorially altered to *cing* in de Teiltiún and Laoide, *Eachtra Mhacacoimh an Iolair* 29 (cf. p. 98). For similar instances of the use of *sir* and *cing* in Irish translations see Lorgaireacht an tSoidhigh Naomhtha, ed. Sheila Falconer (Dublin 1953) pp xix-xx; *Eachtra Uilliam*, ed. Cecile O’Rahilly (Dublin 1949) p. xi. *Rí* has been editorially substituted for *cing* in Macalister’s edition of the narrative; see the list of original manuscript readings departed from by the editor (pp 206-7).

19 See de Teiltiún and Laoide, *Eachtra Mhacacoimh an Iolair* 26 (= 24 P 9, p. 241). *Cuartughadh* has been substituted for *eximnation* in the text on the basis of later manuscript readings. The manuscript reading is given in a footnote. It is also noted (p. 80) that the reading *eximnation* ‘is remarkable as showing the penetration of an English word into the MS style’. Macalister’s edition has *rannsughadh* instead of *eximnation* (p. 114, l. 58).

20 *DIL* s.v. *róp* cites only one example of this English loan-word which is taken from the Irish translation of *Bevis of Hampton*. Undás would seem to be a borrowing from English *windlass*; cf. de Teiltiún and Laoide, *Eachtra Mhacacoimh an Iolair* 97.
INDEX OF NAMES IN *IRISH GRAMMATICAL TRACTS* I-IV

This index of personal names, placenames and population names occurring in the verse citations and continuous text of tracts I-IV of *Irish Grammatical Tracts* (IGT) is intended to fill a gap that has existed since they were first published by Bergin without an index all those years ago.¹ It should serve as a useful tool not just for students of IGT but for others labouring in a discipline which still lacks for comprehensive works of reference on proper names apart from Edmund Hogan’s pioneering *Onomasticon Goedelicum* (1910).

In referencing the texts as Bergin edited them I also incorporate a body of uniquely valuable material which he appears to have overlooked in one of the manuscript sources he drew upon. Some forty or so ascriptions to named authors entered scrivally in the margins adjacent to the citations in the copy of IGT III in the TCD MS H. 2. 17, pp 195a-232b (1319/2/7), are not registered in the edition.² These are indicated below among the list of personal names by an asterisk following the reference number accompanied by the letter H (referring to the manuscript source), e.g. ‘ad 3/408 (H)*’. The value of the attributions scarcely needs to be emphasised. It can be illustrated by reference to a citation from the well-known poem *Damhaidh dúinn cóir a chléirche* (IGT III ex. 280) which is accompanied in the margin of the H text by the ascription ‘M. M.’ The poem’s editor Brian Ó Cuív noted that while a copy in National Library of Ireland MS


² The ascriptions are mainly entered in the margins but occasionally follow the citation in the body of the text; all appear to be in the scribal hand, and the majority are found in the first half of the tract. It may be noted that much challenging work remains to be done in the form of comparative analysis of the manuscript recensions of the various tracts, most notably those on Declension and Irregular verbs (IGT II-III) which show considerable variation in terms of the sequence and make-up of sections and the supply of citations. It is well to remember in this connection also that the copy of IGT III-IV in TCD MS H. 2. 12, pp 237ff, was not consulted by Bergin for his edition.
G 992 (‘Nugent manuscript’) ascribes it to the thirteenth-century author Giolla Brighde Mac Con Midhe, internal evidence suggests strongly that the composition is of the fourteenth century and that the Nugent manuscript attribution is likely to be incorrect. Professor Ann Dooley in a recent study advanced arguments based on stylistic grounds in favour of attributing the composition to Gofraidh Fionn Ó Dálaigh. The ascription from the H. 2. 17 copy of IGT III says otherwise, however. If as seems likely the initials ‘M. M.’ are for ‘Mael Muire’, we may conjecture that the author was Mael Muire Mac Craith (Mág Raith) (fl. 1390), well known as Gofraidh Fionn’s friend and contemporary. Clearly the full cohort of ascriptions from H identified below will merit closer scrutiny.

Method of reference
The index distinguishes between Personal Names and Place and Population Names. It should be noted, however, that I have not as a rule sought to differentiate among holders of the same name except where this is warranted by sound evidence such as the identification of the citation’s source (thus Aodh, Aodh (2); Domhnall, Domhnall (2)). The method of reference is to the edited tract (arabic numeral) followed by a slash and the number of the example (e.g. 2/1450) or section (e.g. 1/§5). In the list of Personal Names an asterisk accompanying the last digit indicates an ascription registered in the text as edited in respect of the citation (e.g. ad 2/1445*), with the modification mentioned above applicable in case of ascriptions present in H. 2. 17 (i.e. H*). Orthography follows the mixed Middle/Early Modern Irish usage of the edition from the manuscripts; nominative forms absent in the texts are supplied as headwords. Where spellings vary the most commonly occurring form is used as headword (variant spellings follow in parentheses); phrases illustrating inflexional forms and / or context are given as appropriate.

3 Brian Ó Cuív, ‘An appeal on behalf of the profession of poetry’ Éigse 14 (1971) 87-106 (at p. 91).
5 This Maol Muire addresses Gofraidh Fionn in Maig chaitheas dlús re dhalta (L. Mac Cionnaith, Dioghluim dána (Baile Átha Cliath 1938) no. 104); for a further half-dozen poems attributed to him see Catalogue of Irish manuscripts in the Royal Irish Academy General Index p. 893 ll 35ff. See below s.n. Mael Muire; Mág Raith, Mael Muire.
PERSONAL NAMES

Acáb 1/§4
Aed Édair 3/299
Aed óc ad 3/131 (H)*, ad 3/473 (H)*
Áedh (Aedh) see Aed, Aodh
Aenghus Ruad, ‘Aenghus r.’ ad 3/8 (H)*; see Aonghas
Afraim 1/§4
Aibheall 3/74
Áine, ‘an ingensa Á.’ 2/330
Ainnrás 2/§109
Aith(e)irne 2/1377, 2/1485, 4/1049
Alúin (?), ‘[ó] A.’ 2/934
Amlaib Muman 3/43
Amhlaibh 2/§112
Amhlaibh Dubh 2/791
An Calbhach, ‘coibchi in Calbaigh’ 2/177, ‘do chléith chuirr an Chalbhaigh’ 2/2023
An Dall, ‘in Dall’ ad 2/1445*
Anábla 2/§3, 2/210
Anmchadh 2/§110; see Í Anmchaidh, Sil Anmchadha
Annlúan 2/§35
Anóra 2/§3, 2/211
Áodh (2), ‘oighidh Áodha’ 2/929, ‘tímcheall Áodha’ 2/930
Áodh Buidhe 2/1483
Áodh Finnliath 2/1762
Árlaidh (Árlaith) 2/2137, 2/2132, ‘inghean Árlaighi’ 2/184-5; see Órlaidh
Art 2/§96, 2/1744, 2/1752, 2/2158, 3/85, ‘trí hAirt’ 1/§18; see Achtadh Airt, Múr Airt
Art Éinfhear, ‘lér mhínigh chloind Airt Énfhir’ 2/1126, ‘a ghlainchineadh Airt Énfhir’ 3/556
Báitér 2/§35
Balar see Beann Balair
Báothghalach, ‘biseach Báothghalaigh’ 2/1399
Béc 2/731 (= 3/871)
Beinéd 3/112
Blad 2/§73, 2/1668
Bodhbh 2/§67
Boibél 1/§4
Brian Banda 2/1145
Brian Sléibhe Sneachta; see [Ó Néill], B. S. S.
Bríone 3/473
Brighid 2/942
Brúnach, ‘a Brúnaigh’ 3/943
Cad see Caid
Cael 3/367
Caid, ‘comhairle Caid’ 2/1353
Caitir fhína 2/§185, 2/2102
Caoi 1/§4
Caomhánach, An, 2/911
Carmac, ‘mac Carmuic’ 2/461; see Cormac
Carrach, An, ‘mac an Charragh’ 3/670
Carrthach (Carthach), ‘crú Charrthaig’ 2/817, ‘a í Char(r)thaig’ 3/381 (= 3/751), 3/539; see Clann Charrthaigh
Cárthann 3/209
Cáirthann Fionn, ‘frémh Cáirthuin Fhinn’ 3/205; see Clann Cháirthainn fhinn
Cas, ‘crech í Chais’ 2/555, ‘furrthain ó gCais’ 2/1125; see Dál Cais
Cathbhaidh (Cathfaidh), ‘C. draoi’ 2/§198, ‘croidhe Cathbhadha’ 2/1826, ‘croidhe Cathfadha’ 2/2156
Céann see Cinedh Cind
Cearball 2/358
Cearball Buide (?), ‘Cerball .b.’ ad 3/54 (H)*
Cermad Milbél 2/30
Cet 2/§15, ‘coinghleaca Chéit’ 2/699
Chailép 1/§4
Clíon 2/§96, ‘clár Céín’ 2/760, ‘ó Céín’ 2/1738, 3/153; see Clann Chéin
Cirine 1/§21
Clidhna, ‘créabh Ch.’ 2/153
Clíthbhordach, An, 2/1431
Cobhthach 2/923; see Clár Cobhthaigh
Colam see Colaim
Cola, 2/1176, 2/1973, ‘óna Collaibh’ 2/1330; see Trí C.
Conaire 2/§112; see Ó Longáin, C.
Conaire 3/203
Conall 2/699, 3/825, ‘oid Conaill’ 2/716, ‘rí Conail’ 2/1581; see Ó Conaill, Tellach Conaill, Tír Chonuill
Conchobhar, 2/348, 2/1804, ‘crech Conchobhair’ 2/361
Condla 2/1932
Dubh Saighleand 2/1509
Dubhthaich, ‘ó senDubbthaigh’ 2/1977
Duibhne, ‘as diármaddha Í Dhuibhne’
   1/§120, ‘fer í D.’ 3/473

Eachaidh see Eochuidh
Eachrí 2/§112, 2/1835
Éamann (Émann) 2/597, 2/1642,
   2/2100, ‘a Éamuinn’ 3/340,
   ‘gníomh Émainn’ 2/1889, ‘d’Émann’ 2/387
Earc, ‘ó chloinn Earca’ 3/455,
   ‘cumha í Erce’ 3/842
Ébha, ‘um fhuil É.’ 2/1572
Echaith 3/993, ‘clann Eathach’
   1/§61, ‘port inghine Eathach’
   2/574; see Éochaidh, Síol Eachuidh
Èibhear 3/219, ‘ó Héibhir/Tadhg’
   2/249, ‘ar chloinn ... Èibhir fhinn’
   3/254
Èinrí 2/1853, 2/1854, ‘Ènrí’ 2/§112,
   2/689, 3/145
Eithne 3/874, ‘tairthi chláir fhád-bhui E.’
   2/167, ‘ag fíalshlait fhóid E.’
   2/1124, ‘Lugh mór mac E.’
   3/473
Èmann see Êamann
Ènna, ‘crích É.’ 2/1673, ‘gort Éna’
   2/1734
Ènna Níadh 2/847
Ènrí see Èinrí
Eocha 1/§88, 2/400
Eochaith 1/§88, ‘Eochaith Eachaidh’
   2/§111; see Síol Eachuidh
Èóghan (Èoghan, Èogan) 3/508,
   3/414, ‘fuil Èoghuin’ 2/1893, ‘ós fhert Èoghain’
   2/1305, ‘a Èoghain’ 2/668,
   3/461, ‘trí hÈoghuin’ 1/§18
Èóin 2/§112, 2/159, 2/390, 2/1468,
   2/1470, 2/1577, 3/688, 3/823,
   3/964, ‘oighir E.’ 2/365
Èóin Baisde 1/§49, 2/842, 2/1905, ‘a E. B.’
   4/1021, 4/1040
Èóin Bruiinde 2/842
Èreamón, ‘fonn Èreamón’ 3/916
Èsú 1/§4
Etrosius 1/§4

Falbraidh 2/2138, ‘mac Falfratha’
   2/2142
Farbhlaith, ‘Farbhlaithd Farbhlaithe’
   2/§192, ‘Farbhlaithe’ 2/605
Fathadh [Canann] 2/350
Fearchar (Ferchar), ‘a longthoigh mhóir fhind Fherchair’
   2/887 (= 2/2042)
Fearghal see Ferghal
Fearghas 2/§110
Fégh Fa Lighe 1/§124 (= 2/1908)
Féidhlim (Feidhlim) 2/1841, 2/1849
Feidhlimidh (Féidhlimidh) 2/984,
   2/1247, 2/1839, 2/1850, 2/1859
Félim 2/872, ‘crú Fh.’ 2/1848
Félimidh 2/1840, 2/1851, 2/1860,
   ‘gan Hélimid’ 3/927
Féinius Farsaidh 1/§4
Feircheirt 2/§112
Fergal Ruad (?), ‘Fergal .R., ad’
   2/240*, ‘.F’ [= Fergal/Ferchor?] .r.’
   3/408 (H)*
Fergal (Ferg(h)al) 3/590, ‘dol d’oll-
   amhain Hhergail’ 2/326, ‘a ttoigh fhinn Hheargail’
   2/886 (= 2/1571)
F. G. ad 2/1403, see Gofraidh Fionn
   (?)
Fíacha 1/§87, 2/1852, ‘mac Fíachach’
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1/§87, ‘do shíl Fhlácha’ 2/1460, ‘re fuil bFíachach’ 2/2108
Fíachaidh 1/§87, 2/§112
Filib, ‘F. Pilib’ 2/§112, 2/1856
Findghúala (Fionnghúala) 2/2152, 2/§145
Fínghin, ‘as d’fhéidhm Fh.’ 3/484
Finntan, ‘fríthi Finntain’ 2/62 (= 3/263)
Fíonn (Finn) 3/6, ‘a n-aimsir Fhinn’ 1/§150, ‘gu ngoirge Fhinn’ 2/2021
Flaithrí 2/§112
Flann, ‘iath Floinn’ 2/1957
Flannchadh 2/§110
Forann 1/§4
F. r. see Fergal Ruad
Furnabhál (Furnamhál) 2/§35, 2/927
Gafraidh 2/1825; see Gofraidh
Gaibhneand Gabha 2/§198, 2/2155
Gaibríal 2/§109, 2/1811, 2/1812
Gáoidhiol, ‘G. mac Eitheóir’ 1/§4
Gáth 1/§4
Gearóid 2/§112, 2/1011, 2/1857, ‘mac G.’ 2/401
Genand Gruadhsholas 3/34
Geóidrisc 3/737
G. f. see Gofraidh Fionn
Gilla Brighde, ad 2/1610 (v.l.)*
Giolla Críosd 2/2157
Giolla na Náomh 1/§124, 1/§135, 3/24
Gofraidh, ‘G. Gafraidh’ 2/§111, 3/93
Gofraidh Fi(o)nn 1/§129, ad 2/212*, ‘Gofhaideadh’ 2/1397, ‘G. f.’
ad 3/47 (H)*, ad 3/76 (H)*, ad 3/123 (H)*, ad 3/175 (H)*, ad 3/181 (H)*, cf. ‘F. G.’ (= G. F. ?)
ad 2/1403*; see Gaifraíd, Gothfraidh
Gofraidh Mérach, ‘a ua ghil Gh. Mhéraigh’ 3/985
Goibnend 2/§198
Goisdealbhach, ‘glímh an gheócaigh Ghoisdealbhaigh’ 3/684
Goll 3/50, ‘bean Ghoill’ 2/1248, ‘marbh Gulla 7 Golla’ 1/§134
Gothfraidh 3/768, see Gofraidh Fionn
Hoiberd 2/§109
Íaichim 1/§4, ‘én Mac I.’ 3/1007
Iar mac Néma 1/§4
Idonius 1/§4
Ihuinnéis 1/§9
Illann ilchrothach 3/232
Írál 2/§109, 2/1814
Laoiseach, ‘mac Laoisigh’ 2/879
Lasair fhína 2/§185, 2/2097
Lorc 2/§67
Lóth 1/§4
Lúcás 2/§35
Lugh 2/1359, ‘L. mac Eithne’ 3/473, ‘imirt sgéith Lagha’ 2/882; see Crích Logha
Lughaidh Meann 2/1955
Lùibhrín Lòsnad 2/§112, 2/1846

Mac an Bhaird 1/§10
Mac an Bhaird, [Cú Ulad?], ‘Con (?)
U Mic in Baird’ ad 3/192 (H)*

Mac Beathadh 3/310
Mac Con, ‘oigri Meic Con’ 3/330

Mac Con Midhe 3/7 (H)*, ‘m. con uidi (?)’ ad 3/101 (H)*

Mac Cumaill 3/468
Mac Léoid 2/1474, 2/1477
Mac Lìag 2/491 (= 2/1647)
Mac Raith 1/§124
Mac Seóin 2/1570
Maein 3/649
Mael Domnaigh 3/870
Mael Echlainn 2/621, 2/1689
Mái see Cliú Mál
Máirt 1/§109
Maitheachán 2/727
Mág Craith 2/1995, see Mág Raith

Mág Raith, M[ael] M[uire](?), ‘m. m. mag rait’ ad 3/193 (H)*, ‘m. m. mag rait’ ad 3/201 (H)*, ad 3/222 (H)*, ‘m. m. muire mac rait’ ad 3/238 (H)*; see Mael Muire (?)

Mág Raith, Seaán, ad 3/177 (H)*

Mág Raith, T[omás] M[ór](?), ‘t. m. mag rait’ ad 3/203 (H)*, ad 3/209 (H)*; see Tomás Mór


Maghnas mac Cathail 3/627
Máire 2/§3
Mairghréid 2/§156
Mairghréag (Mairgrég) 2/§157,
‘mealladh Mairgréige’ 2/430
‘mac Mara grég’ 2/2020

Maithías 2/§109
Máerannán 1/§92, ‘ag mucaibh Man-
annán’ 2/1336
Matha, ‘mac M.’ 2/957

Mathghamhain, ‘maicne Math-
ghamhna’ 2/538, ‘mná Math-
ghamhna’ 2/1307

Meadhbh 3/333, ‘ó Meadhbhia móir’
2/§168, ‘le cloinn Meadhbhia móir’ 2/2051, ‘rí shil … Meadbha’ 3/854

Miach (?), ‘re colaind Miaigh [al. Méich]’ 2/1749


M. M. see Mael Muire (?), Mág Raith, Mael Muire (?)

Mogh Corb, ‘ar lorg Mogha … C.’ 2/729

Mogh Núadhad, ‘ó Mogha N.’ 2/110
Moire see Muire

Moiría 1/§4

Moiris, ‘Úa M.’ 2/669, see Muiris

Mongán 2/1855
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Mór Chaisil, ‘tar Mhóir Chaisil’ 2/289
Morna, ‘mur chloinn Morna’ 1/§150
Morchadh see Murchadh
Muircheartach, ‘ó Muircheartaigh’ 3/289
Muiredach (Muiredhach) 2/1168, ‘madadh í Mhuiredhuigh’ 3/302
Muirgheas, 2/§110, ‘marbhadh Muir-gheasa’ 2/1824

Nabghadón 1/§4
Náimhías 2/§109
Náoisi (Naísi) 2/§8, ‘ar craofb Naisi’ 2/1481
Neamhrúadh, ‘tor Neamhrúaidh mic Cúis mic Cáimh mic Nói’ 1/§4
Néill see Niall, Clann N.
Ngoimhér 1/§4
Niall Breag 3/103
Niall Glündubh, ‘ar sálaibh Néill ghill Glünduigh’ 2/250
Niall Naoighfallach 1/§125
Niall Uisnigh 2/666
Niocalás 2/941, ‘N. Nioclás’ 2/§35
Niccón 2/§35
Nónglach, ‘do chrú na N.’ 3/611
Núada (Núadh) 2/§8, 2/§188, 3/40
Núadh Fion Fáil 2/2109
Núalaith (Núalaith) 2/§192, 2/2141, ‘a ngrúaidh Núalaigh’ 2/312
Ó Baían, ‘an bard Ó B.’ 3/740, 3/741
Ó Beirn, ‘d’ú Bh.’ 2/422
[Ó Briain], Donnchadh Mór, 2/327
Ó Briain, Muircheartach, ‘inghean Mhuircheartaigh Í Bh.’ 2/114 (= 2/304)
Ó Cathán, ‘slabhradh con Í C.’ 2/471
Ó Ceallaigh, Donnchadh, ‘mac Donnchaidh í Cheallaigh’ 2/291
Ó Cearmaid 3/898
Ó Clúmham, An Caoch, ‘ceann mhic an Chaoich Í Ch.’ 3/87 (= 3/182); see Clann Chlúmán
Ó Cobhthaigh, Tadhg, ad 2/1815*
Ó Cobhthaigh, Tadhg Mór (?), ‘t m o cobtaig’ ad 3/169(H)*; see Tomás Mór, Tadhg Mór
Ó Coindlis, Connla, 2/219
Ó Conaill, ‘cain Hf Ch.’ 2/707
Ó Cruindén 2/824
Ó Cuill, Ceann Fáoladh, 1/§129
Ó Dálaigh, 1/§51, ‘Ó glanDálaigh’ 2/1876, ‘Aeradh Hf Dálaig’ 3/4
Ó Dálaigh, Conchubhar, ad 3/503 (H)*
Ó Dálaigh, Domhnall, 1/§15
Ó Dálaigh, Donnchadh Mór; see Donnchadh Mór
Ó Dálaigh Fioid 2/§168
Ó Domhnaill, Aodh, ‘a Aod Í Domnaill’ 3/190
Ó Dubhda, ‘ceand dúithche í Dubhda’ 2/1997
Ó Dubh, Donnchadh, ‘do láimh Donnchaidh í Dhuibh’ 3/258
Ó Feradhaigh 2/1091
Ó Gadhra 2/86
Ó Gofraid 3/901
Ó hEachaidh 1/§18, 2/1288
Ó hÉceartaigh, ‘echlais í É.’ 2/630
Ó hUiginn, ‘tar dhaltai oile Í Uigind’ 2/2105, ‘fa eiti Í Uiginn’ 3/163
Ó hUiginn, Brian (?), ‘brian o huiginn’ ad 3/138 (H)*
Ó hUiginn, Írial, ‘mac Í. Í Uiginn’ 2/1651
Ó hUiginn, Tadhg (?), ‘t. o huiginn’ ad 3/84 (H)*
Oillmam 2/§109; see Fuil O., Uillíam
Oirdonors 1/§4
Ó Longán, Conuing, 2/1855
Ó Máeil Múaid 2/644
Ó Móoil Bhrénuinn, ‘médchuma Í Mháoil Bhrénuinn’ 1/§112, ‘cuirm Í Málí B.’ 2/356
Ó Muineachán 1/§19
Ó Muirghes Mór 2/§168
Ó Néill, Brian, 2/564
[Ó Néill], Brian Sléibhe Sneachta, 2/41
Onóra 2/§3, ‘mac O.’ 2/212
Órlaidh, ‘Ó. Árlaidh Órlaith Árlaith’ 2/§192, ‘an t-eighrisin Orlaidhe’ 1/§133; see Árlaidh
Óse 1/§4
Ó Súillioibhán 2/940
Ó Toirchirt, Aedh, ‘A Áedh Í Thoirchirt’ 2/1862
Ó Toirrdealbaigh, Brian, 3/351
Ó Treasaigh, ‘a tigh í Treasaigh’ 2/242
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Peadar 3/547, 3/922
Pearsoinia 1/§4
Petar 3/160
Pól 2/§96, 2/765, 3/547, 3/922
Raghnaillt 2/1063
Raghnall, ‘R. rí an oirir’ 2/257, ‘fogha ... Raghuill’ 2/531
Ricard 2/§114, 2/1873, 3/158
Risdeard (Risderd) 2/§109, 2/1816, 3/987
Roalb, ‘foirmiam ... in Roailbsin’ 3/915
Roiberd 2/§109
Róisdeach, An, 2/1082, ‘An Róis-deach’ 1/§15
Róisdeach, An, see Róıdeach
Rolón(t) 2/§35
Ruibén 1/§4
Saidhbhín 1/§113
Sáilía 1/§4
Samhradhán see Síl Samhradháin
Sanbh, 1/§39; see Magh Sainbh
Sároid 3/649
Sdrú 1/§4
Seaán (Seóán), 1/§91, 2/932, ‘S. Seóán’ 2/§35, ‘ar Seaínne’ 2/1219
Seafraidh 2/§111, 2/509, ‘Seafraighe’ 2/1833
Séafraidh 2/1719, ‘tar éis Séafradha’ 2/1827, ‘Mac Séfraigh’ 3/1000; see Seafraidh
Sédh 3/939
Seifín 3/764
Séamus 2/1055
Seóin, ‘mac S.’ 2/1570
Scacas, ‘ar deigShíacas’ 3/444
Síghmall 3/260
Síle 2/§3, 2/925 (= 3/646), 2/1986, ‘ón tShíle ... ón tShílisin’ 1/§15
Sligeach 2/§11, 1/§12
Solmhan 1/§154, 2/§194, ‘Solmha’ 2/2149, ‘Solmhan’ 2/2150
Sorcha 2/80
Suibhne 3/473
Tadhg (2), ‘Ó Heibhir/T.’ 2/249
Tadhg Cláire, ‘do ló Thaidhg Ch.’ 2/1616
Tadhg Mór (?), ‘tadg .m. .cc.’ ad 3/53 (H)*
Tadhg Mór (2), ‘Tadhg Mór .cc.’ ad 2/1163*, ‘tadg m’ ad 3/117 (H)*
Tadhg Óg 1/§11, ad 2/633*
Taidgín 2/2062

Teabóid 2/§112, 2/1858

Thalmón 1/§4
Tiamdha, ‘ó T.’ 1/§83


Tomás 2/§35


Torna 2/66, 2/219

Trí Colla, Na, 1/§61, ‘fuil na dtrí C.’ 2/40; see Colla


Úa Moiris 2/669
Úalach, ‘cú i Ualaigh’ 1/§80 (= 2/796)
Uilleg, ‘a U.’ 2/151


Uilliamach, An t-., ‘sgor ... an Uilliam muigh’ 3/267
Uimealcus 1/§4
Uirí 1/§4

Úna 2/1221, ‘Conn mac Ú.’ 2/680, ‘mac Ú.’ 2/1261, 2/1644
Úr 1/§4
PLACE AND POPULATION NAMES

Achadh Airt 2/1046
Achall, ‘le fer nAichle’ 2/293
Adhar, ‘cradh fhóid A.’ 2/300
Adhna (?), ‘a cenn A.’ 2/966; see Aidhne
Ailldin 2/253 (= 3/758)
Airteach, ‘ré nglasláith nAirtigh’ 2/641
Albanach, 2/§17, 2/§18, ‘d’Alban-chàibh’ 2/710, 3/515
Almaineach 2/1388
Almha see Alma
Almhuine (Almaine), ‘slóigh Almhuine’ 2/1432, ‘bile Almaine’ 4/1011
Aoi (Aéi) see Mag A., Crúachain A.
Áolmhaich 2/§138
Ara 2/§152
Ára 2/§131, ‘cúl Árann’ 2/1128
Ard Macha see Macha

Bághaine, see Beann B.
Baile an Chláir 3/61
Baile an Tobair 3/62
Banbha 2/1148, 2/1163, 2/1552, 2/1582, 2/1730, 2/1918, 2/1999, 2/2117; see Inis B.
Baoi see Báí
Béal Feirsde see Bél F.
Beann Bághaine, ‘ó Bheinn Bh.’ 2/1446
Beann Balair, ‘a mbeinn Bhalair’ 2/1107
Beann Bladhma 2/1157
Beanna Bó, ‘fa Beanduibh Bó’ 3/514
Beirbhe, ‘ó lis na Beirbhe’ 2/1369, ‘fa bhruach mBeirbhe’ 2/1373
Béirre (Béire), ‘a B.’ 3/411
Beithil, ‘ón B.’ 3/970
Bél Feirsde, ‘srotha balbha Bheóil Fheirsdi’ 2/1408
Bennchar, ‘barr Bennchair’ 2/255
Birra, ‘fian Bh.’ 2/1456
Bladhma see Beann B.
Bóinn 2/1998
Boirneach 2/§11, 2/§12
Bóruimhe, ‘a bharr B.’ 3/323; see Brían Bóramha
Bretnach (Bretach) 2/§11, 2/§12, ‘na Bretnaigh’ 2/321, ‘Breatnaigh’ 2/1579
Brédach 2/§37
Bregmach (Bregmgh), 2/§138, 2/292
Bréifneach, ‘B. Bréithneach’ 2/§11, 2/§12, 2/§18
Bréithne 2/1958
Bréithneach see Bréifneach
Breta 2/§152
Bretnaig, ‘B. mhóra’ 2/§153, ‘ar lár Bretan’ 3/301
Broine, ‘barr B.’ 2/251
Cabha, ‘ar shuidhe shluaigh Chabha’ 2/1544
Cairbrech, see Donnchadh C.
Cál, ‘rí C.’ 2/1243
Callainn, ‘a cCalluinn’ 2/457, ‘a Callaind’ 2/1320
Caolìne an Druadh, ‘tolcha corra Ch.’ 2/1620
Carn, ‘fian Chairn’ 2/1838
Carn Fearadhag 3/614
Carn Fraích, ‘um Ch. bF.’ 3/586
Cé 2/246, 2/1098, 3/317, 3/490
Ceann Comair, ‘gu tocht Chinn Chomair’ 3/440
Ceann Coradh, ‘re teagh cCinn Choradh’ 1/§76
Ceara, ‘rí Ceara’ 2/828 (= 2/2028), ‘a fód choirmthe Ch.’ 2/2071
Cechna, ‘triath C.’ 2/972
Céis Coruind 2/1827, 3/100
Cenél Conaill 2/937
Ceóil, ‘fìath Ch.’ 2/1123
Ciárraighe, ‘san chríchsi Ch.’ 3/640
Ciárroighigh, ‘coin na gCiárroigh-ech’ 2/44
Cill Athrachta 2/1063
Cill Braín 2/1352
Cill Chluaine, ‘ar sgoil Chille Cluain’ ad 3/924
Cill Da Lú a 2/1810
Cill Lonán 2/1174
Cill Meadháin 3/609
Cinedh Cind 2/869
Clann Bhrún 2/1634, ‘Rainneam … Cloinn mBriain’ ad 3/888
Clann Bloid 3/169
Clann Caímh, ‘Deasmhumha fa chloinn C.’ 2/1888
Clann Chárthaínn Fhinn 3/202, ‘frémh Cáthruinn Fhinn’ 3/205,
‘cland Cáthuinn fhéil Fhinn’ 3/210
Clann Chéin 2/1583, ‘cru Chéin’ 2/1692; see Síl gCéin
Clann Chlúmán 3/4 (v.l. ‘Cholmán’ E, not recorded); see Ó Clúmháin
Clann Chonchubair 3/234
Clann Chonnla, ‘an chlainn sin Chonnla’ 1/§150,
Clann Chonnmaigh (Conmaigh) 2/1424, ‘a cloinn Conmaigh’ 2/309
Clann Cochláin, ‘trí fhedhaibh Cloinni Cochláin’ 2/329 (= 2/969)
Clanna Cuilén, ‘ós fhuilgidhibh chlann gC.’ 2/1326
Clann Eathach, ‘ar Cloinn Eathach’ 1/§11; see Eochuidh
Clann Fheórais, ‘ar clann Fheóraisne’ 2/179
Clann Fhíachrach 2/1899, ‘fuil F.’ 2/1899
Clann Néill, ‘dar cCloinn Néill Ne’ 2/125, ‘do chloinn … N.’ 3/687
Clann Rudhraighe 2/8; see Síl R.
Clann Suibhne, ‘do Chloinn tSuibhne’ 2/189
Clár Caisil 2/1331
Clár Cobhthaigh, ‘fedh Cláir Ch.’ 3/457
Clár Cormaic 2/1332
Clár Eithne, ‘tairthe chlár fháidhuiig E.’ 2/167
Cliach, see Cláchmhagh Cliú
Cláchmhagh, ‘ar beinn Cláchmhuiigh’ 1/§93; see Magh Cliach
Cluán Mháil 2/§97, ‘C. Mháil, do Chliaigh Mháil’ 1/§14
Clochar, ‘rí Clochar’ 3/349
Cluain Cuass, ‘fa Ch.’ 3/122
Cluáin Rámhfhada 2/§124
Cluain Tarbh 3/705, ‘a chThairthigh Th.’ 3/952
Clúain, ‘rí Chluana’ 2/502, ‘a ré Chluaine’ 2/1234, ‘ó Ch.’ (= C. Rámhfhada?) 2/1900
Clúanach (?), ‘ní fiu an eClúanaidh’ 2/1471
Cnáill Cú, ‘a chu Theamhrach í Chnáill Chú’ 2/2091
Cnapadal, ‘ar choilltibh Cnapaduil’ 3/936
Cnoc Balair, ‘eighir Chnuic Bh.’ 3/706
Cnoghbh, ‘rí C.’ 2/1358
Conailleach 2/§17, 2/§18, 2/755
Conallach 2/§17, 2/§18, ‘Conall-aigh’ 2/29
Cong 2/§192, ‘craobh Cunga’ 2/1554, ‘slegha sluaig Cunga’ 3/594
Connachta Mhór 2/§152
Connachta Mhór 2/§152
Connachta Mór 2/§11, 2/§12, 2/§18, ‘rí an chinidh Chonnachtaigh’ 2/780 (= 2/1917)
Cora Finne 2/§167, ‘ó Choraidh Finde’ 2/2051
Corcach 2/828 (= 2/2028), ‘a Corcaigh’ 2/1726
Corca Maigh 3/835
Crích Logha, ‘codhnachchríche L.’ 3/825
Crot, ‘flaith C.’ 3/82
Crích Logha, ‘codhnach chríche L.’ 3/825
Crot, ‘flaith C.’ 3/82
Crúachain see Crúacha
Crúachain, ‘ceólaireacht Crúacháin’ 3/258
Cruachanráith see Réith Cruachan
Cua, ‘tuir Ch.’ 2/862; see Cnáill C., Sliabh gCúia
Cúailgne, ‘Táin Bó C.’ 2/§175
Cualann, ‘cúiche C.’ 2/302, ‘cráobh Chúalann’ 2/1912
Cúil Cnámha, ‘gu C. C.’ 3/68
Cuílennach 2/§17, 2/§18
Cúl Ó bhFind 2/1273 (= 3/398)
Dannahargach 2/§11
Dáoil, ‘sreabh na Dáoiile’ 2/1959
Dean, ‘measga slóig Dean’ 3/238
Dloman, ‘fíath Díomuin’ 3/135
Doire 2/1249, ‘gég D.’ 3/307
Dor, ‘fían D.’ 2/1348, ‘barr D.’ 3/538
Drobhais 2/654
Druim Charraídi 2/653
Druim Clíabh, ‘ó Dh. Ch.’ 2/1249
Druim Deirg, ‘mílidh Dhroma D.’ 2/1980
Dubh, ‘fer Dubh’ 2/220, ‘cleath Dubhe’ 2/1303
Dún 2/1436
Dún Durrlais, ‘rí D. D.’ 1818
Dún Geanainn 2/1566
Dún Leódh 2/1578
Durlas, ‘réalta Durlais’ 3/530; see Dún Durrlais
Eabhroighe, ‘ó Eabhroighibh’ 1/§21
Eachdgha (Eachtghe), ‘fian Eachdgha’ 2/1491, ‘d’arguin ghlais-
beann ghort nEachtghe’ 1/§14; see Eachta

Eachta, ‘bile E.’ 2/931; see Eachdgha

Eachtghe see Eachdgha

Ealla 2/§152


Édair, ‘sgath Édair’ 3/296; see Aed Édair

Éileach (Éleach) 2/§11, 2/§12, 2/§18, 3/165


Éire, 1/§15, 2/1806 et passim


Eithne, An, 3/644; see Clár E.

Éle Mhór 2/§152

Énna, ‘crích É.’ 2/1673, ‘gort Éna’ 2/1734

Éóghanach 2/§17, 2/§18, 3/786, ‘ag Eóganchaib’ 3/650

Éóraip 2/§13, ‘ó fhiadh Eórpa’ 2/437, ‘toirrichim firh fhinnEórpa’ 2/1869

Es Día, ‘gu doindÉs nDía’ 2/1933


Fánaid see Domhnall Fánaid


Feóir, ‘fa Fh.’ 3/856, ‘Clár Fheóire’ 2/1304

Fiachrach 2/§11, 2/§12, 2/§18, ‘láech na mná Fiachruigí’ 2/769; see Clann Fh.


Fidnach Bera 3/735

Findchora, ‘fa chleith fhéil Fhindschoradh’ 2/745


Finnloch, ‘do guais hherchon Finnlocha’ 2/332

Fir Cheall 2/839

Fóidla 2/1211, 2/1854, 2/2009

Foinseann 2/§129

Formael, ‘marcach ... Formaeili’ 3/181

Fraingc, ‘fód na Fraingci’ 3/131

Frémhann Mhidhe 2/§129

Fuil Ghadhra 2/1239

Fuil Oilliam 2/1816

Gabhrán, ‘géis Gabhráin’ 3/553

Gael, ‘um géis nGaeil’ 3/403, ‘um ges nGaíl’ 3/409

Gaídíl, ‘ar Gaídelaib’ 3/969, ‘snáth úaimme Gaídíheal is Gall’ 2/1972

Gaileangach 2/§11, 2/§12, 2/§17, 2/§18

Gaileanga Mhór 2/§152

Gáilían, ‘rí Gáilían’ 3/1

Gallbhaile 2/1915
Glaoi, ‘um ghéis nG.’ 3/643
Gleann Fleisi 1/§28
Gleann na nGealt 2/1496
Gréine, ‘a rí G.’ 3/754
Hí see Í
Í Anmchaidh, ‘suidhe sealga ó nA.’ 2/1820
Í Bhruiún 2/1583
Í Dróna 2/1606
Í Echach, ‘Hí E.’ 2/2083
Í Fhailghe 1/§53
Í Modha 2/1653
Iarmhumha 2/1050
Ibdán 2/1968
Íle 2/1266, 2/1911
Íleach, ‘Muileach 7 Íleach’ 2/1169
Imghán, ‘a leómhain Imgháin’ 3/500
Imleach 2/§11, 2/§12, ‘isin I.’ 2/1012, ‘rí Imlighe’ 2/574
Indía 2/1519
Inis Bhanbha 2/1152
Inis Briaín 3/127
Inis Ealga, ‘trí rígna Innsi hEalga’ 3/649
Inis Eóghuin, ‘gríanchéillidh Insi hE.’ 2/2015
Inis Fáil, ‘ag súr Innse F.’ 2/1405
Inis Glúaire 2/1257
Innse Gall 2/1474
Irras, ‘farthar Irrais’ 2/2006
Laí (Laei) 2/1661, 2/1825, ‘um leóman Laei’ 3/508
Laighin 2/§180, 2/1180, 2/1203, 3/672, ‘ar lár Laighean’ 2/1722
Laighneach, 2/§11, 2/§12, 2/§18
Leac Lughaídh 3/279, L. Luighdheach 2/1895, see Lia L.
Leth Mogha 3/382, 3/533
Lia Lughaídh 2/1896; see Leac L.
Líatruim 2/415
Life, ‘fan ciúnL.’ 2/496
Lind Féig, 2/§176, ‘maighre Linde F.’ 2/2063
Line, ‘sgath L.’ 2/1718
Loch Bó, ‘rí Lacha Bó’ 2/1718
Loch Éirne 2/792
Loch Feabail 3/377
Loch in Sguir, ‘laech Locha in S.’ 2/499
Loch Léin 2/717, 2/884, 2/1718 (v.l.), 2/2159
Loch Oirbsion, ‘eó fhionnLocha O.’ 3/366
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Long Clíach 1/§51, ‘L. Ch.’ 1/§61, ‘a Luing C.’ 2/1774
Lúachair 2/1829, ‘fian Lúachra’ 2/2019
Lúachair Deadhaidh 2/§200, 2/2159
Lúan, ‘láech Lúain’ 2/1894
Luighne, ‘guin ghéige L.’ 2/1380
Lusmhach 2/§138

Macha, ‘do baidb M.’ 3/285, ‘Pádraig M.’ 3/841; see Magh M.
Magh Breagh, ‘a chlár Mhuighe … B.’ 3/31
Magh Céidne, ‘uaidne Moighe caoin Ch.’ 2/1172
Magh Clíach, ‘d’tis roMoigi … Clíach’ 3/203; see Clíachmhagh
Magh Ele 2/991
Magh Fáil 2/§176
Magh Feimhin (Feimin) 2/1319, 3/513
Magh Learga, ‘Ar Mhuighe L.’ 2/1820
Magh Lí, 3/588; see Lí
Magh Luirg, ‘go M. seanL.’ 2/1510
Magh Macha 2/134
Magh Máighe 2/1564; see Máigh
Magh Máoin, ‘nár fholaigh cluíum Moigi Main’ 2/175, ‘réim Mhoighi … Mhaein’ 3/523, ‘ar Mhaghnas Mhoighe Máein’ 3/775 see Máonmach

Magh Leah, ‘Ar Mhuighe L.’ 2/1820
Magh Lí, 3/588; see Lí
Magh Luirg, ‘go M. seanL.’ 2/1510
Magh Macha 2/134
Magh Máighe 2/1564; see Máigh
Magh Máoin, ‘nár fholaigh cluíum Moigi Main’ 2/175, ‘réim Mhoighi … Mhaein’ 3/523, ‘ar Mhaghnas Mhoighe Máein’ 3/775 see Máonmach

Magh Marr, ‘timcheal gealmag Moigí M.’ 3/782
Magh Mis, ‘ar baidhhb n-éisgidh Moige M.’ 2/1966
Magh Monaidh 2/1341
Magh Muile, ‘a Moigh Mh.’ 2/1776
Magh Muireadhaigh 2/1316
Magh Oíligh, ‘a moigh mhínOilígh’ 2/1518
Magh Sainbh, ‘flaith Mhuighe S.’ 2/1837
Magh Seanáir, ‘ar muigh S.’ 1/§4
Maicne Mathgamhna 2/538
Máigh 2/706, ‘ón Mh.’ 2/2097; see Magh MÁigh
Maineach 2/§11, 2/§12
Maing, ‘sreabh na gealMhainge’ 2/1218
Mála, ‘craebh Mhálann’ 2/372; see Málan
Máleann 2/§129
Manann 2/§129
Marr, ‘tuir Mharr’ 2/628, ‘rí M.’ 3/25; see Magh M.
Midhe, ‘géis geilmidhe’ 2/197; see Slemain M.
Midheach, 2/§11, 2/§12, 2/§18, 2/837
Mis 2/1195, 2/1321, 2/1887; see Magh M.
Muileach, ‘M. agus Íleach’ 2/1169
Muimhneach 2/§12, 2/§18, 2/1895
Muine Masáin 3/812
Muir Ruadh 3/978
Murbhach, ‘oireara míne Murbh-aigh’, 2/1723
Nás 2/1960
Oil Finn 2/§166
Oileach 2/1518, 3/21, ‘dí féin achaidh Oiligh’ 2/324, ‘guala fir Oiligh’ 3/862; see O. Néid, Magh Oiligh
Oileach Néid 2/1434
Oileallach 2/§17, 2/§18
Oirghíalla 2/§152, ‘Ríoga Oirgiall’ 3/915
Oirghíallach 2/§17, 2/§18
Port Láirge 2/1448 (= 2/1916)
Port Monaigh, ‘Pádraig Puirt M.’ 3/786
Port Pharrthais 2/1517
Puiérrcha, Na, 2/1891
Ra(o)iliu, see Roílinn
Ráth Breagh 3/77
Ráth Brénuinn 3/602
Ráth Créachan, ‘san ráithsi chráioibhe C.’ 1/§23, ‘a cCrúachanráith’ 1/§93; see Créachan
Ráth Dá Thí 3/849
Ráth Teamhra see Team(h)air
Rodhba 2/1997
Róimh (Rómh) 2/§149, 2/1631
Ros Cré 3/490
Ros Ruadh, ‘fráoch í Rosa Rúaidh’ 1/§125
Sagsa (Saghsa Mhór) 2/§152
Sagsach, ‘neart an tslóigh Shagsoigh’ 2/533
Sagsanach (Saghsanach) 2/§17
Sagsuin, ‘S. Saghsuin’ 2/§153
Scech, ‘rí S.’ 3/293
Sídh Fear Feimin, ‘a S. F. F.’ 3/512
Síl Anmchadh 2/1819; see Anmchadh
Síl Bloid, ‘re S. mB.’ 2/1569; see Clann B.
Síl Briain, ‘do shíol mB.’ 2/1769
Síl gCais, ‘ar an S. gCais’ 3/140; see Dál Cais
Síl Anmchadha 2/1819; see Anmchadh
Síl Bloid, ‘re S. mB.’ 2/1569; see Clann B.
Síl Briain, ‘do shíol mB.’ 2/1769
Síl gCais, ‘ar an S. gCais’ 3/140; see Dál Cais
Tellach Conaill 3/880
Temair Érna 2/§200, 2/2160
Tír Chonuill, ‘eng ré T.’ 2/643
Tlachtgha, ‘craobh Th.’ 2/1025
Tor Neamhrúaidh 1/§4
Traei, ‘do toirneadh T.’ 3/478
Tráigh Li 2/1932
Trí Treana, ‘fear na dT. Trean’ 2/1599
Truim, ‘sídh T.’ 2/567
Tuadhmhumha 2/1425
Tulach an Triúir, ‘tealaigh an Triúir’ 2/1589; see Tulach na dTrí bFear

University College Dublin

Tulach na dTrí bFear 2/2034
Tulach Té, ‘a Tulaig Thé’ 3/92
Tulach, ‘d’fhéin Tulcha’ 2/27

Úí, see Í
Ulltach 2/§12, 2/§18, 2/1892, ‘fine Ulltaigh’ 2/284, 2/294
Umallach 2/§17, 2/823, ‘ar Umhallchaibh’ 2/756

PÁDRAIG A. BREATNACH
WHAT has long been regarded as the definitive article on the place-name Dún Cermna was published in 1939 by T. F. O’Rahilly. In it O’Rahilly accepted without question Geoffrey Keating’s identification of the site with Dún Mic P[h]ádraig (Downmacpatrick), the de Courcy stronghold on the Old Head of Kinsale, Co. Cork. In his usual forthright manner, O’Rahilly comments: ‘Early tradition so unmistakably connects Dún Cermna with the Érainn of Co. Cork that we may justifiably equate it with the town of Ivernys, which, as we have remarked, Ptolemy places in this very district.’ One cannot help feeling that O’Rahilly’s prime objective in this article was to promote his cherished beliefs regarding the predominance of the Builg / Érainn / Iverni in south Munster in the early historical period. He later developed this view: ‘The only point of difference between the names was that Érainn (like Ptolemy’s Iverni) was applied especially to those Builg who dwelt in the south of Ireland.’

Two shortcomings are apparent in O’Rahilly’s article. One is his overlooking of the fact that several different places are styled Dún Cermna in medieval Irish texts (as detailed below). The other involves the probability that Cermna was not a personal name. The Lebor Gabála tradition that Ireland was jointly ruled by two brothers named Sobairche and Cermna (Find) is justly described by O’Rahilly as ‘a palpably artificial legend’, invented because of the existence of sites named Dún Sobairche in the north of Ireland (Dunseverick, near the Giant’s Causeway, Co. Antrim), and Dún Cermna in the south. But if Cermna was not a personal name, the inference must be that it was a territorial name in its own right, and Dún Cermna a fort within its borders. O’Rahilly did not draw this

1 Thomas F. O’Rahilly, ‘Dún Cermna’ JCHAS 44 (1939) 16-20.
2 FFÉ II 124; also I 110.
4 EIHM 54.
5 D. A. Binchy refers to a poet named Cermnae, supposed author of Cóic Conara Fugill and of the lost tract Aí Cermmai, but points out that the name appears only in a late introduction which has no historical value, and that it ‘may be ultimately derived from Dún Cermna on the Old Head of Kinsale’ (‘The date and provenance of Uraicecht becc’ Ériu 18 (1958) 44-54 (at p. 51)).
conclusion, although he did quote from Máel Mura’s poem enumerating the battles gained by Tuathal Techtmair over the people of Munster, which included *cath Ceranna frí Caicher*. This he explained away in a footnote: ‘Here Ceranna = Dúin Chermna’. But he failed to notice a reference from *Suidigud Tellaich Temra* to places in Munster: *a Cléiriu, a Cermnu, a Raithlind*, and another to *Conchobar Ceranna*, named in the genealogy of Ua Cobthaig of Corcu Loígde.

**CERMNA IN MEATH**

O’Rahilly’s lack of reference to Ceranna was noted by Tomás Ó Concheanainn who in 1971 published a well-documented study, ‘Cermna in Meath’, the main conclusions of which it will be useful to summarise here:

(i) The name Ceranna was frequently confused with Cerna, also in Meath. In the Metrical Dindshenchas poem entitled ‘Temair V’ a lengthy list of placenames begins with those around Tara; l. 9 reads: *Cermna, Caprach, is Caland*, and l. 30: *Cerna, Collamair, Cnogba*. Variants from other MSS for *Cermna* in l. 9 are *Cerna* and *Cernad*, while a corresponding line in *LL* puts both names side by side: *Cerna Ceranna Coprach Cár*. This line in *LL* begins a six-line verse on Cerna, on which there is a much longer poem of twenty-five quatrains in the Metrical Dindshenchas. No poem or prose section is devoted to Ceranna.

---

6 O’Rahilly, ‘Dún Ceranna’ 18; see also GT 66.
8 John O’Donovan, ‘Geinealach Chorca Laidhe’ *Miscellany of the Celtic Society* (Dublin 1849) 1-140 (at p. 58).
9 Tomás Ó Concheanainn, ‘Cermna in Meath’ *Ériu* 22 (1971) 87-96.
10 *MD* I 38-45.
11 *LL* 22329. This line is also in Whitley Stokes, *The Bodleian Dinnshenchas* (London, repr. from *Folk-Lore* 3 (1892)) 512 (no. 48).
12 *MD* IV 202-9. In his 1971 article Ó Concheanainn accepted the judgement of Rudolf Thurneysen ( *Die irische Helden- und Konigsage* (Halle 1921) 36-46), giving precedence to the *LL* version of the Dindshenchas. In later studies, however, Ó Concheanainn put forward the theory that the recension as contained in BB, Lec., Book of Uí Maine and the Rennes MS was the earliest, with the others, including the *LL* version, ultimately deriving from it (‘The three forms of Dinnshenchas Érenn’ *Journal of Celtic Studies* 3 (1981-2) 88-131; ‘A pious redactor of Dinnshenchas Érenn’ *Ériu* 33 (1982) 85-98). (I wish to express my gratitude to Tomás Ó Con Cheanaíin for giving me the benefit of his scholarship in this matter.)
(ii) In regard to the vexed question as to whether Cerna and Cermna were two separate places or just different forms of the same name, Ó Concheanainn holds them to be distinct. Cerna has been identified with the townlands of Carnes (E / W), par. / bar. Duleek, Co. Meath, but the exact position of Cermna, seemingly the name of a district, has never been determined. Of the two, Cerna is the more frequently referred to, in the Dindshenchas and elsewhere, so that by the eleventh century ‘Cermna in Meath was an unrecognised name or a name of no importance.’

(iii) Ó Concheanainn shows that at all times a well-defined connection existed between Cermna and Tara. The eponymous Cermna, for example, according to LG, slew Eochu Étguðach i cath Temra, and lines from a poem on the battle of Ros na Ríg contain these words addressed by Conchobar mac Nessa to his grandson, Erc:

Do gessaib ríg Temrach tair
a fhlaith Cermna can ni clé.

One of the prohibitions of the king of Temair to the east, O prince of Cermna without crookedness.

(iv) A revival of interest in the name Cermna seems to have occurred in later centuries, as two instances from fíanaigecht show:

(a) Tinóilis Cairibri na ccreach
colamhain teanna Teamhrach …
Cruinnigit Ulaidh Eamhna
fa Cairibri chosgrach Chearma [sic].

Raiding Cairbre gathered the stout Columns of Tara … The Ulstermen from Éamhain gather around conquering Cairbre of Cearma.

---

13 Cath Mhuighe Léana or The Battle of Magh Leana, ed. Eugene O’Curry (Dublin 1855) 66; Paul Walsh, Irish men of learning (Dublin 1947) 233. Edmund Hogan also connects it with the Patrician site, æclessia Cerna (see The Patrician texts in the Book of Armagh, ed. Ludwig Bieler (Dublin 1979) 130), which he identifies with tl. / par. Kilcarn, bar. Skreen, Co. Meath (Ononmasicon Goedelicum (Dublin 1910) 229).
14 Ó Concheanainn, ‘Cermna in Meath’ 90.
15 LG V 210 (= LL 2101-2).
16 Cath Ruis na Ríg for Bóinn, ed. Edmund Hogan (Dublin 1892) 57; LL 23249-50.
17 Duanaire Finn, ed. Eoin MacNeill and Gerard Murphy, 3 vols (London & Dublin 1908, 1933, 1953) II 40.
Agus do éirigheadar Fiana Éireann ar thaoibh Mhic Lughach do éirigheadar fir Bhreagh 7 Mhidhe 7 Chearmna 7 Columhna na Teamhrach ar thaoibh Chairbre.

And the Fiana of Ireland rose up on the side of the son of Lughaidh; the men of Breagha and Midhe and Cearmna and the Columns of Tara rose up on the side of Cairbre.\footnote{Tóruigheacht Dhiarmada agus Ghráinne, ed. Nessa Ní Sheaghdha (Dublin 1967) ll 178-9, 1584-5.}

A still later development was the adoption of Cearmna as a synonym for Teamhair / Breagha / Banbha by sixteenth- and seventeenth-century poets of Leath Chuinn eulogising their patrons. Ó Concheanainn discusses three examples of this:\footnote{Ó Concheanainn, ‘Cermna in Meath’ 92-5.} Cormac Cearmna (O’Hara);\footnote{The Book of O’Hara. Leabhar Í Eadhra, ed. Lambert McKenna (Dublin 1939) l. 3109.} Fir dar chóir cáin na seinChearmna (MacMahon);\footnote{Aithdioghluim Dána, ed. Lambert McKenna, 2 vols (Dublin 1939) I 77.} don chhraoi-se Chearmna (O’Reilly).\footnote{Poems on the O’Reillys, ed. James Carney (Dublin 1950) l. 3326.} Further examples in the same mode are: ríghe chríche Cearmna (O’Rourke);\footnote{‘Tuireadh Aodha Úi Ruairc’ Transactions of the Ossianic Society V 1857 (App. 1) 133-151 (at p. 140).} Cnodhbha, cleath Cearmna is Colt (Nugent).\footnote{Éamonn Ó Tuathail, ‘Nugentiana’ Éigse 2 (1940) 4-14 (p. 10).}

Consideration must, however, be given to the possibility that Cerna and Cermna (Cerma) did refer to the same place. Our only clue to the location of Cermna comes from a poem on Cnogba:

Dolluid Mac in Óc ergna
fodess co Cerainn Cermna.

The illustrious Mac in Óc came southward to Ceru Cermna.\footnote{MD III 40-41.}

Presumably Mac in Óc left from Newgrange (Brug Meic in Óc) on the feast of Samain to travel southwards ‘to play with his fellow-warriors’; certainly the townland of Carnes lies in that direction.
A Dinnshenchas poem on Carn Conaill relates how Umór’s people (Fir Bolg) came from ‘Crích Cruithne’ to seek from Cairpre, king of Temair, some of the best lands in Brega, including *treb Chermna* ‘the farmland of Cermna’. This is how it appears in the Rennes / BB version, but *LL* has *treb Cherna* (l. 19705), while *LG* has *treb Chermna* (v.l. *Chearna*, Lec. 2). When Dubhaltach Mac Fhir Bhisigh came to copy his grandfather’s version of *LG*, in a prose summary he wrote *Cermna nó Cerna*. This indicates how a seventeenth-century historian (perhaps following his predecessors) was under the impression that these were two versions of the one place-name. The question remains, however, a complicated and very much an open one.

**DÚN CERMNA: THE VARIOUS SITES**

(1) **Meath**

Folamh anocht Dún Chearmna
do Ráith Teamhra is cúis bhaoghail.

Deserted tonight is Dún Cermna; a hazardous plight for the fortress of Tara.

Given the literary associations created between Cermna and Temair, it is no surprise to find such a name in this well-known poem (attributed to the early tenth-century queen Gormlaith) which obviously relates to the Tara area. At least three other sites can lay claim to being so designated, according to various legendary and genealogical sources – as detailed below – but none has left any trace in later toponymy. So it is debatable if any of the four had a real, as opposed to a literary, existence – excepting the one on the south coast which

---

26 *MD* III 440.
27 *LG* IV 64.
28 Ó Concheanainn refers to it as ‘a late text of the introductory prose summary which some reviser prefixed to the Carn Conaill poem’ (‘Cermna in Meath’ 90).
29 *GT* 102; ‘Leabhar na nGenelach’ UCD Add. Ir. MS 14, p. 66.
30 See discussion by Ó Concheanainn, particularly in relation to ‘Cera in or near Cermna’ (‘Cermna in Meath’ 91-2).
32 I do not include Dr John O’Brien’s identification of ‘Dún Cearma’ with the town of Wicklow (*Irish English Dictionary* (Paris 1768) 205), as there does not appear to be any textual evidence for it.
33 I have elsewhere argued that *Carn Uí Néid* was a purely literary creation, used mainly by writers of Leth Cuinn and not current locally; see D. Ó Murchadha, ‘Carn Uí Néid’ *Dinnseanchas* V (1973) 101-113.
presumably gave rise to the Sobairche / Cermna legend, and which is mentioned in the annals for 858 (see below). The author of Folamh anocht could have had in mind a site in Cermna / Cerna, referred to above (p. 73), perhaps on or near the burial-place celebrated in the (prose) Dindshenchas of Cerna: is and atá primrelich airthir Midhe 7 Breg ‘there is the chief cemetery of eastern Mide and Brega’.³⁴ Such sites were often fortified and used as residences. In the Metrical Dindshenchas the opening verse indicates the possible proximity of a dún to the burial site:

Cía bem sund ’nar suidi sel
hi cnuc Cerna na coinnem
atá thall ’sin Cherna chrúaid
drem, ’sa menma ri mór-úaill.

Though here we sit a while
on the hill of Cerna, where troops find quarters,
yonder in stern Cerna lie
a multitude whose heart was set on pride.³⁵

(2) Ulster

O’Rahilly made reference³⁶ to Corcu Bairdíne from Dún Cermna, and to Dál mBairdíne, who were one of the divisions of the Érainn, according to their genealogy.³⁷ He assumed that this Dún Cermna was in the south, mainly because an earlier account states that Der Draigen, wife of the mythical Mug Ruith (supposed ancestor of Fir Muige Féine) and her sister, mother of Cairbre Liphechair, were described as di siair do Chorco Bardéinne ó Dún Chermna.³⁸ But Mug Ruith was regarded as a son of Fergus mac Róig of the Ulaid, and Cairbre a son of Cormac mac Airt. All those details are related in the section of Senchas Síl Ír entitled De forslointib Ulad iar coitchiund in so,³⁹ which would make a southern location for this Dún Cermna extremely unlikely. Similarly, the Érainn genealogy from which O’Rahilly quoted⁴⁰ has a distinct northern orientation. One segment of Dál mBairdíne, we are told, namely Síl nÓengusa,

³⁵ MD IV 202-3.
³⁷ Now published in CGH 324 d 44 - f 13 (= LL 42204-57).
³⁸ CGH 157, 41-2.
³⁹ CGH 157, 19-47.
⁴⁰ O’Rahilly, ‘Dún Cermna’ 19.
was extirpated by Leth Cuinn, after the Érainn had won ten battles over the Ulaid, and lost to them in eight. There is no genealogy of the Érainn in the earliest compilation (Rawl. B 502), and that provided in the slightly later Book of Leinster is an obvious fabrication. One section, *m. Sin m. Rosin m. Thréin m. Rothréin m. Rogein m. Ardil*, is a direct borrowing from *Geneloige Rí nUlad*.

We also encounter Bairdíne as the name of the doorkeeper’s father at Emain Macha in the Ulster story *Tochmarc Emire*:

> Scél mac Bairdini, a quo Belach mBairdini nominatur, doirsid Emna Macha.  
> Scél son of Bairdini, from whom Belach mBairdini is named, doorkeeper of Emain Macha.

In the annals the only reference to Corcu or Dál mBairdíne is in the obit of Columbán or Colmán, abbot of Clonmacnoise, described in *Ann. Tig.* (s.a. 627) as *filii Bardani do Dháil Baird Ulaid*, and in *AFM* (s.a. 623) as *Colman mac Ua [? recte moccu] Barrdani (i. do Dal Barrdaine a chenel).* This equivalence of *Baird Ulaid* and *Barrdani* again points to an Ulster location for Corcu / Dál mBairdíne – and to a site in Ulaid territory for this Dún Cermna. Perhaps the place was at Slieve Gullion in Co. Armagh, where we find a *síd* named ‘Tech Cermnai’ in *Senchas Dáil Fhiatach: Síd Culind quod dicitur Tech Cermnai i Sléib Chulind*.

(3) Béirre

In his poem *Can a mbunadas na nGáedel* Máel Mura of Othain lists a number of kings named Lugaid, including *rí Dúin Chermna Berre [baigne] Lugaid Laigde,* an awkward title which O’Rahilly disposed of by translating as ‘king of Dún Cermna [and] Bérre’. The word

---

41 CGH 324 e 60 - f 13 (= LL 42253-7).
42 CGH 161 b 32 - bb 44.
43 Compert Con Culainn and other stories, ed. A. G. Van Hamel (Dublin 1933) 21 (v.l. Barnéni, LU 10145).
44 The name is also listed in *CGSH* no. 707.303 (= LL 50988) as ‘Colman m. ua Bairrddeni’ (and indexed under ‘Moccu Bairdéné’).
45 CGH 330 b 12 (= LL 43530-31).
46 LL 16134; the LL version was edited by J. H. Todd, *The Irish version of the Historia Brittonum of Nennius* (Dublin 1848) 262. The above line omits baigne, thereby lacking two syllables. Three of the more reliable MSS, NLI G 131 (Phillipps 17082, f.27), RIA A iv 4, and B iv 2, all have baigne / báoighne. (I am indebted for this information to Dr John Carey who is currently preparing a new edition of the poem.)
baigne (v.l. báoighne) is difficult to explain. The editors of LL did not put the word in the text, but in a footnote made reference to three manuscripts which had baigne and to one with baide, a word which occurs two lines further on. Perhaps there is a connection between baide and later baí / baoí – as found in a críchaib Bái is Béire,47 and in Baoi Bhéirre,48 which in AFM s.a. 1602 (VI 2808) is used to describe the island (recte promontory) on which stood the castle of Dunboy. In Scéla Cano meic Gartnáin this site is called Dún mBaíthe (v.l. mBáithi / Baiti / Buíthe), the chief residence of Illand mac Scandláin, king of Corcu Loígde.49 This name, as Binchy pointed out (p. xxiv), is borrowed from the Illand mac Scandláin who was son of the king of Osraige (AI s.a. 646, 656), and links up with the old tradition of the Osraige having been under the sway of Corcu Loígde. It seems possible that Dún mBaíthe and Dún Cermna Béirre may have been intended for the same place.50

O’Rahilly also quoted from an early tenth-century poem, contained in the preface to Amra Choluim Chille, which listed twelve men named Aed who were said to have attended the Convention of Druim Cett (A.D. 575), among whom was: Aed Bolgc rí Dúin Chermina chaíss / Aed mac Grillini glannais.51 He utilised this to bolster his Builg / Érainn theory, but in quoting from the Bodleian version of the poem he overlooked the version in LB (also found in Laud 615): Aed bolc mac grilleni gloin / ba ri isin iarmumain.52 The actual extent of Iarmuma is somewhat vague; according to the Tripartite Life, Patrick did not travel tar Luachoir [siar] i níarmumain,53 that is to say, the territory to the west of Sliab Luachra, in Co. Kerry. Keating gave its boundaries as:

ó Luachair Dheaghaidh go fairrge siar, agus a tarsna ó Ghleann ua Ruachta [Roughty valley, Kenmare] go Sionann.54

47 Acallamh na Senórach, ed. Whitley Stokes, Irische Texte 4/1 (Leipzig 1900) l. 736.
50 Binchy (p. xxiv) follows O’Rahilly (ibid. 16) in assuming that Béirre was not in Ross diocese, and therefore an area ‘lost’ to the Corcu Loígde. But most of the Bear peninsula was (and still is, in the Church of Ireland dispensation) in the diocese of Ross, and was occupied by the Úi Eidirsceoil in the thirteenth century.
52 LB 238 C 16; Kuno Meyer (from Laud 615) in ZCP 13 (1919) 8.
53 Bethu Phátraic, ed. Kathleen Mulchrone (Dublin 1939) l. 2430.
54 FFÉ I 126.
Generally, the references to Iarmuma point to Co. Kerry, and it could have included the Béirre peninsula (which is divided between Cos Kerry and Cork) – but could hardly have extended as far eastwards as the Old Head of Kinsale. In the Banshenchus the above-mentioned Illand mac Scandláin is described in one section as *rí iar Muman*, and in another as *rí Corco Laige*. In either case Béirre would suit the context, whereas the Old Head would not.

(4) **SE coast**

Of the numerous references to this place in the literature, almost all derive from the statement in *LG* that Ireland was for a time divided between joint rulers Sobairche and Cerma, sons of Ebrec son of Ír, the first of the Ulaid to rule over Ireland. The dividing line was from the Boyne estuary to Limerick, *ó Indber Cholptha co Luimneach*. One of the verses in *LG* tells us:

```
Dún Cermna nad chreis, celar
tess for muir medrach Muman.
```

Dún Cermna, no paltry place, is concealed southward on the lively sea of Mumu.

Although in *Senchas Síl Ír* we are told that Cermna was the builder of Dún Cermna, the genealogy of the Érainn in *LL* assigns its construction to Caicher (son of Eterscél), a name which recurs frequently in the context of Dún Cermna, apparently in Munster. As noted above (p. 72) *cath Cermna fri Caicher* was one of the Munster battles accredited to Tuathal Techmar. Caicher is allotted three sons in the *LL* version of the genealogy, but Lec. / BB add three others, one of whom, Láechrí, is nominated as progenitor of Érainn Dúin Cermna, and (under the cognomen ‘Gallchú’) of Muinter Gallchon,

56 *LG* V 210 (= *LL* 2098-104); *CGH* 156a32-36; ‘Laud Gen.’ in ZCP 8 (1911) 325. So celebrated were their forts that in the Triads they are named as two of the three most famous in Ireland: *Trí dúine Hérenn – Dún Sobairche, Dún Cermna, Cathair Chonruí* (K. Meyer, *The Triads of Ireland* (Todd Lecture Series 13 (Dublin 1906) 4).
57 *LG* V 212; also *AI* 10.
58 *LG* V 442 (= *LL* 2151-2).
59 *CGH* 156 a 34.
60 *CGH* 324 d 29 (= *LL* 42207-8).
who are given a Munster provenance.\textsuperscript{61} The position is best summed up in one of the genealogical collections in the Book of Lecan:

\begin{quote}
Ar slicht Mael Umai mc. Caithir ita Erna Medoin Muman 7 ar slicht Duifni mc. Caithir ita Corco Duifni 7 ar slicht Laechri mc. Caithir ita Erna Duine Cermna theas 7 is iad is ergna.\textsuperscript{62}
\end{quote}

The Érna of Mid-Munster descend from Mael Umai son of Caither, and Corcu Duibne descend from Duibne son of Caither and the Érna of Dún Cermna to the south descend from Laechri son of Caither, and the last are the most distinguished.

Caicher features in Sanas Cormaic, in the story of Cáier, king of Connachta, ousted by his nephew, Néde, whose satire caused blemishes to appear on the king’s face. Cáier then fled and took refuge in Dún Cermnai la Cacheur mac nEitrisgéli.\textsuperscript{63} There may also be an echo of the name in a Dindshenchas poem on Laimuin: Maic Achir (v.l. chaithir) Chirr cháim ón chúan / d’Érnaib Muman na marc-shlúag ‘The gentle sons of Acher Cerr from the harbour, sprung of the Erainn of Munster of the cavaliers’, although the father of ‘Acher’ is here named as Eochu / Eochaid Finn.\textsuperscript{64} But then the artificial character of the whole construct can be detected in another section of LG where the builder of Dún Sobairche, Dún Cermna, Dún mBinne and Carraig Brachaide in Murbolc is said to be Mantán, son of Caicher,\textsuperscript{65} but, it would seem, a different Caicher, for he was son of Náma,\textsuperscript{66} and a druid.\textsuperscript{67}

In a treatise on the kingship of Dál Cais, a list of renowned places in Munster captured by Conall Echluath includes:

\begin{quote}
Caiseal, Coinchend, Raithlenn, Lethna
Focharmháigh, Dún Cearnna chain.\textsuperscript{68}
\end{quote}

What appears to be the latest reference to Dún Cermna occurs in a listing, in verse, of the Munster chiefs who fell at the battle of

\begin{footnotes}
\item[61] CGH 377 (note k-k).
\item[62] GT 160.
\item[63] Sanas Cormaic, ed. Kuno Meyer (Dublin 1913) 58-60 (at p. 59).
\item[64] MD III 68-70.
\item[65] LG V 156 /170 (= LL 1841-3).
\item[66] LL 1125, 1154.
\item[67] LL 196-207.
\item[68] An Leabhar Muimhneach, ed. Tadhg Ó Donnchadha (Baile Átha Cliath [1940]) 84. There is another version of this in FFÉ II 170.
\end{footnotes}
Belach Mugna in 908, one of whom was Domhnall a Dún Cermna caomh,\textsuperscript{69} also termed by Keating Domhnall, rí Dún Cearmna.\textsuperscript{70}

GEOFFREY KEATING

This brings us to Keating’s unequivocal identification:

Do ghabh Cearmna an leath budh dheas, agus do rinne dún láimh ré fairrge theas .i. Dún Cearmna agus is ris ráidhtear Dún Mic Pádraig i gerích Chúirseach aníú.\textsuperscript{71}

Cearmna obtained the southern division, and built a dún beside the southern sea, namely, Dún Cearmna; and it is now called Dún Mic Pádraig in the Courcy’s country.

That location was accepted by later writers in Latin and English, e.g. Roderic O’Flaherty (1685),\textsuperscript{72} Sir Richard Cox (1687),\textsuperscript{73} Charles Smith (1750),\textsuperscript{74} as well as by such nineteenth-century scholars as O’Donovan,\textsuperscript{75} Todd,\textsuperscript{76} O’Curry\textsuperscript{77} and Hennessy,\textsuperscript{78} and was accordingly adopted by O’Rahilly as part of his Érainn proposition.

We do not know why or when Keating decided upon this location. In 1626, a decade or so before he compiled \textit{Forus Feasa ar Éirinn}, a lament, attributed to him, was composed on the death of Seaghán Óg Mac Gearailt, Lord Decies. This was an \textit{aisling}-type poem, in which the poet spoke to the fairy woman, Clíodhna, who related to him all the places in Ireland she had visited in her sorrow. These included \textit{Dún Cearmna, Árd Macha, is Árainn} in a quatrain devoted

\textsuperscript{69} \textit{FAI}, s.a. 908 (p. 160).
\textsuperscript{70} \textit{FFÉ} III 208; also \textit{FAI}, s.a. 908 (p. 156).
\textsuperscript{71} \textit{FFÉ} II 124-5; also I 110.
\textsuperscript{72} Roderic O’Flaherty, \textit{Ogygia} (London 1685) 205.
\textsuperscript{73} Sir Richard Cox, ‘Regnum Corcagiense’ \textit{JCHAS} 8 (1902) 173; idem, ‘Carbriæ Notīta’ \textit{JCHAS} 12 (1906) 147.
\textsuperscript{74} Charles Smith, \textit{Antient and present state of the county and city of Cork}, 2 vols (Dublin 1750) I 54, 241. (Smith frequently acknowledges Keating among his sources; Cox refers vaguely to ‘Irish chronicles’, but his account of Dún Cermna is obviously based on Keating’s.)
\textsuperscript{75} O’Donovan, \textit{AFM} I 44.
\textsuperscript{76} Todd, \textit{Nennius}, 262.
\textsuperscript{77} Eugene O’Curry, \textit{On the manners and customs of the ancient Irish} (London 1873) II 111, 218; \textit{MM} 430.
\textsuperscript{78} \textit{AU} (I) I 368.
to sites in the northern half of Ireland.\textsuperscript{79} If Keating then believed that Dún Cearmna was on the Old Head of Kinsale, why did he not put it in the second-next quatrain, which names a dozen places in Munster, including Cuan Dor (Glandore) and Ceann Sáile (Kinsale)?

Undoubtedly Keating was, in the tradition of the early Irish \textit{literati}, devoted to the \textit{dinnshenchas} of famous places, so that placenames constituted a significant feature of his writings. And while Anne Cronin’s comment: ‘Keating has a great respect for the old tradition, he practically never alters anything’\textsuperscript{80} may well be true, he did on occasion propose his own locations for the names under discussion. When the \textit{Dinnshenchas} poems (and prose versions) were first written, the sites being celebrated were so well known that they needed no descriptive identification. But at the time Keating wrote his history, the locations of many ancient sites had been long forgotten, and when he ventured to identify them, he not infrequently went astray. So it was with such examples as Áth Troistean, Bealach Conglais, Buas, Druim Abhrad, Lochmhagh, Magh Beanachair, Magh gCéidne, Magh nÉinsciath, Rinn Chinn Bheara.\textsuperscript{81}

These comments are not in any way intended to disparage Keating’s wide-ranging and pioneering work, but to indicate that in the matter of place name identification he is by no means infallible, and in the absence of corroborating evidence, his location of Dún Cermna at the Old Head of Kinsale needs to be re-examined.

\textbf{ARCHAEOLOGY AND EARLY HISTORY}

It has for long been assumed that the large fosse which cuts across the isthmus linking the Old Head peninsula with the mainland is an indication of an early promontory fort. However, an archaeological survey carried out in 1991 reported that the stone-built fortifications were late medieval in date (obviously connected with the adjacent fifteenth-century de Courcy tower-house). They are described as ‘built in line with a substantial rock-cut fosse which could be of an earlier date’, but there were no apparent traces of prehistoric habitation on the headland itself.\textsuperscript{82} These findings were confirmed by a

\textsuperscript{79} \textit{Dánta amhráin is caointe Sheathriúin Céitinn}, ed. Eoin Mac Giolla Eáin (Baile Átha Cliath 1900) l. 435.
\textsuperscript{80} Anne Cronin, ‘Sources of Keating’s Forus Feasa ar Éirinn’ \textit{Éigse} 5 (1946) 122-35 (at p. 123).
\textsuperscript{81} I hope to examine in more detail Keating’s treatment of placenames at a later date. I have also argued that Keating was wrong in locating Belach Conglais near Cork: see Diarmuid Ó Murchadha, ‘Belach Conglais: one or two?’ \textit{Peritia} 16 (2002) 435-443.
\textsuperscript{82} Denis Power \textit{et al.}, \textit{Archaeological inventory of County Cork} (Dublin 1994) II 65.
partial excavation carried out in 1996, at the time the Old Head was being developed for use as a golf course. Two trenches were then excavated across the main fosse. (A second fosse, to the south of the keep, was left untouched.) The excavation was undertaken by a team from the Department of Archaeology, University College Cork, under the direction of Rose M. Cleary, who concluded that there was no indication of an an early phase of occupation within the excavated area. Furthermore, on the headland area, neither archaeological monitoring of the work on the golf course nor geological surveying uncovered any new archaeological features.83

The modern townland name, Downmacpatrick (Keating’s ‘Dún Mic Pádraig’), derives from Patrick de Courcy, whose mother was Margaret, daughter of Milo de Cogan.84 But in 1261 Miles de Courcy (a son of Patrick) had his stronghold at Rinn Róin85 (Ringrone, nearer Kinsale), and in 1301 the Old Head was called by a Viking name, Houldernesse.86 It is possible that Dún Meic Phádraig (recte ‘Dún Mac Pádraig’) is a fifteenth-century name and that ‘Meic Phádraig’ may have been a local patronymic for the de Courcy family.

Despite O’Rahilly’s best efforts to place the Old Head under the Érainn / Corcu Loígde hegemony, there is no evidence that it ever was so. The Corcu Loígde genealogy, which provides a detailed survey of their holdings in west Cork in the twelfth century, does not lay claim to any territory east of Timoleague,87 while the earliest townland list we possess, dated 1301,88 puts ‘Houldernesse’ in the cantred of Kynaileth-Ytherach, i.e. the Éoganacht tribeland of Cenél nÁeda (? Iartharach).

AN ALTERNATIVE LOCATION

If Keating was not correct in putting the south-coast Dún Cermna on the Old Head, the question of an alternative location must be

84 Irish monastic and episcopal deeds, ed. N. B. White (Dublin 1936) 227.
85 AI s.a. 1261.13.
86 Liam Ó Buachalla, ‘An early fourteenth-century placename list for Anglo-Norman Cork’ Dinnseanchas 2 (1966) 7. A similar name, Holderness in Yorkshire, is explained as ‘headland of the hold’, a hold being an officer of high rank in the Danelaw (Keith Cameron, English place-names (London 1961) 138). There may accordingly have been a Viking settlement at the Old Head.
88 See n. 86.
considered. It is essential in this context to analyse the only reference
to a Munster Dún Cermna in the Annals of Ulster. Under the year
858 we are told of an expedition into Munster by the king of Temair,
Máel Sechlainn son of Máel Ruanaid. Having defeated the
Munstermen at Carn Lugdach, Máel Sechlainn returned, bringing
with him the hostages of Munster o Belut Gabráin co Insi Tarbnai
iar nÉre, 7 o Dún Cermnai co hArainn nAirthir ‘from Belat Gabráin
to Inis Tarbna off the Irish coast, and from Dún Cermna to Ára
Airthir’. These were the furthest extremities (respectively NE / SW
/ SE / NW) of Munster at its most extensive. Belach Gabráin (near
Gowran, Co. Kilkenny) is named because the Osraige were for a
period under Corcu Loígde rule and so regarded as Munstermen. Inis Tarbna has been equated with Dursey Island / Bull Rock off the
south-west coast of Co. Cork. The Aran Islands are included
because of their association with Eóganacht Árann. We should
accordingly expect Dún Cermna to mark the extreme south-east cor-
ner of Munster, namely, in the east of Co. Waterford.

If a line were to be drawn from Inisheer in the Aran Islands to the
Old Head of Kinsale, there would be no hostages from a large part
of east Munster, including all the southern Déise territory of Co.
Waterford and south Co. Tipperary – a remarkable omission when
we consider that the only king recorded as having been slain at Carn
Lugdach was lethri na nDeise, Maelcron m. Muiredhaigh. Flann, son of the above Máel Sechlainn, led another expedition against the peo-
ple of Munster, whom he harried o Ghabhran co lLuimnech AU (2) s.a. 906.
Micheál Mac Cáithigh, ‘Dursey Island and some placenames’ Dinnseanchas II
(1966-7) 51-5; EIHM 492.

89 Identified as ‘Corran Hill’ in par. Desertserges, bar. East Carbery, Co. Cork, in
90 AU (2), s.a. 858. Similar boundaries are given in the seventeenth-century com-
pilations, CS, AFM, FAI, but in these Belach Gabráin, because it had for long been
regarded as being in the Leinster heartlands, was replaced by ‘Comar Trí nÚisce’
(Waterford harbour).
91 Cf. CGH 147 b 30; LL 1745.
92 AU (2) s.a. 858.
94 EIHM 64.
It is surely significant that, in an extensive list of battles ascribed to Óengus Óluicaid, the only one fought against the Érainn was cath Sliabh Cua for Érnu. Sliabh Cua is now represented by the Knockmealdown mountains between Co. Tipperary and Co. Waterford. The most easterly point in Co. Waterford is Creadan Head, which takes its name from the townland of Creadan, par. Killea, bar. Gaultier. Keating names the headland as the eastern boundary of the southern Déise: ó Lios Mór go Ceann Criadháin.

There is an isolated reference to a place called Srúb Cermna in a specification of the length and breadth of Ireland: ó Srub Cerma co Srub Brain / ónd ocian thíar co muir sair. Srúb Brain has been identified with tl. Stroove par. Lower Moville, bar. East Inishowen E., Co. Donegal, and O’Rahilly took it for granted that Srúb Cerma was the Old Head peninsula. But, assuming that the word srúb was not being used merely for rhyming purposes – a matching phrase in Moling’s prophecy has o Dún Cerma co Srub Brain – then Srúb Cerma might perhaps denote the long narrow peninsula that is Creadan Head.

O’Rahilly does not advert to ‘Cuan Cearmna’, which occurs in a sixteenth-century poem of praise for Pilíb Ó Raghallaigh: cuan Éirni, cuan Corcaighi, ‘s na srotha fá chuan Cearmna. If cuan is intended here to denote ‘harbour’, there is none such at the Old Head; the nearest is at Kinsale, some five miles distant. But Waterford harbour, into which Creadan Head juts eastwards, could have had the name Cuan Cerma applied to it because of its proximity to a district called Cerma – perhaps also known as Cerna. In the poem Cid dech do liadaib flatha, appended to the story, Scéala Cano meic Gartnáin, Comar Trí nUisce (in Waterford harbour) and Cerna appear in the verse:

Cormand Comair Trí n-Uisqi
san can im Inber Fernai;
nicon eisbìs súg tairis (?)
berta do chormu[i]m Cearnai.

---

97 LL 2237; AFM I 48.
98 FFÉ II 316.
100 Edmund Hogan, Onomasticon Goedelicum (Dublin 1910) 617.
101 MM 633.
102 Carney, Poems on the O’Reillys, II 2174-5.
103 ‘Old Head of Kinsale’ is somewhat of a misnomer; the original form was probably ‘Old Head off Kinsale’.
104 Binchy, Scéala Cano 17 (ll 454-57).
The ales of Comar Trí nUisce
round about Inber Fernai;
I have drunk no juice transcending it
cargoes (?) of the ale of Cerna.

While Inber Fernai (v.l. Fearo) could be a corruption of Inber Berba / Berua (estuary of the Barrow, one of the three rivers forming the comar), another occurrence of the name Fearna (also Fearna / Fearghna) indicates that it may have been an actual river name. This is found in a praise-poem for Donnchadh Ó Briain, fourth Earl of Thomond, *Aoidhe ó Cais’ na chrích fēin*, for reference to which I am indebted to the Editor of Éigse. It gives details of a journey as follows:

Tar Siúir tar Fearghna tar Feóir
na dheoig go Dún Cearmna do cháidh. 106

Over Suir, over Fearghna (Fearn), over Nore, thereafter to Dún Cermna he went.

This suggests that Fearna lay between the rivers Suir and Nore and may have been an old name for the Blackwater (Co. Kilkenny), a river which joins the Suir estuary just above Waterford. The reason why the Barrow does not feature could be the fact that Nore and Barrow unite north of New Ross before flowing the last twenty miles or so into Waterford harbour. At any rate, the quatrain as a whole reinforces the likelihood that Dún Cermna was in the neighbourhood of Comar Trí nUisce.

With regard to Cerna in *Scéla Cano meic Gartmáin*, the editor, D. A. Binchy, was understandably puzzled at what he took to be the sudden deviation northwards to Carnes in Co. Meath, in the middle of a section dealing with tribes and places on the south Leinster / Munster borders, and wondered whether Cermna (= Dún Cermna) was the name intended. 107 I believe that Cermna was the name in

---

105 The editor notes (ibid., p. 35, n. 455) that ‘one would expect it to be the estuary formed by the confluence of the three waters’ (Barrow, Nore, Suir), which reaches the sea at Waterford harbour.

106 Book of O’Conor Don, f. 299a, q. 6.

107 ‘Or should we read Cermna, for Dún Cermna on the Old Head of Kinsale, once the seat of an important monarchy of the Érainn (see O’Rahilly [‘Dún Cermna’])? But this kingdom was hardly more than a dim memory when the poem was composed’ (Binchy, *Scéla Cano* 35, n. 456).
question, alternating (just as it may have done in Co. Meath) with Cerna, and that it was located near Waterford harbour.\textsuperscript{108}

Further evidence of the identification of Dún Cermna with this area comes from the references to the slaying of Cerinja in his fort. In\textit{ Minigud Senchais Êbir} this reads: \textit{Mac didiu don Chonmáel-sin Eochaid Fáeburglas, is é ro marb Cherinja ina dún}\textsuperscript{109} ‘A son therefore to that Conmáel was Eochaid Fáeburglas; it was he who slew Cerinja in his fort’, while \textit{Senchas Síl hÍr} has: \textit{Eochu mac Conmáel a mMumain ro marb Cherinja ‘na dún}\textsuperscript{110} ‘Eochu son of Conmáel in Munster slew Cerinja in his fort’, to which \textit{LL} adds: \textit{vel in bello},\textsuperscript{111} ‘or in battle’. This is called the battle of Dún Cerinja in the tract \textit{Do Fhlathiusaib Hérend}, as follows: \textit{dorochair Cerinja Find la hEochaid Fáeburglas mac Conmaeil i cath Dúin Chearinja ‘Cerinja Finn fell at the hands of Eochu Fáeburglas son of Conmáel in the battle of Dún Cerinja’}.\textsuperscript{112} The following section of \textit{LG} lists five victories gained by Eochu: \textit{cath Lauachra Dedad, cath Fossaid Dá Gort, cath Conmair Trí nUsci, cath Tuamma Drecon, cath Dromma Liatháin}.\textsuperscript{113}

In the corresponding verse section, the same five victories are celebrated, with the battle of \textit{Conmair Trí nUsci} clearly linked to the slaying of Cerinja, and so, one presumes, to Dún Cerinja:

\begin{quote}
Dia lám do cer, cen lesce, 
Cerinja Fál, find a thuíse, 
ocus Inboth hua Follaig, 
i cath Chommair Trí nUsce.
\end{quote}

By his hand there fell, without sloth 
Cerinja, of Fál, clear his understanding, 
and Inboth, grandson of Follach, 
in the battle of the Meeting of Three Waters.\textsuperscript{114}

Assuming the two battles to be synonymous, the evidence appears to indicate that a district named Cerinja / Cerna lay to the west of

\textsuperscript{108} The name ‘Caicher Cearnda’, in a list of Clanna Míled servants in \textit{LG} (V 29), may derive from the belief that Caicher was the builder of the southern Dún Cerinja (as related in the Érainn genealogy in \textit{LL}, referred to earlier).

\textsuperscript{109} \textit{CGH} 147 a 15.

\textsuperscript{110} \textit{CGH} 156 a 35.

\textsuperscript{111} \textit{LL} 43414.

\textsuperscript{112} \textit{LG} V 212-13 (\textit{LL} 2103-4).

\textsuperscript{113} \textit{LG} V 212 (\textit{LL} 2170-71).

\textsuperscript{114} \textit{LG} V 444-5 (\textit{LL} 2183-6).
Waterford harbour, the estuary of the three sister rivers, where the battle of Comar Trí nUisce, also known as the battle of Dún Cermna, may have been fought. (This district was later occupied by the Ostmen of Waterford, when it became known as Gall-Tír ‘the foreigners’ country’, now the barony of Gaultiere.)

A possible site for the actual dún is in the townland adjoining Creadan to the south, namely Dunmore, in which is the fishing village of Dunmore East. Close by the fishing port, on a small peninsula called ‘Shanooan’ (? Seándún), also ‘Black Knob’, are the remnants of a promontory fort, no doubt the eponymous Dún Mór.\textsuperscript{115} It appears to have been an extensive and well-fortified dún, judging by Westropp’s description of it early in the last century.\textsuperscript{116} Regrettably, as the most recent account informs us, ‘the defences were levelled and the topsoil removed in the 1970s to create a carpark’\textsuperscript{117} – surely a lamentable fate for what might perhaps have been the once-celebrated Dún Cermna.
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Bun an Tábhairne, Co. Chorcaí

DIARMUID Ó MURCHADHA
TÁNN TÚ

Tá úsáid an fhoircinn -ann sa dara pearsa de pharaidímí gaolmhara tá agus fuil ar cheann de na tréithe is sainiúla a bhaineann le Gaeilge Chiarraí agus Chorcaí; is iad seo a leanas na foirméacha atá i gceist (Ua Súilleabháin 1994, 533):

(1) Neamhspleách
Spleách  tán tódh tách bun
fuileann tódh fuileann bun

Ní luann an Súilleabhánach, ná aon fhoinse eile go bhfios dom, *taíonn sibh* sa 2 iol.

Níl sna foirméacha a bhfuil -(a)nn leo ach cuid den réimse foirméacha 2 u. sna paraíomí úd i gcanúintí Chiarraí agus Chorcaí. Tugann LASID I (lch 244) na leaganacha Gaeilge seo a leanas den cheist ‘how are you?’ ó phointí sna contaitha sin: conas taoi?; conas tán tú?; conas táonn tú?; conas tá tú? Is féidir conas tár? a chur leo sin, ó chuntas Uí Bhuachalla ar Ghaeilge Chléire (2003, 82). Is le Pointe 20 (Dún Chaoín) amháin a luann LASID an leagan conas tá tú?, agus é mar mhalaírt ar conas taoi? ansin (David Greene a bhailigh an t-eolas). Ní thuairiscíonn LASID conas tánn tú? ó Dhún Chaoín, cé gurb in é an gnáthleagan in iar-thairg Dhuibhneach anois, agus le fada is dócha (féach ráiteas Jackson thíos). Tá conas taoi? in úsáid fós timpeall ar Bhaile an Fheirtéaraigh, ach ní cuimhin liom é a chloisint i ngnáthchomhrá i nDún Chaoín. Is é conas taíonn tú? a bhí ag an leathchainteoir Gaeilge deireanach ar an mBaile Dubh, in aice le Baile an Bhuinneánaigh i gCiarraí Thuaidh (Ó hAnracháin 1964, 98). Is ar Chorca Dhuibhne a dhíreoidh mé anseo, toise i bhfad níos mó a bheith i gcló mar gheall uirthi ná ar chanúintí eile na Mumhan. Luaigh údair éagsúla na foirméacha neamhspleách a leanas den 2 u. le canúint Chorca Dhuibhne san fhíchíú haois (agus ní i ndiaidh conas amháin é, dar ndóigh):

(a) taoi, táir, tán tódh, taoin tódh san ord sin ag Sjoestedt-Jonval (1938, 137), a bunáidh ar obair pháircce a rinneadh sna fícheidí (‘Les diverses formes de 2e pers. sg. du présent s’emploient indifféremment’, a deir sí (lch 139));

(b) ‘taoi (táir, taíonn tódh, tán tódh, tás tódh als Nebenformen)’ ag Wagner (1959, 19), ag tarraingt ar obair pháircce a rinneadh i 1946;

Tá cúpla sampla de tá tú sna scéalta a bhailigh Jackson (1938) ó Pheig Sayers. Maidir le taoiann tú, ní miste a lua go raibh dul amú ar Sjoestedt-Jonval nuair a rinne sí [ti:n´ tu:] taoín tú de. Sna nótaí teanga a cheir sé leis an saothar thuasluaite deir Jackson (lch 98): ‘Tuíon tú (not tuín tú), rarely, for the regular Blasket tán tú (táir and taoi are exceptional)’; ní foláir gurb é cuntas Sjoestedt-Jonval a spreag an ceartú idir lúibíní. Tugtar faoi deara nach luann Jackson an fhóirm tá tú sna nótaí teanga.

Ag éirí as an méd thuas is é an réimse iomlán foirmeacha neamhspleáchacha 2 uatha a tuairisciú ó Chorca Dhuibhne san fhichiú haois, agus iad scagtha anseo agam, ná:

(2) Táite Scartha gan -ann Scartha le -ann Scartha le -as

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>taoi</th>
<th>taoi</th>
<th>taoi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>tán</td>
<td>tán</td>
<td>tán</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tóir</td>
<td>tóir</td>
<td>tóir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tóir</td>
<td>tóir</td>
<td>tóir</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Samplaí dóibh seo is ea: Táoi fliuch, a Mhícín! arsa mise (Ní Mhainnín agus Ó Murchú 2000, 69), na mísléáin atáir a dh’ithe (Ó Sé 2000, 309), Tá tú ‘g obair go cruaig (Jackson 1938, 9), Tá tú as do mheabhair (ibid. 24), Tán tú aige baile (ibid. 15), Dia ’s Muire dhíbh, ’fheara, taoiann sibh ansan (Ní Mhainnín agus Ó Murchú 2000, 69), nach aonarach atuion tú (Jackson 1938, 3), Conas tás tú féinig? (Ó Sé 2000, 310).

D’fhonn éachtáint a bháil ar mhinicíocht na bhfoirméacha sin ag cainteoir cáilúil amháin bhaillíos na samplaí go léir den 2 u. neamhspleáchach i dtéacsáí Jackson (1938). Is mar seo atá:

(3) tán | 8
| taoi | 4
| táir | 2

Tá na figiúirí seo ag teacht le nóta thuasluaite an eagarthóra maidir le minicíocht na bhfoirméacha (ag cur san áireamh arís nach luann sé tá tú sna nótaí teanga ar lch 96). Is dealrach gur imigh taoiann tú as úsáid sa cheantar le linn an fhícheátí haois agus gur chúngaigh a thuilleadh ar úsáid taoi san achar céanna. Nórbh amhlaidh do táir,
áfach, a bhíodh ó am go ham ag roint partíocht a mhair go dté le déanaí agus a chuala mé mar fhreagra ar cheist ó chainteoir atá fós beo. Ní luaitear tά tüş i mo mhangrafr ar an gcánúint cé go bhfuil na foirmeacha spleácha fuil tů, nǐl tů agus ca’iúl tů? (< ca’ bhfuil tů?) luaite ann (lgh 271, 274-5) mar rogha ar fuileann tů etc. ag födhuine. Tá roint partíocht ann atá an-tugtha do tás tů, cé gur cuireann tů etc., a bheadh acu le bhriathra rialta (seachas cuireas tů, a bhí ann tráth de réir Murphy 1940, 78). Mar sin féin is é an gnáthnós in iarthar Chorca Dhuibhne anois ná tάnn tů agus fuileann tů.

Maidir le taobh na staire de, is léir nach bhfuil san -(e)nn a fheicimid in tάnn tů etc. ach an foireann -ann atá ag forleathadh sa teanga ó aimsir na Meán-Ghaeilge i leith. Ní heol dom, áfach, gur foilsíodh aon mhíniú go dté seo ar conas a tháinig sé isteach sna paraidímí briathartha in (1). Déanfaidh mé iarracht a leithéid a sholáthar thíos. Ní miste a rá ar dtús gur ceataí mhór é sa chúram a laghad samplaí de na foirmeacha sin a bheith ar fáil i dtéacsáí atá in eagar ón ochtú haois déag, tréimhse ina raibh tréithe canúna ag éirí coitianta sa teanga scríofa. Is í an fhianaise is sine go bhfios dom ar -(ann) sna paraídmí úd ná an fhoirm spleách a’bh[hu]iulionn tů a luann Murphy (1940, 76) ó lármhscríbhinn de chuid Mhíchíl mhic Pheadair Úi Longáin, a fuair bás i 1766, agus dhá shampla eile den 2 iol. spleách (ina bhfuili[ó]n sibh agus go bhfuili[ó]n sibh) in Trompa na bhflaitheas a haistriódh sa bhlian 1755, is cosúil (O’Rahilly, C. 1955, 328). Is iad na samplaí neamhspéala leis an lá atá feicthe i gclo agam ná atánn tů, atáinn sibh in dtráchtaireacht ar an mBíobla a scríobh an tAthair Muiris Paodhar (1791-1877) ó Ros Cairbre ná blianta i ndiaidh 1864 (Ó Madagáin 1974, 386). Tá fhianaise ar na foirmeacha spleách breis is céad bliain roimh na foirmeacha neamhspéala leis an lá. Foirceann spleách ab ea -ann ar dtús, dar ndóigh, agus d’huiadhfaí glacadh leis na dátaí thuas mar chomhartha gur tré pharáidimí spleách fuil a tháinig an fóircéann isteach sa bhriathar seo. Ach cuimhnímis ar a ndeir an Rathaileach (1932, 132) i dtaoibh dul chuin cinn -ann: ‘In the Early Modern period it supplanted the alternative flexionless form (e.g. caill), and during the seventeenth century it began to oust the absolute form in -idh (caill-idh) as well’; deir Ó Cuív (1970, 165) maidir le Párlaimint na mBan: ‘The ending -(e)ann is used in absolute, dependent and relative forms,’ agus níl aon sampla cinnte de -idh sa téacs. Bhí -ann ina fhoirceann spleách agus neamhspéalach ar aon bhfhad roimh lár an ochtú haois déag mar sin, agus ní féidir a chur as an áireamh go raibh sé i bpharáidim tů chomh maith le fuil faoi lár an ochtú haois déag.
Maidir le tás tú, tá sé le múiníu sa tslí chéanna le an gciós tú/ciós tú? agus an dtuigeas tú? a bhíonn ag roinnt cainteoirí ioinn ar Chorca Dhuibhne, .i. mar thoradh ar mhascán a tharla naíomh na tosaoíodh ar -ann a úsáidh le hais -as i gclásail choibhneasta (Murphy 1940, 77). Dá bhfrís sin níl aon múiníu le chéile leis an gclásail chéanna le an gcíos tú/ciós tú? agus ní thréachtfaidh mé air a thuilleadh anseo.

Toisc an foirceann -ann a bheith ag gach briathar eile nach mór san aimsir láithreach, ní haon ionadh é a bheith dulta i bhfeidhm trí analach ar tá – fuil i gcanúintí áirithe. Is é an rud is saithinsí gur sa dara pearsa amháin é; níl aon tuairisc ar tánn nó fuileann gan forainm ina ndiaidh (e.g. *tánn deabhadh orm), ná ar *tánn sé/sí nó *fuileann sé/sí sa 3ú pearsa. Tá foinsin stairiúil -ann i bparaidímí tá agus fuil le fáil i mbéal an dorais, i bparaidím an ghnáthláithrigh bíonn. Ach dá leathfadh an foirceann -ann ó pharaidím bíonn go dtí paraidímí tá – fuil sa ghnáthshlí bheifí ag súil leis go gcumfaí bunfhoirmeacha nua *tánn, *fuileann ar aon dul le bíonn, ar aon le foirmeacha scartha nua ag tosú leis an 3ú pearsa: *tánn sé/sí → tánn tú agus *fuileann sé/sí → fuileann tú; aithnítear le fada gurb í an 3ú pearsa an phearsa bhunúsach sa pharaidím agus gur uirthi sin a bhunaítear paraidímí nua (Benveniste 1966). Ach ní hín é a tharla. Is amhlaidh a léim an foirceann ón dara pearsa i bparaidím bíonn go dtí an dara pearsa i bparaidím tá nó i bparaidím fuil (nó go dtí an dá cheann in éineacht). Ní fhéadfadh a leithéid tarlú go dtí go raibh bíonn tú/sibh ar fáil, ach tá siad sin sean go maith (faoi lár an ochtú haois déag ar a laghad, féach O’Rahilly, C. 1955, 329). Múineann prionsabail na teangeolaíochta dúinn go bhfuil an uimhir uatha níos bunúsaithe ná an uimhir iolra. B’ait an rud é tánn sibh, fuileann sibh a bheith níos sine ná tánn tú, fuileann tú. Dírímis mar sin ar pharaidímí uatha tá, fuil agus bíonn.

Is é an chéad chéim ná paraidímí uatha tá, fuil agus bíonn a atóg-aínt faoi mar is dóichí a bhíodhar díreach sular léim an foirceann -ann ón tríu ceann a thuilleadh ón dá ceann eile. Is iad seo thíos, in (4), na foirmeacha atá le fáil sna téacsanna de chinntiú a chomh maith ní foláir, cé nach maíonn si leis an gcúram atá idir láithreach agus an tríú ceann. Má b'fhéadfadh a thostú leis an t-éineacht tánn tú/sibh, fuil, bíonn, (bírn?) tánn sé/sí. Táim fuilim bím bátr dom é an tríú ceann a thuilleadh ón dá ceann eile.


(4) táim fuilim bíonn tús, (bírn?) tánn tú, táir tá sé/sí fuil tús, fuilir fuil sé/sí bíonn sé/sí
Tugaim tús áite do taoi sa 2 u. de tá. Ba í an fhoirm stauriúil í agus ní foláir gurb í a bhí in uachtar fós trí chéad bliain ó shin nó mar sin. Luadh thuas go raibh taoi níos coitianta i dtús an fhichiú haois i gCorca Dhuibhne ná ag a deireadh, agus dá bhféadfaí dul siar a thuilleadh le fíanaise canúna ba dhóigh leat gur i lóinmhaire a bheadh an fhoirm úd ag dul.

Toisc nach féidir teacht chun cinn tánn tú / fuileann tú a léiriú go mion le samplaí comhaimseartha ní móir dúinn dul i muinín argóintí teangeolaíocha, go háirithe cinn a bhaineann leis an tuiscint atá againn ar phróisis analaí agus ar anuachan paraíomhí. Ní móir díríú ar cheist lánach amháin: Cén fáth gur sa dara pearsa amháin a tháinig -ann chun cinn i bparaíomhí tá ~ fuil? Aon réiteach a mbeidh dealramh leis caithfidh sé easpas -ann sa 3ú pearsa a mhíniú chomh maith le húsáid -ann sa dara pearsa. Ní miste scrúdú a dhéanamh ar na hargóintí ar son -ann a theacht chun cinn ar dtús (A) i bparaíomh fuil, agus (B) i bparaíomh tá.

(A) -ann i bparaíomh fuil ar dtús

Faoi mar a luadh thuas an chéad fhianaise a foilsíodh go dté seo ar fuileann tú breis is céad bliain níos sine ná an chéad fhianaise ar tánn tú. Ina theannta sin b’fhoirceann spleách é -ann ó bunús agus tharlódh sé gur eascar an fhoirm fuileann tú an fhad a bhí sé fós ina fhoirceann spleách. Ach ní féidir liom a shamhlú conas a ragadh biónn tú i bhfeidhm ar fuil tú (~ fuileann tú) gan biónn sé/sí a dhul i bhfeidhm ar fuil sé/sí ag an am gcéanna (~ *fuileann sé/sí). Is bac an-mhór é seo ar ghlacadh leis an tuairim gur i bparaíomh fuil a tháinig -ann chun cinn ar dtús.

(B) -ann i bparaíomh tá ar dtús

Cé gur sine an fhianaise ar fuileann tú ná ar tánn tú, ní fál go haer é sin toisc na samplaí a bheidh chomh gann. Ina theannta sin bhí tánn tú ag an Athair Muiris Paodhar, a saolaíodh i 1791, agus níl aon chúis lena cheapadh gurbh iad a ghlúin féin an chéad dream a bhain úsáid as an bhfoirm sin. Má gheallimid gur dócha gur raibh -ann i bparaíomh tá chomh luath agus a bhí sé i bparaíomh fuil is féidir linn ár méar a leagadh ar phróiseas analaí a chúngódh an foirceann go dtí an 2 u. amháin. Is dócha gurbh í an chontrárthacht bhunúsach sa 2 u. an uair úd ná:

(6) Fíolráithreach 2 u.: taoi
Gníathláithreach 2 u.: biónn tú
Bheadh an dá fhoirm sin á n-úsáid le hais a chéile go rialta aon uair a dhéanfai contrárthacht idir suíomh poncúil agus suíomh gnáthach, agus laistigh d’aon abairt amháin go minic, mar shampla:

(7) *Taoi cortha vs Bíonn tú cortha* (poncúil vs gnáthach)

(8) *Taoi ag obair go dian anois ach ní bhíonn tú amhlaidh i gcónaí*

Is comhthéacs struchtúrtha é seo ina bhféadfadh foirm mheasctha *taíonn tú* teacht chun cinn, tríd an bpróíseas a dtugtar *contamination* air as Béarla (deir Hock 1991, 197: ‘it consists in one form become phonetically more similar to the other, related, form, without losing its distinct identity’). Is ‘fulcram’ analaí é an gaol idir *taoi* agus *bíonn tú* a mhíniúna cúngú an fhoircínn -ann go dtí an dara pearsa de pharáidim *tá*. Tar éis dó teacht chun cinn choinnigh *taíonn tú* a ghaol gairid le *taoi*. Níor baineadh úsáid as *taíonn* riacht sa 2 il., de réir dealraimh. Chuaigh *taoi* agus *taíonn tú* ar an láthair an fhichiú haois i gCorca Dhuibhne. Bheadh *tánn tú* le múnú mar thoradh *taíonn tú*. I bhfianaise an méid a d'úrthas thuas i dtábhacht *tá* agus *taíonn tú* i mBéarla, de réir dealraimh. Chuaigh *taoi* agus *taíonn tú* ar an láthair an fhichiú haois i gCorca Dhuibhne. Bheadh *tánn tú* le múnú mar thoradh *taíonn tú*. I bhfianaise an méid a dúrathas thuas i dtábhacht *tá* agus *taíonn tú* i mBéarla, de réir dealraimh.

(9) *taoi x bíonn tú → taíonn tú*  
    *taíonn tú x tá → tán tú*

Athrú ‘siontagmatach’ an chéad cheann agus athrú ‘paraidímeach’ an dara ceann, sna téarmaí a thug de Saussure dúinn. Céim eile fós a bheidh i dtéacht chun cinn *fuileann tú*, agus ní gá go mbeadh aon mhoill i gceist.
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DIARMAID Ó SÉ

An Coláiste Ollscoile, Baile Átha Cliath
THE DATE AND PURPOSE OF ACALLAM NA SENÓRACH

There has long been a consensus among Irish scholars that Acallam na Senórach is one of the greatest of medieval Ireland’s literary achievements. However, this general agreement that it is an important work seems to have been attended by a concomitant unwillingness to investigate it critically in ways that would attempt to contextualise it as a text of its time and place. There is a sense, then, of the Acallam as being somehow freer than most Irish literary texts of a burden of historical reference. It is indeed tempting to take the famous words of the angels to Patrick on the purpose of the work – *budad gairdiughadh do dhronguibh 7 do degdaínib deridh aimsire* ‘a delight to the lords and commons of later times’ – at their face value and see it as a work of pure entertainment, a charming *pot-pourri* of native tradition that draws on deep resources in oral popular lore and props it all up by a blatantly artificial frame of anachronistic but aesthetically pleasing rapport between kings, Fenian representatives of a pagan past, and St Patrick. That it represents a culmination of a rapidly expanding genre of Fenian matter is clear, but to approach it only in this way tends to blur the specific literary footprint of the work itself, thus relegating it to the status of a symptom of the general, critically familiar, phenomenon known as ‘the rise of fíanaigeacht’, and inhibiting closer scrutiny of its writerly status or its historical context. In addition, the fact that a number of versions

---

1 Textual references throughout are to the edition by Stokes (1900). Stokes’s line numbering is retained throughout apart from the fact that in citations from the second half of the edition I have silently corrected the error in numbering (a jump of 200 at l. 4215).

2 Murphy (1970) provides a good sense of how to read the text as an innovating product but keeps the focus firmly on the twelfth century. Ó Coileáin (1993) provides the most interesting literary account of the Acallam using Northrop Frye’s model of romance genre form, and making some useful distinctions as to the popular nature of Fíanaigeacht in general: ‘... the Acallam itself is an untraditional text fashioned in traditional prosimetrum form out of what we generally assume to have been more-or-less traditional sources, and in no wise can it, or any part of it, be regarded as raw oral literature’ (Ó Coileáin 1993, 53-4). Nagy (1985, 1997) also represents richly this view (especially 1997, 317-26). By way of contrast, the discussion by Ó Muráile (1995) anchors the work in other ways through means of a careful discussion of manuscript transmission and of geographical realism.

3 Mac Cana (1985) offers a general historical framework. For him the key historical node which defines the social role of fíanaigeacht in a work like the Acallam is a very general one; it is that of royal guardians of the land and is the result of tenth-century historical processes, namely the Norse invasions and the emergence of high-kingship.
of the basic Acallam model developed quickly from the twelfth to the fourteenth century contributes further to this sense of the essential fluidity and atemporal resonance of the work. Various statements on the dating of the text may also have been influenced by this tendency to romanticise the Acallam by seeing it as far as possible within an earlier, more purely ‘native’, time-frame. Ó Máille (1912) opted for the early or mid-twelfth century, while Murphy (1970), Sommerfelt (1923) and Dillon (1927) thought it should be located towards the end. Most recently Jackson assumed the question of the dating of the Acallam as settled at a date around 1200 (1990, p. xxvi). However, Nuner (1959), the only scholar to make a detailed comparative study of the language of the text, gave as his opinion that, on the basis of comparison with other twelfth-century texts, it must belong to the first quarter of the thirteenth century (p. 309). No one, to date, has brought forward any internal evidence which might assist the linguistic dating efforts.

That the work seems almost certain to be post-Norman does not, of course, mean that there will be any definite trace in the text of this crucially significant event in Irish history; few Irish literary texts of a similar or later period present any sense of disturbance in the image they offer of a politically harmonious Gaelic totality, so the Acallam is not unusual in that respect. The mixed prosimetrum format and the layered nature of the text means that its responsiveness to contemporaneous event may indeed be registered as cumulative and general, rather than precise. Must one, then, fall back on the well-worn historian’s cliché of ‘the long twelfth century’ to describe the cultural context within which a text such as the Acallam may best be situated? Evidence for its reflection of twelfth-century cultural concerns is indeed plentiful and may be summed up under two main headings: firstly, concern for the status of aristocratic marriages and their conformity with the norms of twelfth-century ecclesiastical reform; and, secondly, the growing need to establish some

4 For a useful discussion of the various recensions see Ó Muraíle (1995, 103-9).
5 I address the question of Anglo-Norman presence in the text in a forthcoming paper on the Leinster elements in the work. For a balanced discussion from the standpoint of Irish warfare and the interplay of Norman and Irish see Marie Therese Flanagan (1996) and Katharine Simms (1996). The linking of Fenian narratives and the emergence of a distinct fighting class in military service to regional kings, alluded to by Simms (1996, 102-4), has also been made by me in ‘The “medieval” values of medieval Irish literature’ (unpublished paper, Celtic Studies Association of North America Conference, University of California at Los Angeles, 1989).
6 Simms (1996) has addressed this question briefly, as has Ó Corráin (1987).
commonly agreed norms for the operation of increasingly militarised kingship polities.7

I shall return to these themes in more detail later as part of my effort to pinpoint a more precise dating and place of composition for the *Acallam*. In the course of so doing I hope that my speculations will help to anchor the overarching purpose of the text as well. But first, I want to discuss briefly one point of internal evidence normally brought forward for assigning a date to the text. First cited by Stokes (1900) as helping to define the period within which the *Acallam* was written, is the reference to Mellifont Abbey, which was founded in 1142 and consecrated in 1157:

… téit Caílte roime co hIndber mBic Loingsigh a mBregaibh, risi räidter Mainistir Droichit Átha isin tan so .i. Bec Loingsech mac Airist itorchair ann .i. mac rígh Rómán taimic do ghabháil Eirenn co rus báidh tonn tuile ann hé. (ll 52-5)

Caílte went to Inber Bic Loingsigh ‘the Estuary of Bec the Exile’ in Bregha, now called the Monastery of Drogheda: Bec the Exile who died there was the son of Airist, King of the Romans. He had come to conquer Ireland, and a great wave drowned him there.8

Dillon rightly pointed out (1970, 25 n.) that this may not be a particularly convincing dating marker, and suggested the possibility of a later gloss, but from the way in which he presented his text, placing the above reference to the story of Bec Loingsech in parentheses (1970, ll. 53-5), it is clear that he held back from dismissing the Mellifont reference as intrusive and unoriginal. It did, however, by way of reaction, provoke him into making his most assertive dating statement: ‘From the evidence of the language, however, the *Acallam* is not to be dated earlier than c. 1200’ (1970, 25 n.).

All of this serves to demonstrate that the usefulness of the Mellifont citation is limited for dating purposes. The reference is, however, important to the work in another respect and is neither casual nor naively anachronistic; in my view it is the first indication we have that the author intends to project a contemporary aspect and agenda on his compendium of tales. What is required here is to attempt to gain a more precise sense of the contours of that

---

7 These points I discuss briefly in Dooley and Roe (1999, Introduction *passim*).
8 Translations are from Dooley and Roe (1999), unless otherwise stated.
contemporaneity. It is clear that much care has been taken with the rhetorical cadences and resonances of the great opening sentence of the *Acallam*, as befits an ambitious major text. The reference to Mellifont is also part of the complex literary stratagem of opening the text and introducing the interpretative agenda. Mellifont functions as a sign of the co-ordinates of the entire work: the span of ‘literary’ time bridges the Fenian ‘historical’ time of the great battles set in the past, and the ideological Christian/Patrician time of the enduring present in which the fiction itself is set.

The work, then, shares the same rhetorical structure for beginning a composition – that of a temporal *translatio studii* – with other key European medieval texts of the period. Such a topos operates in much the same way as the invocation of the Troy legends and their connection with Arthurian structures in such exemplary twelfth-century works as Geoffrey of Monmouth’s *Historia regum Britanniae*, Robert Wace’s *Roman de Brut*, and Chrétien de Troyes’s *Erec et Enide*. In these it sets the tone of *gravitas* for the new literary ambitions of medieval Angevin chivalric fictions. In much the same way that the topos of the *translatio studii* is invoked as an assertion of contemporary vernacular cultural self-confidence in Chrétien’s *Cligès*, so too Mellifont represents the author’s confident inscription of the work as modern. In addition, as if to cancel at the outset any pre-existing literary effect of a Patrician/Ossianic dialogue tradition – the line represented by the *Acallam Bec*, for example – and to clear the Fenian/Patrician decks for a new beginning, the author causes the trajectory of the two warriors to fissure. The one, Oisín, retreats (as Nagy has noted) to the farthest recesses of imaginable time, namely

9 Nagy has recently described the significance of the Mellifont allusion as ‘the death knell for the earlier literary milieu rung by the Cistercian reforms’ (Nagy 1997, 320). In this view the Mellifont reference is an index of defensiveness and anxiety on the part of the literary élite. In view of the very dynamic cultural background which I see operating in the west of Ireland specifically in the years of reform from the 1160s to the 1220s, a culture to which both Cistercian and older churches contribute, I do not see the need to assume that a reference to Mellifont will be anything other than entirely positive; the idea of an author consciously bringing fresh materials to bear on his understanding of his society and, in so doing, creating an entirely new kind of literary product must be seen not as an act of defensiveness but of positive response to social challenge. We tend as scholars to subscribe to the ‘backward glance’ as a principle of Irish literary criticism; this often requires large assumptions of wisdom in hindsight.

10 On the significance of the Troy story-frame see Patterson (1987, 157-95); for the uses of the past to construct contemporary fictions of Angevin ambition see Ingledew (1994).
to the Otherworld refuge of his fairy mother; the other, Caílte, embarks on the more difficult track of Patrician instruction – for which read reformed-church modernity in the author’s own world of the beginning of the thirteenth century, when the influence of Mellifont and its daughter monasteries, particularly in the west, is at its height and they are functioning under their still full-blown Gaelic identity, supported by the strong patronage of the western kings.\textsuperscript{11}

Indeed, in this respect it may be worthwhile to revisit here that very well known passage towards the beginning of the \textit{Acallam} when Patrick has his famous crisis of conscience about indulging the circulation of Fenian tales. He is told by his angels in resoundingly positive terms that these tales deserve the very highest of literary treatment:

\begin{quote}
Ocus scríbhthar na scéla sin letsa i támloisibh filed 7 i mbriab-\begin{math}\text{traibh ollaman òr budh gairdiugudh do dronguisibh 7 do degdánibh deridh aimsire éisdecht frisna scéluib sin.}\end{math} (ll 299-303)

Arrange to have this written down in poets’ tablets and in the language of the best literary men because it will be a source of pleasure to the lords and commons of later times to listen to these tales.
\end{quote}

This represents in many respects the author’s own entertainment and instructional agenda as he processes and upgrades the available pool of Fenian material under the transformational directive of writing. Thus the writing turn in the \textit{Acallam}, although usually seen in the context of the chronology of Fenian literary development as simply another important endorsement of Fenian \textit{matière} and of its entry over the high literary threshold, is significant in other ways also. Because the author is now inscribed in the text, his own contemporary concerns can also be foregrounded. Thus there is a twofold view

\textsuperscript{11} On the Cistercian houses of the west see O’Dwyer (1972, 83-101). It may be significant that Tomaltach Ó Conchobhair archbishop of Armagh died at Mellifont in 1201. According to Jocelyn of Furness, he was partial to the de Courcy ambition to establish a revitalised cult of Patrick, Brigid and Colm Cille at Downpatrick in the mid-1180s. This cult is mentioned elsewhere in the \textit{Acallam}: \textit{Mo baili-si a crich Ulad. Is rem craide bus chuman, / bemaitni, bid maith ar lí. triar alaind a n-aenbaile} (ll 5431-2). A scribal gloss in the Laud manuscript at this point reads \textit{i. Patraic 7 Colum cill 7 Brigit} (Stokes 1900, 149). Such a mention is without precedent in native Irish sources and is a much more significant dating indicator than the foundation of Mellifont. On de Courcy, see most recently Flanagan (2000).
of the period of time during which the work can circulate with profit and effect; *deredh aimsire* is both the large and general ‘sixth-age’ Christian period, and also, simply, most recent time, being the contemporary world of the author. The catholicity of audience presumed in this statement is also notable. It is not necessarily a text restricted to the élite, but a text for all – *do dronguib 7 do deagdáinibh*, the *nobles et ignobles* so often cited by the western annalists. The work is not just accessible to all because its *matière* is popularly Fenian; it may be that the *sens* of the compilation, the authorially shaped meaning of the work, is also aimed at a non-restricted contemporary audience. I will return to this later with a suggestion concerning the composition of the intended audience.

One of the first ‘strangenesses’ that subvert almost immediately the seemingly simple charm of the *Acallam* and its tone of magic elusiveness, which works almost as an end in itself, is that the author flies in the face of traditional convention on the synchronisation of Irish kings with Patrick’s mission. He makes Diarmait mac Cerbaill (d. 566) to be the king of Tara, rather than Laegaire, and provides fictitious names for the regional monarchs. Later versions of the *Acallam* revert to the traditional alignments of kings and Patrick’s mission. This stratagem serves to destabilise the text in its relationship to previous historical or hagiographical projects such as the *Vita Tripartita*, for example, with which it has obvious affinities. The fictional freedom of the work is thereby established, and the reader is directed to look for its significance elsewhere. The deliberate shift from Laegaire to Diarmait may be taken, along with an accumulation of other telling details – some of which we shall discuss later – as evidence of a western bias in the text as a whole. Diarmait was

---

12 For discussion of this see Ó Briain (1989).

13 It is clear that some Fenian materials utilised in the *Acallam* have had points of contact with the project of a Leinster Legendary, as posited by Sharpe (1991, 347-67). There are obviously close connections between the vernacular Life of St Maedóc II in that both texts share a Fenian poem of prophecy which Plummer recognised as standing apart from the rest of the Life (1922, I, 192-3.). There are also obvious connections between the vernacular Life of St Moling in that both it and the *Acallam* share an identical prophetic poem. There are links also with the two vernacular Lives of St Coemgen (ibid. p. xxviii). I am inclined to think that the association of Finn with the lake at Glendalough and the legend of the monster in both *Acallam* and Coemgen’s Lives derives not one from the other, but from a common source. The account in *Ann. Tig. s.a. 1177* of the great flood in the lake may have influenced the telling in the *Acallam*. See also Plummer (1922, I, pp xxvii-xxxvii).
revered at Clonmacnois as its royal founder and through the long course of its history Clonmacnois came to be particularly heavily patronised by the Síol Muireadhaigh kings of the western province. The greatest of all her later patrons was probably Toirre Dhealbhach Mór (†1156), and there is evidence that this western tradition of patronage was only broken when the consequences of ecclesiastical reform placed Clonmacnois in an untenable position, and when the western kings turned instead to their own new Cistercian foundations in Connacht at the very end of the twelfth century. Paradoxically, then, it is this cavalier treatment of the ‘canonical’ materials of learned tradition which releases the text and allows the Acallam to convey meanings of a more up-to-date kind, in particular, meanings that direct the readers’ attention to the families and interests of the western kingdom at the turn of the twelfth century. Thus, for example, the names of the kings of Connacht are Muiredach mac Finnachta and his son Áed; here the key element is surely that the reader is directed to consider the Síol Muireadhaigh dynastic line from its founder Muiredach Muillethan (†702), through Fínsnechta (†848) to Cathal Croibhdherg (†1224) – the king almost certainly reigning at the time the Acallam was composed – and his son Áed. The special nature of the western scenes is shown both early and late in the text. The first major segment of the narrative, the opening fifteen hundred lines, is rounded off by a spectacular show of saintly and royal co-operation at the inauguration site of Carn Fráoich. On the very mound itself we have first an extraordinary account of the old Fenians’ moment of conversion to belief in the one true God many years before, a conversion occasioned, significantly

14 For a brief summary of Diarmait mac Cerbaill’s connections with Clonmacnois see Byrne (1973, 90-92, 95-100); for Connacht kings and the monastery in the earlier period see ibid. pp 251-3.
15 The evidence of his patronage is vivid in the obituary notice in Ann. Tír. Although his gifts to the church in his final testament are not specific to Clonmacnois, it may be safely implied that this church received the lion’s share with the internment of the king by the altar of Ciarán.
16 The last occasion the annals mention Clonmacnoise as having been used as a burial place for Síol Muireadhaigh princes is in 1181, referring to the royal heirs slain in the battle of Magh Diughba and interred in otharlighe rigraide a sinnser (ALC). Other later burials are however mentioned in the poem on the Graves of the Kings at Clonmacnois, written, it would seem, by a member of the Ó Mael Chonaire family. It is significant that the section of this poem that enumerates the graves concludes with a quatrain commemorating Diarmait mac Cerbaill: A thempail cháidh claindi Néill, / re lind Diarmata drechréidh, / cóica rí[ ]nocha gréim bec, / ised dotríacht, a reilec (Best 1905, 168).
enough, by a divine curse of the earth-swallowing kind upon the
carefree young recruits to the royal retinue of the king of Tara (ll
1453-85). The ceremonial joint proclamation of royal and ecclesi-
astical power follows:

Is and sin do éirig Muiredach mac Finnachta ri Connacht roime
d’imluadh a ríghi 7 a fhlaithiusa, 7 táinic Pátraic roime do
shílad chreitmhe 7 críbaid [7 croisfighill, Fr] 7 do dhíchur
deman 7 druaadh a hÉirinn, 7 do togha naemh 7 fhírén 7 [do
tócáil, Fr] cros 7 uladh 7 altoiredh, 7 do thairnemh idhul 7
arracht 7 eladhan ndráidhechta. (ll 1495-500)

Then the king of Connacht, Muiredach, son of Finnachta, set
about proclaiming his kingship and sovereignty, and Patrick set
out to preach the faith and religious observance, to expel the
demons and druids from Ireland, to elect the holy and right-
eous, and to erect crosses, penitential stations, and altars, and to
destroy idols and spectres, and the arts of druidism.

Beginning with the Synod of Cashel in 1101 and continuing to the
role of Cathal Croibhdherg in promulgating the decrees of the Fourth
Lateran Council of 1215-17, the history of church attempts to influ-
ence the evolving role of kings in Ireland is inter alia that of attempts
at the reform of public codes of conduct. A series of local, regional,
and national interventions is initiated on the part of church and kings
acting in concert to shield the church and the ordinary population
from the worst turbulence and hardship occasioned by the aggressive
military thrust for power of the regional dynasts. The reformation
of public morals in the matter of marriage, as it pertains to the west-
ern dynasts, is an issue which is manifestly as dear to the author of
the Acallam (with his detailed accounts of the monogamously

17 Going on the mound was in itself one of the signs of assumption of sovereignty,
as for instance in 1310 when Máel Rúanaid Mac Diarmada had his foster-son
Feidlim Ó Conchobhair inaugurated with ceremony, ocus rucusdair lais hé ar Carn
Fraoich mhic Fhidhaigh (ALC s.a.). In a related vein, but not in an inaugural con-
text, Walter de Lacy brought a hosting to the crannóg of Ó Raighilligh in 1220 (slu-
aiged mór do dhenumh dó docum crandoige I Raighilligh), and, as we are told, ‘he
went upon it and obtained hostages and great power’ (a dul uirre, ocus braighde do
ghabhail dó) (ALC s.a. 1220).

18 For papal communication on the subject of the Council’s decrees and Connacht
see Sheehy (1962, 169-70, no. 92).

19 For some features of this royal and ecclesiastical cooperation see Watt (1970, pas-
sim) and most recently Flanagan (1989, 237-9, 253-4).
marked, land-endowed, and church-sanctioned weddings of the daughters of the king of Connacht and of the king, Áed, himself) as it is to the western annalists of the period with their formulae of praise for the monogamy of Cathal Croibhdherg (AC s.a. 1224 gives the most fulsome eulogy) and their condemnatory lament for the descendants of Ruaidhrí, in which they offer as sufficient cause for their downfall the sexual excesses of their father (ALC, AC s.a. 1233). The optimism that suffuses the Acallam and the contemporary annals on the ability of ecclesiastical initiatives to leaven polity will become increasingly a mirage, however, in the years of civil war in Connacht following the death of Cathal Croibhdherg in 1224.

To return now to the first western node in the Acallam. Before this can be addressed directly, however, it would be helpful to point to the exemplary nature of the layering and sequencing of texts that precede it. By doing this one may gauge something of the manner in which contemporary concerns are built in through the complex of story-lines. Much of the substance of the narrative up to the point of entry to Connacht is taken up with rehearsing stories that deal with the problems of young noblemen; the multiple time-frames of the narrative – Fenian past and Patrician present – are cleverly placed so as to refract on each other. Thus in the threefold geographic division of these first fifteen hundred lines, ‘mirror’ tales are presented concerning, above all, the iuvenes, and exemplifying issues of military training, conduct, civility, inheritance, and fair recompense. The story, set in mythic time, is of the king of Ireland’s sons and the denial of their inheritance by their father on grounds that it is his own personal sword-right, while they later receive it through magical

20 The reference to the curious offer from Pope Alexander, cited in the obituary for Ruaidhrí, to the effect that he and his descendants would inherit Ireland if he would give up polygamy and adultery, is not without context. Perhaps one may read between the lines of some of the annals entries on synods for these intervening years and discern a fairly continual concern for moral reforms. The synod of Cardinal Vivianus, the envoy of Pope Alexander III, which, according to AFM (s.a. 1177), enacted deithide iomdha ná comhailtear ‘many ordinances not observed’, might be construed as being concerned with marriage, if we take into account both the canon law preoccupations of the particular pope involved and the somewhat cynical tone of AFM. But it could equally be a reference to a legislation similar to that of the 1172 Synod of Cashel concerning the exemption of churches and their possessions from secular requisitions. Anglo-Norman use of monasteries as campaign billets was viewed with dismay by Irish churchmen, and the Gaelic lords were not slow to follow the Norman practice. We do not know what laws, eittir ecclais 7 tuaith (AFM) were enacted at the synod in Dublin in 1201, but this meeting was followed up most promptly by a similar meeting of clergy and laity in Connacht.
intervention at the hands of Túatha Dé Danann (ll 354-468). In its concern with the principle of partitive inheritance this parallels the ‘contemporary’ tale of the fian brother Falartach (ll 469-529) who is enabled to come into what is rightfully his through the maledictory power of Patrick. Out of the list of Fenian horses grows the tale of the foreign youth in service, Artúir, who as a newcomer to Irish military convention must be taught to respect the common ethos of heroic cooperation (ll 170-289). Artúir’s foreign acquisitiveness is rebuked and his British incivility redeemed by the cavalry mounts which he is forced to supply to the Irish militia. Tales involving the thrusting together of social groupings that might not have had to endure the same vis-à-vis before the age of the Acallam, rehearse problems of retainer responsibility, violence, and self-control. The personal retainer and the young prince are not allowed to forget their fundamental difference of rank, for all the apparent peer parity of military apprenticeship in the story of the Fenian chess-game (ll 1334-61). From the other end of the age-spectrum, the tale of the sorely tried old retainer, Garaid mac Mórna, illustrates the advisability of preserving a dignified integrity when handling volatile issues of insult and honour, such as are provoked by kin vulnerability and the perceived devaluation of social rank and office in the oireacht. This is felt most keenly when such insults come from the women of the more successful competing peer group. The story of Mac Lugach’s difficulties and the long poem on the obligations of the young recruits in the fian (ll 535-610) parallels the tale of the unruly Munster prince Bran who must also be taught manners and his place in the social group (ll 872-930). The advice to Mac Lugach (ll. 580-605), which is so different in quality from the more customary Irish examples of ‘advice to a prince’ hitherto in circulation, is the most convincing example yet of the ‘modern’ value of the Acallam in registering perceptions of the urgency of the problems posed both by the conduct and the social prospects of young noblemen in Ireland c.1200.

As Irish kings seek to extend and deepen their lordships, as they recruit and maintain standing armies, as the institution of the

---

21 The name Artúir figures for a brief period in Leinster dynastic lines in the late tenth century. See Mac Shamhráin (1996, 82-7).
22 I use oireacht here in the less restricted sense of the traditional high lineages of a kingdom and the personal officers of the king, however these may overlap. For a finely-nuanced picture of the oireacht see Simms (1987, 60-78).
23 The moral of this tale becomes even more pointed when one remembers the variant of it in which Garaid actually burns the house full of women; cf. Tóiteán Tighe Fhínn, ed. Gwynn (1904, 24).
oireacht is undergoing rapid transformation, as the demand for mercenaries grows, as social displacement becomes more common – and nowhere more so than in the west where Síol Muireadhaigh polity and rivalries repeatedly convulse the social scene from the mid-twelfth century on – the need for a fresh literary formulation to cater for these relatively new social conditions becomes manifest. In the advice to Mac Lugach we read the new chivalric code of a royal Irish household at the beginning of the thirteenth century. For such a social situation, a literary ‘reinvention’ of old fian tradition is entirely appropriate, if not inevitable.

At this stage one might well ask what evidence is there that the composition of the Acallam, in the state in which it has come down to us, should be western? Surely, it will be said, the names of the kings are too general an index to signal provenance. If Patrician, why not Armagh? And, if the references to Armagh are so scanty, why so? If Fenian, why not some Leinster centre closer to the heartland of Fenian tradition? Here is where one must begin to look for more specific clues. Are there any genealogical strands at all in the Acallam that stand up to scrutiny? One genealogy does stand out and is presented with some flourish as a genealogical test. Cailte, when asked, recites perfectly the genealogy of Mochúa, one of the Patrician retinue (ll 2350 ff). Despite the rather ragged verse compression of the Acallam genealogy (using all versions, viz. Mochua mac Lonáin … meic Senaid … m. Aenghusa … (m. Mugna) m. Blait breachduirn m. Aedhain m. (Blai Àedha) m. Fhergais m. Chneaetha m. Fiachach (m. Airt don Muig) m. Muireadag m. Éogain [m. Dui Galach]), its Úi Briúin outlines are indicated by the two final names. When one compares it with the genealogical information on this saint, Mochúa of Timahoe, in the Book of Leinster (LL), Book of Ballymote (BB) and Book of Lecan collections (viz. Mocua, Tigi Mochua m. Lonáin m. Senaig m. Oengusa m. Lugna m. Bregduilb m. Airt Chirp [thus far LL] m. Cormaic m. Aengussa m. Eithach Find m. Fuath nÄirt m. Feidlimid Rechtada), one can see that a diversion has been made in the Acallam from one of the Fothairt, Leinster-origin types in LL, BB, etc., to an Úi Briúin type.24 Thus one might say that the cultural context is changing from the mid-twelfth-century interests of midland scholars to the later medieval scene, which emphasises western origins, or the obscure Dochua/Mochua of Ahascragh, Co. Galway?

24 See Ó Riain (1985, 4, no. 5). This is essentially the same genealogy as in Fèilire Óengusso (ed. Stokes, 1905, 262). Is there some confusion between Mochua of Timahoe and western individuals of the name such as Mochua of Balla, with Ulster origins, or the obscure Dochua/Mochua of Ahascragh, Co. Galway?
ties. But this is almost a perfunctory, even if bravura, performance in the *Acallam* and carries no charge of narrative invention.

There is one other genealogical strand, however, which contains the most crucial evidence of all for the placing of the *Acallam* in a western setting, a setting which I believe most appropriately accounts for both the Patrician strands of the work and its Fenian subject-matter. It also serves to introduce a family which is supremely well placed to articulate the social interests of the Patrician church in the west, whether these interests are spiritual in nature or material, relating to control of key religious institutions. This same family is also exemplary of the other secular strand of the work, the evolution of the *oireacht*, as kingship itself evolves in the west. In the last quarter of the text we are once more again in the west. Patrick has the equivalent of a car breakdown in Mayo, when he meets a young man who kindly gives up his chariot to him (ll 6432 ff). The description given of this youth is rhetorically the most elaborate in all the *Acallam* and even more decorative still in the Franciscan version (marked *Fr* in parentheses here). I quote the passage in full:

Ocus tangadar rompo na sluaig iarum co Cluain Carpait siar a mBreicthír, risa raite Firchuig (: Firchaill, *Fr*) isin tan-so, .i. carpat Pátraic ro moid ann 7 ro tshuid naemPatraic ar in firt fótbaig (: fótbaid, L) ar moidm na cuinge 7 ní cían r[o] badur ann, co facadar in carpat da n-indsaige 7 gilla óc issin charpat.

---

**Laud**

7 ba comderg re corcair chaille cechtar a da gruad.
7 ba comglas re bugha cechtar a da rosc.
7 ba geal

cach ball aile ina cholaind.
7 ba comdub re gual

in blai futairlli *do bóí fair.*

7 tainic da n-indsaíg mar-sin.

**Fr.**

*Dergithir re corcair* lossa líac cechtar a da gruad 7
*glaisithir re bodb* mucc cechtar a da righros.
Samalta re snechta nua n-oenaídchi

cach n-alt 7 cech n-áighi dhe 7
*duibithir* re sméraib ar na cur a ndobur-úisci gemreta

an curach fuilt cais duib *ro bí fair*

7 doriacht an carpat da n-indsaíd.

---

25 Manuscript witnesses to the text at this point are Laud 610, ff 141a2-141b1 and UCD-Franciscan ms A4, ff 73a-b (Stokes 1900, 184-5, 329-30).
'Ra thoillfed ort a fhir in carpait,' ar Beneon, ‘foirithin (: ben-nachtain, Fr) nóemPatraic?’ ‘Cia siut amlaid?’ ar in gilla óc. ‘Patraic mac Alpraind siut,’ ar Beineon, ‘.i. cenn irsi 7 crabaid fer nEirenn.’ Ocus ro eirig in gilla assin charpat 7 tic a chenn a n-ucht Pátraic 7 adubairt: ‘Ní maith in carpait ré roind,’ ar sè, ‘7 in carpait uile do Pátraic.’ ‘Raith duit gan chomraind 7 dot mac 7 do t’úa,’ ar Pátraic (: ‘Anuair ro sìa Rath duit,’ ar Pátraic, ‘cen comroind crichi coidchi ret mac na rét ua it degaid’ Fr) 7 cá … léo .i. thusa a maccáim?’ (: ‘Ca slondud tusa a macaim?’ Fr) ar Pátraic. ‘Dub mac Muirgissa (meic Tomalt)aig misi,’ ar se. ‘Is fhir um,’ ar Beneon, ‘is (rodub, Fr).’ ‘Mo debróth um,’ ar Pátraic, ‘bid Hí Raduib cháidchi (festa do tsíl, Fr) 7 do tsémed tré t’umaloit.’ ‘Mo maicni-se (: mainchine, Fr) duitsiu eter béo 7 marb,’ ar in gilla. ‘Ac eter,’ ar Pátraic, ‘.i. i cind cét bliadon onfú do béo 7 do marb damsa 7 do Dia co brath.’ ocus adubairt Pátraic: Radub caithfid mor do rath . sochaide a tsil o so amach, uada in tres aicme co mbauid . i crich Connacht in morsluaig. Da rabat sunn haithle áir . clann Raduib co mét conaich, acht adhalácfer co bráth mbán . am Fhabhur is am Chruachan. (accom aidléacht co brath . ’com ádhraid is ’com Cruachán, Fr) Fácaim-si dóib na n-inadh . buaid n-abbad is buaid filed, buaid tighidhís orro de . buaid céile is buaid comairle. Adeirim-si ribsi de . bid fír dam in faistine, ragait a fir or and or . iss ed geinfes ó Radub. Radub. ‘Ocus is cet lem,’ ar Pátraic, ‘grindiugud (: glinniugud, Fr) cacha dala 7 cacha caingne risa racha fer do tshil do dénam dó, acht corub cóir. Uair is co grind tucais in carpait dam (: is cuithglind in carpait tucais dam, Fr).’ Ocus ní cian ro badur ann co facadur in carpait aile da n-ind-saigid 7 da ech chutruma chomméite fáé 7 ben chroderg issin charpat sin, 7 brat croderg uimpi, 7 delg ór issin brut 7 lann d’ór buidhe re héatan. Ro thairling assin charpat 7 tic a cenn a n-ucht Pátraic 7 ro slecht dó. ‘Cia tusa a ingen?’ ar Pátraic. ‘Aíffi Derg ingen Chonaill Chostadaig ingen rig Connacht mé,’ ar si, ‘7 mathus mainech moradbhul fuil acum,’ ar in ingen, ‘7 da chomairli riutsa thanac cá fer risa fáeigiu (: fáeiub, Fr) uair is tú aenduine is fer a nEirind.’ ‘Ac sin accut ar do lethlaim hé.’ ‘Cia seo amlaid?’ ar in ingen. ‘Dub mac Raduib meic
The hosts then went off westwards into Breicethír to Cluain Carpait, now called Firchuing, for the chariot of Patrick broke there, and Saint Patrick sat down on an earthen mound, after the axle had broken. They had not been long there when they saw a chariot driving towards them with a young boy in it. His cheeks were as purple as foxglove, his royal eyes as blue as hyacinth. The rest of his body was like the new snow of a single night, and as black as (coal) berries that have been into dark wintry water was the tangle of curly black hair on his head. His chariot drew near to them. ‘Would you be able, O man of the chariot,’ said Benén, ‘to help holy Patrick?’ ‘Who is it who is there thus?’ asked the young boy. ‘Patrick, son of Calpurn, is here,’ said Benén, ‘the head of the faith and piety of the men of Ireland.’ The boy descended from his chariot, put his head into the lap of Patrick and said, ‘It is not a good chariot for sharing.’ ‘Let Patrick have it all.’ ‘Grace to you without division and to your son and to your grandson,’ said Patrick. ‘What is your name, boy?’ asked Patrick. ‘I am Dub “Black”, son of Muirgius mac Tomaltaig,’ he said. ‘It is true indeed,’ said Benén, ‘he is very black.’ ‘By my God of Judgement,’ said Patrick, ‘because of your humility your seed henceforth will be the Descendants of Radub (“Very-Black”).’ ‘The service of my family, both living and dead, to you,’ said the boy. ‘This instead,’ said Patrick, ‘at the end of a hundred of years from today, your being living
or dead, for me and for God until doom.’ Patrick then recited this verse:

Radub will enjoy great grace and many of his seed henceforth.
From him a line victorious in mighty Connacht’s land.
Radub’s children after him here with a measure of wealth,
He shall lie here till Doom, by Fore and by Cruachán.
I leave to his descendants a gift of abbots and poets.
A gift of husbandry on them of fellowship and plans.
I tell you now of it. What I say is true.
All of this will profit the children of Radub.

‘It is my will,’ said Patrick, ‘that each legal decision in every assembly, and every claim in which a man of your seed may be involved, will go his way, providing the procedure be fair. For you gave the chariot to me without hesitation.’ They soon saw another chariot coming towards them, with two great horses of the same size under it. A blood-red woman rode in the chariot, with a blood-red cloak about her with a pin of gold in it. She had a plate of yellow gold on her forehead. She got down from the chariot, put her head into Patrick’s lap and did homage to him. ‘Who are you, good woman?’ asked Patrick. ‘I am Aífe Derg (“the Red”), the daughter of Conall Costadach (“the Maintainer”), the daughter of the King of Connacht. I have great and precious wealth and have come to you for advice on what man I should sleep with, for you are the one man who is best in Ireland.’ ‘Look you,’ said Patrick, ‘he is beside you.’ ‘Who is this one?’ she asked. ‘Dub, son of Rodub, son of Muirgius mac Tomaltaig,’ said Patrick. ‘What bride-price and dowry does he have for me?’ said the woman. ‘What bride-price do you ask from him?’ said Patrick. ‘That I be an only wife to the man who will wed me,’ said the girl, ‘for it is not fitting that he leave or repudiate me.’ ‘Do you agree to that, my boy?’ said Patrick. ‘I agree,’ said the boy, ‘to everything that you tell me to do.’ ‘If that is so, then take the woman so that your children and your race may be from her,’ said Patrick, ‘and allow her her request.’ He married her thus by the counsel of Saint Patrick. ‘But without land,’ said Aífe, ‘it will be difficult.’ ‘Where is the King of Connacht?’ said Patrick. ‘Here, holy cleric,’ said the King. ‘Give me some land for this pair,’
said Patrick, ‘that came to me for counsel.’ ‘The cantred that is
due him as patrimony,’ said the King, ‘they shall both have
together.’ They parted from him in this way.

Dub’s genealogical strand does indeed correspond with the family
name given in the text, so that for once the author leaves us in no
doubt as to who exactly this fictional young man represents. He
stands for the founder of that Síol Muireadhaigh line of Clann
Tomaltaigh which descends from Áed, son of Cathal mac Muirgiussa
(king of Connacht †839); the family is later known by the surnames
Ua Úaidubh and Mac Oireachtaigh. Especially noteworthy in the
Acallam account is the role of legal adviser and peacemaker, rhetor-
ically sanctioned by the formal blessing-poem of Patrick and
repeated in the prose that follows.  

The Mac Oireachtaigh/Ua Raduibh family occupies a unique slot
in the history of Connacht and their rise and fall occurs precisely in
the years in which we consider the Acallam to have been composed
in its present form. The head of the family is known in the annals as
the dux of Clann Tomaltaigh and, as the surname Mac Oireachtaigh
signifies, they are, along with the Mac Diarmada family of Loch Cé,
the chief members of the Connacht king’s oireacht. The family, possi-
bly at some point after the composition of the Vita Tripartita,
gained control of the Patrician foundation of Achadh Fhabhair
(Aghagower) and they already had a crucial territorial and ecclesias-
tical base around Crúachan; they also seem to have close connec-
tions with the church of Tobar Phátraic (Ballintubber, AC, s.a. 1224)
and seem to have entire control of the undoubtedly lucrative

26 This Áedh is referred to in the Lecan, Ballymote and Mac Fhirbhisigh genealog-
ical collections as Áedh .i. Radub. It is noteworthy that in later genealogical collec-
tions such as those represented in RIA MSS 153 (23 M 17) and 148 (23 D 9), the
founder of the line is called Dubh dá Chróich (23 D 9, p. 300). The reference to dou-
ble territory is as interesting as the name change. One cannot be sure, however, that
the Acallam has not influenced this reading.

27 Earlier Patrician hagiography mentions the site of Achadh Fhabhair and the Vita
Tripartita has Patrick spend Lent on the mountain and Easter at Achadh Fhabhair. In
both texts Patrick utters essentially the same poem on the salmon in the well.
Chariots and charioteers are a feature of Patrician hagiography and Patrick does lose
a charioteer on this occasion in the Vita Tripartita ll 1388-9. See Nagy (1997, 211-
232). Nothing like the Acallam story concerning Áed / Rodubh is to be found in the
earlier material, however. This would indicate that the Ua Raduib takeover of
Aghagower occurred later than the date of the VT; as there seems to be no interest in
maintaining the older traditions of bishop Senach and his family as recorded in VT.
But perhaps there is also some kind of synthesis between Aghagower and Radub and
the bishop Ródán, búachaill Pátraic i Muirisc Aigle of VT 87.
pilgrimage of Cruachan Aighle. Already in the mid-eleventh century they seem to have expanded beyond their local power base in Connacht to take up secular office in Armagh; one of them is mentioned as *muire Cloinne Sionaich* ‘steward of Clann Sinaigh’ (*ALC s.a.* 1059; *AFM* has *tigherna* ‘lord’ here, but this cannot be correct). They seem to occupy a position of trust with a sequence of kings for almost a century. Although figures from other families are named in the annals as personal officials to Cathal Croibhdherg and his son Áedh (viz. Ó Carmaccáin, Ó Finn, Ó Fínnechta, and Ó Taidhg), their role as loyal members of the *oireacht*, mediators and advisers to the king of Connacht, takes on special prominence in the last years of the twelfth century. In 1176 Aireachtach Ó Raduibh is a leading witness to a donation of land at Toomagh by the king of Connacht to the monastery of St Berach (*AFM s.a.*). In 1190 he acts as go-between for the archbishop of Armagh (himself a close kinsman, a nephew of Cathal Croibhdherg and of Cathal Carrách’s father), Cathal Carrach, and Cathal Croibhdherg in the aftermath of Conchobhar Maenmhaighe’s murder by his *aés grádha*, during the uncertain years before the final exit of Ruaidhrí Ó Conchobhair from the western political scene (*AFM s.a.*). In 1215 a dispute between the archbishoprics of Tuam

28 The evidence of the *Vita Tripartita* would place the pilgrimage at Lent and the annals entry recording the death of pilgrims from lightning in 1113 (*ALC*) occurs on the eve of the feast of Patrick. The evidence given in the annals’ entry for 1224 could imply that the pilgrimage took place after the death of Cathal Croibhdherg at the end of May, but the expression used to denote the time in *ALC* and *AC* (*re faebur*) is ambiguous. The fact that there is later medieval evidence for indulements (with the feast now celebrated on the Sunday after the feast of St Peter in Chains) to the churches of the Reek implies a good deal of pilgrimage custom still firmly under ecclesiastical management (cf. *Calendar of Papal Registers* 440).

29 A later picture of the position of Mac Oireachtaigh as one of the four royal chief-tains of the king’s *oireacht* is provided by the tract on the inauguration of O’Conor (Dillon 1961, 186-202).

30 In 1143 one *Murchadh mac maic Aireachtaigh Hui Raduib* acts as surety in a land transaction between Toirdhealbhach Ó Conchobhair and the coarb of Roscommon (*Ann. Tig.* s.a. 1143).

31 The annals entry in *ALC* s.a. 1189 which lists the members of the *aes grádha* involved in the murder of Conchobhar Maenmhuighe does not include any of the Úi Raduibh, and this is probably significant. Peace is finally made between the two Cathals in 1199 (cf. *síth do dhenum do Cathal Croibderec ocus do Cathal Charrach, ocus Cathal Carrach do tabairt don tír; ocus feronn do thabairt dó*, *ALC*). There is some confusion in the annals on the date of Airechtach’s death. He is listed as having drowned in the royal shipwreck of 1190 (*ALC*); certainly he was in the royal entourage as they made their way from Clonfert to Clonmacnois (*AFM*). Óne Airechtach mac Duinncaithaig is also reported killed in 1211 (*ALC*).
and Armagh concerning Patrician churches, including the churches of Cruachan Aighle and Achadh Fhabhair, is taken to Rome to be decided (the dispute is finally settled in 1241). Aireachtach’s successor, Donn Cathaigh, known in the genealogical tradition as Donn Cathaigh Mór, seems to have further built up the family’s prestige: this is the individual who is referred to in the genealogical traditions of Lecan and Ballymote as having taken up forgbhail moir nach argaib neach roime da chenel i.e. taisigeacht cloindi Taidg 7 claindi Murrthaile itir tighernus (forgabhail BB) 7 maerighecht (‘a great pickings never before won by any of his kin, viz. the lordship of Clann Taidhg and Clann Murrthaile, both lordship (?) and stewardship (?)’). He died in 1224 (AC), the same year as Cathal Croibhdherg, and much of the drama of the next few years in Connacht affairs concerns the revolt of the oireacht of the new king Æadh under the son of Donn Cathaigh, Donn Óg.

The succession of the new king is viewed in the western annals exclusively from a Mac Oireachtaigh perspective. His reign is declared to have begun auspiciously because there was successful protection of the pilgrims on the Patrician/Mac Oireachtaigh pilgrimage to Cruachan Aighle, and Æadh enforced the law strictly on the only malefactors noted for that year’s event. The vigorous and innovative nature of the writing for these years in the western annals underlying the narratives in both ALC and AC has been described by O’Dwyer (1972) as the responsibility of Clarus Mág Maoilín and his community at Loch Cé. But the close attention given to local detail and the heroic saga-style account of Donn’s rebellion of 1225 and 1228-30 suggest that we should also posit a significant line of

32 Book of Lecan (RIA MS 535 (23 P 2)), 65ra, Book of Ballymote (RIA 536 (23 P 12), 58rd, RIA 466 (C iv 2), 131. For the territory of Clann Taidhg see AC 1224. 2, n.1. It may be significant that Clann Taidhg were part of Ó Flathbheartaigh’s oireacht. Clann Murthaile is obscure. In the same annals at 1225.31 Muiredach Ó Finnchecht is described as taisch Clainni Murthaile (note the similarity between his name and the ancestor of the Síol Muireadhaigh named in the Acallam; such naming games in the work would repay more study). In the later tract on the inauguration of O’Conor, a branch of Ó Fhinnachtaig, one of twelve royal chieftains of Síol Muireadhhaig, is described as Clann Murthuile (Dillon 1961, 189). Freeman wrongly corrects the annals entry to Clann Murchada in order to bring the entry into line with the other annals (the error is already present in ALC). Forgabhail ‘pickings’ implies a forcible taking; but we simply do not know enough about the context of the reference to interpret accurately what precise connotations the terms tighernas ‘lordship’ and maerigheacht ‘stewardship’ might have here, save that the latter must refer to the right to collect dues from these areas outside the territory.

33 Compare the blessing pronounced by Patrick on the protectors of the pilgrimage towards the end of the Acallam, ll 7575-82.
Aghagower information and interest underlying the annals of these years. Of the two western sets of annals, AC represents events marginally better in this respect than ALC.\textsuperscript{34} Two factors served to alienate Donn Óg, and both bear closely on the western narrative stream in the Acallam: first is the matter of his having been deprived by the newly inaugurated Áedh of his ferann \textit{aicidecht} (ALC, AC).\textsuperscript{35} Here a distinction is being made between two types of land tenure, although the precise significance of \textit{aicidecht} is not sufficiently clear to me.\textsuperscript{36} There is one suggestive reference in the detailed description of the campaign as described by AC which points to Donn Óg as being married to the daughter of Ó Flaitheartaigh, king of west Connacht. In the narration of Donn Óg’s rebellion of 1225 Áedh Ó Conchobhair’s suspicions of Áedh Ó Flaitheartaigh are reported: \textit{Doronne-som comurli aili ann sin .i. impo dochom h. Flaitheartaigh ar cula, ar nir tharise leis mar do faccaibh e, ar ro batur meic Ruaidri allaniar do Loch aice 7 a chlaimin fein .i. Dond Occ mar aen riu} (‘Then he changed plans, deciding to turn back towards Ó Flaitheartaigh; for he did not trust how he had left him, because the sons of Ruaidhrí were west of the Lake with him and his own son-in-law, Donn Óg, as well’) (AC 1225. 16). The innovations in annalistic style in this period sometimes throw up moments of a less than satisfactory syntactic clarity and there are problems of interpretation with the above. I take the emphatic -\textit{som} of \textit{Doronne-som} to refer to Áedh Ó Conchobhair, from whose perspective this particular segment of the campaign is being narrated. In these circumstances, a subsequent emphatic -\textit{féin} should refer to the subject of the action, viz. Áedh, thus making Donn Óg a son-in-law to Áedh, or vice versa. This latter option is hardly likely, as we do know the names of Áedh’s two wives, and the question of his marriage is, I believe, dealt with somewhat later in the Acallam. If

\textsuperscript{34} AC alone contains the entry on the death of Donn Cathaigh on pilgrimage at Ballintubber in 1224 and provides a better organised account of the events of 1224-25 as well as more data for the important events of 1228 than does ALC.

\textsuperscript{35} The question of the changing base for royal legitimation is crucial to an understanding of the problems of Síol Muireadhaigh in the time when this text is taking shape.

\textsuperscript{36} The double expression is suggestive of the doubling attributed to his father in the Lecan genealogies; ferann is the generalised term used throughout the annals at this point. DIL gives as its meaning ‘land owned by hereditary right, patrimony, occupation’, but as the reference under consideration is the only entry which is not toponymic in nature, the definitions are unhelpful. If the word \textit{aicidecht} is related to \textit{aicde}, then a tenantship of some kind may be implied.
Donn Óg had indeed married an Ó Conchobhair princess it would have been a somewhat unusual alliance, with little in the way of advantage to the king in such a match. But in this case there is a more proximate antecedent in the passage, Ó Flaithbheartaigh, to whom aice refers. This would then make Donn Óg a son-in-law or father-in-law of Æedh Ó Flaithbheartaigh. The latter is earlier referred to as a sworn ally of the cause of Donn Óg (perhaps because of marriage ties) and the sons of Ruaidhrí, and he plays a fairly important role in the war at this stage. What circumstances would have brought about a wedding between a daughter of Ó Flaithbheartaigh and a son of Mac Oireachtaigh, brokered by Patrick in this way and sanctioned and endowed by the king of Connacht? Is the significance of the marriage scene in the Acallam to be located in the context of an amicable solution to problems between the Ó Conchobhair king and the king of west Connacht, once a prominent figure in the Galway heartland, and now driven more and more into a position of subordination and marginalised? These are problems which the Mac Oireachtaigh family have done their best to resolve. Have they been rewarded for it by Cathal Croibhdherg on the occasion of this marriage, only to be deprived of the land thus acquired on the accession to power of Æedh? Is this a hostile action on the part of the king, who now sees too close a friendship between the two families – an action that drives Donn Óg into open revolt?

There is a narrow window of opportunity for such an alliance to happen, and to understand it one also must take the political circumstances of the Úi Fhlaithbheartaigh into account. Antagonistic, and fighting a losing action against the rise of Síol Muireadhaigh throughout the eleventh century, the kings of west Connacht are yet to be found in alliance with Toirrdhelbhach Mór in the twelfth-, and even beyond his death, with other figures from the Ó Conchobhair line. Relations sour definitively, however, in the reign of Cathal Croibhdherg and tension comes to a head with the proscription of Ruaidhrí Ó Flaithbheartaigh in 1196. From his exile in Tír Conaill peace is arranged between the two through the mediation of the comharb of Patrick. Ó Flaithbheartaigh submits to Cathal and receives his land back from him. But the peace is an uneasy one. He is imprisoned by Cathal in 1197, set free in 1199. In 1201 he is again

---

37 This is how O’Donovan understands it (AFM III 235 n.).
38 At the battle of Magh Diughba in 1181 (ALC) the Úi Fhlaithbheartaigh presence offers a good example of a classic hosting of an oireacht. Ruaidhrí is again briefly on side in the raid by Cathal Croibhdherg into Meath in 1200.
tempted to act treacherously towards Cathal Croibhdherg, but, according to AFM, tension between the two is averted through the guarantee of the ecclesiastical sureties to the peace brokered by the Patrician clerics in 1196. The friendly conditions for the two families and the reliance of the Uí Chonchobhair kings on the good offices of Mac Oireachtaigh could well have been cemented by a marriage at this time, such as that described in the Acallam. Is this, then, the immediate context lying behind the story in the Acallam of Radubh, his royal bride, and his marriage portion – a land transaction brokered by the Patrician cleric, given by the king to be shared by both partners? The unusual ferann pósta given by the king, normally intended for the bride but shared by both partners in the marriage of Donn Óg / Radubh in the Acallam, may be seen in two ways: either the king of Connacht who grants it is the hitherto absent father of Aífe (hence Ó Flaithbheartaigh), and the land is given in gratitude for the good offices of Ó Raduibh; or, as is more likely, it is offered by the king of Connacht as an idealising example of his largesse and of his power as dominus terrae. We know from elsewhere in the annals that royal Connacht women were indeed given a ferann pósta. In 1239 Lassairfhína, daughter of Cathal Croibhdherg, wife of Ó Domhnaill, gave a lethbaile do fherunn phusta to Clarus Mág Maoilín and the community of Loch Cé. Were these lands understood as part of a king’s own mensal lands? But neither members of Uí Raduibh nor Uí Fhlaithbheartaigh are hereditary officials of the king. It seems that it is equally likely that the Acallam incident is symbolic for an action that would be seen by Cathal Croibhdherg as a convenient means of disposing with confiscated and still contentious Uí Flaithbheartaigh lands in the heartland from which they have been pushed by Síol Muireadhaigh. So they are represented as disposed of by way of a compromise, by being allocated to the couple jointly. The gains for Cathal and for Donn Óg, and even for Ó Flaithbheartaigh, are obvious both in terms of the deferral of difficult

39 For some consideration of rank and marriage patterns and of property-related issues in marriage see Patterson (1994).
40 ALC, AC s.a. 1239. One cannot assume that advancing age played a part in this transaction, for she lived on until 1282. She must have married considerably earlier than this date. Her husband died, however, in 1241 at the monastery of Assaroe, having assumed the Cistercian habit; thus his death may have been foreseen and Lassairfhína may have felt compelled to donate a (her?) share of dowry lands to the neutral safe-keeping of a church among her own people rather than among her husband’s.
41 Earlier Caílte had just provided a marriage portion for a woman out of the hidden treasure at Cruachain (Acallam II 3893-959).
proprietary issues, and in view of strengthened bonds of loyalty and military indebtedness to be achieved thereby.

The second reason cited for Donn Óg’s ultimate disaffection is the habit of Áedh and his father before him of relying on the alternative model of rule and enforcement at hand, namely reliance on the authority of the Justiciar, and above all, the availability of paid military help afforded by the presence of the Anglo-Normans and their stockade at Athlone. As premier members of the king’s oireacht the position of a family such as Clann Oireachtaigh is becoming increasingly ambiguous. It is not just the more tension-filled relationships that suffer, such as that between king and the Úi Fhlaithbheartaigh, in which confiscation and deliverance of the latter into the hands of Anglo-Norman justice (see AC only s.a. 1226) are the common stock of the king/vassal relationship. The loyal members of the oireacht and the king’s officers also experience the downside of proximity to the king when traded as hostages against Cathal’s son Áedh, in 1210 in dealings with King John. The feeling of the western annalist is roused frequently by the plight of hostages used as political pawns between Anglo-Norman and Irish king. The best example is the entry for 1227 (ALC, AC) where Áedh plunders Athlone, takes hostages of the Normans, breaks up the market and releases all Irish prisoners. The annalist praises the action thus: *ba gnim sochair do Connachtaibh uile sin, uair fhuaire simh a meic ocus a ningina ocus braigde Connacht ocus sith do Connachtaibh da éis* (‘That was an act that benefited all Connacht people, because they recovered their sons and daughters and the hostages of Connacht and there was peace for the people therefrom’) (ALC s.a.). Donn Óg himself is seen throughout as having a special relationship with the glaslaith of Síol Muireadhaigh, a term which could be taken as denoting the same kind of raw recruits into the king’s army as is represented in the Acallam by the figure of Mac Lugach.42

The advantages of a Gaelic polity, self-regulated through competition, and the interest of the oireacht in maintaining standards of military and civil propriety – factors with which the Acallam is entirely absorbed, and which a mixed religious and secular family such as Clann Oireachtaigh seems to have previously endorsed and actively pursued – are, then, continually being complicated and subverted in the third generation after the submission to Henry II by the

---

42 What is probably the earliest usage of this word, links it with fian. Cf. Cor’ cuirsed Hui Beicc fian glaslaith insin Ògais dia frithaileam (Ann. Tig. 1131, RC 18, 54.26).
presence of another military option with a very different stake in the country. In any case the sheer number of Ruaidhrí’s competing descendants would probably have made civil strife inevitable after Cathal’s death. This is another reason for the annalists to bemoan Ruaidhrí’s promiscuity in 1233. In these circumstances any ideal of the king’s justice that could be salvaged quickly falls away in the reign of Áedh.

Donn Óg’s final downfall (1228-30) is written up by the western annalists as an heroic tragedy which affects both him and the militarily active male members of the family – the son of his brother Amhlaíbh is also among the casualties. It is an event which elicits the annalists’ pity for the plight of Clann Tomaltaigh as a whole: *An deachaid dib sin mBac, in mhéid nach ar baidhit, ro airgid ocus ro marbuid. Truagh amh sin, gach oen ro gab gu Dub chungha ro báidhit, ocus is amhluid do geibhthi na carranna co na cescanaibh ocus a lán do lenbuib ar na mbathad innta* (‘As many of them as got to the Bac without being drowned were plundered and slain. A pitiful thing: all who went to Ballycong were drowned, and the weirs were found to have their baskets full of drowned children’) (*ALC* s.a. 1225, vol. I 278-9). There is concern throughout the annalists’ accounts for the crumbling standards of military conduct and propriety. Kings and sons of kings find themselves alone without a proper retinue. Vassals, notably Ói Thaidhg, break their oath of loyalty in the *oireacht*. A number of times the narrative of these years makes a considerable general statement condemning the breakdown of civic life; thus, for example: *Ba truagh tra ant olc do ceduig Dia don chuigid is ferr do bi a nEirinn toir na tiar thes na thuaidh; uair ni caicledh in mac óglaech a chele ag creachadh no ag arguin acht comad treisi dho. Do cuirit mná ocus leinb ocus óigtigern ocus treoin ocus ettroin re fúacht ocus re gorta don cogadh sin* (‘Pitiful indeed was the tempest which God permitted to descend upon the best province of Ireland, north, south, east or west. For the young warrior would not forbear, if only he were the stronger, to plunder his comrade, while women and children, feeble folk and lords’ sons were brought to suffer cold and hunger through this war’) (*ALC* s.a. 1225, vol. I 280). When the whole sorry affair of the civil war is finally over in 1233, the annalist comments: *Sith ocus smacht ar ceternaib ocus ar macaib mallachtan* (Connacht, add. *AC*) *do eirigh fo cedhóir re linn in righ óig sin in bliadain sin go raibh na tírthi na teighle re reimhes* (‘Peace and discipline over the armed bands and the malefactors [brigands as *fian* bands ?] of Connacht were restored
by the young king so that all the districts were orderly’) (ALC s.a. 1233, vol. I 314-15; cf. AC s.a. 1233.5). It is in this year also that Donn Cathaigh, airchinneach of Aghagower, dies. His obituary is worth quoting here as it contains, beside the common platitudes of annalistic eulogy, some statements that show close congruence with the prophecy of Patrick in the Acallam:

Donn Cathaigh, .i. airchindech Achaid Fabair, xuiii Kl. Ianuarii in Cristo quieuit; fer co nairmidin chelli ocus crotha a tuaithe ocus a negluis, duine dob ferr ocus dob fheile im crodh ocus im biudh tanic i gcomaimsir ris, díden truagh ocus trén, airmidin tire ocus talman, sdiuraidh ocus rédhugaid cacha dála idir a muintir fein ocus cach a geoitchinne

Donn Cathaigh, i.e. airchinnech of Aghagower, xuiii. Kalendas Januarii in Christo quievit: a man reverenced by clergy and laity for his qualities of mind and body; the protector of the wretched and the prosperous; an honour to his land and country; the reconciler of all disputes both among his own kin and among the public in general. (ALC s.a. 1233, vol. I 316-17)

But the Acallam, even as it deals with precisely these issues, surely has the advantage of having been written before these tragic events. The work constantly plays up the ideal relationship of mutual respect between monarch and church, and in the overarching story-line of the family of Fionn and the family of Goll mac Mórna most strikingly concentrates on the role of competing kindreds in the king’s military retinue. Knowing what we know of its western context, it may largely be the case that this rather specially placed, second-tier, family in western Ireland of the late twelfth/early thirteenth century viewed such a civilised and civilising vision of an ideal Gaelic polity as an attainable goal which served their own self-interest. The Acallam is notable for its scanty treatment of the role of Armagh itself as the prime church of Patrick. For this reason alone, the western Patrician churches present themselves as a reasonable place of origin for this text which inculcates the prestige of Patrick at every turn. Inevitably, then, we have been led to consider seriously the possible role of Clann Oireachtaigh in the shape of the text as we know it from its surviving manuscripts. The family benefits from the enormous cachet of popular pilgrimage enjoyed by the western Patrician churches during a period when an Ó Conchobhair has succeeded in
holding the see of Patrick at Armagh, and the relationship between
king and vassal is at its closest, measured in terms of adherence to
the classic ideal of military loyalty and wise counsel which the
oireacht symbolised. All such advantages were, of course, strength-
ened by appropriate marriage alliances. Members of the Mac
Oireachtaigh family are uniquely poised to serve the best of both
secular and clerical ideals in the Connacht of the day. The Acallam
interest in the adventures of Fionn turns to celebrate the family of
Mac Oireachtaigh at the height of its power, at the moment when an
advantageous, because peace-symbolising, marriage is celebrated
between the young Radub / Donn Óg and the daughter of the ‘other’
king of Connacht.43 Although the fictional bride, Aífe Derg, has an
arbitrarily named different royal parent, Conall Costadach, she
comes punningly packaged, so to speak, in the good offices of the
major royal figure in the contemporary scene, Cathal Croibhdhearg,
as she is a *ben cróderg*, with a *brat cróderg*. The other royal princess
in the Acallam, the wealthy Echna marries Cas Corach, Caille’s
musician companion and member of Túatha Dé Danann. She shows
some reluctance to marry someone whose family is not of the first
rank of Túatha Dé until she is reassured by St Patrick. There are no
clues as to the identity of Cas and perhaps his real significance is as
a symbol of the literary and performative ambitions of the architects
of the Acallam itself. His marriage remains, on the level of the
socially symbolic, a sign of the enormous ambitions unleashed by
the changing world of Gaelic culture in early thirteenth-century
Ireland.

Would Aghagower and its controlling family have had the
resources to produce a work like Acallam na Senórach? It is clear
that the west of Ireland offers the best environment for a work com-
bining new treatments of hitherto under-used narrative traditions and
Patrician interests with new reform interests. The close relationship
between the archbishop of Dublin, who was responsible for imple-
menting the Lateran Council reforms, and the west is a matter of
record. An interest in new musical innovations, as evidenced in the
Acallam by the leading role given to Cas Corach, is also recorded in
the annals (possibly as a feature of liturgy) in connection with indi-
viduals who include a son of Ruaidhrí based in Cong (ALC s.a.

---

43 In fact the annals record only one Mac Oireachtaigh marriage. At 1190 Aillen,
wife of Donn’s grandfather dies; she is the daughter of Ríacán Ó Mael Ruanaidh,
whose grandson, Florentius, became bishop of Elphin.
1224). Aghagower’s comarba are themselves shown as acquirers of books in the annals’ entry for 1221.

The Acallam occupies a special niche in Irish literary history because of its placement on the edge of performative and written tradition; an audience is implied which is accustomed to listen to tales but which is here being encouraged to respond to tales that are both told and read to a plurality. Here, finally, one must return to the stated audience of the work – the common people and the nobility in unison. Long ago the great scholar of the chansons de geste, Joseph Bédier, in arguing that these works with their formulae of audience inclusiveness were composed by the monks in the houses that were the way stations for the pilgrimage to Compostella (Bédier 1908-13, III 367, 448), coined the memorable phrase: Au commencement était la route. Might not also the Acallam have been composed for a similar audience, not in a spirit of defensiveness against modernity, but rather of active engagement with it? It is a work that presents an

44 Muirghes Cananach, mac Ruaidhri I [Chonchobhair], duine is comdeisi tainic do Gaoidealaibh riam i lligend ocus i cantaireacht, ocus hi vers dénmhuidhecht, do ég is in bliadainsi, ocus a adhluacadh a Cunga Feichin iar mbuaigh oingt ocus aithrighe (ALC I 270).
45 Diarmaid O Culecháin, sói senchusa ocus scribhinn, do éc is in bliadain sin, i. fer fa mó sgreatra ocus colus tanic na amsir fein; ocus issé ro sgríobh leabhar oifinn in Chmuic, ocus leabhar oifinn eli a dhingmhála do Diarmaid mac Oirechtach, dá oide, ocus do Ghillapadraic da comdhalta, do comarbuibh Achad Fabair diadh a ndiaidh (ALC s.a. 1221, vol. I 264). In the genealogies Diarmaid is the son of Donn Cathaigh and brother of the Aireachtach who died in 1190 (or 1211?); Gilla Pádraic is given in the genealogies as Diarmaid’s son. The implication of the annal entry is that Diarmaid is no longer alive in 1221. For a discussion of Irish missals of the later Middle Ages see Gwynn (1992).
46 Verbal similarities between the Acallam and the western annals exist, but they are probably too sparse to be significant. We may mention, for example, the repetition of clauses introduced by iar followed by verbal noun in the opening of the Acallam, and a similar use in the western annals’ account of the rebellion of Donn Óg: Iar n-arcnib 7 iar marbad doine 7 bo in tire 7 in talman 7 iar cur chaich re fuacht 7 re gorta tanicc teidm morgalair isin tir 7 isin talmain (AC s.a. 1225.27) (the use of the iar-construction is also seen in the H-interpolator’s work in Recension I of Táin Bó Cuailnge (O’Rahilly 1976, 61, ll 1982-3); cocad adbalmor (AC s.a. 1228.3) may be compared to mathus moradbul (Acallam ll 6472) used by Echna, the Connacht princess. It is also possible that the blessing of the well in Tír Luigni at ll 7500-08, and the related three failing omens, one of which is the drying up of the Galway river, represent a memory of the recent drying up of the river recorded in the annals at 1190. Note that these latter two examples are drawn from the western ‘matrimonial’ part of the Acallam. Another relevant date-marker from the Leinster segment is suggested by the poem in praise of Glendalough. Here a flooding caused by the beast in the lake is dramatised. Such a flooding did occur, recorded in Ann. Tig. s.a. 1179. I hope to discuss the Leinster section of the Acallam in a forthcoming article.
ideal image of regional kings who hear, over and over again, the exploits of the military men of whom Cailte is the surviving representative, and who expresses at all times both his due deference to authority and his proud commitment to the ideal of parity and mutual respect. That ideal answers to the aspirations of the institution of the oireacht as we have seen it evolve at this time and in this place. The Acallam, then, would be an expression of confidence in a bright new dawn of opportunity in Gaelic culture and polity in the west of Ireland at the period when pilgrimage to the Reek was flourishing and when the end of Gaelic kingship as a serious construct of western medieval Christendom was not yet envisaged.47

APPENDIX

Ambiguity in the annals concerning the phrase a chliamhain féin
(see above p. 115)

The 1225 reference is the first to occur (above p. 115), and there are two further instances.

(i)

AC s.a.1419.17:
Sluagad adbalmor do thecclad 7 do tinol la mac Mailsechlainn h. Cellaig .i. Uilliam, do dol i conne Remaund meic Hopert cona caeraigeacht da thhabairt les i Clainn Ricairt, amail ro gell do co ticfad leis do cocad for Clainn Ricairt. Et is iat-so na maithi 7 na moruasl do deachadar and .i. Mac Uilliam Burc .i. Uater mac Tomas a Burc a chliamain fein, et Dondchad h. Cellaig ri h. Maine, & Cathal Dub h. Conchobair adbur rig, 7 Tomaltach Mac Diarmata adbar rig Moigi Luirc, & da corugad galloclaech.

A vast army was collected and assembled by the son of Maelsechlainn Ó Cellaigh, that is, William, to go meet Raymond son of Hubert with his drovers and bring him into Clanrickard, since Raymond had promised to come with him to make war on Clanrickard. Now these were the nobles and great lords who went on that hosting: MacWilliam Burke, that is Walter son of Thomas, his father-in-law; Donnchad Ó Cellaig, king of Úi Maine; Cathal Dubh Ó Conchobair, eligible royal heir and two battalions of gallowglasses.

Here the entry begins with the announcement concerning the hosting collected and assembled by Ó Ceallaigh; but before proceeding to the listing the information on the promise of Réamand a Búrc is interposed. It is likely

47 This article is dedicated to the memory of Máirtín Ó Briain, Fenian scholar and friend.
that the term *cliamain* here should be interpreted as ‘father-in-law’, since Ó Ceallaigh marries a daughter of MacWilliam (Mary, see *AU*) at this time. The contextual point to note here is that, in spite of the interposed information on Raymond, the referent of *cliamain* is clearly the main actor and initiator of the somewhat complex action which the annalist is tracking. *Féin* is then added for extra emphasis as a way of resuming the listing under the aegis of the subject, Uilliam Ó Ceallaigh, and as an intensified reference to the personalised bond existing as a basis for the allied initiative. It thus runs counter to the inferences of the earlier citation.

(ii)

*AC*, 1466.12

Sluagad la Gallaib Mide 7 Laigen a nUib Falgi cur marbad Seaan mac meic Tomais for imruagad, int aenchenn fedna dob ferr do Gallaib Mide 7 Laigen. Dopo bainne ri frais do Gallaib sin, ar do madmaiged ant Iarla 7 a Gaill arabarach 7 do gabad int Iarla and 7 do benad a arm 7 a eded de 7 do tinlaic Tadc h. Conchobair a *cliamain fein* e co caislen Carpri.

The Galls of Meath and Leinster made an inroad into Offaly, when Seaan son of FitzThomas, the best captain of all the Meath and Leinster Galls, was killed in a skirmish. This was the drop before the shower for the Galls, for next day the Earl (of Desmond) was taken prisoner, and stripped of his arms and armour and Tadc Ó Conchobair, his brother-in-law, conducted him out of this rout to Carbury Castle.

This is a simpler narrative context than the former. No referential confusion is involved here, but the annalist imparts a satisfying ironic nuance to his narrative by referring to the relationship between the two men. O’Donovan tellingly quotes Leland’s account of this passage, with its astonishment at this sense of honour arising from quaint custom among the mere Irish – Leland refused to consider that the two men could have been linked by marriage (see *AFM* III pp 1042-3). It is hardly likely to have been a display of nobility on Ó Conchobhair Failghe’s part; the earl’s person was safeguarded with a view to a handsome ransom.
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University of Toronto
THE ‘POETICAL PERFORMANCE’ BETWEEN
JOHN ROY STEWART AND LORD LOVAT (1736)

Nothing makes the crime of high treason more arbitrary than when indiscreet speech becomes its material. (Montesquieu, De l’Esprit des loix (1748)).

‘Robert Chevis, of Murtoun, Esq’, was the first witness to appear against Simon Fraser, Lord Lovat, on the first day of Lovat’s trial before the Lords (9 March [o.s.] 1747). Chevis was, according to a member of the prosecution team, ‘a near Neighbour of the impeached Lord, but one at a very great Distance from his Way of Thinking or Acting’. Or speaking, presumably: for a distinct, if subsidiary, thrust of the evidence which Chevis supplied was designed to convey an overall sense of the treasonable colour of Lovat’s table-talk in order to show that ‘The general Turn of his Conversation was in Favour of the Pretender, and his Family.’ To that end, one of the prosecutors, Sir John Strange, drew Chevis into the following exchange. (Chevis had already described how John Roy Stewart, in jail on suspicion of high treason in Inverness, had in 1736 escaped with the connivance of Lovat – the high sheriff of the county! – and afterwards passed six convivial weeks at Lovat’s house. Chevis claimed to have been ‘very often’ in company with both men during this period.)

Sir John Strange. I desire the Witness may inform your Lordships, whether, during the Time that the noble Lord at the Bar and Roy Stuart were together, they diverted themselves with composing any thing, and what?

Chevis. They did, in composing Burlesque Verses, that, when young Charles came over, there would be Blood and Blows.

Sir John Strange. You have not mentioned it in a poetical Manner: Pray, can you recollect the Lines?

Chevis. When young Charley does come o’er,

There will be Blows and Blood good Store.


2 The Whole Proceedings in the House of Peers, upon the Impeachment Exhibited by the Knights, Citizens, and Burgesses, in Parliament Assembled, in the Names of Themselves, and of all the Commons of Great Britain; Against Simon Lord Lovat, for High Treason (London 1747) 30.

3 ibid. 34.

4 ibid. 36.
Sir John Strange. I beg that you will acquaint their Lordships, whether this Verse, that you mention, is a Translation, or whether this is the original Language in which it was composed?

Chevis. It was framed in Erse; and this is the Substance of one Verse.⁵

Although this anecdote is well known, its implications have not been fully explored. The purpose of this brief paper is to discuss those implications which strike me as most interesting.

Among the contrasting images of Lord Lovat which we have inherited from friends, foes and fascinated observers like Hogarth, it is pleasant to include the above picture of the Old Fox going verse for verse (and, one imagines, glass for glass) with one of the most remarkable Scottish literary figures of the age. Few would disagree with John Lorne Campbell’s comment: ‘It is to be regretted that none of the “burlesque verse” composed by this distinguished pair has come down to us.’⁶ But Campbell’s collection of Jacobite song shows that the two men were improvising within a familiar idiom of seditious anticipation – cf. lines 27-8 of Alasdair Mac Mhaighstir Alasdair’s ‘Óran Nuadh’, looking ahead to the Stuart prince’s arrival: So an cumusg, am bi na buillion, / An deantar fuil a dhórtadh (‘Here’s the fight where blows are given / And blood will start a-flowing’).⁷

⁵ ibid. 37.
⁷ Alastair Mac-Dhonuill [sic], Ais-Eiridh na Sean Chánoin Albannaich; no, An Nuadh Oranaiche Gaidhealach (Edinburgh 1751) 59-64 (p. 60). Against common editorial practice, I retain Mac Mhaighstir Alasdair’s spelling in order to preserve an eighteenth-century flavour. The standard modern edition of the song (from which I borrow my translation) is in Campbell, Highland songs 62-71 (at pp 64-5).

An Irish example of this idiom of anticipation is Ódriúin Mac Cruitín’s composition Go cúig roimh luis dá dtugadh grása Dé (1735), which foresees ‘bodies, skulls, bones and chests being crushed, Smothering in mud a multitude that is powerful’, and ‘London, ah! bloody be the strand of your Thames’ (Lé mbrúfar cuirp, cluigne, cnámha is cléibh / Ag múcha i muirt na druinge atá go tréan […] / A Lundain, uil, ba fuilteach tráig do Thames’: T. F. O’Rahilly, ‘Deasgán Tuanach: selections from modern Clare poets, III’, Irish Monthly 53 (1925) 160-61 (at p. 160)). For the circumstances of this song’s composition, see idem, ‘The history of the Stowe Missal’ Ériu 10 (1926-28) 95-109 (at pp 102-4, 106-8); cf. P. A. Breatnach, ‘Oral and written transmission of poetry in the eighteenth century’ Eighteenth-Century Ireland 2 (1987) 57-65 (at pp 63-4).
‘Òran Nuadh’, of course, is no ‘Burlesque’; and although there was a vigorous tradition of ridiculing the Hanoverian dynasty in Gaelic song, the verse which Chevis quoted does not appear to belong to that mode. Was it a slip of the tongue on Chevis’s part to state that Lovat’s and Stewart’s poetical diversions were mainly in the burlesque vein? This seems unlikely. He was obviously a well-coached witness. Rather, I suspect that Chevis and Strange had settled on ‘Burlesque Verses’ as the phrase they would use to characterise the two Jacobites’ diversions in order to deepen the impression of truculent and offensive sedition.

No aspect of the Jacobite counter-culture was more infuriating to the authorities than its rich tradition of seditious mockery. Inept conspiracies and unco-ordinated outbursts of mob violence might be pardoned or overlooked, if kept at a low level; the state could even assist in broadcasting straightforward assertions of Jacobite sentiment, as it did by countenancing the delivery and publication of condemned rebels’ dying speeches.8 But the governments of early Georgian Britain were highly sensitive to being laughed at, or to having their monarchs made figures of fun. In the anti-Jacobite periodical which he produced in response to the 1715 uprising, even that cool cucumber Joseph Addison is reduced to spluttering indignation by the ‘Libels [and] Lampoons’ being circulated by Jacobite women who had nothing better to do than ‘string together a Parcel of silly seditious Stories, that are equally void of Decency and Truth’.9

At Lovat’s trial, Strange and his witness seem to be linking Lovat’s and Stewart’s compositions with this specially odious class of seditious expression. By representing the two Jacobites’ compositions as lighthearted mockery rather than deadly serious incitement, the prosecution, paradoxically, was blackening their crime. And what crime was that, exactly? Uttering ‘seditious words’ was a misdemeanour, and one which the Whig state of the eighteenth century, like earlier régimes, took seriously – so much so that one scholar can write (of the detailed records left by such prosecutions):

One of the very few opportunities for historians to eavesdrop on the conversations of the past, to be able to listen to what

---

ordinary men and women actually said to each other on specific occasions, is when someone at the time tried to silence them.\textsuperscript{10}

But Lovat had not been impeached for uttering seditious words (which legally would be an impossible, or extremely unlikely, contingency). If Chevis’s testimony on this point is relevant to any of the articles brought against Lovat, it is to the seventh (and last, and vaguest) of those articles: that the Fraser chief ‘at divers [. . .] Times and Places, did unlawfully and traiterously hold, entertain, and keep Intelligence and Correspondence, […] with divers […] Persons, who were employed by the […] Pretender’s […] Son; […] including John Roy Stuart […]’.\textsuperscript{11}

We should divest ourselves of any suspicion that there was no prosecutorial purpose in specifying the content of Lovat’s and Stewart’s poetical diversions. The trial of a rebel lord was a rare and solemn event, partaking of the highest levels of state and juridical ceremony. Prosecutors did not go into such a proceeding absent-mindedly, and there is little chance that Strange was playing for time by drawing Chevis out on a trivial subject while he rummaged among his notes or tried to collect his thoughts before the next major step in his examination. This was an examination of which every stage was meticulously planned out and rehearsed.\textsuperscript{12} In his summing-up, Strange saw fit to remind his audience of ‘the poetical Performance between Roy Stuart and the noble Lord’.\textsuperscript{13}

But the ‘traiterous’ character of that performance, we should note, depends entirely on its context and on a subtlety of Chevis’s paraphrase. Considered in isolation, the verse which Chevis quoted can be read as neutrally predictive: who in the Whig camp would deny, or even hesitate to declare, that a Jacobite invasion would result in ‘Blows and Blood’? That an invasion on the Stuarts’ behalf would embroil the kingdom in bloodshed was a point frequently made, in fact, in anti-Jacobite rhetoric. The assumption that the two men desired such an invasion derives from their known histories and


\textsuperscript{11} \textit{The Whole Proceedings} 13.

\textsuperscript{12} Strange’s fastidiousness in preparation and attentiveness in court are demonstrated by his surviving briefs and notes for the Jacobite commoners’ trials at St Margaret’s Hill, Southwark, July to December 1746 (these show him making alert jottings as each trial is in progress): British Library, Egerton MS 2000.

\textsuperscript{13} \textit{The Whole Proceedings} 154.
from the circumstances of their keeping company together – and just possibly, from the designation ‘Charley’ which Chevis adapted from the Gaelic original (presumably Teàrlach). Rendering Teàrlach as ‘Charley’ may seem like a neutral decision. But we should always be alert to the politics of translation in the eighteenth century – never more so than in the context of pre-scripted testimony at a state trial.

Lovat’s prosecutors always required their witnesses to be precise about how Lovat, or anyone else, referred to Charles Edward Stuart or his father on any particular occasion. Here is a typical exchange between Strange’s colleague Sir Richard Lloyd and the witness Hugh Fraser:

Sir Richard Lloyd. What did he call the Pretender? by what Name?
H. Fraser. He called him the Prince.14

In the eighteenth century the distinction between ‘Prince’ and ‘Pretender’ was no finer than the edge of the headsman’s axe. For the anglophone lords sitting in judgement on Lord Lovat, ‘Charley’ carried an overtone of affection which is not necessarily present in the Gaelic Teàrlach. (Remember that William Chisholm’s widow addresses Charles reproachfully as ‘Tearlach òg Stiubhairt’.)15 This is a small detail in the massive structure of evidence brought against the Old Fox. But it is not insignificant. Lovat’s conviction, and death sentence, rested in part on the purposive shading of a translation from Gaelic into English, in order to refine the seditious import of an alleged Gaelic utterance.

The larger point suggested here is that Gaelic poetry was not, as some may imagine, beyond the reach of the eighteenth-century British state’s capacities for surveillance and penalisation. Éamonn Ó Ciardha reminds us that ‘at least three [Irish Gaelic] poets were prosecuted for composing seditious verse, and a number of others expressed fears of prosecution’.16 Robert Chevis’s testimony at Lovat’s trial illustrates how various and indirect were the paths by which one’s verses could come back to accuse their maker. Evidently the government had ears everywhere, and it was not only when

---

14 ibid. 87.
16 Éamonn Ó Ciardha, Ireland and the Jacobite cause, 1685-1766 (Dublin 2002) 50.
venturing into print, as Alasdair Mac Mhaighstir Alasdair did in 1751, that the Gaelic Jacobite poet exposed himself to the authorities’ displeasure. (Famously, the bulk of Mac Mhaighstir Alasdair’s print-run was burnt by the common hangman in Edinburgh.)

If eighteenth-century Gaelic poets, no matter how geographically and culturally remote from the centres of state power, were conscious of working within earshot of an alert and menacing government, then that would explain why Gaelic Jacobite poetry conforms to so many of those patterns of secrecy – cryptic and oblique allusion, *double entendre*, historical and mythological typology – which define Jacobite expression in the English language. That the main symbolic features of Jacobite expression were the same across the several linguistic, cultural and religious communities of Britain and Ireland has been understood at least since the publication of Murray Pittock’s *Poetry and Jacobite politics in eighteenth-century Britain and Ireland*. More recently I have argued that one of the Scottish Gaelic codenames applied to Charles Edward Stuart in the 1740s partook of a cosmopolitan scheme of allusion, widely operative in British and Irish (and continental) Jacobite culture. In light of that argument, it is telling that the Munster poet Liam Inglis, one of those who, as Ó Ciardha says, ‘expressed fears of prosecution’, should have looked forward (in 1742) to a Jacobite victory as an event which would end the obligatory use of codenames for the Stuart prince (‘*S is maigr do bhéarfadh leas-ainm ar Shéarlas*’).

One of those patterns of secrecy, whose occurrence in Gaelic poetry has not received the attention it deserves, relates to what Pittock calls ‘the feminisation of Stuart imagery’ during the Jacobite

---


19 *M’atuirse traochta na fearachoin aosta* in Risteárd Ó Foghludha, *Cois na Bríde: Liam Inglis, O.S.A., 1709-1778* (Baile Átha Cliath [1937]) 40-41 (at p. 40). For Inglis’s anxiety about being heard to speak treason, see his ‘*Atá an fhuireann so thall gan amhras díleas*’ (1757), ibid. 36-7 (at p. 36). This poet’s career is set in political context in Eamon Ó Ciardha, ‘A voice from the Jacobite underground: Liam Inglis (1709-1778)’ in *Radical Irish priests, 1660-1970*, ed. Gerard Moran (Dublin 1998) 16-8.
This was a complex process, driven by a multiplicity of influences not all of which were felt with equal force throughout the various cultural regions of Britain and Ireland. One effect of women’s exclusion from political life was that they could get away with sedition (in the literary realm as elsewhere) more readily than men. They could speak treason, or display Jacobite emblem, or participate in demonstrations with little fear of serious consequence for themselves. Jacobite publications attributed to women were less likely to be investigated or suppressed. The state’s patience with openly disaffected women was not boundless, but it was a visible phenomenon relative to the controls set on the behaviour of the other, politically unexcluded, sex. As Addison said when complaining about female traffickers in Jacobite burlesque, such women ‘act with the greater Licentiousness, because they know they can act with the greater Impunity’. Combined with other factors, including an old cult of Stuart queenship and a widespread assumption that women as a group were predisposed to Jacobitism, the ‘greater Impunity’ enjoyed by female activists helped to feminise the Jacobite cause in eighteenth-century perceptions. This was a bipartisan process. Jacobites at once boasted of and were mocked for their dependence on heroines such as Jenny Cameron, ‘Colonel Anne’ MacIntosh, and Flora MacDonald. Charles Edward Stuart’s experiment with transvestism, under Flora MacDonald’s guidance, looked glamorous or contemptible according to your point of view. When that prince saw fit to publicise his version of the events leading up to his expulsion from France in 1748, he did so through the persona of a ‘Lady at Paris’. When the Whig poet and Under-Secretary of State Thomas Tickell had wanted humorously to ventriloquise the Jacobite perspective as he understood it, he spoke through the persona of ‘a Lady in England’.

---

23 Addison, *The Freeholder* 135 (no. xxiii (9 Mar. 1716)).
25 [Thomas Tickell], *An Epistle from a Lady in England; to a Gentleman at Avignon* (London 1717).
This aspect of eighteenth-century culture is not altogether unfamiliar to students of English literature nowadays. But the feminisation of the Jacobite viewpoint and the Jacobite cultivation of an imagery of heroic female action are phenomena which have received little comment in Irish and Scottish Gaelic studies, except insofar as they relate to the aisling. Examples abound, and await in-depth investigation. There is, for instance, Mac Mhaighstir Alasdair’s post-Culloden waulking song *a rinn duin’-uasul d’a leannan, air dhì dol thor fairrge* (‘composed by a gentleman to his sweetheart, after she had gone over the water’). Mac Mhaighstir Alasdair’s preface to his book reflects something of the contemporaneous élite fetishisation of peasant culture, and this attitude may help to explain his appropriation, for high political ends, of a genre associated with women’s labour. But quite as remarkable as his adapting the polished literary set-up of an epistle between lovers to the rough-and-ready rhythms of a waulking song, is Mac Mhaighstir Alasdair’s eroticising portrayal of Charles Edward Stuart (the subtitular ‘sweetheart’) as a gorgeous woman (‘Mórag’) with ‘beautiful budding breasts’ (*Cíochan léaganach na ’n guccag*) whom the poet implores to return with an army of ‘Maidens to waulk the red cloth [as in red-coats] firmly’ (*’S cuimhnich thoir leat bannal ghruagach, / A luaighis an Cló ruagh go daingiunn*). In another waulking song, retrieved from the oral tradition but (partly) verifiable as Mac Mhaighstir Alasdair’s work from a manuscript fragment, Charles Edward figures as a man but the Highlanders whom the poet foresees joining him are ‘maidens’, ‘girls’, or ‘women’ (*gruagaichean,*...
maighdeanan, nìonagan, ribhinmean, mnathan): ‘Your red cloth will be waulked with gore, blood, and urine besmearing it’ (Gum bi do clò ruadh-sa luaidhte / Le gaoir, fuil, is fuel ’ga shliobadh).31

Another pertinent text is the verse dialogue, seemingly contemporaneous with Mac Mhaighstir Alasdair’s post-Culloden songs, which is preserved in an early nineteenth-century manuscript at Invercauld House, near Braemar. (The manuscript records songs collected in that area by the Rev. Robert MacGregor, who ministered there from 1799 to 1822.)32 The dialogue form is not unusual in Gaelic political poetry,33 but this composition has some curious features. In it a father converses with his daughter whose age (‘not half a year old’) lends an air of the fanciful to the proceedings. The father’s voice is the voice of weary political realism:

A nighean na toir luadh air Tearlach,
’S beag a’s fheaird sinn e bhi ann;
Tha a naimhdean lionar laidir,
Ged nach ’eil a chàirdean gann;
Na daoin’ uaisle ’s fearr ga àicheadh.34

32 ‘Òran a rinn fear d’a nighinn fèin nach robh leth-bliadh’ a dh’aois, agus anns a’ bheil iad a’ freagradh a chèile’ in Adam Watson, ‘Old Gaelic poems from Aberdeenshire’, SGŠ 14/1 (Winter 1983) 25-58 (poem no. 3; pp. 35-7). For the statement that this poem was composed in Glengairden ‘immediately after’ the battle of Culloden, see: Charles M. Robertson, ‘Gaelic poems collected in Braemar by the Rev. Robert MacGregor, minister of Kilmuir, Skye, and others composed by himself and Mr. Alex. MacGregor, schoolmaster, Dull’, Transactions of the Gaelic Society of Inverness 33 (1932) 2-43 (p. 13). The authority for this statement is uncertain, but it seems to be based on (or transcribing?) a note by Robert MacGregor himself.
33 Cf. the Jacobite works discussed in William Gillies, ‘Gaelic songs of the ‘Forty-Five’, Scottish Studies 30 (1991) 19-58 (at pp 45, 47); and the Land Agitation song (early 1880s) at pp 111-12 in Tuath is tighearna / Tenants and landlords: an anthology of Gaelic poetry of social and political protest from the Clearances to the Land Agitation, ed. and trans. Donald E. Meek, Scottish Gaelic Texts, vol. 18 (Edinburgh 1995). In between these two periods we find the late eighteenth-century Òran eadar Dughall, agus Donull, ann am beil cor truagh nan Gael, dh’a’n eigean an tir fein fhagail, air a leigeadh ris’, which Sorley MacLean called ‘one of the most uncompromising attacks on landlords in all Gaelic poetry’ (Cochrinnieacha Taoghta de Shaothair nam Bard Gaélach: A Choice Collection of the Works of the Highland Bards, ed. Alexander Stewart and Donald Stewart, 2 vols in 1 (Edinburgh 1804) II 305-18; ‘The poetry of the Clearances’ in Ris a’ bhruthaich: the criticism and prose writings of Sorley MacLean, ed. William Gillies (Stornoway 1985) 48-74 (at p. 54)).
34 Watson, ‘Old Gaelic poems’ 37.
Daughter, do not talk of Charles, little the better would we be for him being there; his enemies are numerous and strong, although his friends are not scarce; the highest people are renouncing him.

The little girl, still untouched by those worldly considerations which have induced her father’s caution, responds with scorn (and burlesque) to his suggestion that the two royal rivals, King George and Charles Edward, are, after all, interchangeable:

Uainn e dhui’n, gur sibhs’ tha gòrach,  
’Sleasach broin domh-fhèin ’ur cainnt;  
’Samhlach Prionnsa rioghall bòidheach,  
Re bodach ròmach gun bhi glannt;  
Re duine molach coimheach geòcach,  
Air ’mbiodh an t-sron o’n d’thigeadh srann;  
Ruaigidh sinn e do Hanóbher,  
Is Tearlach òg bidh oirn ’na cheann.35

Let us leave it, man, it is you that is foolish, a blistering of sorrow for myself is your speech; likening a handsome royal Prince, to a shaggy unclean boor; to a gluttonous, barbarous, rough fellow, on whom would be a nose from which comes a snore; we shall chase him to Hanover, and young Charles will be over us as chief.

The final lines of this dispute are given to the daughter, whose anticipation of a Jacobite restoration invokes the familiar trope of the spinning Wheel of Fortune,36 but finds its climax in an original and striking metaphor:

Ged tha Chuigs’ ’san trath so ’n uachdar,  
Theid am bual’ ’nuair thig am Prionns’:  
Bheir an rothan car mu’n cuairt air,  
O nach dual do Dheòrs’ bhi ann:  
’S theid e-fèin sa shlioichd air fuadan  
Mar chloich fhugasgailt ruith le gleann! 37

35 ibid.
36 See Gillies, ‘Gaelic songs’ 27, 54 n. 5.
37 Watson, ‘Old Gaelic poems’ 37.
Although the Whigs just now are on top, they will get thrashed when the Prince comes: the wheel will take a turn about, because it is not hereditary for George to be there: and he and his progeny will go astray like a loosened stone racing down a valley!

Certain possible links between this poem and its immediate cultural and historical setting can be discerned. The poet’s ‘fuadan’ is perhaps a conscious echo of Síleas na Ceapaich’s line on George I: *Rìgh fuadan nach buineadh dhuinn*38 (‘a stray king who has no place with us’). (Síleas had lived in Banffshire most of her adult life.) And one cannot but notice the curious circumstance that this poem, which has a male voice speak in favour of political circumspection and a female voice reply with unwavering Jacobitism, should survive in a manuscript preserved at Invercauld House. That house was once the seat of James Farquharson, 9th of Invercauld, whose daughter Anne is known to history as ‘Lady MacIntosh’; she was the young wife of the MacIntosh chief who raised her husband’s clan in the ’45, when her husband timorously sided with the government.39 As several of the poems in this manuscript allude to places in the countryside around Invercauld House or to Farquharson traditions, our verse dialogue may well be a Farquharson poem, designedly recalling Lady MacIntosh’s example. (Although a veteran of the 1715 rising, Lady MacIntosh’s father kept quiet through the ’45 and claimed to be ‘far from approving of her imprudent deportment’40 – a stance which was not popular in the Farquharson country.)41


39 For Lady MacIntosh see Ruairidh H. MacLeod, ‘Everyone who has an intrigue hopes it should not be known: Lord Loudoun and Anne Mackintosh – an intrigue of the ’45’, *Transactions of the Gaelic Society of Inverness* 55 (1989) 256-323.

40 ibid. 303.


My suggestion that this is a Farquharson song conflicts with the attribution, recorded in another manuscript version of the text and noticed by William Gillies, to
But when we look beyond its local context, we find that our Aberdeenshire dialogue has some surprising parallels, notably in the political dialogues of the Lancashire poet John Byrom (1692-1763), recently described by Howard Erskine-Hill:

[Byrom’s] dialogues are usually explicit as to their Jacobite occasion, but very cautious as to what they say. Usually between a Whiggish master, mistress or magistrate on the one side, and a workman or servant speaking in Lancashire dialect on the other side, the dialogue works so that the humbler person, sometimes inadvertently, touches on the Jacobite points and ends up unintimidated.42

Byrom’s dialogues, which were not published in his lifetime but ‘had casually circulated’ (in Jacobite networks),43 are constructed along an axis of social position, not gender. (When his Jacobite spokesperson is a maidservant, she faces a female not a male member of the gentry.)44 But their similarity to our Gaelic poem, in which the party who is disadvantaged by her age as well as her sex nevertheless has the last word, is unmistakable.

Such dialogues seem to go back to precedents in recusant literature – an important underground tradition in shaping Jacobite discourse – where we sometimes find rustic Catholics whose simple affirmations of faith penetrate like laser beams the sophisticated

---

43 John Byrom, Miscellaneous Poems, 2 vols (Manchester 1773) I i (preface).
ideological defences of an élite Protestant interlocutor. The tactical purpose in such indirect arrangements is that they leave their author an escape hatch: no one can prove his endorsement of one side of the argument over the other; indeed, he seems, however subversively and insincerely, to be privileging the official position. Likewise, Alasdair Mac Mhaighstir Alasdair, if challenged, could always say that in the waulking song he published in 1751 he never explicitly refers to Charles Edward Stuart, and that the song is just a harmless piece about a group of women thrashing some red cloth.

Of course, Mac Mhaighstir Alasdair’s 1751 collection does include plenty of explicitly seditious material (including his elegy on Lord Lovat), so camouflaging himself politically was not high on this Jacobite bard’s agenda. (Mac Mhaighstir Alasdair’s waulking songs seem to be playing with the Jacobite tactic of gender-shifting – testing its limits – rather than seriously employing it for self-protection.) My point about the feminised Jacobite poems which we have glanced at, is not that each and every one of them was composed in a state of trembling paranoia, and that each poet’s couching things in a female voice or feminised imagery was a desperate bid to stave off prosecution. The pressures which act upon literary traditions are usually subtler than that; and tactics which originate with a secretive purpose can take on an interest and appeal independent of that purpose. Jacobite literature displays an acceptance and internalisation of (to borrow a phrase from Steven Zwicker) ‘the conditions of utterance that politics and history had imposed’. I merely submit that these Gaelic poets made use of a symbolic language of indirectness or obscurity which had become intelligible, even fashionable, in

---

45 See, e.g., the narrative of Elizabeth Shirley’s conversion in The chronicle of the English Augustinian canonesses regular of the Lateran, at St Monica’s in Louvain (now at St Augustine’s Priory, Newton Abbot, Devon), ed. Adam Hamilton, 2 vols (Edinburgh and London 1904-6) I 102-5. Occurring in a convent’s in-house historical chronicle, this narrative can hardly have been framed with a view to covering the writer’s religio-political tracks. Rather, it seems to reflect the assimilation of secretive tactics to the recusant community’s literary consciousness – I return to this point, in the context of Jacobite literature, below.

their milieux precisely because Jacobite poetry in Gaelic, as in English, was understood to carry risks – a lesson Lord Lovat learnt the hard way.\footnote{I am grateful to W. C. MacKenzie for his learned advice during the writing of this paper.}

\textit{University of Cambridge}

\footnote{I am grateful to W. C. MacKenzie for his learned advice during the writing of this paper.}

\textit{A CHOMPÁIN COIMHNIGH MEISE}

A chompáin coimhnigh meisi,
car mo chumann id chroidhesi,
    a ro-ghrádh do thúr mh’annsa,
    ’s gur tú is iomrádh agamsa.

Ná tréig is ní thréigiobh sibh
    ar mo shamhuil féin do dhaoinibh;
    tabhair mo dhíleas fan amsa,
    ’s ná tabhair mímheas oramsa.

A ccéin úaibh nó a ngar daoibh
    coimhnhigh orm a mhacaoimh,
    ’s go bhfuil deirgchneidh ón ghréith ghráidh
    dom sheirgne anois, a chompáin.

\textit{A COMPAIN.}

RIA 5 (23 D 4), 209 1 coimhnic 2 cumann ad 5 thréigibh 8 ormsa 11 on greith

P. A. B.
AMHRÁN é seo ar bháis saighdiúil de mhuintir Bhriain ón gcéad leath den 18ú haois (fonn 'Giolla Gruama'). Tuairiscíonn an bháis amháin den traidisiúin téacsúil gurb é Dochtúir Tadhg Ó Briain, sagart paróiste Chaisleáin Ó Liatháin, atá á chaoineadh; géal eile adeir gurb é Dochtúir Ó Briain, sagart paróiste Leasa Móir, é (ainm baiste in easnamh); agus i dtuaireacht na lámhscribhinnse is sine is é ‘bás an Dochtúir oirdheirc i.e. an tAthair Seádhán Ó Briain’ atá á chaoineadh (K, 1769 nó roimhe).1 Ceithre cinn de chóipeanna a thugann amach i gceannscríbhinní gur ‘ar bhás an Athar Tadhg Ó Briain’ a cumadh é (L, M, C, E thíos). I nóta iar-scribhinnse i dhá cheann díobh (M agus E), a théann siar go dtí cóip an údair féin de réir chosúlachta,2 tá tuairisc nóis iomláine an tAthar Tadhg Ó Briain (†1747) is ábhar do mharbhna seo, ach is mithid an fhianaise nach réitíonn leis sin a chéadadh.

Tá tuairisc in easnamh sa téacs féin ar ainm baiste an té atá i gceist. Níl d’fhaisnéis tugtha ina thaobh ach gur Bhrianach é (l. 20), a d’éag ‘i gcill Bhríde’ (l. 16). Más tagairt d’aithiú sin (i.e. Cill Bhríde) – seachas do shéipéal mar a áiteofar ar ball – ba chúis go mbeadh sé ar ár gcumas pearsa an mhairbh a shuíomh i gceann éigin den dá

1 Feic na malairtí (ceannscríbhinní).
2 Malairtí ag ll 32 (E) agus 36 (M) faoi seach; féach an cuntas ar an ngaol idir E agus M thíos lgh 160-1.
pharóisté atá ainmnithe sna ceannscríbhinní. Ach níl a leithéid d’áit aimsithe agam in aon cheann den dá pharóisté.4 Tuairiscéann scríobhái K (Séamas Ó Murchadha ó Thiobraid Árann, fl. 1769-99)⁵ gur ‘Seádhan’ a bhí mar ainm baiste ar an té atá á chaointeadh, ach ní luann sé áit ná paróiste leis. Más ea tá cuntas ar shagart den ainm Seána Ó Briain ó Chaisleán Ó Liatháin le fál mar chuid d’imreas fileata ón 18ú haois a tharla idir cléireach sagairt áirithe ó Lios Mór (Éamann Ó Lúba) agus cléireach eile ó Shliabh gCua (Dáth Brún) – ‘da fhios cia a chua fo aco file is féarr’.⁶ Is amhlaidh a cuireadh an cás seo i láthair an Athar Seaán i bhfoirm ghearrán véarsaóchta, dar tosach D’éis deimhinchúntais d’fhagháil le dúthracht dúinn óm bráthair;⁷ d’ordaigh an sagart, mar fhreagra, an lucht aighnis ‘a chur ceangailte cruaidhchuibhrighthe chuige féin go Caisleán Ó Liatháin’, agus d’eisigh sé a bharrántas orthu, tos. Do bhhrigh gach raoba ar dhli na héigse leis dá ndearnthas.⁸ Is féidir dáta ante quem a chur leis an mbarántas sin, sa mhéid go bhfuil aímnneacha deichniúir éigin d’fhíil comhaímsireacha ón Mumhain luaite ann, a bhfuil Aindréas

⁴ Maidir le háiteanna darb ainm Cell Brigte (Cill B(h)ríde) in Éirinn, feic ráiteas Úi Ógáin s.v.: ‘there are 37 [townlands] and [parishes] in Ireland … called Kilbride or Kilbreedy’ (Edmund Hogan, Onomasticon Goedelicum (Dublin 1910) 179). Chomh fada le laghad, lasmuigh de Thobar Bríde (St Brigid’s Well) atá suite tamall siar ón seanreilig i mBriach (Britway), ceithre mhíle soir ó dheas ó Chaisleán Ó Liatháin (cf. Lord Killanan and M. V. Duignan, Shell guide to Ireland (London 1962) 276), is ó athair na Bríd atá aon aítheanna eile sna dúcháin seo a chuidh sé a bharránta, a bhfuil an eilimint Bríd(e) iomtu, viz. (i) Bride(s)bridge atá ar an taobh theas de bhaile Caisleán Ó Liatháin, mar a bhfuil séipéal an pharóiste inniu (feic thios 152); (ii) Baile Bríde (Ballybridge), feilear fearainn atá suite tuathair is mheile is féidir tháidh seal an chonaithe; (iii) Ballyready (Baile Bhride?), baile fearainn i bpar. Ráth Chormaic; (iv) Breeda, i bpar. Ard Achaidh, bar. Uíbh Mac Coille, tuairim is leath slí idir Tulach an Láir (Co. Phort Láirge), agus Eochail. Eírinn an Bhríd laistiar de Caisleán Ó Liatháin in mBarrachaibh, agus sníonn sí fan teoran an bháile ar an dtaobh theas idir san Abhainn Mhór, roinnt míle slí dha ó Lios Mór.

⁵ Cf. Pádraig de Brún, Catalogue of Irish manuscripts in King’s Inns Library Dublin (Dublin 1972) xvii.

⁶ I gcló in Cois na Cora .i. Liam Ruadh Mac Coitir agus a shaothar fileata, eag. Risteard Ó Foghludh (Baile Átha Cliath 1937) uimh. 20 (ígh 62-6).

áirithe ina measc, i.e. Aindrias Mac Cruitín, file a fuair bás sa bhliain 1738. Ós rud é gur sa bhliain sin, mar a chonaicceamar cheana, a ainmniodh an tAthair Seán mac Thomáis Uí Bhriain le bheith ina shagart paróiste i gCaisleán Ó Liatháin, ráineodh gurbh eisean file an bhfharántais Do bhrigh gach raoba. Ach má b’i sé ar éigin a d’fhéadfadh baint a bheith ag an marbhna seo leis, mar fuair an tEaspag Ó Briain bás ar an 13 Márta 1769 i Lyons na Fraince – agus ní ‘i gcill / gCill Bhríd’ é, mar atá ráite sa teács.

Deir lámhscríbhinní áirithe gur mar shagart paróiste i Lios Mór (luaithe ag F agus G), seachas Caisleán Ó Liatháin, a ghníomhaigh an té atá á chaoineadh. Arís, más ‘Seádhán’ a bhí air (agus nach Tadhg), agus más i bparóiste Leasa Móir (agus nach i gCaisleán Ó Liatháin) a bhí sé lonnaithe, ba chóir gurbh fhéidir tuairisc a aimaíarfadh ag shagart a bheadh le hionannadh leis í bhfoinsí na haimseire. Ach cé gur mó sagart de mhuintir Bhriain darbh ainm Seán ar a bhfuil tuairisc in annála liteartha na Mumhan on gcéad leath den 18ú haois, ní heol dom éinne ina measc ab fhéidir a cheangal le Lios Mór.

Ní foláir a fhiosrú, ar deireadh, ar mhár bhain ábhar an mhárbhna le Lios Mór, ach gcéadaimh eile a bhí air seachas ‘Seádhán’, nó ‘Tadhg’ – léamh ab fhéidir a bhuíocht ar fhianaise na lámhscríbhinní F, G, nach luann aon ainm baiste. Duine a d’fhéadfadh teacht san áireamh sa chás sin, ar an gcéad amharc pé sceál é,


10 On uair nach luann lámhscríbhinní an bhfharántais teideal an tsagairt pharóiste leis an údar (an tAthair Seán Ó Briain) is féidir a chur i gcás gur ainmníodh é agus roimh dhó dul i mbun oifige (1738) a tharla an t-imreas fileata. Ag táirgí don chúirta laistiar dá cheapadh mar shagart paróiste, féach tuilleadh Ní thuigim cuntas ar na sagairt seo leanas a raibh an t-ainm orthu: (i) Seán Ó Briain ‘an Sagart Dubh’ (paróiste Leasa Cearnbaile agus Bhaile an Teampaill); (ii) Seán ‘Riabhach’ Ó Briain (Carraig na bhFear) fl. 1740; (iii) Dr Seán Ó Briain O.P. (†1738 nó 1747); (iv) Seán Ó Briain, sagart paróiste Bhaile an Teampaill (fl. 1738) (scriobhafai); (v) Seán mac Diarmada, Baile Átha hUlla (‘sagart saoire sáireolach’; aistritheoir) (†1752); (vi) Seán mac Diarmada Ó Briain (fl. 1747); (vii) Seán Ó Briain ‘Dé’ (fl. 1736). Do thuairim gurbh éinne amháin iad (i) agus (iv) feic Coombes, A bishop of penal times 103; agus do thuairim gurbh éinne amháin iad (ii) agus (vii), feic Éigse 22 (1987) 112 (feic n. 15 thuas); éinne amháin iad (v) agus (vi), dar le Ó Conchúir, Scríobhraith Chorcaí 256 (n. 159).
ná ‘Dochtúir (Ó) Briain i Lios Mór’, atá ainmnithe i bprós a ghabhann roimh an ngearán véarsaíochta úd a luadh ó chianaihb, D’éis deimhinchuntais d’fháil le dúthracht, sna lámhscríbhinní, mar seo leanas:

Ag so imreas d’fás idir Eamonn Ó Lubaidh .i. cleireach Dochtuir Briain a Lios Mor et Dath Brun .i. cleireach an athar Pádraig Í Mheisgil air shliabh Guadh da fhios cia aco file is feárr, gidh eadh is troid fa asair fhoilimh an ghlic sin …13

Is dealratach, áfach, gurb é Brianach a bhí i gceist ansin ná Dr Uilliam Ó Briain.14 Tá eolas air mar ‘diaconach Leasa Móire (sic)’ a maraíodh nuair a leag a chappall é sa bhliain 1738.15 Fear ab ea é a raibh aithne fhairising air i measc an aois liteartha. Dá mb’é a bheadh á chaoineadh san amhrán seo bheadh coinne againn go mbeadh a chéadainm luaite i gcás a chás anois nó i gcás eile sna ceannscríbhinní. Chomh maith leis sin, ba dheacair a mhíniú conas a mheascadh scríobhaithe maithe é leis an Dr Tadhg Ó Briain, nach raibh aon teist air mar údar Gaeilge. Ar an láimh eile do bhfuiriste a thuiscint, dar ndóigh, go bhféadfadh scríobháil bhuailfeadh mar mhuintir Bhriain dul sa tseans le tuairimí gur bhí fear Leasa Móir é. Nuair a chuirtear gach ní san áireamh, mar sin, measaim gur deacair gan tabhairt isteach don fhianais atá ar son an Dr Tadhg Ó Briain, sagart paróiste Chaisleáin Ó Liatháin, mar ábhar an mharbhna atá in eagar anseo, seachas aon duine eile dá bhfuil luaite.

13 Luaite as G 351, 8 (feic thuas lch 142); cf. Ó Foghludha, Cois na Cora 62.
14 Cf. Ó Foghludha, ibid. 89.
15 Chum an tAthair Seán Dubh Ó Briain marbhna air, tos. A Uilliam Í Bhríain is dian do ghlanraobais, cf. Catalogue of Irish manuscripts in the Royal Irish Academy, Index 1 150. Maidir leis an ‘Sagart Dubh’, feic thuas n. 12 (i). An tAthair Seán Riabhach Ó Briain (n. 12 (ii)) atá luaite mar údar le dán eile d’Uilliam Ó Briain a cumadh tar éis gur chríochnaigh sé a chuid staidéir i Sorbón Phárais, agus le linn dó bheith ar a shlí abhaile ‘go críoch Éireann’, viz. A shárfhir ghraoidhe fhíorglan is forasda ciall (e.g. RIA LS 1382 (23 0 73), lch 274; i gcóip sa LN, G 122, 181, tá an dán leagtha ar an údar céanna agus a chum Fáilte is fiche do chuirim le diograis (eag. P. A. Breathnach, Éigse 22 (1987) 118-21), viz. ‘An tAthair Seán Ó Briain’, al. Seán Ó Briain Dé (feic thuas n. 12 (vii)).
De Bhrianaigh Choill na Cora\textsuperscript{17} ab ea an tAthair Tadhg Ó Briain, D.D., mar a dhearbhaíonn an tuairisc seo leanas ón 18ú haois:

He was descended of the most noble and antient Family of the Ó Briens, and was born on the twelfth of March, 1671, at Roberts-town, in the parish of Gotroe, which is situated in the Diocese of Cloyne, and County of Cork. His Father was of the Ó Briens of Killcur, in the parish of Castle-Lyons; a branch of the House of Arra, in the County of Tipperary. His Mother was descended from the noble and ancient Family of the Barry’s and was daughter of Barry of Leamlare, so that both by his Father and Mother he was not only a Native, but also Originally of the Diocese of Cloyne, Barrony of Barrymore and County of Cork.\textsuperscript{18}

D’fhág Tadhg an baile chun dul go Coláiste na nÉireannach, Toulouse, sa bhliain 1691. Fuair sé ord sagairt ann ar an 2 Meitheamh 1703, agus bronadh céim dhochtúra sa diagacht air go TOGHA NA hÉIGSE 1700-1800 145

\textsuperscript{16} Tá an cur síos a leanann ar bheatha an Dr Ó Briain bunaithe sa chéad áit ar eolas atá le fáil i bpaimfléad a foilsíodh go gairid tar éis a bháis, agus ar aimsíos cóip de i Leabharlann Náisiúnta na hÉireann (uihm. thag. P 590), \textit{Dr O Brien, late of Castle-Lyons: Essay towards his Character}; tá an leathanach teidil ar iarraidh sa chóip, agus ní fios cé scríobh ach amháin gur chara dílis é don mBrianach (feic thíos n 28).

Tá treoir luachmhar ar stair eaglasta Chaisleáin Ó Liatháin i rith ré shaoil an Dr Ó Briain le fáil i dhá shaol, viz. David O Riordan, \textit{Castlelyons} ([Castlelyons] 1976) (go háirithe lgh 21-3). Gabhaim buíochas anseo leis na daoine seo leanas as a gcomhairle i dtaobh pointí éagsúla is m’é i mbun an taighde seo: an tOir. Dáibhí Ó Riordáin, S.P., Cluain Droichid; an tOir. Neilus O’Donnell, S.P., Ráth Chormaic; an Canónach Parthalán Ó Troithe, S.P., Mainistir na Corann.

\textsuperscript{17} ‘C. na (g)Curra’, \textit{Kilcor}, suite c. 2 mhile soir ó dheas ó Chaisleán Ó Liatháin ar an dtaoibh ab shubhain na Bhríde, bar. an Bhharraigh Mhóir. Teaghlach ab ea Brianagh Choill na Cora a mhair le linn ré na bPeindlithe faoi scáth an Farla Brrach, agus a choinnibh seilbh ar a guid titile dá bharr sin, d’ainneoin a gcreidimh, feic Coombes, \textit{A bishop of penal times} 104, O Riordan, \textit{Castlelyons} 49, 55. Feic tuairisc ar fhlíofhacht a bhaineann le Brianagh Choill na Cora, ag P. A. Breatnach, ‘Dhá dhúain leanbhaíochta’ \textit{Éigse} 22 (1987) 111-23.

gairid ina dhiaidh.\textsuperscript{19} Ceapadh mar uachtarán ar an gColáiste é sa bhliain 1706,\textsuperscript{20} agus chaith sé náoi mbliana sa phhost, go dtí gur éirigh sé as chun fileadh ar Éirinn sa bhliain 1715. Cuireadh é mar shagart paróiste go Ráth Chormaic, Co. Chorcaí, an bhliain ina dhiaidh sin. Bhí teacht ag údar an phaimfléid, \textit{Essay towards his character}, ar a chuid díntiúirí i scríbhinn, mar is léir:

In 1716, he was install’d in the United Parishes of Rathcormac and Gotroe, and Dr Donat Mac-Carthy, then Bishop of Cork, and Administrator of Cloyne gave him a Collation which bears date the 6th of December, 1720 for the United Parishes of Castle-Lyons, Britway, and Coole, which were most spacious Fields, to display his Virtue and able Talents.\textsuperscript{21}

Is é an tAthair Conchubhar Ó Briain, de Bhrianaigh Choill na Cora,\textsuperscript{22} duine muinteartha le Tadhg, a bhí i bhfeighil pharóiste Chaisleáin Ó

\textsuperscript{19} \textit{Essay towards his character} 11.
\textsuperscript{21} \textit{Essay towards his character} 13. Cf. Walsh, ‘The Irish college at Toulouse’ 24 (‘appointed parish priest of Castelleyons, Co. Cork in 1715’); Coombes, \textit{An bishop of penal times} 22 (‘In 1716 he returned to Ireland where he became parish priest of Rathcormac’). (I ndearmad atá an méid seo leanas ráite ag Walsh, \textit{The Irish continental college movement} 130: ‘in 1720 he resigned and returned to Ireland where he was appointed parish priest of Castelleyons’.) Dá chomhartha go raibh teacht ar pháipéirí príobháideacha an Athar Tadhg ag údar an phaimfléid, féach leis an méid seo leanas atá le rá aige maird leis na for imeacha éagsúla d’ainm baiste an mhairbh a mbaintí feidhm astu: ‘The last thing I have now to observe, is, that tho’ Dr O Brien was accustomed, for occasions I know not, to sign Timothy, as his Christian Name, yet in as much as in all Latin Instruments he subscribed Thadee, which is the name he is called by in his Letters of Ordination, the Diploma’s of his Degrees, and in the Collactions he had for his Parishes; I therefore thought it more proper to make use of the name Thady than Timothy’ (\textit{Essay towards his character} [p. xiv]).
\textsuperscript{22} Tá tagaírt dá dhúchas ag Coombes, \textit{A bishop of penal times} 122, O Riordan, \textit{Castelleyons} 47.
In 1738 Thady O’Brien resigned his parishes in favour of Dr John O’Brien, on condition that he could retain one third of the parish revenues for his own maintenance. The new pastor also became archdeacon of Cloyne and vicar general. Soon afterwards Thady O’Brien regretted his decision and appealed to Dr Christopher Butler, archbishop of Cashel [1711-57] for redress. Butler’s handling of the case was blundering and inept. Thady O’Brien had really no case, at least not according to the letter of the law. He had resigned his parish on terms which were the normal practice in Catholic countries … [T]he issue was finally decided by the nuncio at Brussels in favour of Dr John O’Brien on 26 November, 1738.25

Níl aon tagairt don chor áirithe seo i saol an Athair Tadhg luaite sa phaimfléad a foilsíodh i ndiaidh a bháis, ná sa bhfógra a foilsíodh ar ócáid a bháis i nuachtán i mBaile Átha Cliath.26 Tuairiscíonn an dá...
fhoinse gur tháinig an bás chuige i gCaisleán Ó Liatháin sa bhliain 1747 sa séú bliain déag is trí fhichid dá aois; tá idir lá agus mhí luaite leis an dáta sin ag údar an Essay towards his character mar aon le faisnéis shuaithinseach eile ar a chróilí, agus ar an ómós mór a taisteáineadh dó i ndiaidh a bháis:

[T]hus did he continue in his Perfect Senses till the 20th of September 1747 when the cold Sweats hung on his Brows, and tho’ his Breath and Speech fail’d, yet notwithstanding a heavenly Smile sat on his Face, a Smile that easily compelled the Tears of the Spectators to flow. He, in fine, resign’d his pure Soul into the hands of his Blessed Creator while the propitiatory Victim of the Altar was offered up for his happy Exit, and that in his Presence. And thus dy’d this Gem of Priests and the Honour of Doctors, in the 76th Year of his Age; 44 of which he employ’d in the Ministry. And as he was during Life beloved by those, who had the favour of his personal acquaintance, so was his Death lamented by all who heard his Character; which was so upright, that even those of different Communions published advantageous Accounts of him … The account of his Death was respectfully mentioned in the News Papers of Dublin, printed on the 10th October 1747, and in those of London, on the 17th of said Month and Year; much about which time was Publish’d at Cork, a well penned Elegy, and his Funeral Sermon was declaimed by his most faithful Friend, the Rev. Mr James Butler of Mitchel’s Town … His very body … was decently interr’d in the Chancel of the Parochial Church of Castle Lyons.27

Fágaim ar leataoibh go fóill an trácht ar ‘a well penned Elegy’, i dtreo dheireadh an ghiota sin, a thagairt don mharbhna atá in eagair anseo. Ach maidir leis an tè de réir an phaimfléid a thug an tseanmóin uaidh ar ócáid na sochraide, ráineodh, sílim, gurbh ionann é agus James Butler ar deineadh Ardeaspag Chaisil de níos déanaí

27 Essay towards his character 24-6. Mar seo a chríochnaíonn an tuairise air san Dublin Courant (feic n. 26): ‘On account of his good behaviour and inoffensive deportment he was greatly esteemed, not only by his own, but by those of a different Communion to him, and was interred in the chancel of the parish church of Castle-Lyons, where a monument and inscription is intended for him.’ Maidir leis an ‘monument and inscription’ atá luaite ansin, feic thíos.
Dála an scéil, tá dearbhú le fáil ar chuinneas na tuairisce a thugann údar an phaimfléid uaidh i dtaoibh na háite inar cuireadh an Dr Ó Bráin. Mar is amhlaidh atá leac na huaighe inaradhacadh é le feiscint fós inniu faoi bhun an túir láir sa tseanreilig Phrotastúnach atá suite ar an imeall thuaidh de bhaile Chaisleáin Ó Liatháin, ar thaobh Mhainistir Fhear Maí (b. f. Kill St Anne). Tá inscríbhinn Laidne snoite ar an leac ar deacair do dhuine í a léamh inniu. Ach ó chomparáid a d’éirigh liom a dhéanamh idir an fhoclaíocht agus téacs atá curtha i gcló faoin gceannteideal ‘Epitaph of Dr O’Brien’ i ndeireadh an Essay towards his character (i Laidin agus i mBéarla) is léir dom nach mar a chéile iad. Cuirim síos i mo dhiaidh an inscríbhinn Laidne a sholáthraítear sa phaimfléad:

D.O.M.

Siste Viator vide, lege, luge
In hac recorduntur Urna Gloriam expectantes imarcessibilem
Exuviae Mortales
Viri admodum Venerabilis, Orthodoxaeque
Pugilis Strenuissimi

Thadaei O Brien Sacrae Theologiae Doctoris
Collegii Hibernorum apud Tolosanos per novem annos Rectoris
Vicarii Generalis Cloynensis ac Pastoris de Castle-Lyons, etc.
Scriptor fuit in Polemicis accuratissimus
Ut quos edidit Libri Sane Doctissimi et eruditissimi.

Obiit per omnia Mundus die 20 Septembris 1747.
Ætatis 76. Sacerdotii 44.

28 Is dó a thiomnaigh an Bráthair Tadhg Ó Conaill ‘Trompa na bhFlaitheas’ sa bhliain 1755; cf. Trompa na bhFlaitheas, ed. Cecile O’Rahilly (Dublin 1955) viii-xi. (Go deimhin, b’fhéidir tuairim a thabhairt gurbh é an Buitléarach céanna — ‘his most faithful Friend’ — an t-údar a scríobh an paimfléad a bhfuil a ainm gan lua sa chóip de atá againn.)

29 Ní hábhar iontais de réir nós na haímsire gur sa reilig Phrotastúnach a chuirfí an Brianach, ós í ba ‘theampall dúchais’ ag a shinsir.

30 Essay towards his character 28. (Sid é an leagan Béarla: ‘D.O.M. / Stop Reader, Behold, read and lament / In this urn are reposed in hopes of never fading Glory / The Mortal Remains / Of a man truly Venerable, who was a Strenuous Champion / Of the Orthodox Faith Thady O Brien, doctor of divinity. / Who was for Nine Years Rector of the Irish College at Tholouse. / Afterwards vicar General of Cloyne/And Parish-Priest of Castle-Lyons, etc / He exhibited the strongest proofs of his Accuracy in Polemic writings, by the Learned and Ingenious Treatises, which he published on that Subject / He dy’d Spotless in every Shape, on the 20th of September 1747, in the 76th Year of his Age, and 44th of priesthood’ (ibid.). Is dócha gurb é seo an téacs dá bhfuil tagairt déanta san Dublin Courant a luann ‘a monument and inscription … intended for him’ (feic thuas n. 27).
Is maith mar a léiríonn an clabhsúr déanach a chuir údar an phaimfléid lena shaothar ar an meas a bhí ag a lucht comhaimsire ar an mBhrianach. Tugtar an clabhsúr isteach i bhfoirm mar seo leanas: ‘After the Epitaph of Dr O Brien, are added several curious and valuable Inscriptions and Epitaphs taken from, or designed for the Tombs of Illustrious and eminent Divines, who for their extraordinary parts and great services to their Country, highly deserve to have their fame transmitted to Posterity’ (Ich 27). I measc deichniúir éigin d’eagail-sigh mhórainmneacha, ón gceathrú haois déag ar aghaidh, a gcuirtear tuairisc dó réir sin síos in dtaobh, tá Richard FitzRalph (Ardeaspag Ard Mhacha), Flaithrí Ó Maoil Chonaire, OFM (Ardeaspag Thuama), an tAthair Seán Mac Colgan, OFM, agus an tAthair Lúcás Wadding, OFM.

* * *

I ndiaidh dó filleadh ar Éirinn ón bhFrainc, agus i gcaitheamh an téarma a chaith sé mar shagart paróiste, ghlaic an Dr Ó Briain seasamh stóinsithe in aghaidh na bPéindlithe. Foilsíodh roint paimfléad óna pheann ar ábhair a bhain le cúrsaí creidimh, a thug ar údar an Essay towards his character cur síos a dhéanamh air mar ‘this venerable Pastor and intrepid Stickler for the Catholic Tenets’. 31 Sa bhliain 1728, nó roimhe, thóg sé séipéal i gCaisleán Ó Liatháin ar a chostas féin, mar is féidir a thuiscint ón inscríbhinn seo leanas atá le léamh ar umar uisce choisreactha a aistríodh go dtí eaglais nua San Nioclás ar an mbaile, nuair a deineadh atógaint uirthi (1845):

‘Docter Tim O Brien me fieri fecit 1728’.

Ó am go ham, d’fhéachtaí chun a dhíograis ar son an chreidimh a cheansú. I mí Meán Fómhair na bliana 1733, mar shampla, mar gheall ar bhrú a tháinig ó Phrotastúnaigh áitiúla, fógraíodh ordú a thabhairt don sagart ‘not

31 Tá tuairisc tugtha san Essay towards his character ar chuid de na paimfléid is tábhachtáí a foilsíodh uaidh, ina measc The history of the Waldenses and Albigenses (1743), agus Truth triumphant (1745). Chomh maith leis sin tá liosta de na teidil a bhain le seacht gcinn déag de lámhscribhinní a bhí ullamhaithe ag le foilsíú dá bhfágheadh sé na síntiusóirí chun an costas a foc, agus a bhí ‘in the Possession of his Amanuensis’, e.g. ‘A defence of the perpetual Virginity of the blessed Mother of God’, ‘A plain Refutation of several Antient and Modern Calumnies against Roman Catholicks’, ‘The Celebration of Mass in an unknown Tongue justified’ (ibid. 21). Tá tagairt dá chlú mar údar paimfléad déanta ag O Riordan, Castlelyons 51, Coombes, A bishop of penal times 22.

32 O Riordan, Castlelyons 52; cf. Coombes, A bishop of penal times 122 (n. 16). Tá an t-umar suíte isteach sa bhfalla ar an mbinn thiar den séipéal, ar an dtaobh clé de dhoras na binne lasmuigh.
to celebrate mass for the future under pain of transportation’. 33
Tháinig slua armtha go dtí geata an tséipéil ar an ócáid, agus
deineadh é a iamh suas le cláracha. 34 I rith na mblianta i ndiaidh dó
a bheith éirithe as an obair pharóiste, dealráonn sé gur mhaolaigh ar
an mbrú a bhí air ó na húdaráis, dá ainneoin gur lean sé ar aghaidh
lena chuid scríbhneoireachta ar chúrsaí creidimh. 35 Tá tagairt dó i litir
a scríobh William Pearde, Protastúnach, ag triall ar a chara Francis
Price, ó Chaisleán Ó Liatháin sa bhliain 1744, ina dtuaireiscíonn sé:
‘All the priests in the district have absconded except only your old
friend who expects some favour to be shown him on account of his
age.’ 36 Bhí an Dr Ó Briain trí bliana déag is trí fichid an uair sin.
Ón gcuntas litreach sin, agus óna bhfuil ar eolas ó na foinsí eile ar
a bheatha atá pléite, is léir gur lean an Brianach air ag maireachtaint
i gCaisleán Ó Liatháin sna blianta deireanacha dá shaol. Eolas tábh-
achtach é sin dúinn agus sinn ag casadh leis an bhfuilid feic thíos lch 142. Tá litriú na bhfocal i gcill Bhríde
míshocair sna lámhscríbhinní (feic na malairtí); maidir le mírialtacht mheadarachta a bhaineann leis an líne ina bhfuilid feic thíos lch 158.

33 W. P. Burke, Irish priests in the penal times 1660-1760 (Waterford 1914) 383; 
cf. Coombes, A bishop of penal times 61, O Riordan, Castlelyons 52.
34 Cf. Burke, Irish priests in the penal times 383 (litir ó George Ross go dtí Francis
Price); O Riordan, Castlelyons 52.
35 Feic thuas n. 31.
36 Burke, Irish priests in the penal times 384; cf. O Riordan, Castlelyons 53.
37 Feic lch 142. Tá litriú na bhfocal i 1 gceill Bhríde mishocair sna lámhscríbhinní
(faic na malairtí); maidir le mírialtacht mheadarachta a bhaineann leis an líne ina bhfuilid feic thíos lch 158.
stair an bhaile go raibh seaneaglais, ainmnithe do San Nioclás, ar láthair díreach laistiar de láthair an tséipéil nu a nuair a tógadh é. An tEaspag Simon Quin faoi deara an tséipéil sin sin a thógaint sa bhliain 1774, agus is chuige a thóg só go bhfuil se ans a ná i bháthas inar tógadh tógadh i, ‘to replace the one which had been used by Fr Timothy O Brien’. Mairí le suíomh an tséipéil úd a thóg an Brianach, tá bun maith fo suíomh a rocht an tAthair Ó Riordáin gur dúch go raibh sé san áit chéanna inar tógadh forgnemh na bliana 1774. Taispeáineann sé, le cabhair ó fhianaise eile a thug sé chun solais, go raibh cuí ag an Dr Ó Briain chun go roghnóidh sé an láthair áirithe sin seachas aon áit eile ar an mbaile. I nóta a breacadh i leabhrán baistí an pharóiste ón mbliain 1880, tá trácht ar sheanchas áitiúil a deir gurb é ainm a tugtaí aithntear de láthair an tséipéil nua nuair a tógadh é, ‘Chapel field’, agus an tAthair Ó Ríordáin gur domh de dhéanamh go háirithe sin a réidh i, cothrom aothar a bhí ann chun úsáidte a gcuid tionóntaithe. Is dóigh liom go bhfuil bun tuisceana aimsithe sa tuairisc sin chun dul amach ar bhfí na cainte i gcill Bhríde, b’fhéidir. D’fhás cos a bhain ag droichead na Bríde (Bridesbridge), de chúirt a bhain lena mhuintir fhein, a bhí an tséipéal tógtha ag an mBrianach, is féidir a shamhlú go dtabharfaí ‘cill Bhríde’ mar ainm ar an tséipéal sin. Bheadh fonn orm a chur i gcás sin, dá réir sin, gurb é atá i bhfeidhmiú go mbeadh cill eile suite ar an dáta de na daoine. Is dóigh liom go bhfuil chumhacht aimsithe sa tuairisc sin chun dul amach ar bhfí na cainte a léirítear in leabhar baistí an pharóiste ón mbliain 1880, nóta a bhí ag O Riordan, Castlelyons 55. Deir an tAthair Ó Ríordáin liom i litir nach seanainm é ‘Bridesbridge’ agus gur ‘Bridge lane’ a bhíonn ar an áit i gcáipéisí ón 19ú haois.
bhfoicail na líne úd a luadh as an amhrán ná tagairt don séipéal ar láthair ghort na cille (Chapel field), lámh le droichhead na Bride (Bridesbridge), i gCaisleán Ó Liatháin, mar a bhfuair an Brianach bás.

Maidir leis an gcuid eile den líne a thráchtann ar an mBrianach a bheith gan puinn daoine farais ar uair a bháis – caint atá ag teacht do tagairt eile sa téacs do lá fríodh thú in áit sínte id aonar (l. 12) – níl an pictiúir a thugtar ann bun os cionn leis an radharc ar an ócáid a bhuaill linn cheana féin san Essay towards his character. De réir mar a léímse an sliocht áirithe sin (luaite ina chomhthéacs ar lch 148 thuas) is ann a shaohtraigh an Dr Ó Brian an bás i láthair pobail a bhí bailithe mórhimpeall air le linn an aifrinn a rá ar a shon (a Smile sat on his Face, a Smile that easily compelled the Tears of the Spectators to flow ... while the propitiatory Victim of the Altar was offered up for his happy Exit, and that in his Presence).

AN TÚDAR

Níl aon ainm údair curtha leis an téacs sna lámhscríbhinní. Ach i dhá chóip críochaíonn an cheannscríbhinn atá ag gabháil leis leis an bhfoicail cecinit (‘cct’, LC). Tugann seo le fios gurb ionann é an t-údar agus file an dáin a ghabhann roimhe sna foinsí sin, tos. Mo ghearán mór le huaislibh Fódhla.46 An tAthair Uílliam Inglis atá ainmnithe leis an dán sin san dá lámhscríbhinn.47 Chaith Liam Inglis (†1778) an chuid is mó dá shaol mar bhráthair Aibhistíneach i

---

44 Feic an nóta téacsúil a ghabhann le l. 12.
45 Don ngaol eatarthu feic thíos lch 160.
gcaithir Chorcaí, agus tá dlús dánta a thugann fianaise air sin tagtha slán. Ach bhí sé chun cónaithe sa taobh tíre timpeall ar Chaisleán Ó Liatháin um an mbliain 1733, ní foláir, tráth ar dhréacht sé mar mhban de dhuine de chlann Craith i bpáirtí le Liam Rua Mac Coitir (ó Churrach Diarmada i bparóiste Chaisleáin Úi Liatháin). D’fhéadfadh aithne a bheith curtha aige ar Thadhg Ó Briain an uair sin, más ea. Ach tá sé ráite ag Risteard Ó Foghludha ina chuntas ar bheatha Inglis gur chaith an file an tréimhse idir 1743 (nó 1744) agus 1749 ina ábhar sagart i mainistir na nAibhistíneach Éireannach sa Róimh. Dá mb’iontaoibh na dátaí a luann sé ba dheacair Inglis a áireamh mar údar leis an dán ón mbliain 1747 atá in eagar anseo. Níl tugtha ag Ó Foghludha i bhfoirm fhianaise mar thaca leis na dátaí, áfach, ach “[nach bhfuil] cruthuíghadh againn gur cheap [Inglis] oiread is aon lín amháin ar shiubhal na mbliadhanta san.” Tá lúb ar lár sa méid sin, áfach, mar go bhfuil ar a laghad dán amháin sa chnuasach de shaothar an fhile a d’fhóilsigh sé, a mbaineann dáta leis laistigh den tréimhse a deir sé a chaithe Inglis sa Róimh, viz. 1745. Deir Ó Foghludha chomh maith gurb é an chéad dán a chum Inglis 1745.


49 *Cidhe hasbathadh d’Éirinn éag mic Golaimh na dtreas* (ar bhás Dhonchnaidh Óg Mhic Craith), i gclo ag Ó Foghludha, *Cois na Bride* uimh. 3 (agus, idem, *Cois na cora* uimh. 12). Maidir leis an gCoitireach feic thuas n. 7. Ó Foghludha, *Cois na Bride* xvii-xviii.

50 *Cois na Bride* xvii. Cuidheas sa chlann Coláiste Óg Mhic Craith, i gclo ag Ó Foghludha, *Cois na Bride* uimh. 3 (agus, idem, *Cois na cora* uimh. 12). Maidir leis an gColáiteach feic thuas n. 7. Ó Foghludha, *Cois na Bride* xvii-xviii.

51 Cuidheas sa chlann Coláiste Óg Mhic Craith, i gclo ag Ó Foghludha, *Cois na Bride* uimh. 3 (agus, idem, *Cois na cora* uimh. 12). Maidir leis an gColáiteach feic thuas n. 7. Ó Foghludha, *Cois na Bride* xvii-xviii.

52 Is déarach an bhliain ’1745’ luaite le cóip an dáín i lámhscríbhinné éagsúla (in easnamh sa téacs foilsithe), e.g. LN G 441, lch 63 (’Uilliam English cct. san mbliaghain 1745’), RIA 81 (23 F 18), lch 30; 82 (23 0 26), lch 24.
tar éis dó fillleadh ón Róimh ná marbhna ar dhuiné de mhuintir Ghlasáin a fuair bás sa bhliain 1750.\textsuperscript{53} Ach cé go bhfuil an dáta sin luaite i gcóip amháin a tháinig anuas den téacs atá i gceist, tá ‘1760’ luaite mar dháta leis in áit eile.\textsuperscript{54}

Ar deireadh, mar sin, is léir nach bhfuil aon chúis dáiríribh againn chun amhras a chaithreamh ar thuairisc an dá lámhscríbhinn (más tuairisc indíreach féin í) a chuireann an marbhna atá in eager anseo, ón mblaíomh 1747, i leith Liam Inglis. Ní miste a lua nach laighe leis an cás atá ar a shon mar údar, fonn ceoil a bheith luaite le gabháil leis (viz. ‘Giolla Gruama’), mar tá foinn ainmnithe le suas le dhá dtrian de na hamhráin atá curtha i leith Liam Inglis sna lámhscríbhinní.\textsuperscript{55}

Chonaiceamar cheana go bhfuil údar an \textit{Essay towards his character} mar fhínné gur foilsíodh marbhna ar an Dr Ó Briain i gCorcaigh tuairim is míir atá bháis dá dó (‘much about this time was Publish’d at Cork, a well penned Elegy’). Más sa chiall ‘made public’ atá an téarma \textit{Publish’d} á úsáid sa chomhthéacs sin, is áirithe, dar liom, gur don mharbhna a chum an tAthair Inglis a bhí údar an phaimfleid ag tagairt.

\textbf{MEADARACHT, FONN AGUS STÍL}

Véarsaí ceathairlíneacha; ceithre aiceann meadarachta ar aon patrún amháin rithime, le críoch bhaineannach (–), atá sna línte ó thuaisce.\textsuperscript{56} Tá corp an dáin (vv 1-6) scartha go foirméalta ón gceangal (vv 7-9), sa mhéid go n-athraíonn an córas amais i ndiaidh v. 6. (Níl an téarma ‘ceangal’ úsáide sna lámhscríbhinní.)

\begin{verbatim}
(vv 1-6)

(–) x | y ~ x | y ~ x | y ~ l é ~
\end{verbatim}

Críochnaíonn na líné i gcorp an dáin le hamas aiceanta ar an nguta é (–). Tá amas dúbalta faoi thrí i gcuid tosaigh na líne, e.g. 1-4 á 
ua á 
ua (an t-aiceann meadarachta ar 
ua faoi seach). Athraíonn fuaim an amais aiceanta (= y) ó 
ua go ó (5-8), go i (9-15), agus go 
i a

\textsuperscript{53} Ó Foghludha, \textit{Cois na Bríde} xviii.
\textsuperscript{54} Tóis. \textit{A Díth Ó Ghlasaín, mo ghreadán bróin tú} íbid. uimh. 12; ‘1760’ atá luaite in RIA 30 (23 M 14) lch [122], agus ‘1750’ in LN G 218, lch. 169.
\textsuperscript{55} Ní i gceol a luann Ó Foghludha na foinn a bhfuil tagaírt sna lámhscríbhinní dóibh, cf. \textit{Éigse} 1 (1939) 70-1.
\textsuperscript{56} Tá trácht ar mhírialtaí rithimiúla i líné aonair sna nótaí téacsúla.
(17-20), agus filleann *ua* mar a bheadh clabhsúr foirmeála i v. 6 (21-4); tá l. 16 eisceachtach (*á i i i i i*) (feic thíos).

(vv 7-9)

\[ (-) \mid x \ y \ \sim \ x \ y \ \sim \ x \ y \ \sim \ \text{ú} \sim \]

Críochnaíonn na línte sa chuid seo (an ceangal) le hamas aiceanta ar ú. Tá amas dúbalta faoi thrí i gcuid tosaigh na línse anseo, den chuid is mó; titeann aiceann láidir ar fhuaime an amais thosaigh (= x), agus téann athrú ar a cáilfócht ó é (25-8) go í (29-30) agus go ú (33-4) i ndiaidh a chéile. Tá amas in easnamh sa suíomh aiceanta sin i gcás amháin nó i gcás eile i línse áirithe (31-2, 34), agus tá an t-amas ó aithint ann sa dá línse dheireanacha, mar a bhfuil an téacs lochtach sna lámhscríbhinní.

**Stádas vv 8-9**

Cé go mbaineann sé le gnás an chineál seo filíochta go dtéann athrú ar an meadarach sa cheangal, tá stádas an dá véarsa dheireanacha den cheangal achrannach sa chás seo. Níl an cháiréis chéanna ar chúrsaí amais i gcuid de na línte iomtu is atá i v. 7 agus sna véarsaí roimhe; agus tá an t-ordú atá ar an bpéire véarsaí i dtrí cinn de lámhscríbhinní (FGE) difriúil lena n-ord sna cóipeanna eile. D’fhéadfaí a mheas ar an mbonn sin nár chuid iad de bhundéantús an údair, agus gur cumadh iad níos déanaí le cur mar bhreas leis an téacs. Má thógtar ina choinne sin go bhfuilid le fáil i bhfoirm amháin nó i bhfoirm eile sna lámhscríbhinní go léir, ní mó é sin a mheas i gcomhthéacs fhianaise an tradisiúin téacsúil. Taispeáineann sé sin go mb’fhéidir nach ó théacs an údair a shíolraigh na cóipeanna uile, ach ó athlaga gan de. Pé léamh a dhéantar ar a stádas, áfach, is gá a aithint go bhfuil an chuid de na línte is féidir a léamh san dá véarsa dheireanacha ar ionannas rithime leis an gcuid eile den téacs. Is é sin le rá gur cumadh iad le ghabháil ar an bhfoinn céanna le véarsaí eile an amhráin.

**Fonn**

Luann K fonn leis an téacs, viz. ‘Giolla Gruama’. Tá dhá phhort thraidisiúnta leis an ainm sin tugtha faoi deara agam, agus iad ar aon ag freagairt ina struchtúr don chomhdhéanamh prosóideach a

\[ Fuaim ó de ghrá na meadarachta i gcás *fóghla 5, tóite 7, tóitre 8* (feic nóta téacsúil); don fhoirm mhírialta *iodhlae 20*, feic n. *ad loc.* \]
bhaineann leis an dán. 58 Seo im dhaithid ‘An Giolla Gruama’ mar atá sé i gcnuaach James Goodman, agus focal a chéad véarsa den amhrán curtha in oiriúint dó. 59


Stíl liteartha
Is déanta searmh snasta é, a dtugann amas na bhfuaimeanna fada ó líne go líne, agus na hatharacha i gcomhleanúint na bhfuaimeanna ó véarsa go véarsa, cáilíocht doilbh dhobrónach dó. Is áirithe gur ceapadh a t-amhrán le ghabháil ar mhodh a d’oirfeadh chun ono-

58 Maidir leis an siméadracht a bhíonn le haithint idir struchtúir na véarsaíochta rithiúilí sa Ghaeilge agus forimeacha traidisiúnta an cheoil amhránaíochta, féach m’aiste ‘Múinlái véarsaíocht rithiúil na Nua-Ghaeilge’ in Folia Gadelica: aistí a bronnadh ar R. A. Breanach, eag. P. de Brún et al. (Corcaigh 1983) 54-71.

59 Tunes of the Munster pipers: Irish traditional music from the James Goodman manuscripts, ed. Hugh Shields (Dublin 1998) uimh. 280 (cóirithe anseo le caoinchead na bhfoilsitheoirí, Taisce Cheol Dúchais Éireann, agus le comhairle ó Dr Mary Breanach, Ollscoil Dhún Éideann).

60 P. W. Joyce, Old Irish folk music and songs: a collection of 842 airs (Dublin 1909) no. 684 (cf. ibid ix). Amhrán eile a tháinig anuas ar an bhfonna ‘Giolla Gruama’ is ea Is ceasnaídeach cásmhar atáim is is léannar (3 v.) atá leagtha ar Aindrias Mac Craith (an Mangaire Súgach), cf. Eíge na Máighe, eag. Risteárd Ó Foghludha (Baile Átha Cliath 1952) uimh. 86. Baineann dáta c. 1758 leis sin, máis fíor (ibid. 50, 259). Is fiú a thabhairt faoi deara go gcleachtann Mac Craith an cineál céanna amais dhúbalta sa dara véarsa den amhrán sin (e.g. Dlighthe cruadha na Whigs do ruaig me in imeall Tuaithe im aonar etc.) agus atá sa dán seo againne.
mataipé na bhfocal a thabhairt go righin fadanálach. Tá an t-amas curtha chun taírbhe Chun na véarsaí a tháthú le chéile i gcorp an dáín ar shlíte éagsúla: mar shampla, marcáltar deireadh leis an gcuid sin den dáín i v. 6 trí úsáid a bhaint as an amas dúbalta céanna agus atá i v. 1. Tá marcáil den sórt céanna déanta ar lár na coda sin sa mhéid go bhfuil an dá véarsa 3-4 ar ionannas patrúin. Ina theannta sin measaim gur féidir féachaint ar an mírialacht amais a tugadh faoi deara cheana sa lín i ndeireadh na véarsaí láir (l. 16, viz. á í í í í é) mar a bheadh ceadaíocht ann, ar mhaithe le aird a tharraingt ar an tuairisc ar láthair bháis an té atá á chaoimeadh (feic thuas lch 156).

Tréith shuaitheinseach eile i gcorp an dáín is ea an t-anafar a gcloítear leis i dtosach na línte tríd síos i bhfoírm an fhocail Lá. Tá macalla liteartha san úsáid áirithe sin, agus i bhfo-áit eile sa téacs, ó bhluíre a cumadh timpeall le ceithre bliana déag roimh dháta an dáín seo againne. Marbhna atá i gceist ar bhás Dhonnchaidh Óg Mhic Craith ó Choill (Chill ?) Bheithne, Co. Luimnigh, sa bhliain 1733. Tá sé leagtha ar údair éagsúla na sábháil le feidhmiúnaí féin dóibh, agus é le fáil i dhá fhoirme, leagan fada (6 v.) agus leagan gearr (3 v.). Cuirim síos anseo na trí véarsa thosaigh (a fhaightear mar leagan gearr ar uairibh) ar son na comparáide.

RIA 297 (23 B 14), 204
An tAthair Conchubhar Ó Briain cct …61

Lá déarach d’éigsibh agus d’ollamhuiin tuaidh
Lá bréag[ach] baoghalach gan bhlosgadh gan bhuadh
Lá créimmeach céasda na ccrosa mágcuard
Mar d’ég an daonachnt le Donnchadh suairc.

Lá éirlig[h] éigse agus osna na suadh
Lá faolchon féinne dá ttorchar a nguais
Lá géarghuil géarluit fá gorguidheach graum
An lá déaghnaich do laethibh ar ar nDonnchadh Mór.

Lá léirsgrios laochradh agus loisgidhthe luain
Lá céasda do chléir is do bhochttaibh gan tuaith
Lá taodach taomnach stuirime is truaith
Is lá léin ar an éag do rug Donnachadh uainn.

61 Ar an Athair Conchubhar Ó Briain atá sé leagtha in RIA 895 (12 F 17) 55 (3 v.) chomh maith. Dar ndóigh ní fhéadfadh an tAthair Conchubhar Ó Briain a fuair bás sa bhliain 1720 (feic thuas lch 147), a bheith i gceist anseo, cé go bhfuil an téacs i gclo faoina ainm ag Ó Foghludha, Carn Tighearnaigh uimh. 19. Feic tagaírt do mharbhna eile ar an bhfear céanna thuas n. 49.
D’ainneoin na macallaí flúirseacha atá eatarthu, áfach, níl aon chomórtas i gcúrsaí cáilíochta liteartha idir na véarsaí ón mbliain 1733 agus an laoi ealaíonta atá in eagar anseo (vv 1-7). Is bocht le hinsint é an smáil atá ar an téacs ag an deireadh (vv 8-9), gan amhras, má bhain na véarsaí sin leis an mbuntéacs in aon chor. Ach is cuid de mhianach an traidisiún liteartha i gcoitinne san 18ú haois an cineál sin laige seachadáíochta, faid a bhí Éire i riocht mar ‘a ruined, fragmented country’ (Frank O’Connor).

Lámhscríbhinní:
King’s Inns Library:
6, lch 8 (Séamus Ó Murchadha, Co. Tiobraid Árann 1769)62 (K)
Acadamh Ríoga na hÉireann (RIA):
103 (23 L 6), lch 331 (Seaghán Ó Dála, Co. Phort Láirge 1826-27) (L)
305 (23 M 8), lch 160 (Seadhán Paor, Co. Phort Láirge, 19ú haois (?))63 (M)
895 (12 F 17), lch 1 (Seamus Cheorais, Píce na Carcharach, Co. Chorcaí 1843-44) (F)
Leabharlann Náisiúnta na hÉireann:
G 122, lch 143 ([Co. Chorcaí] / Sasana, 1849 (?))64 (G)
Coláiste Eoin, Port Láirge:
16, lch 204 (Pattruig Den, Co. Phort Láirge 1801) (C)65
32, lch ccxxxiii (Margaret Kiely, Co. Phort Láirge 1839-46) (E)

Gabhann na cóipeanna uile siar chuán téacs ina raibh mionearráidí i ll 20, 29, is cosúil, agus truaillú tromchúiseach i ll 35-6 (feic na nótaí faoi seach). Ar an mbonn sin, agus i bhfianaise a bhfuil de lochtanna ar an dá vearsa dheireanacha den cheangal a pléadh cheana, d’fhéad-fadh sé gur ó athleagan den bhuintéacs a shíolráigh na cóipeanna.
Tá an-éagsúlacht foirmeacha léirithe sna malairtí tríd síos, agus cé

62 Cf. de Brún, Cat. of Irish MSS in King’s Inns 13; tá an dáta ‘August 1769’ scríofa isteach sa lámhscríbhinn K (ibid.). Ag tagairt don scríobháir, feic thuas lch 142.
65 Ag tagairt do chomhthéacs an dáin sa LS seo feic thuas n. 47.
go bhfuil cóngais áirithe le haithint (FG; LC; ME) níl aon fhianaise le fáil ar spleáchas dfreach a bheith idir aon dá chóip. B’éigin léamha na leaganacha uile a chur chun tairbhce ar son na heagarthóireachta dá réir.

(K) Is í seo an t-aon chóip amháin atá againn ón 18ú haois; tá a neamhspleáchas ón gcuid eile de na LSS le feiscint san fhaisnéis a thugann an cheannscríbhinn ar ábhar an mharbhna (pléite thuas ar lch 142), agus sa mhéid gur anseo amháin atá teideal an fhoinn ar ar ceapadh an t-eacs luaithe. Lasmuigh de mhalarí údarásach atá roinnte le E, F (l. 10 ‘chaoinsfid’) agus de mhalairtí áirithe eile a d’fhéadhadh a bheith údarásach (1, 8) nó atá suaithseinseach ar shlí amháin nó eile (16 ‘ghillbhriogh’, 20 ‘dá Ial a’, 35 ‘diar áigh dá bhffórfháig’), is léamha earráideacha a mhalairtácha cuid mhóir de na mhalairtí a dhealaithe ag an chóip seo ó na cóipeanna eile (9, 13, 15, 17, 18, 22, 30, 34). Tá gaol le haithint idir í agus FG (murab ionann annus LCME) i ndornán beag mhalairtí (7, 11, 14, 23, 29).

(FG) Tá foirm na ceannscríbhinne agus ag an t ordú ar an dá véarsa dheireanacha (feic mhalairtí l. 29) mar an gcéanna; tá sraith de mhalairtí tábhachtacha comhoiteann iomtu (3, 5, 6, 7, 9, 13, 14, 24) (‘tásg uaiti’), 26, 27 (tri chás), 32; tá miondífreacha litrithe i gcéiste i gcás 2, 15, 17, 20, 25, 35, 36). Is giorra FG do K ná d’aon chóip eile (feic tuairisc K). In ainneoin na gcosúlachtai a cheanglaíonn F agus G tá roinnt léamha (ar botún iad a bhformhór) ag F amháin (3, 10, 11, 18, 19, 28, 29, 34, 36), agus ag G amháin (8, 9, 18, 20) faoi seach. Tá fo-fhoirm Údarásach ag G (29) agus, níos tábhachtaí ná sin, mórán frásaí aonair i línte tríd an téacs atá cruinn ó thaobh meadarachta, ar an mórgcóir, agus a thugann crot neamhspleách don chóip sin (8, 10 [cf. F, l. 9], 12, 13, 23, 24, 26-7 (ordú), 29, 34).

(LC) Tá an cheannscríbhinn chéanna iomtu a thugann faisnéis go hindreach ar an údar trí úsáid an ghiorrócháin ‘cct’ (feic lch 153). Tá roinnt léamha suaithseinseach eile comhoiteann iomtu (3, 5, 10, 12, 16, 20, 33) agus dlúthghaoil idir na léamha i gcásanna eile (13, 18, 32, 35). Ní ó C a shíolraigh L, mar is léir ó roinnt mionlémhama (litríuchaíon etc.) in C nach roinneann L leí (7, 16, 18, 21, 31); tá beagán mhalairtí den chineál céanna dá cuid féin ag L (13, 17, 27 [lectio difficilior], feic an nóta téacsúil), 36 bis).

(ME) An cheannscríbhinn chéanna agus an colafan céanna iomtu, mar aon le roinnt mhalairtí comhoiteanna (ach miondífreacha eatarthu i gcúrsaí litrithe) (24, 32, 33, 36). Léirionn foirm na cainte sa cholafan a thugann an dá chóip seo gur dóichí go dtéann an nóta siar go láimh an údair. Briathar sa chéad pearsa uatha atá i dtosach
na cainte iomtu ar an de, viz. ‘Aig sin mar adeáthart’ (*sic*) (malairtí ll 32 (E), 36 (M)). Tá deimhníú ar chruinneas na forime sin le fáil i bhfianaise a thugann bheas litrithe áirithe a chleachtann scríobhair M go minic tríd an dtéacs, viz. *ai* a scríobh in áit *a* (3, 4, 24, 33, 34, 35); tá samplaí den tréith sin le fáil chomh maith i bhfoclaíocht an cholafain (e.g. ‘bháis’, ‘aithar’), ach tá an tréith seachanta d’aonghno, ní foláir, san fhoirm bhriathartha.


**TÉACS**

*Ar bhás an Athar Thaidhg Uí Bhriain*

Fonn: ‘Giolla gruama’

1. Lá luainscrios lá gruama lá buartha d’éigsibh, Lá uaigneach lá cruaghoil lá uaisle a chéasadh, Lá fuadaigh lá ruaga lá buan faoi néalta An lá fuarais bás uainne, a bhláth shuadh na cléire.

2. Lá brónach lá deorach lá fóghla a dhéanamh, 5 Lá fóisgar lá breoite lá gleo agus péine, Lá fómhair gan fáil tóice, lá rómhair do chéas mé, Lá tóitre ar lár cóngais an lá leon an t-éag thú.

3. Lá síolchuir chráigh tíortha an lá cloíodh go faon thú, 10 Lá chaoinfid fáidh liofa, an lá is dtíth don chléir seo, Lá chríochnaigh a lán aoibhnsi i n-ardchríochaibh Éireann Mo lá nimhe-se an lá fríodh thú in áit síntse id aonar.
4. Lá coímhtheach lá díoltais lá fuoch faoi éclipse, Lá nimheach lá fíorghóil lá draíocta ar spéartha, Lá sceimhle ag mná caointe, lá a ndaoine in éagruth, An lá fríodh i gceil Bhríde gan puinn daoine an caomhfhlaith.

5. Lá sianmhar lá ciapach lá fiain gan faosamh, Lá stiaillfaid mná a gciabhaíbh, lá dian ag déaraíbh, Lá iarmhair ’fáil ciapa lá ciar do thraochadh An lá triall an fáidh Brianach dá Íodhlac i gcré uainn.

6. Lá duaircis lá uallfairt lá guaise ag cléire, Lá luafaid baird duanta, lá fuachaí is spéirling, Lá uaibreach lá cuatain lá buaramh chéadta An lá fuarais bás uainne chraigh tuath is aolbhrog.

[Ceangal]

7. Mo léan bás on ’ghéig d’fhás de phréimh ard na Múmhan Craobh stáit nár chlaon cáil ba bhreagán don chúige, Laoch sámh ba chéimghrách is ba chléir cháidh mar lonradh, Is gur cré atá ar do bhéal breá is daol trád do spiúnadh.

8. Atá buíon ’ghnáth ag snoíomh dáin i ndíl bháis an údair, Símhná na ngníomh sámh led taoibh tá go túirseach, Meadhbh cháidh ó Chruachán ’s an tsíoth ghrámhar Una Is bean álainn Chnoic Àine is dian tá sí i gcumha thríot.

9. Is cumha tá dom dhlúthchrá ’s is dubhach táid na Muses I gcús bháis gach aon lá ’s i bpúir ghnáth gan múscailt rialacha an Úirmhíc Triath is flaith mo phian tú seal ... ... ...
MALAIRTÍ


Ceannscríbhinní: Air bhás an dochtuir oirdheirc .i. an t’athair Seádhan Ó Briain. Fonn, Giolla gruama, K; Air bhás an athair taidhg ui bhriain cct [= ‘Uiliam Einglis’, lch 330] (feic thuas lch 153)], L; Air bhás an aithair Thaidhg Úi Bhriain, M (feic malairtí l. 36); Marbhcaoine Dhochtuir Úi Bhriain saguirt puirsais Leasamoire, F; Laoi air bhas Dhochtuir Úi Bhriain sagart puroiste Leasa Moire mar a leanus, G; Air bhás an Athair Taidhg Úi Bhriain cct [= ‘Uilium English’, lch 202 (feic thuas lch 153)], C; Air bhas an Athair Taidgh Ó Boriann, E (feic malairtí l. 32).

6 breoise] deorach FG agus: et L píinne K: phéinne E
14 fiorghual LMCE: siorghuil FG draoíchteach K: draoigh- eachta LM: droighcheatha G spéarrtha L: spéirrtha M


Lá luainscrios Cálíocht chaol an chonsain deiridh sa tsuíomh ginideach ar ceal (-sgrios in áit -sgris) sna cóipeanna laismuigh de L, F, M, de bharr éifeacht chomhshamhlaitheach an túschonsain a leanann, is cosúil; dá leithéid chéanna cf. ‘Lá lèirscrios [sic LS] laochradh et loisgdhthe luain’ in Lá déarach d’éigsibh is d’oll-amhain tuaidh l. 9, 23 B 14, 204 (luaite thuas lch 158) (feic Ó Foghludha, Carn Tighearnaigh, 28), foirm deimhnithe i dhá chóip. Tá úsáid an ainmhnigh in áit an ghinidigh le tabhairt faoi deara in áiteanna eile sa téacs i roinnt LSS, viz. lá draoidheacht(a) (14), lá guaïs / guais(e) (21), lá fuacht(a) is spéirling (22) (feic na malairtí faoi seach), ach a stádas sin a bheith amhrasach de bharr an ghuta a leanann ar an bhfocal sa ghinideach (foirm eisceachtach is ea spéirling).

lá fuadaigh, lá ruaga Comórtas reitriciúil idir fuadach agus ruaga anseo (feic thios n. 9). Maidir leis an bhfoirm ruaga, litriú ar bhonn foghraíochta é atá coitianta sna lámhscríbhinní i gcás ainm-neacha bhrataigh in –adh (féach an gléas malairtí i gcás ll 2 chéasadh, 19 thraochadh, 27 lonnradh, 28 spiúadh etc.) nach dtais-peáineann in hilleadh leis na seach, ní ghéillim don litriú sin ach amháin i gcás don ainm br. a bheith i suíomh ginideach.

Lá fómhair Imeartas anseo, is dócha, idir an fómhar (nach mbaintear) agus saosúr na bliana ina bhfuair an Brianach bás (ar an 20ú lá de mhí Mheán an Fómhair) (feic thuas lch 148).

tóite i.e. toice (G) ‘tairbhe, maitheas’; an guta fada de grá na meadaracha. Bhain scríobhaithe (seachas KG) an bhrí neamhcheart as an bhfocal, i.e. ‘tóigthe’.

mé An guta gairid ag freagairt don fhuaime (i.e. me) ina lán LSS mar is gnáth (cf. t(h)u in áit t(h)ú sna ll 8, 9 (gléas)).

tóitre i.e. toit retríth; is é seo a shamhláim laistiar den litriú ‘tóitreith’ (K) (cf. Dinneen, Foclóir Gaedhilge Béarla (Dublin 1927) s.v. toitreach). Tugann an fhóirm sin in an mheadaracht ó l. 5 léi sa líne (tóitre ar ló – l) murab ionann agus tóitribh (LMCE) a thugann siolla breise; ach b’fhéidir na focail tóitribh ar (l ó – l) a léamh agus an chaint ag freagairt dó sa líne roimpi a léamh dá réir (7 fómhair gan l ó – l). Maidir le tóitribh (L etc.) is do tóitrimh (< *tōitreamh) a sheasann an litriú, a thuigim mar mhalaist fhaoirme ar toitrighadh (Dinn. s.v. toitrighim ‘I burn, scorch, broil’).

leon Tá caolú deiridh san fhoirm bhriathartha i bhformhór na LSS (‘léoin’).
9 lá síolchuir Comórtas idir an tagairt don síol a chur anseo agus lá fómhair (7).

chráigh Is cruinne a thugann an fhoirm gan an mhír bhritharththa (F, cf. ‘do chr.’ sna LSS eile) an mheadaracht léi ó ll 10, 12 (l í − á; seachas l í − − á) anseo (feic chomh maith l. 24 n.); is minic an mhír do in easnamh sna LSS, e.g. 8 an lá leo(i)n an t-éag thú, 11 lá chríochaigh, 20 lá thrill. Cf. l. 11 n.

10 chaoinfid 3 iol. (KEF); ‘tíortha’ i l. 9 nó ‘cléir’ (sa líne seo) atá le tuiscint mar ainmní ag an mbr.

fáidh líofa Tá an cur síos seo ar an Athair Tadhg ag teacht le ráiteas ó údar an phaimfléid Essay towards his character: ‘He was consulted as an Oracle in his Neighbourhood, about all abstruse points which admitted of Difficulty …’ (lch 23).

Tá cuma an-éagsúil ar fhoirm na líne seo i leagan G (‘lá caointe ag faig líofa an lá frith go fonn [leg. faon] tu’).

11 chríochnaigh a lán aoibhnis Mar seo atá ag KG (l í − − á l í −); tá an focal ‘a’ in easnamh sna cóipeanna eile agus an mheadaracht ag freagairt do ll 9, 10, 12 dá réir (l í − á l í −); ar bhfearr chríocha a léamh? D’héadfadh sé go raibh crot eile ar thosach na líne sa bhunteács, viz. lá chríochaigh lá an aoibhnis (‘aoibhneas’ atá ag CE, ach i ndearmad, mar is léir).

12 friodh ‘frioth’ (litriú stairiúil) atá in LC; léiríonn an litriú foghrúil (‘fríoch’) sna cóipeanna eile agus an fhainaise a thugann comhthéacs meadarachta an tsampla i l. 16 chomh maith leis gur cóir géilleadh don litriú déanach anseo.

sínte id aonar Tá an fhaisnéis ar chorp an mhairbh a fháil ag teacht leis an dtuairisc thíos (16) ‘gan puinn daoíne’; tá an t-eolas in easnamh sa leagan den líne a thugann G atá cruinn óthaobh meadarachta (‘mo lá nímhse an lá síneadh ar chlár sios tu id aonar’). Maidir leis an gcúlra a bhaineann leis an dtuairisc, féach thuas lch 153.

13 coimhtheach i.e. coimhthíoch (DIL s.v. comaithech); tá an-éagsúlachta a litriú ar an bhfocal sna LSS, ach léiríonn siad gur fuaimníodh f ín a lár.

16 Níl an t-amas dúbalta lár líne (á í í i i í é) ag teacht le patrún na línte 9-15: feic trácht air seo ar lch 158.

cill Bhríde Léiríonn an litriú mishocair atá sna LSS i gcás an dara eilímint go raibh na scríobhaite amhrasach i dtaobh an aínm; féach an trácht ar bhrí na cainte seo agus ar an gcuid eile de shubstaint na líne sa réamhá lch 152.

17 Tá foirm na líne an-mhíshocair sna LSS.
lá sianmhar lá ciapach  (i) Tá na malairtí ‘sianmhar’ (L) / ‘sionmhar(ra)’ (MCE) gairid dá chéile agus iad le tagaírt do sían ‘continuous sound, murmuring’ nó sión ‘bad weather’ (soláideí aidiachtacha in easnamh) faoi seach; is ar éigin a oireann ‘siansach’ (FG, ach ord na bhfocal a bheith difríúil iontu) < sians ‘music’ don chomhthéacs (cf. ‘socharach siansach’ Éigse 22 (1987) 120 (l. 34)); b’fhéidir go mbaineann ‘fiachach’ (K) le fíoch ‘anger’, ach tá amhras ar an bhfoirm ós rud é go bhfuil an chaint ‘lá fiach’ sa dara cuid den líne sa LS sin. (ii) Is treise an fhianaise atá ar son ‘ciapach’ (KLMCE) (cf. ciap ‘contention’) ná ar son ‘ciach(h)ach’ (FG) (cf. ciach ‘oppression’).

lá fiain gan foasamh ‘a wild day without relief’; tá an fhoirm fiain anseo ag brath ar ‘fiadain/fiaghuin’ (LG); ag freagairt di tá ‘fian(n)’ (MFEC) agus an chiall ‘a day without relief for warriors’ leis an bhfrása in F, is cosúil; ach cuir i gcomparáid ‘lá fian gan féarsa (: péarsa)’ (MCE) ‘a day on which warriors (are) without verse (?) / perch [of land] (?)’ (‘péarsa’ i.e. péirse); tá ‘fiach’ (K) amhrasach (feic thuas).

19 lá iarmhair ‘fáil ciapa ‘day of torment for survivors’. Tá an réamhfhocal ag in easnamh roimh an ainm briathartha sna LSS toisce, is dócha, go.gcúirfeadh sé forshiolla sa mheadaracht i gcomórtas le línte eile (ach feic l. 11 n.); tá crot eile ar an bhfrása seo in G, viz. ‘lá iarmhair lá ciaptha’.

20 dá íodhlaí Oireann léamh E (cf. M) anseo i gcúrsaí brí (‘being conveyed’); measctar adhlacadh / tiodhlacadh de réir Dinneen, Foclóir s.v. Íodhlacadh: ‘for (1) adhlacadh, (2) tiodhlacadh’ (tá an t-ainm briathartha tiodhlac luaithe mar mhalaírt i gcás (2) íbid.). Dar ndóigh, bheadh an t-amás i : ia anseo eisceachtach, cé go bhfaightear é, e.g. l. 32 dian (K) ag freagairt do tsíoth; cf. Éigse 33 (1989) 69 n. 24, agus cuir i gcomparáid an t-aistriú ó líl – go lí – sna véarsaí deir- eanacha den dán Fáilte is fiche do chuirim le diograis, Éigse 22 (1987) 118-21. Ina choinne sin, níl aon tsoláid agam d’fhuaímní an fhocal adhlacadh le í nó ía, rud a fhágann an fhoirm in LC (‘adhlac’: lochtach (cf. T. F. O’Rahilly, Irish dialects past and present (Dublin 1932) 178). Is iad na léamha is cruinne ó thaobh an amais: ‘dá Ial a’ (K), ‘da fhíalchar’ (F), ‘da chial cur’ (G) faoi seach, ach ní léir cén chiall a d’fhéadfadh a bheith le haon léamh díobh sa chomhthéacs, ach amháin, b’fhéidir, F ‘from his loved ones (?)’ (cf. fhíalchar aid. ‘having the love of kindred’ DIL s.v. – níl aon tsoláid dá úsáid mar ainmfhocal luaite). I gcúrsaí rithime, K amháin atá rialta (‘Ial a’ ag freagairt do fíain gan / dian ag / cliar do sa chuid eile den véarsa); tá siolla breise sna malairtí eile go léir.
24 An lá fuarais bás uainne Athrá ar fhrása atá i l. 4; tá sé seachanta in FG (‘an lá fuair iog (sic leg.) tásg uaiti’).

25 Mo lean bás ‘on ghéig Litriú an leagain K (‘an’ > ’on) leasaithe ar son na céille (‘alas! the death of etc.’); tá cuma lochtach ar chomhréir thús na líne seo sna cóipeanna eile.

26 bréagán ‘darling’.

27 ba chéimghrách (L) ‘who had orders and distinctions (?)’.

Sílim gur fearr an lectio difficilior i gcomórtas leis na léamha eile sa chás seo.

29 Atá buíon ‘ghnáth Cóiriú thosach na cainte seo bunaithe ar KFG (an fhoirm ghnáith á ghlacadh agam mar fhoirm ghillraithe in áit ‘do ghnáith’); tá an mhalaírt leagain ‘i bpian ghnáith’ (LMCE) as áit ón uair go bhfágann sé an briathar (atá) gan ainmní aige (gabhann símhna 30 mar ainmní le tá sa líne chéanna).

29 ag snoíomh Léamh bunaithe ar G; snoí (snoidhe) an fhoirm den ainm briathartha atá aitheanta; meascadh idir í agus sníomh faoi deara an fhoirm atá anseo, b’fhéidir. Tá an chaint sna cóipeanna eile, viz. ‘agus suim dáin’ etc., as alt sa chomhthéacs, lasmuigh de F (‘a sinní’), foirm atá lochtach sa mheadaracht.

31 Meadhbh cháidh ó Chruachán Tá amas in easnamh sna siollaí aiceanta sa chuid tosaigh den líne seo agus tá patrún an amais dhúbalta atá sna línte a ghabhann roimpi briste dá réir (féach iarraidh déanta ag scríobhái K chun an scéal a leigheas i gcás ‘Miadhbh’). Is i ndearmad atá Meadhbh luaite le Cruachán anseo seachas le Cruacha / Cruachain (i gConnacht) mar ba chóir.

32 bean álaimh Chnoic Áine An locht céanna meadarachta anseo agus atá i l. 31 (n.).

34 aon Amas in easnamh.

35-6 Tá na línte seo truaillithe sna LSS agus idir bhrí na cainte is cheart na meadarachta ó aithint iomtu, cuid mhór, i dtreo nach féidir téacs muiníneach a sholáthar.

TRANSLATION (vv 1-7)

A day of doom and devastation, a mournful day, a day troubling to poets, a lonesome day, a day of hard weeping, a day of anguish for nobles, a day of stealing, a day of scattering, a day bedecked by lasting cloud, the day when death took you away from us, o flower of sages among the clergy.
A sad day, a tearful day, a day of pillage-taking, a day of violence, a day of sickness, a day of clamour and pain, an autumn day without harvest-fruits, a day of digging that distressed me, a day when fire struck in the midst of loved ones, the day when death wounded you.

A day of seed-sowing that grieved countries, a day when you were prostrated and laid low, a day when they will mourn an eloquent oracle, the day that is a deprivation for these clergy, a day when much joy ended in the highlands of Ireland, my day of heartbreak, the day when you were found stretched out in a place alone.

A day of estrangement, a day of retribution, a day of lamenting under an eclipse, a noisome day, a day of bitter crying, a day of magic across the skies, a day of terror for keening women, a day when their people were stricken, the day the fair prince was found in the church of the Bride (?) with few people (near him).

A day of din, a day of anguish, a wild day without relief, a day when women will pluck out their hair, a hard day of tear-shedding, a day of torment for survivors, a day when clergy were wearied, the day when the oracle O’Brien went from us escorted into the clay.

A day of grief, a day of sobbing, a day of peril for clergy, a day for bards to strike up poems, a day of cold and of tempests, a disconsolate day, a day of hardship, a day of distress for hundreds, the day when death took you afflicting common folk and lime-white mansions.

Alas! the death of the scion sprung from the noble kin of Munster, ruling branch of unblemished reputation, darling of the province, steady champion, honoured and distinguished, and cleric chaste like a torch! And alas! that clay should cover your noble mouth and that worms now despoil you.

PÁDRAIG A. BREATNACH

An Coláiste Ollscoile, Baile Átha Cliath
COMPARISON OF SCOTTISH AND CAPE BRETON VARIANTS OF THE SAME WAULKING SONG

PURPOSE OF THIS STUDY

1.1. There is now consensus among scholars of Gaelic on the value and interest of waulking songs (*òrain luadhaidh*) within the corpus of Gaelic song-poetry. The articles by James Ross in this journal from the nineteen-fifties (1955, 1955A, 1957) together with the responses to them by John Lorne Campbell (1956, 1958, 1958A), attest to this consensus. Even more indicative than these, however, are the published volumes dedicated to the waulking song, most especially *Hebridean Folksongs* in which Campbell was again a prime mover (Campbell 1969, 3 vols). In the Outer Hebrides of Scotland ‘waulking the tweed’ or the fulling of newly woven cloth was done by the manual labour of women, who sang while they worked. As Campbell points out in his introduction to *Hebridean Folksongs*, water-powered fulling mills existed until the nineteenth century, but were not generally available in the Highlands and Islands, and the traditional time-honoured custom of waulking persisted into the twentieth century. A team of women would sit six or so on either side of the waulking-board (*cliath-luaidhe*), and after the ends of the tweed were tied together to facilitate its movement around the table, it was dipped in hot urine and the work would begin. The first singer would sing the first line of a chorus and the other women would quickly join in, taking up the chorus again after every verse the leader sang. At the same time, each woman would grasp the cloth to her immediate right, kneading it and passing it rhythmically to the one on her left, and so sunwise (*deiseil*) around the table. The rhythm is akin to that of rowing, and some waulking songs exhort each woman to begin work with the word *iomair*, which in a boating context would be understood to mean ‘row’. After three songs, the hostess would measure the cloth to discern how well it was shrinking, and after another three songs or so, would measure again. Finally the moment would come when she might say: ‘*Aon òran eile!*’ (‘One more song!’)

1.2. When the Gaelic immigrants came to Nova Scotia from the ‘old country’ (as Nova Scotia Gaels refer to Scotland), they brought their language, their religious beliefs and their customs with them.
For them, the songs associated with these customs initially assured them of their continuing link with the beloved homeland; but in time, as Gaels will, they sang them for the love of the songs, thus perpetuating many of them to this very day, and indeed adding new songs to that store. The waulking work became what it is today, known as a ‘milling frolic’, in which both men, women and children gather to sit around the milling table and give vibrant and energetic renditions of their favourite songs, as they pound the cloth backwards and forwards in rhythmical strokes. Gaelic Day at St. Francis Xavier University, Antigonish, Nova Scotia, would not be complete without its milling frolic, and in Cape Breton, it is possible to go on a milling frolic circuit throughout the island in the Summer-time.

1.3. Waulking songs have considerable variety of structure. However, Ross described them as falling essentially into two types, which he calls Type I and Type II (1955, 3, 7). Type I is more ancient, ballad-like, therefore more narrative. It is characterised in the waulking songs by single-line verses alternating with vocables. The theme is developed from line to line, with assonance on the penultimate syllable. When a new theme is introduced, this is characterised by a different assonance. The same theme-lines might then be considered a stanza. The number of lines per theme is irregular, but each line usually consists of eight syllables. The song whose nine variants are studied in the present article belongs, generally speaking, to Ross’s Type II. It contains a chorus of three lines, the first and third with the same vocables, and the central line with meaningful words. The chorus alternates with a two-line verse. Ross speaks of each line in songs of this type as having two stresses, a light and a heavy one. However, our song has two heavy stresses per line of chorus and verse; the verses have varied assonantal chiming between the penultimate syllable of the first line of each verse and (usually) the first stressed syllable of the second line. In addition, in all variants assonance is unfailing throughout the song on the penultimate syllable of each second line, with the vowel ḍ. This kind of waulking song structure belongs almost wholly to the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. It should be noted that the viewpoint throughout is male; in fact, this song most powerfully demonstrates that the women at the waulking table, while most often expressing in song a
woman’s point of view, had no trouble viewing life from a masculine perspective.1

1.4. Five of the nine variants of the song studied here were recorded in Scotland (Appendix A 1-5) while four were recorded in Cape Breton, Nova Scotia (Appendix B 1-4). All derive essentially from four great Gaelic traditions: Lewis, South Uist, Barra, and Skye. A1, the version I was accustomed to from my youth, is found in *Eilean Fraoich* (1982: 79-80); A2 was collected on South Uist by Margaret Fay Shaw during her sojourn there between 1930 and 1935, and can be found in her *Folksongs and Folklore of South Uist* (Shaw 1955: 222-23). The variant A3 was one of one hundred and forty-five waulking songs (text without music) collected by K. C. Craig (1949, 109). One might very well expect the Shaw and Craig versions to match closely. However, the latter has seventeen verses while the former has only nine, five of which correspond closely: Shaw verse 1 with Craig v. 14; v. 3 with v. 6; v. 4 with v. 12; v. 5 with v. 8; and v. 7 (the most commonly occurring verse in all the variants) with v. 11. Interestingly, the Shaw version corresponds very closely to the *Eilean Fraoich* version except in those verses beginning *Ag eis-deachd ris*, which *Eilean Fraoich* and Craig versions share. Already, by comparing only three of the nine variants in a very general way, we become aware of a common, somewhat older Gaelic tradition from which all three, and as it seems when we examine them most probably all nine, variants draw. A4 can be found in the *Gesto Collection of Highland Music* collected and arranged by Keith Norman MacDonald (MacDonald 1895), which is ‘dedicated to the MacLeods of Gesto’ in the Isle of Skye and is the oldest of our published sources. This collection was meant to emphasise the music as a source for pipers and, more and more today, for fiddlers. However, words are included for most of the songs, suggestive of the importance of word-rhythms for instrumental success. The most interesting feature of this version is that of the extant twelve verses vv 7-11

1 John MacInnes (in Thomson 1994, 81) and others have pointed out that waulking songs with a male perspective may very well have been rowing songs (*iorraim*) originally. Waulking songs with sea themes almost certainly were *iorraim*. On the other hand, it is not so clear that male-perspective waulking songs with a love theme were originally *iorraim*. Further comparative semantic study may shed light on this. In Nova Scotia milling songs with martial or military themes are often sung, e.g. ‘An Gille donn’, found in *Gaelic Songs in Nova Scotia* (Creighton and Macleod 1979) 68-70, where it is noted that the song had already been published in *An t-Oranaiche* 456-7 and in *Órain Luaidh* 49-51.
have no corresponding verses in the other four Scottish variants, nor in three of the four Cape Breton variants. Rather extraordinarily, however, vv 9, 10, and 11 correspond quite closely to vv 5, 6, and 7 of B4, which are found on the North Shore Singers’ tape in Cape Breton sung by a male voice group steeped in the Lewis tradition! This apparent anomaly daunts the researcher. Do these Gesto verses belong to an older version of the song brought to Cape Breton by Gaelic immigrants in the nineteenth century? Or is another explanation possible?

A5 belongs in the MacDonald Collection of Gaelic Poetry (MacDonald 1911), collected by Angus John Norman MacDonald from Benbecula, and Archibald MacDonald, born in Harris of Uist ancestry, and published in Inverness. B1 is found in Creighton and Macleod (1979, 214-17); B2 was collected by John Lorne Campbell on his visit to Cape Breton Island and Antigonish County in Eastern Nova Scotia in 1937 (Campbell 1990, 191-96), while B3 appears in Fergusson (1977, 65-66).²

1.5. While it may very well be true, as John Lorne Campbell asserts (1958A, 131), that it is impossible to reconstruct an ‘original’ version, or a close-to ‘original’ version, of a single song, considering the extemporising habits of the women singers and the pool of traditional material that remained in the folk-memory, yet it might be possible to determine, by close comparative study that takes in thematic, phonetic, lexical, and syntactical properties of song variants, degrees of likelihood as to which were likely to be ‘original’ or early elements, and which later extemporised variants. At the very least, we can derive a sense of the thematic properties which belong to a particular song; how each sub-theme is introduced and structured; and how the sub-themes are woven together. What I offer here is a beginning only. Apart from the nine variants studied here, other versions have been recorded but not transcribed; no doubt more may surface, even now. Finally, while I treat the Scottish/Cape Breton Gaelic tradition as an unbroken continuum, which seems a legitimate procedure, at the same time whatever phonetic, lexical, or syntactic variant Cape Breton versions may manifest will be of interest for their own sake.

² Campbell (1990, 195) points out: ‘The text of this song appears to be composed of the words of two very similar songs – the one after the other’. Only the first twelve verses (those reprinted in the Appendix below) belong to the song which is the subject of the present study.
Comparative Analysis

2.1. Séisd or fonn (Chorus)
In the Scottish and Cape Breton versions of the song, the vocables vary little. The middle, ‘sensible’, line in the Scottish variants is the same in all but the Lewis version, i.e. *Gur tu mo nighean donn bhòidheach* compared with *Bu tu mo chruinneag bhòidheach*. The syntax matches:

[Copula (dependent/independent) + Noun phrase (Pronoun) + Complement NP (possessive + NP (N + Adjective (+ adj.)))]

Among the Cape Breton variants Campbell’s version has *Gur tu mo chruinneag bhòidheach*, the Ferguson has *Gur tu mo nighean donn bhòidheach*, and both North Shore versions have *Mo rùn, mo nighean donn bhòidheach*. This chorus version is the dominant one in Cape Breton at the present time. It has banished the copula and introduced a second noun phrase. The down beat still comes on the ù-sound, as is to be expected. The heavy stresses fall on the ù-sounds (second and penultimate syllables) throughout the chorus except in the middle line where the stressed penultimate syllable is ò, therefore matching assonance with each couplet’s second line.

2.2. Principal and subsidiary themes
Principal theme: The lover has lost his sweetheart to another.

Subsidiary themes:

(Found in three Scottish Variants) i) He has heard the bad news that his sweetheart has agreed to marry another.

(Found in most Scottish and Cape Breton variants) ii) He would go with her to various places – even to the moon or the stars, with / without difficulties in getting there – if only she / her parents would be willing or if she would marry him.

iii) He remains outside behind the house while others of high station discuss his sweetheart’s beauty and vie to possess her.
(Found in all four Cape Breton versions; one couplet found in Scottish versions)

iv) As he mentally addresses his sweetheart in various descriptive ways, he worries that he will not win her since so many are in pursuit of her.

(Found in two Cape Breton variants only)

v) The lover (or the singer) warns against marrying various individuals (the cobbler, the miller, the tailor, etc.) for various job-related reasons (because… / although…).

(Found in one Scottish version and in one Cape Breton version)

vi) The lover discovers his sweetheart’s unfaithfulness by reading a letter he takes from her pocket, much to her distress.

These themes are expressed in runs of couplets of which there are two basic kinds: narrative and non-narrative.

2.3. The narrative couplets may show a certain amount of parallel structure between lines of succeeding couplets, together with repetition of a key word. For example, Craig’s first two couplets, exemplifying sub-theme (i):

’S olc an sgeul a chuala mi
Di-Luain an déidh Dhi Domhnaich

*Sgeul nach bu mhath lium e –
Mo leannan dol a phòsadh.

But they also tell of when he heard the bad news and what its impact was. Compare the second and third couplets of the Gesto version as follows (A4):

Thuair mi *sgeul o’n tra so’n dé
A leubh mi nach do chòrd rium

*Sgeula nach do thaitinn rium
Mo leannan dol a phòsadh,

with the second, third and sixteenth couplets of the MacDonald version (A5):
Chuala mi o dh’èirich mi
An sgeula nach do chòrd rium

Sgeula nach bu mhaith leam
Air mo leannan a’ bhi pòsadh

’S bochd an sgeul a fhuir mi ort
Diluain an deigh Didonnaich

(Note that Craig’s verses 3-5 (A3) continue the narrative run in verses not found elsewhere.) Clearly the last couplet in MacDonald does not fit the logical time-frame, even if it does obey the lexical and rhyme schemes of the song. Comparison of the three versions suggests the order:

’S bochd / olc an sgeul a chuala mi / fhuir mi ort
Di-luain an déidh Dhi Dòmhnaich

Chuala mi o dh’èirich mi / Fhuir mi sgeul o’n trà so’n dé
An sgeula nach do chòrd rium/ A leubh mi nach do chòrd rium

Sgeula nach bu mhaith leam / do thaitinn rium
(Air) Mo leannan dol a phòsadh / a bhith pòsadh

The run has a cumulative effect and builds to the revelatory line, playing on sgeul and its unpleasant connotations. These verses offer a beautiful example of variations within the same theme such as that which one finds in oral transmission, i.e. primarily lexical substitutions of a synonymous character occurring within the same, or almost the same, syntactical patterns.

2.3.1. Neither the Eilean Fraoich (A1) nor the Margaret Fay Shaw (A2) versions have this run. Indeed, none of the Cape Breton versions has it either. If, as seems likely, this run belongs to a version of this song which is the hypothetical original, then the Lewis and S. Uist versions must have lost it at an earlier stage, indeed early enough for it not to have travelled to the New World. The Lewis and S. Uist versions appear to be truncated versions anyway, pared down, as they are, to the three runs most representative of the nine versions which we have here. One of these three representative runs
is a ‘false’ narrative run (see 2.3.2 below); and the remaining two are non-narrative runs.

2.3.2. Two couplets as found in Shaw (A2), MacDonald (A5) (both of them ‘old country’ versions) and Fergusson (B3) (Cape Breton, Barra tradition) must be considered, for at first sight they may seem to constitute a narrative run:

'S mise / gur mise t(h)a / gu muladach
Air m’ uilinn ann(s) an (t-)seòm(b)ar

Mise muigh air cùl na tobhta (na tota)
'S tusa (‘us càch) (a) st(a)igh a (ri) còrdadh

In all other song versions – except in the North Shore Singers’ tape, where neither couplet is found – one or other of the couplets appears. But only in the Shaw version does one immediately succeed the other. Contextually these couplets do not belong together: the lover cannot simultaneously lean sadly on his elbow in a room and also wait outside behind the house while his sweetheart is inside agreeing to marry someone else. When one or other of the couplets occurs singly it almost always acts as a ‘lead-in’ verse to the non-narrative run beginning (Mi) 'g éisdeachd (i.e. subsidiary theme (iii)). In other words, the lover may be outside the house while discussions about his sweetheart’s hand are progressing, or, alternatively, he may be inside actually listening while other men of high degree haggle concerning his beloved. Once again the MacDonald version helps clarify matters for us. This uses 'S mise ta gu muladach / Air m’uilean anns an t-seòmar as ‘lead-in’ verse to the narrative run Chuala mi o dh’éirich mi etc., which is the run we have just considered (2.3). Naturally, he is sad leaning on his elbow in the room since he has heard the bad news of his sweetheart’s defection. In addition, MacDonald (A5) also uses the second of these two couplets Mise muigh air chùl na tobhta etc. as ‘lead-in’ verse to the non-narrative run 'g éisdeachd ris (see 2.4.4).

2.4.1. The two most representative runs
The two most representative true runs are such because they are found in almost all versions of the song, and are non-narrative. The relevant couplets may occur in almost any order. In addition, they are marked by parallel syntactical structure in the first lines. The following of the two runs exemplifies sub-theme (ii):
It should be noted that Gesto (A4) alone omits this run. In succeeding verses the lover emphasises in essence that he would go with his sweetheart to Uist or Ireland or Edinburgh – even to the moon – ‘if you would promise to marry me’ or ‘would be willing’.

2.4.2. There is considerable congruity in the occurrence of this run throughout the nine versions under scrutiny here. As one might expect, we find dialectal variations, e.g. Lewis dhéidhinn for rachainn. In addition, lexical substitutions of like meaning occur, e.g. ‘S ge b’eadar e do’n Òlaind for Nam b’éginn, no dha ’n Olaind. Occasional couplets take second lines which do not belong to them. The North Shore singers’ couplet As a sin a dh’Éirinn / Gu sràid na ceuman còmhnard (B4) should have as second line (following Craig, Campbell, Fergusson),

Nam b’fheudar (b’eadar) / (b’éginn) e do’n Òlaind.

Gu sràid na(n) ceuman còmhnard seems to belong with Edinburgh (A5 v. 11, B1, v. 15). On the other hand, Sléibhte is only found in MacDonald (A5 v. 14 and Creighton-MacLeod (B1) v. 18; and in each the line is paired with ‘S ge b’eadar (fheudair) e do’n Òlaind. This serves to illustrate selection from an existing pool of second lines which can be pressed into service when the occasion requires. The first lines, however, appear more fixed; and the majority still pair with what must be the second lines which originally belonged to them. Having said that, Glaschu occurs once (A3): Rachainn leat a Ghlaschu / Far am bi na fásain bhòidhead; Caol Miile likewise appears once (A2), and is paired with Gun fhuireach ri mo bhrògan, a line whose motif occurs in other waulking songs. Only in the Cape Breton versions does America appear, and here only in the two North Shore examples. Perhaps these were extemporised on the North Shore, although we cannot be sure without further comparative study.

2.4.3. The second of the two most representative runs of a non-narrative nature is shorter than the first; it exemplifies sub-theme (iii). The first line of each couplet has the following pattern:
In this run, the second lines of each couplet are also in parallel:

\[
\text{[Verb phrase} \quad + \quad (\text{Noun phrase}) \quad + \quad \text{Prepositional phrase}] \\
\text{Verbal Noun} \quad ((\text{Poss.}) + N) + (N)) \quad \text{(Prep. + NP)} (\text{Prep. pron.}) \\
\text{a’cur/ag (’gad) iarraidh/} \quad \text{do chliù} \quad \text{(ann) an òrdugh (òrdan)/} \\
\text{a’bruaidhinn/ a’tigheann} \quad \text{ceart is còir} \quad \text{gus do phòsadh/} \\
\text{a’cur/-} \quad \text{gus air do/ bhòidhchead/ (ort)}
\]

Note that both Shaw (A2) and North Shore Singers (B4) omit this run. The structural parallelism in the second lines of the couplets means that whatever variations are found to occur will be almost entirely lexical. Indeed, the only structural variant occurs in (B3) Ag raitinn gum bu chòir e, but this connects lexically with ceart is còir. On the other hand, the marked parallelism readily allows lexical substitutions which may admit social comment, e.g. ‘ministers’ (ministeirean) (A1, B1) instead of ‘lords’ (tighearnan), ‘captains’ (caiptinean), ‘baileys’ (iarlachan) (the last two only in Cape Breton versions, i.e. B2, B3).

2.4.4. In two Scottish versions, Craig (A3) and MacDonald (A5), the couplet

Nighean bhàn is àille dreach
Mo chreach mur faighe mi càir ort

serves as a lead-in to the non-narrative run which introduces sub-theme (ii). Two other ‘old country’ versions have variants of this couplet: Do shlios (do dheud) mar chailc as àille dreach / Mo
chreach mur faigh (nach d' fhuair) mi cóir ort (Shaw A2, Gesto A4). The Shaw couplet also leads into the non-narrative run which introduces sub-theme (ii). In Gesto it is the final couplet and there, fittingly, it ends with the past-tense phrase: Mo chreach nach d'fhuair mi cóir ort. All these variants draw from a common pool of phrases in praise of the beauty of the beloved. Of the four Cape Breton variants of the song, this couplet appears only in Fergusson (B3). There it serves as ‘lead-in’ to a new run which occurs in all four.

2.5. This new run is non-narrative and introduces sub-theme (iv) (see 2.2). It is a run suitable for beginning the song, as is shown by three of the four Cape Breton versions. In fact it supplants the narrative run, sub-theme (i), which introduces ‘old country’ versions Craig (A3), Gesto (A4) and MacDonald (A5). The first lines are in parallel structure and, to a degree, so are the second lines. The first lines are patterned in this fashion:

\[
\begin{align*}
&[ \text{Noun phrase} + \text{(Relative clause)} ] \\
&\text{(Conj.) + Voc. + NP} \\
&\text{Particle} \\
&\text{N + adj. (+adj. + adj.)} \\
&( + \text{NP}) \\
&\text{(Art. + N in poss. case)} \\
&\text{(def. art. + N)}
\end{align*}
\]

A first line like \textit{A nighean donn bhòidheach mheall-shùileach} is conventional and readily put to use whenever a maiden’s beauty is to be extolled. On the other hand, this run tells us something of who the beloved is: \textit{nighean mhòr (bhuidhe) a’ Bharronaich} (‘great (yellow-haired) daughter of the Barony’) (B1).

2.6 The four couplets, vv 9-12, of the Creighton version (B1) stand alone. Verses 9-11 are in parallel but they cannot be taken in any order. Like the narrative couplets with repetition of \textit{sgeula} which we noted, these three couplets repeat \textit{a’dealachadh}, but they are not narrative. They have a cumulative effect, building up to \textit{a’ dealachadh}
's a' dealachadh in v. 11. Structurally, the first lines of vv 9 and 10 correspond to the run (Mi) 'g éisdeachd ris …' of sub-theme (iii). Listening to others vie for his beloved would certainly lead the lover to envisage parting from her: the secondary lines 'S mi suidhicht' air a pòsadh chimes disconsolately with 'S fear eile faighinn còir ort. Can these be lost ‘old country’ verses? Or were they extemporised on the North Shore in Cape Breton? Either way, we are glad to have them because they suggest considerable sensitivity to the theme of the song. On the other hand, v. 12 does not properly belong in the run; rather it serves as ‘lead-in’ to the run which expresses sub-theme (ii).

2.7. Verses 19-23 in Creighton (B1) and vv 5-7 in Fergusson (B3) show different ways of handling a theme found in other ‘old country’ waulking songs, viz. sub-theme (v). (The lover (or the singer) warns against marrying various individuals, etc.)

2.7.1. Creighton vv 19-23 are a non-narrative run with first lines in absolute parallel:

Fiach nach pòs thu ’n griasaiche / ceannaiche /
‘m muilleir / ’n gobha-guail / gairnealair

These verses have been inserted into this song and, instead of melancholy at parting, which the original exemplifies, we find a considerable amount of light-hearted banter suggestive of the women at the milling table joking with each other about husbands to avoid. Verses 19-22 could be taken to have a male or a female perspective; the last of the verses, however, clearly has a male perspective, except, perhaps, v. 19 which also occurs in Fergusson (v. 6). Were these verses, in fact, extemporised on the North Shore?

2.7.2. On the other hand, the Fergusson verses exemplifying this theme suggest a Scottish origin since v. 5 refers to the Clan Ranald chief: Cha tugainn do mhac Ailein thu / Ged mhealladh e le ór thu.

2.8. Finally, what are we to make of vv 7-11 of the Gesto (A4) version – v. 12 seems misplaced – which are echoed only in vv 4-7 of the North Shore Singers’ tape (B4)? It is a narrative run, summed up more or less in sub-theme (vi) (see 2.2) or, more succinctly, as ‘the lover finds the letter which proves his sweetheart’s unfaithfulness’.
Thematically, however, none of the other versions in any of their couplets show unfaithfulness; rather the lover has been bested by a rival of higher degree.

CONCLUSIONS

3.1. The general theme of the song, then, which is that of the lover who has lost his sweetheart to another, has the potential to attract a myriad number of sub-themes. The runs in which these sub-themes are developed must, however, fit both structurally and thematically. There are chiefly two kinds of variant in the song: (a) lexical substitutions and syntactical variances (within limits) in individual couplets within the most representative runs; and (b) additional runs expressing sub-themes which may or may not fit within the larger thematic framework. The first kind of variant is natural and to be expected in oral tradition: it in no way obviates the couplet, or the run itself, since the run expressing a particular sub-theme is present in most variants of the song. The substitutions, however, may be of interest for other reasons: dialectal, psychological, sociological.

3.1.1. If, however, we intend to grapple with the problem of which runs originally belonged to a song and which did not, we are immediately confronted by the second kind of variant which also is an oral tradition phenomenon. In this case structural congruity, as for instance in matters such as the occurrence of the same assonantal patterning as elsewhere in the song, combined with an expected syntactic parallelism, particularly in the first lines of couplets, may tend to obscure thematic incongruity. An example of such congruity of structure linked with incongruity of theme occurs, I believe, in the highly patterned runs found in two Cape Breton variants only, Creighton (B1) and Fergusson (B3), which introduce sub-theme (v). Not only is this sub-theme found in other waulking songs (although not necessarily with the same structural patterning and certainly with a different tune and chorus), but it also serves to introduce a note of levity which conflicts with the serious tone of the song as a whole. It is certainly an interpolation, an extemporisation perhaps, which was invented on Cape Breton’s North Shore. Lexically, the B1 version of the run fits well with pioneer life in the second generation through its mention of the cobbler and the tailor as well as the merchant, the miller, the ‘coal-smith’ and the gardener. The link with the ‘old country’ is decidedly present in version B3, however, with ‘MacAilein’.
3.1.2. On the other hand, the run found only in Creighton (B1) beginning ‘S a’ dealachadh ri m’ chruinneig-s’ not only continues the pattern established in sub-theme (iii), but follows immediately after the familiar verses, essentially integrating itself with this sub-theme and with the repeated a’ dealachadh and bringing that sub-theme to a climactic closure. If this is a North Shore extemporisation, it fits beautifully with the theme. Further credence is added to this interpretation because none of the ‘old country’ versions exemplify these singular couplets; nor do the other Cape Breton versions.

3.2. Perhaps the most interesting contrastual feature is that three Scottish versions of the song open with the run exemplifying sub-theme (i), whereas in all Cape Breton versions (save Fergusson in which the run comes near the end) we find the run exemplifying sub-theme (iv) as song-opener (Creighton begins with it at couplet 2). In the latter versions, the first line of each couplet is in the vocative case. Compare a couplet found in ‘old country’ versions, Craig (A3)

Nighean donn bhàn as àille dreach  
Mo chreach mur faigh mi còir ort

and MacDonald (A5)

Nighean bhàn is àille dreach  
Mo chreach mur faigh mi còir ort’

with the one like couplet introducing sub-theme (iv) in Fergusson:

A nighean donn as àille dreach  
Mo chreach nach robh sinn pòsda.

Only in the Cape Breton versions is the sub-theme developed. It is the only run that tells us something about the woman in the song: it fits both structurally, thematically, and logically. One suggestion is that, even given the possibility that a couplet or two might have been extemporised in Cape Breton, it is an ‘old country’ run which was largely lost there. This idea is reinforced by the high station of the young woman: ‘Great (yellow-haired) daughter of the Barony’. On the other hand, sub-theme (i) is absent in our four Cape Breton variants. Since an opening run was therefore needed for the song, this may have been improvised, quite properly, on the vocative example of Nighean bhàn is àille dreach.
3.3. The ‘run’ introducing sub-theme (vi) is a narrative run which exemplifies no parallel structure, but which does have the expected assonantal pattern. Thematicallу, it introduces the question of the woman’s infidelity which is not corroborated in any of the most representative versions of the song. Perplexingly, it is found only once in the ‘old country’ versions, i.e. Gesto (A4), which is, after all, also our oldest representation as far as date of publication is concerned. Likewise it occurs once only in our Cape Breton versions, viz. the tape of the North Shore Singers (B4). Adding to our perplexity, Creighton (B1), also from the North Shore, lacks this run. Certainly it came from Scotland; but I would contend that it was already an interpolation there. A4 tells us she was of hightanding: Nighean bhàin an t-seompuir (or an t-seomradair), the fair-haired daughter of the chamberlain, or treasurer. Thus, here we have another point of contact, this time thematic, with a representative element of our song in addition to the assonantal pattern. Interestingly, the run is woven much more seamlessly in A4 than in the B4 version where it seems out of place.

3.4. Finally, the runs for sub-themes (ii) and (iii) clearly belong in the original song. Most probably, sub-theme (i) also belongs to an early version of the song: it introduces the three oldest versions in our study. Clearly, too, the two couplets beginning Mise muigh air cùl na tobhta and ’S mise tha gu muladach, because of their almost universal prevalence, go back to an ‘original’ or ‘early’ version. Instead of appearing together as a run, however, they work better contextually when used simply to introduce thematic runs. Thus in MacDonald the phrase ’S mise ta gu muladach leads into sub-theme (i), and Mise muigh air chùl na tota introduces sub-theme (iii). Sub-theme (iv) is most probably an extemporisation based on an ‘old country’ run, while sub-themes (v) and (vi), as suggested above, are likely to be interpolations.

I hope this study will prompt other scholars to come forward with further variants of this song which will serve to corroborate, or contradict, these initial findings and conclusions. Continued comparison of waulking song texts will only serve to widen and deepen our understanding of the themes, structures – and likewise the historical and sociological significances – of this dynamic genre of Gaelic song.
APPENDIX A

1.

Fonn:
Fill-iù oro hù o
Bu tu mo chruinneag bhòidheach
Fill-iù oro hù o.

1. Dheidhinn dha’n a’ ghealaich leat
Na’n gealladh tu mo phòsadh.

2. Dheidhinn leat a dh’Uibhist
Far am buidhicheadh an t-eòrna

3. Dheidhinn leat a dh’Eirinn
Gu fèill nam ban òga.

4. Dheidhinn dha na rionnagan
Na’m bitheadh do chuideachd
deònach.

5. Dheidhinn leat an ear ’s an iar
Gun each gun srian, gun bhòtuinn.

6. Mise muigh air cùl na tobhta
’S mise tha gu muladach
Air m’uileann anns an t-seòmbar.

7. Mi ’g éisdeachd ris na diùcannan
A’ cur do chliù an òrdugh.

8. ’S ag éisdeachd ris na h-iarlachan
’Gad iarradh gus do phòsadh.

9. ’S chuala mi na ministeirean
A’ bruidhinn air do bhòidheach.

(Eilean Fraoich) Lewis tradition

2.

Fonn:
O ù ho ro hù ò,
Gur tu mo nighean donn bhòidheach,
O ù ho ro hù ò.

1. ’S mise tha gu muladach
Air m’uileann anns an t-seòmbar.

2. Mise muigh air cul na tobhta,
Is tua staigh a’ còrdadh.

3. Do shlios mar chailc as àille dreach,
Mo chreach! mur faigh mi còir ort!

4. Shiubhlainn leat an ear ’s an iar
Gun each, gun strian, gun ròpa.

5. Rachainn gu Cinn-Tìre leat,
’S dha ’n tir ’san robh mi eòlach.

6. Rachainn ro’ Chaol Muile leat
Gun fuireach ri mo bhrògan.

7. Rachainn leat a’ dh’Uibhist,
Far am buidhicheadh an t-eòrna.

8. Rachainn do na runnagan,
Nam biodh do chuideachd deònach.

9. Rachainn-sa dha’n ghealaich leat,
Nan gealladh tu mo phòsadh.

(Shaw) S. Uist tradition
3.

Fonn:
Hi ìò ó ro hù o
Gur tu mo nighean donn bhòidheach
Hi ìò ó ro hù o

1. 'S olc an sgeul a chuala mi
Dì Luain an déidh Dhi Dèomhaich,
2. Sgeul nach bu mhath lium e –
Mo leannan dol a phòsadh.
3. Truagh nach mi bha taca riut
An t-seachdain air na chòrd sibh.
4. Bheirinn sa mo ghealladh
Nach ann aigesan bhiodh cóir ort.
5. B’fheàrr lium na dusan bó ghual-
Bhith taobh shuas dhe’n chòmh-
laidh.
6. Nighean donn bhàn as àille dreach,
Mo chreach mur faigh mi cóir ort.
7. Rachainn leat a dh’Éirinn,
Nam b’eigin, no dha’n Òlaind.
8. Rachainn do Chinn Tire leat,
Dha’n tìr an robh mi eòlach.
9. Rachainn do Dhùn Òideann leat,
Gum b’éibhinn lium am fòrladh.
10. Rachainn leat a Ghlaschu
Far am bi na fasain bhòidheach.
11. As a sin a dh’Uibhist
Far am buidheachadh an t-eòrna.
12. Rachainn leat an ear ’s an iar
Gun each gun srian gun bhòtan.

13. Shiùbhlainn leat an saoghal,
A ghaoil, nam biodh tu deònach.
14. 'S mise tha gu muladach
Air m’uilinn anns an t-seòmbar,
15. Ag éisdeachd ris na tighearnan
A’ tigheann air do bhòidhchead.
16. Ag éisdeachd ris na diùcannan
A’ cur do chliù an òrdan,
17. Ag éisdeachd ris na h-iarlachan
Ag iarraidh gos do phòsadh.

(Craig) S. Uist tradition

4.

Fonn
Iu horo hu o
Gur tu mo nighean donn bhòidheach
Iu ho ro hu o.

1. 'S fhada ’s gur a fada
'S fhada o’n bha mi toir ort.
Iu ho ro hu o.
2. Thuair mi sgeul o’n tra so’n dé
A leubh mi nach do chòrd rium,
Iu ho ro hu o.
3. Sgeula nach do thaitinn rium,
Mo leannan dol a phòsadh.
Iu ho ro hu o.
4. Mise ’muigh air cul na totadh
'S tusa stigh a’ cordadh.
Iu ho ro hu o.
5. 'G éisdeachd ris na deucanan
A’ cur do chliù an òrdugh.
Iu ho ro hu o.
6. 'G èisdeachd ris na Iarlachan
Ag iarradh gus do phosadh.
Iu ho ro ho.

7. Cha robh fiosam de bu choireach
I bhi foille dhomh-sa.
Iu ho ro hu o.

8. Is ann a thug mi’n gaol a chraidh mi
‘Nighean bhan an t-seompuir.
Iu ho ro hu o.

9. Gus an d’thuair mi fin gun fhios dith
An litir bha na pocaid.
Iu ho ro hu o.

10. Rug mi orra ’s thug mi bhuaíthe i
’S bha i ’n gruaím gu leoir rium.
Iu ho ro hu o.

11. Bha na deoir bha ruith o suillean
Drughadh air a cota.
Iu ho ro hu o.

12. Do dheud mar chailc is aille dreach
Mo chreach nach d’thuair mi coir ort.
Iu ho ro hu o.

(Gesto) Skye tradition

5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fonn</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hù hòro hù ò,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gùr tu mo ngh’n donn bhòidheach,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hù hòro hù ò.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. ’S mise ta gu muladach,
Air m’ùilean anns an t-seòmar.

2. Chuala mi o dh’eirich mi,
An sgéula nach do chòrd rium.

3. Sgéula nach bu mhaith leam,
Air mo leannan a’ bhi pòsadh.

4. Mise muigh air chùl na tota,
’S tusa stigh a còrdadh.

5. ’G eisdeachd ris na diucanan,
A cur do chliù an òrdugh.

6. ’G eisdeachd ris na h iarladh,  
Ag iarraidh cho ’n do phòsaidh.

7. ’G eisdeachd ris na tighearann,  
’G iarraidh ceart is coir ort.

8. Nighean bhan is aille dreach,  
Mo chreach mur faigh mi coir ort.

9. Shiubhlainn leat an saoghal,  
A ghaoil, na ’m biodh tu deònach.

10. Shiubhlainn leat an ear ’s an iar,  
Gun each, gun strian, gun bhòtuinn.

11. Shiubhlainn a Dhuneidean leat,  
Gu sràid nan céuman còmhnard.

12. ’S rachainn leat a dh’Eirinn,  
’Nam biodh tu fein leam deònach.

13. Rachainn leat a dh’Uidhist,  
Far am buidhe ’m bi an t-eòrna.

14. Rachainn leat do Shleibhte,  
’S ge b’eadar e do ’n Olaint.

15. Rachainn fada, fada, leat,  
Cho fad’ ’s a rachadh m’eòlas.

16. ’S bochd an sgeul a fhuaire mi ort,  
Diluain an deigh Didonnaich.

(Macdonald) S. Uist / Benbecula
APPENDIX B

1. 

Fonn:
I iù o ra hù o
Mo rùn, mo nighean donn
bhòidheach,
I iù o ra hù o.

1. 'S mise tha gu muladach,
Air m’uilinn anns an t-seòmar.
2. 'S a nighean bheag a th’aig a’ chrea-
gan,
Feagal orm nach pòs sinn.
3. 'S a nighean mhór a’ Bharronaich
Tha fir a’ bhaile ’n tòir ort.
4. 'S a nighean bheag a th’aig an allt
Tha feagal orm nach còrd sinn.
5. Ag éisdeachd ri na diùcaichean,
Tha cur do chliù an òrdugh.
6. Ag éisdeachd ri na h-iarlaichean,
'Gad iarraidh air son pòsaidh.
7. Ag éisdeachd ri na tighearnan,
Ag iarraidh ceart is còir ort.
8. Ag éisdeachd ri na ministearan,
Tha bruidhinn air do bhòidhchead.
9. 'S a’ dealachadh ri m’chruinneig-s’,
'S mi suidhchicht’ air a pòsadh.
10. A’ dealachadh ri m’ghruagaich,
'S a gruaidhean mar na ròsan.
11. A’ dealachadh, 's a’ dealachadh,
'S fear eile faighinn còir ort.

12. B’fhearr leam na bhi ’g òl an fhìon’,
Bhi deanadach ’gad ’phòsadh.
13. Shiùbhlainn leat an ear ’s an iar,
Gun each, gun strian, gun ròpa.
14. Shiùbhlainn leat an saoghal,
A ghaoil nam biodh tu deònach.
15. Shiùbhlainn a Dhùn-Éideann leat,
Gu sràid nan ceuman còmhraid.
16. Shiùbhlainn leat dh’Amairiga
'S na h-eileanan as bòidheche.
17. Rachainn leat do dh’Uibhist,
Far am buidhchheadh an t-èorna.
18. Rachainn leat do Shléibhte,
'S ge b’fheudair e do’n Òlaind.
19. Fiach nach pòs thu’n griasaiche,
Ged 's breagh a ni e brògan.
20. Fiach nach pòs thu’n ceannaiche,
Ma’s meall e thu le stòras.
21. Fiach nach pòs thu’im muilleir,
Bidh dhust is mhuill an tòir ort.
22. Fiach nach pòs thu’im goba-gual,
Ma’s buail e leis an òrd thu.
23. Fiach nach pòs thu’n gàirnealair,
Ged tha mi’n dràsd’ a’ scòladh.

(Creighton-MacLeod) North River,
Cape Breton; Lewis / Harris tradi-
tion
Fonn:
I ù òr a hù ó,
Gur tu mo chruinneag bhòidheach,
I ù òr a hù ó.

1.
A nighean donn bhòidheach
mheall-shùileach,
Tha fir a’ bhaile an tòir ort
A nighean donn bhòidheach
bheadarrach,
Cha bheag orm do chòmhradh.

3.
’S mise tha gu muladach
Air m’uilinn anns an t-seòmar.
4.
Ag éisdeachd ris na tighearnan
A’bruidhinn air do bhòichead.
5.
Ag éisdeachd ris na caiptinean
Ag iarraidh ceart is còir ort.

6.
A Mhàiri thug mi gaol dhut,
Nuair bha mi aotrom gòrach.
7.
Shiùbhlainn leat an saoghal,
A ghaoil, nam biodh tu deònach.
8.
Rachainn leat a dh’Éirinn,
Nam b’fheudar, dha’n Òlaind.
9.
Rachainn leat a dh’Uidhist
Far am buidhcheadh an t-eòrna.
10.
Rachainn leat a dh’ Ìle,
Cinn Tire a’ bharraich bhòidhich.
11.
Rachainn an ear ’s an iar leat,
Gun each gun strian gun bhòtain.

12.
Rachainn fada fada leat,
Na b’fhaide na bha m’eòlas.

(Campbell) MacKay’s Corner
near Glace Bay, Cape Breton
S. Uist / Barra tradition

3.
Fonn
Hi dhiu o ro hu o,
Gur tu mo nigh’n donn bhòidheach,
Hi dhiu o ro hu o.

1.
Gur mise tha gu muladach.
Air m’uilinn ann an seombar.
2.
Ag eisdeachd ris na bailidhean,
Ag raitinn gu’m bu choir e.
3.
Ag eisdeachd ris na Tighearnan,
Ag iarraidh ceart ’us coir ort.
4.
Ag eisdeachd ris na Iarlachan,
Gad iarraidh son do phosadh.
5.
Cha tugainn do mhaic Ailein thu,
Ged mhealladh e le or thu.
6.
Cha tugainn thu dha’n ghriasach thu,
Ged ’s briagha ni e brogan.
7.
Cha tugainn thu dha’n tailleir,
Ged charadh e do chleochda.
8.
Shiùbhlainn leat an Iar’s an Ear,
Air each gun strian gun ropa.
9.
Rachainn leat a dh’Uidhist,
Far am buidhcheadh an t-eòrna.
10. Rachainn leat gu Eirinn, ’S na’m b’ eiginn e do ’n Olaind.
11. Rachainn leat a’ chul na greine, ’S threiginn mo chuid eolais.
12. A nighean donn as aile dreach, Mo chreach nach rohb sinn posda.
13. A nighean bhuidhe bharranaich, Tha fir a’ bhail’ an toir ort.
15. Na geill ’usa gu dilean dhaibh, ’S gu dean mi-fhin do phosadh.

(Fergusson) Cape Breton / Barra tradition

4.

*Fonn*
I iù o, ra hù, o.
Mo run mo nighean donn bhòidheach,
I iù o, ra hù o.

1. Nighean bhuidh’ a ’Bharronaich Tha fir a’ bhail’ an tòir ort.
2. A nighean bheag a th’ aig an allt Tha mis’ an geall do phòsadh.
REFERENCES

John Lorne Campbell, 1956: ‘Some notes on Scottish Gaelic waulking songs’ Éigse 8/2, 87-95.
—1958: ‘Notes on Alexander MacDonald’s “Oran a’ Gheimhraidh”’ Éigse 9/1, 57-60.
—1990: Songs remembered in exile. Aberdeen
Craig, K. C., 1949: Òrain luaidh Màiri Nighean Alasdair. Glasgow
Creighton, Helen and MacLeod, Calum, 1979: Gaelic Songs in Nova Scoti. Ottawa.
MacDonald, Rev. Drs. Angus John and Archibald, 1911: The MacDonald collection of Gaelic poetry. Inverness.
—1955A. ‘The subliterary tradition in Scottish Gaelic song-poetry. Part 2’ Éigse 8/1, 1-17

CATRIONA NICIOMHAIR PARSONS

St. Francis Xavier University, Nova Scotia
TRÉIGINT AN BHLASCAOID (1953-2003)

An tOllamh Risteard Breatnach (nach maireann) a thóg an blúire cainte seo ar téip thaifeadta ó Mhaurice Mhuiris Ó Catháin (†1961), uair éigin le linn bhreacadh ábhair a bheatha ón gCathánach (Ar muir is ar tír, Maigh Nuad 1991).

Tá leathchéad bliain imithe ó tháinig an rud i gcrích, sa bhliain 1953, a deir Maurice Mhuiris a d’iarr sé ar Éamon De Valéra a dhéanamh nuair a tháinig sé ar cuairt go dtí an Blascaod mar Thaoiseach (sa bhliain 1947) – ’sé sin, muíntir an Oileáin a aistriú amach go tír móir. Is maith is fiú, slíom, an cur sios seo aige ar an gcomhrá idir é agus an Taoiseach istigh san Oileán a fhoilsíú mar chuímhniú mios.

Tá focal Mhaurice Mhuiris scríofa amach sa chúl inar chóirigh m’athair an cuntas uaidh sa leabhar. Tá focal doiléir thall is abhus ar an dtéip marcálta le [...] P. A. B.

Is maith an tamall ó shin bhí sé cloiste againn De Valéra a bheith ag teacht insa hoileáín ag fiosrú na ndaoine, agus bhí sé déanta suas againn lena chéile rud éigin cóir a long air. Agus is é rud a bhí agamsa le long air, sinn a dh’aistriú as. Fear eile gob é rud a bhí le long aige, plúr a thabhairt dóibh le ceannach agus mar go raibh an plúr gann insan am.

Sea, bhíos-sa ag triall ar mo bhó ar maidin chun í thabhairt abhaile chun í a chru, bhí sí amuigh istoiche agam, agus nuair a ghabhna aniar – mar bhí sé thiar ar thaobh cnoic, mo ghort beag – agus mo bhó agam, ’sea chonac an gunboat a’ Gob anuas. Ó, tá ’fhios aige Rí na bhFeart, arsa mise, go b’é De Valéra a thá inti. Bhí Peats Tom agus a mhac amuigh ag tarrac phoítaí theoir as Beiginis agus is sin é a thug isteach ar a’ Núin1 é. D’imíos i leith an anam sios ar a’ Núin, agus ansan do lasamar (sic) tine chnámh ar barra na Núinach nuair a bhrathamair ag teacht thios ar a’ Núin é, tháiní sé fhéin is a mhac isteach aige naomhóg Pheats Tom ar a’ Núin. Ansan bhí an tine chnámh ar lasadh, agus méd pósáíos a dh’fhéadamair – ach [...] ní raibh ann againn – féin bhráid, ag déanamh [...] dhon d’Taoiseach uasal. Ghaibh sé an tslí anfós agus caipín raunálta air. Agus a’ mh’anamsa [...], ach ní bhfaighfai éinne a ragadh chun caint’ leis, le náire roimis, mar dhe.

Ach do chrothas suas me fhéin agus do chuaas féin bhraíd, agus do chuaas ar mo leathglúin.

‘Mhuise, céad fáilte romhat,’ arsa mise, ‘anso, ’Thaoisigh uasal! Conas tá gach aon ruainne dhíot?’ Agus dh’eiríos dom ghlúin ansan agus chuireas orm mo chaipín agus do bheireas ar láimh air.

1 i.e. Inneoin (gin. Inneonach)
Shea, ‘Cad tá ort anois?’ a dúirt sé.
‘Tá ceist agam le rá leat, a dhuine uasail,’ arsa mise, ‘bygor, agus ceist a theastaíonn go cruaidh.’
‘Ó, cad é seo?’ a dúirt sé.

‘Níl anso anois,’ arsa mise, ‘ach daoine a chaith f’neach ann, agus a chaithfidh [...] mara ndéanfaisre aon trócaire orthu.’

Sea, staid sé agus d’fhéach sé orm. ‘B’fhéidir,’ a dúirt sé, ‘nár mhaith le daoine uaisle Bh’leá Cliath sibh a dh’aistriú as.’

Stadas féin ansan. ‘Ó mhuiise,’ arsa mise, ‘ba chóir ná déanfaimis éinní as an slí ar aon duine uasal ar an saol.’

‘Ó, ná fuil Gaoluinn bhreá agaibh,’ a dúirt sé, ‘agus sibh á labhaínt anso i dteannta a chéile, agus b’fhéidir go gcaillfeadh sibh í nuair a raghadh sibh ag triall ar an mBéarla, is ar na daoine?’

‘Dhera, an méid Gaoluinne a thá againn,’ arsa mise, ‘fanfadh sí ’ár mbolg go deo go dtí go raghamaí i dtír muair, agus nuair a raghamair i dtír muair,’ arsa mise, ‘nuair a bheam ar ár suaimhneas, [...]’, agus b’fhéidir gur fearr an scéal é ná bheith ann.’

‘An bhfásann aon chrúithneacht ann?’ a dúirt sé.

‘Ní fhásann, mhuis’, ‘arsa mise, ‘a dhuine uasail, ach go holc.’

‘Canathaobh san?’ a dúirt sé.


‘Bhfásann prátaí ann?’ a dúirt sé.

‘Fásann prátaí ann,’ arsa mise.

‘Sea, nach maith an rud a fhásann?’

‘Is maith an rud prátaí, leis,’ arsa mise, ‘a dhuine uasail, ach cad é an mhaith sin, a dhuine uasail,’ arsa mise, ‘dá mbeimis ag maireachtaínt go deo, bheafar orainn ar deireadh.’

’[...] Nach maith an rud,’ a dúirt sé, ‘go bhfuil bás ag frioitháilt oraibh?’

‘Dhera, dá mbeadh a bhfuil do bháid ag an Rialtas,’ arsa mise, ‘– agus tá an Rialtas agatsa – anso againne chun tindeál’ orainn, ní aon mhaith é.’
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2 fanacht
‘Canathaobh?’ a dúirt sé.
‘Canathaobh san?’ a dúirt sé, tháinig dhá shúil mhuara dho.
‘Dhera mar,’ arsa mise, ‘tá na daoin a thá a’ fás anso anois agus tá ábalta ar an bhall fógra a ruath, tá an fear is óige acu glan fiche bliain. Agus cad é an mhoill,’ arsa mise, ‘a bheid siad a’ dul [...], mar caithfidh an t-aos a chuid féin a dh’fháil.’
Bhí sé ag éisteacht liom. ‘Caithfidh an t-aos a chuid féin a dh’fháil,’ arsa mise, ‘agus beimid gan mhaith,’ arsa mise, ‘insa deireadh, agus ní bheidh éinne a thabharfadh an sagart do dtí an nduine eile thiar ar deireadh. I gcuntas an tsaoil, a dhuitheas ar bith,’ arsa mise, ‘má tá aon phaiste agat ar fuaid na hÉireann spárafaidh tú sli bheatha éigin duinn, is tóg amach as sinn.’
Sin é a dúirtsa le De Valéra. Ansan d’imigh sé uam, agus chuaigh sé ’on Phost Office, agus do dhin sé pé rud a dhin sé ann, wire éigin is dócha a dhin sé abhaile go raibh sé dulta an méid sin, agus d’imigh sé uainn ansan, d’imigh sé uaidh chun na Gaillí.

3 Tiocfaidh
MAIRG DO DHUINE MAIRG DO NEOCH

Mairg do dhuine mairg do neoch
bhíos go droichéadaigh doichleach,
mo-ghéanar duine do-ní
don tsaoighal uile neimhní.

Bheith go doichleach olc an béis
do neoch dá bhfuil a ccorp chriadh,
millidh a dhealbh is a dhreach,
mairg darob déán droicheineach.

Duine doichleach ima phroinn
is olc a thoisc a ccolainn,
ní cóir a chaoine ná a ghul
arna dhola don domhan.

Bíd piasda ifirnn fhuaire
ag crádh a chuirp ’s gach aird,
duine doichleach ar na dhul
ní cóir a ghul ná a mhairg.

P. A. B.
LÉIRMHEAS


The Spiritual Rose (SR) is a manual of lay devotion in Irish containing miscellaneous litanies, rosaries, meditations and prayers. The book was first published in Monaghan in 1802. The present work is based on the second edition printed by Greacen in Monaghan in 1825. The title-page tells us that the matter contained in SR was rendered into Irish by Matthew Kennedy, a layman and small farmer of the parish of Manfieldstown, Co. Louth. Roman characters are used throughout. The language of SR is of interest, reflecting as it does the Irish of Oriel at the beginning of the nineteenth century.

McKenna’s edition contains a full introduction in which he discusses the various editions of SR, the contents of the work, the translator, the historical and linguistic background and the method he has used in his own edition. He has a very full discussion of the language of the text in which he relates features of the dialect of SR to what is known of the Irish of Co. Louth from twentieth-century sources. The work is also supplied with textual notes, glossary, a list of proper names, a list of variant readings from other editions of SR, and a bibliography.

Lay-out

The editor has reproduced the printed text on the left-hand side and his own normalised text on the right page, the lines of the text on the left corresponding to the lines in the normalised text on the right. In order to achieve this alignment, the printer has been compelled on occasion to use typefaces of differing sizes where the type was all of the same size in the original. Presumably because of the decision to align both left and right texts, both diplomatic text and normalised version have very wide margins on both sides and at the foot of the page. Moreover, neither text is justified at the right margin and the spacing of headings is frequently cramped and looks awkward.

The pages in the edition follow the pages in the original printed version, the pagination of both original text and of the author’s text appearing at the top of every page. At the same time references in the textual notes (281-303), in the glossary (304-89), in the index of proper names (390-92) and in the list of variant readings (393-418)
cite both the page number and the number of the line. Unfortunately
the line numbers are shown neither in the diplomatic text nor in the
editor’s normalised version.

Although not written in a standard spelling, the original text is by
no means impenetrable to anyone with a reasonable knowledge of
Irish. Perhaps, therefore, the printing of both the original and nor-
malised texts was not entirely necessary. An edited version of the
original text (with readings from the original cited in footnotes) on
the left side of the page and an English translation on the right might
have been preferable. I am not even sure that keeping the pages and
pagination of the original was wise. The whole text could have been
broken up into numbered paragraphs, which would have made find-
ing any item on the page rather easier. In addition the large amount
of empty space would have been avoided. The absence of right justi-
fication also looks untidy.

**Historical background**

In his discussion of the historical background to SR McKenna points
out how far removed is the language of the work from the Classical
Irish standard. As part of his discussion he explains that Fláithrí
Ó Maolchonaire and Aodh Mac Aingil, two seventeenth-century
writers of Irish devotional works, set out deliberately to write in sim-
ple language because, as they both claim, neither was sufficiently
well versed in the ornate literary style. Of course, in Ó Maol-
chonaire’s case the apology was unnecessary, since he does write in
a wholly literary manner.

Other writers excuse themselves in more or less the same terms.
John Carswell, the Scottish Calvinist, for example, writes in 1567:
_Agas ar an adhbhar sin, dá bhfaghadh saoi re healadhain locht
sgriobhtha nó deachtaidh sa leabhar beag sa, gabhadh sé mo leith-
sgéalsa_ (‘And therefore if a man learned in literary language should
find mistakes in writing or spelling in this little book, let him accept
my apology’). Similarly, the Anglican Seán Ó Cearnaigh writes in
1571: _Achd cheana, tré go bhfuil gach aon tosach anbhfann ann
féinn ... atámsa agá ghér-ghuidhe ar gach aon fó leith ... gan im-
dheargadh, achnhasán, nó masla do thabhairt di, ná fós damh féin
tríthi, mar thuarasdal: Ach an t-ionadh a bhfuighge tú locht nó ain-
imh uirre, do dhithcheall cheartuighe 7 leasuígh do thabhairt air
(‘Moreover, because every beginning is weak in itself ... I beseech
every single person ... to revile, criticise or insult neither it [his
book] nor me because of it as a reward: But wherever you find a fault
The Franciscan Francis Molloy in the introduction to *Lucerna Fidelium* (1676) calls his book *tabhartas miotharbach* ‘an offering of little value’, and begs his readers not to be too harsh on it.

It is clear, therefore, that the apology for writing inaccurately or too simply was little more than a commonplace in such religious works and cannot be taken literally. It is not clear that McKenna realises this, as he bases much of his argument on the ‘popular’ nature of the language of devotional manuals of this kind. Yet such books by definition had to be accessible, precisely because they were aimed at the uneducated laity. In every case the author’s apology for the defects in his written Irish is purely conventional. Indeed, in the case of Aodh Mac Aingil it is illogical as well. Mac Aingil, as McKenna observes, apologises in *Sgáthán Shacramuinte na hAithridhe*, ed. Cainneach Ó Maonaigh (Baile Átha Cliath 1952) (= SSA) for his own lack of ability in writing correct Irish. Mac Aingil goes on to say that the ‘heretics’ of Ireland have produced an Irish version of the Book of Common Prayer and much of the Bible (a reference to the Irish New Testament of 1603) and he adds & is lór a neimhchirti sgríobhthar iad ‘and they are written in very inaccurate Irish’ (SSA l. 89). On the one hand, then, Mac Aingil apologises to his readers for not being an arbiter of correct Irish as far as his own book is concerned; on the other hand, when discussing the Protestants he clearly considers himself an arbiter of correct Irish. This inconsistency is enough to make us realise that when writing his apology, Mac Aingil was following convention rather than speaking from the heart.

**Normalisation**

McKenna’s decision to print a normalisation opposite the diplomatic text means that he has had to explain in great detail exactly how his normalisation has been accomplished (pp lxxiv-lxxxiii). There are, however, some instances where the editor’s normalised text is not completely consistent.

McKenna normalises *ann a honóir* ‘in her honour’ (32), *a hanam* ‘her soul’, (93), *a hanama* ‘of her soul’ (110), *a hiomchar* ‘her behaviour’ (95) and *a haon Mhac* ‘her only Son’ (37), all without a hyphen between prefixed h and the following vowel. Elsewhere, however, he writes ‘her only Son’ with a hyphen after the prefixed h: *a roibh a h-aon Mhac* (77), *air a h-aon Mhac* (93), *air mhór- phiantaigh a h-aon Mhic* ‘at the agonies of her only Son’ (104-5).
Why the inconsistency? In his normalised text the editor writes \textit{i n-onóir} ‘in honour’ (32, 48 (five times), 49), \textit{i n-onórchas} ‘in honour’ (86), but \textit{ann onóir} ‘in honour’ (82, 112). Similarly, he normalises as \textit{ghabh sí ina broinn} ‘she conceived in her womb’ on p. 20 but \textit{do-rinneadh duine dhe anna broinn} ‘he was incarnate in her womb’ on p. 23. The inconsistency in normalisation of the same phrase is unexplained in the section on normalisation. Indeed, the editor seems to be telling us (pp lxxvii-lxxviii) that the preposition \textit{i} ‘in’ is spelt \textit{ann} before possessive adjectives in his normalised version. In which case \textit{ina broinn} ignores his own guidelines. In his normalised text McKenna inserts a mark of length over long \textit{eo}, though it is absent in the diplomatic text, e.g. \textit{a Mhic Dé bhithbheó} (11), \textit{idó Dhia bhithbheó} (15), \textit{feóil} (20), \textit{mo bheóil} (22), etc. On occasion, however, he writes long \textit{eo} without any mark of length over it, e.g., \textit{a Mhic Dé bithbheo} (29), \textit{a chuirt leo} (32) and \textit{ag diospóireacht leo} (37) (twice). \textit{Bithbheo} (29) may simply be a slip for \textit{bithbheó}. The examples of \textit{leo} without mark of length, however, cannot be explained as slips, for there are too many of them. The editor also inserts a length mark over \textit{a} before \textit{rd} when such is missing in the diplomatic text, e.g., \textit{sa ngáirdín} (22, 39, 40), \textit{Mo ghárdha buan} (83), \textit{don ngárda buille} (128) and \textit{i nGáirdín Gethsemani} (39). Inconsistently, however, certain words containing -\textit{ard}, -\textit{aird} are invariably written without any mark of length: \textit{ós ard} (30), \textit{go hArd} (75), \textit{mo aird-dídean} (82), \textit{go hard} (126), as \textit{aird} and a \textit{ghairdian} (138). The variation in orthographic practice here also seems curiously inconsistent. In addition the editor writes \textit{Na huaire canónsta so} ‘These canonical hours’ on p. 66, but \textit{Na huara canónsta so} translated identically on p. 73.

In his discussion of relative particles McKenna says of the original text: ‘There may be \textit{da} where the indirect rel. particle \textit{a} is to be expected; this usage is retained in normalization’ (p. lxxxvi). The editor seems here to be implying that such occurrences of \textit{da} are normalised as \textit{dá}. I am slightly unhappy about the expression ‘is to be expected’, since the indirect relative particle \textit{a\textsuperscript{n}} is itself a reflex of earlier \textit{dá} (in the same way that the indirect relative particle \textit{go\textsuperscript{n}} is a reflex of earlier \textit{agá}). One should therefore not be astonished to see \textit{da} for modern \textit{a\textsuperscript{n}} in the text. Moreover, the normalised version sometimes has \textit{a} where \textit{dá} is required. At 6.18, for example, the diplomatic text reads \textit{BHEREMUID mile buidhchas dhuit, a Dhia, fá gach tiolcaindh agus grasta a dtug tu dhuinn o thanic muid air an tsaolsa}. This is normalised as: \textit{Bheireadmuid mile buidhechas}
dhuit, a Dhia, fá gach tiodhlcaidhe agas grásta a dtug tú dhúinn ó thainic muid air an tsaoighal so. Although McKenna explains tiodhlcaidhe/tiodhlcaidhe in his textual notes, he does not mention his curious indirect relative clause beginning a dtug tú dhúinn. I think we should read fá gach tiodhlaice agas grásta dá dtug tú dhúinn here (‘for every gift and grace of all those which thou hast given us’). Clauses with de + the indirect relative particle an are normal after gach + noun.

Editor’s interpretation
There are many further places where one might disagree with the editor’s normalised text. I cite a few of them below.

15.5-8 The diplomatic text here reads: tabhair dhuin ta da iarraidh ort claonadh founmhay agus dortadh umlan an da gra ro diagh. McKenna does not understand founmhay and in his normalised version replaces it with ellipsis: tabhair dhúin atá dá iarraidh ort, claonadh … agus dortadh iomlán ann do ghrá roidhadha. I understand founmhay to be a misprint for *fonnmharc ‘eager’; cf. rodh fhonmhor at 9.11. I should translate: ‘grant unto us who beseech thee, an eager obedience and to be wholly immersed in thy most divine love’.

22.18-9 The diplomatic text reads: mar bhocsail agus mar bhual siad e; mar Sciur siad e aig an Philar claoithe. This McKenna normalises: mar bhocsái agus mar bhual siad é; mar sciúrs siad é ag an philéar cloiche. Wherever any other part of the verb sciúraim ‘I scour, I whip’ occurs, McKenna normalises it to sciúrsaim, for example at 40.9, 40.12, 50.11, 87.14 and 130.16. It is quite true that the noun sciúrta ‘scourge, whip’ is well attested in SR, for example at 27.16, 48.18, 113.17 and 130.17, but there is no need to emend the verb sciúraim to sciúrsaim, particularly since there are so many instances of sciúraim in SR. The basic sense of sciúraim is ‘scour, scrub’, but it bears the secondary sense ‘cane, lash, trounce’. This sense is cited by both Dinneen, Foclóir Gaedhilge agus Béarla (Dublin 1927) (= DFGB) and Ó Dónaill, Foclóir Gaeilge Béarla (Baile Átha Cliath 1977) (= FGB), and indeed the south-east Ulster text Seánmóna Chuíge Uladh, ed. Cainneach Ó Maonaigh (Baile Átha Cliath 1965) (= SCU) uses the verb in this sense when speaking of the scouring at the pillar: Is air a son a ceangladh a lamha go cruaidh air an cholmhnui 7 a sgiuradh a chorp le sgiúrseadh garga (SCU ll 1478-80); ordaigheas an breitheamh Iosa a cheangal air chomhain 7 a sgiuradh (SCU ll 1642-43).

37.4-7 The diplomatic text reads: Meoramuid sa Rundhiamar so mar chaill an Mhaighdonbeannaigh [sic] Muire gan aon fhrahta da taobh, a haon Mhac ghraidh a Jerusalem. This is normalised: Meabharamuid sa Rundhiamar so mar chaill an Mhaighdean Beannaighthe [sic] Muire, gan aon … dá thaobh, a haon Mhac gráidh i nJerusalem. Although the editor does not
render *fhraitha* in his normalised text, in his note on p. 286 he says: ‘read *gan aon fhheasta dá thaobh* “without any tidings of him”’. *Fheasta* he suggests is perhaps the plural of *fios*. This tentative interpretation is unlikely to be correct. The word *fios* has no plural. Moreover the compound preposition *de thaobh* means ‘with respect to’ rather than ‘about, concerning’; cf. *do thaobh De, agus na comarsain* ‘with respect to God and [my] neighbours’ on p. 74. I suspect that *gan aon fhraitha da taobh* is in fact a misreading of an original text *gan aon fheacadh da taobh*. This, the second edition of SR, was published in 1825, that is to say, thirty years before the definition of the dogma of the Immaculate Conception (1854). Popular Catholic piety of the early nineteenth century was very concerned with the sinlessness of the Blessed Virgin. Anything which might show her to have been less than perfect was to be vigorously rejected. I would restore this passage as follows: *Meoramuid sa rúndiamhar so mar chaill an Mhaighdean Bheannaigh Muire *gan aon fheacadh dá taobh* a haon mhac gráidh i Jerusalem ‘In this mystery we contemplate how the Blessed Virgin Mary without any sin on her part lost her beloved only son in Jerusalem.’

39.9-12 The diplomatic text reads: *Smunamuid sa Rundhiamar so mar bhi ar Dtiagharna cho claoite marsnaigh shin air ar son a ngardin Jethsemani . . .*, which is normalised: *Smuaineamuid sa rùindiamhar so mar bhi ar dTighearna chomh claoite meirtnighthe sin air ar son in nGàirdin Gethsemani.* The same (verbal) adjective *marsnaigh, marsnigh* occurs also at 99.2, 132.7 and 139.8, and on each occasion it is emended to *meirtnighthe*. Whatever the origin of *marsnaigh*, it is unlikely to be connected with the verb *meirtnighim* ‘weaken, enfeeble’. The stressed syllable of *marsnigh* is a back vowel, not a front one; the consonant cluster is *rsn*, not *rtn* and the cluster is broad, not slender. I should tentatively derive *marsnigh* from *marsnaighthe*, the verbal adjective of the unattested verb *marsnaighim* ‘dominate, master, overwhelm’ and I should compare the adjective *mursanta* ‘domineering’ and the noun *mursanach* ‘a subject, one lorded over’ recorded from Rathlin Island by DFGB.

40.14-6 The normalised text reads: *Is sé uimhir na mbuillidhe a bualadh air (do réir mar hadmhadh do Naomh Brighid) ós cionn chuig mhile bulle.* McKenna has no note on this passage, nor does he say anything under *Brighid* in his index of proper names, other than to compare the name *Brighid* with *Brighid* in *Diogluim Daná*. It would seem, then, that the editor believes Brighid to be the Irishwoman, St Bridget of Kildare. This is not the case. The saint alluded to here is Birgitta/Bridget of Sweden (†1373), author of a book of ‘Revelations’, which describe in detail the passion of Christ: see, for example, Donald Attwater, *The Penguin dictionary of saints* (London 1965) 74.

46.8-9 The diplomatic text here reads *a gcuidéacht na Naomh Ainghiol*, which the editor normalises to *i gcuidéachta na naomhaingeal*. Indeed, *[a] gcuidéacht* he normalises to *i gcuidéachta* wherever it occurs, e.g. 44.16, 123.18 and 127.4. It must be admitted that the expression *gcuidéachta leacht*
‘together with thee’ occurs at 88.25, 96.13 and gcuideachta leis ‘together with him’ at 93.17. Yet the form cuideachta is equally well attested in SR and would seem to be a genuine variant. Indeed the variant cuideachta is cited by DFGB. It probably arose when speakers took the simplex cuideachta to be genitive singular and analogically restored a nominative *cuideacht. At all events, there is no need to emend cuideachta to cuideachta everywhere.

46.18 The diplomatic text reads: go rachamuist go luaghirah laugarach as a Staid shaolta sa and the editor suggests that the phrase go luaghirah laugarach ‘is most likely to be a case of dittography.’ This is unlikely. I take luaghirah laugarach to be an alliterative expression, which in normalised orthography would read: *go lúthgháireach lángháireach, where lángháireach means ‘completely joyful’; cf. go súghach siorgháirioch in Párlament na mBan, ed. Brian Ó Cuív (Dublin 1952) (= PnB) l. 2542.

46.19-20 The diplomatic text reads: le seilbh ail air a Mbeatha mharanta shioraidh, which is normalised as: lé seilbh a fhagháil air an mbeatha mharthanach shioraidhe ‘to get possession of the lasting and eternal life.’ It is difficult to see how mharthanach could have given mharánta. I take mharánta to be the Ulster word maránta cited by both DFGB and FGB with the sense ‘mild, gentle, unperturbed’. I should translate: ‘to obtain possession of the eternal and serene life’.

47.9-12 The diplomatic text reads: guidhmuid hu an Rosary so ghlacan ma<r> Chroín Ghlórmhar rosaidh ta shin ofrail aige na chosa. When a relative clause contains the verbal noun and the object of the verbal noun is the antecedent of the relative clause, the particle ag may not be used; instead one uses a (< do). Thus in Irish one says táimid ag déanamh tí ‘we are building a house’, but an teach atáimid a (< do) dhéanamh ‘the house which we are building’. The present passage has been normalised as: guidhmuid thú an Rosary so a ghlacan mar chorónaigh an Mac an Mhaighdean Muire ‘how the Son crowned the Virgin Mary’. Mary, crowned Queen of Heaven, is now enthroned at her son’s side in heaven. What is offered to her is also offered to him. I should translate the whole: ‘We beseech thee to accept as a glorious crown of roses this rosary which we offer at his feet.’
The text is completely grammatical and makes perfect sense as it stands. With modern punctuation, word-division and slight emendation of initial mutation one could read the original text as follows: *agas fadh dúinn, a Mhaighdion roghrástmhuill, le d’eidirghuidh ar n-anam a lasamh le mian d’fhacsint corónaithe cho glórmhar so nár bhásaidh sé ionainn go sioraith nó go n-athróchar shine chum seilbh sholásah do naomhamhairc* ‘and obtain for us, O most gracious Virgin, by thy intercession that our souls may be inflamed with the desire to see thee crowned so gloriously that it [the desire] may not die ever in us until we are changed unto the radiant possession of the holy sight of thee’.

48.17 The diplomatic text reads: *Ofrálam suas i a nonair da cuig creata naomtha Slanaigh* which is here normalised: *Ofrálam suas i i n-onóir do chúig créachta naomthta slánaidhe*. Slanaigh is again emended to slánaidhe at 76.2, 76.21 and 84.10. Moreover slánaidhe is cited as headword in the glossary with the meaning ‘healing, salutary.’ The editor cites no example of this adjective from any other source and indeed it appears to be wholly unattested. Slanaigh in SR I take to be the genitive of slánadh ‘salvation’ used adjectivally with the sense ‘restorative, salvific, health-giving’. Notice that slanaigh, the genitive of the verbal noun slánadh is attested in SR at 43.7, 45.24, 108.27, 109.21 and 113.22. McKenna’s *slánaidhe* is a ghost-word. All instances of slanaigh in SR should be listed under slánadh ‘salvation’.

59.11-2 The normalised text reads: *Lé seacht n-ursa seasmhach/ Agas bord grásamhail bídh* and the glossary translates ursa here as ‘prop, support’. This is perhaps not the best translation. The passage here describing the Blessed Virgin Mary derives ultimately from Proverbs 9:1-2. The Vulgate text of verse 1 reads: *Sapientia aedificavit sibi domum, excidit columnas septem*, and the Authorised Version says: ‘Wisdom hath builded her house, she hath hewn out her seven pillars.’ I should translate ursa here as ‘pillar’ or ‘column’.

60.4 The verb *srioifaidh* occurs here, i.e. 3 sing. fut. < *sroichim* ‘I reach’. this form occurs again at 61.9 and 62.15. Different spellings are Srioifidh 20.5, sraifidh 66.6, sraoifidh 63.22, sraoifadh 64.25 (probably future) and scriofaidh 58.24. In every case the normalised text emends the form to roichfidh. This I find perplexing. It is true that the *sroich* is a reflex of earlier ro-saig, but in the modern language the verb is invariably sroichim in Ulster and Connacht and sroisim in Munster. Indeed FGB cites roich only as a variant of sroich. One of the most important features of SR is the light it sheds on the spoken Irish of Oriel in the early nineteenth century. It is thus a pity that the editor has chosen in his normalised text and his vocabulary to substitute for the spoken form *srioifidh, sraifidh* the unwarranted archaism roichfidh.

60.19 The diplomatic text reads: *Mil sháimh Sampson*. This title of the Blessed Virgin is normalised as Mil sháimh Sampson ‘the pleasant honey of Samson’. I am not convinced that this is the best translation. I take saimh to be a bad spelling of saithe (satha, saoithe) ‘a swarm of bees’. The allusion is to the story in Judges 14:8-9 of Samson’s finding honey in the carcass of
the lion and his setting a riddle about it. Judges 14: 8-9 reads in the Revised Standard Version, ‘he turned aside to see the carcass of the lion, and behold, there was a swarm of bees in the body of the lion, and honey. He scraped it out into his hands, and went on, eating as he went.’ Mil shaimh Sampson should be translated ‘Honey of Samson’s swarm’.

62.9 The diplomatic text reads: Mar lilidh measg criochan. In his note McKenna points out that the English version of the Office of Our Lady has ‘thorns’ here, and he compares lilidh measg criochan with the phrase lile idir spiúnaibh in the poetry of Aogán Ó Rathaille. The editor does not seem to have noticed that the expression is from the Song of Songs 2: 2. The Vulgate reads: Sicut lilium inter spinas, sic amica mea inter filias. FGB glosses creachán as ‘small bush’. Aodh Mac Domhnaill implies that both the blackthorn and the bramble are criocháin: see Fealsúnacht Aodha Mhic Dhomhnaill (Dublin, 1967), §§ 60, 61. I would understand lilidh as the singular here and would translate ‘Like a lily among brambles’; cf. the RSV: ‘As a lily among brambles, so is my love among maidens.’

64.19-20 The diplomatic text reads: V. An sua Flaighios rinne me soilse neamhfhacaidh. R. Agus dfoilaigh me an saoghil go hule mar cheo. The normalised text does not render neamhfhacaidh, replacing it with ellipsis. In the note on p. 291, however, neamhfhacaidh is glossed as ‘unfailing’, though the editor gives no evidence for this interpretation. The versicle and response here are a paraphrase of Ezekiel 32: 8. The RSV reads: ‘All the bright lights of heaven I will make dark over you, and put darkness upon your land.’ Clearly the Irish versicle means something like ‘In the heavens I make the heavenly bodies dark.’ I would understand neamhfhacaidh to be a bad spelling for *neamhfhaicthe, *neamhfsheicthe ‘unseen, invisible’.

65.15-19 The diplomatic text reads: Croin rialt na speir. Gan cha i os cionn Aingiol, Rarc do mhic a ngloir. Do shuidhe air a dheas l-a mh, Deisítte a nor. This is a description of the Blessed Virgin after her coronation in heaven. The editor normalises: Coróin réalta na spéir: Gan chaói os cionn aingeal. Radharc do Mhic i ngloir, ‘Do shuidhe air a dheasláth, Deisíthe i n-ór. In his glossary s.v. réalta McKenna makes rialt (his réalta) nominative singular. I take it to be the genitive plural. The allusion is surely to Revelation 12: 1, ‘a woman clothed with the sun, with the moon under her feet, and on her head a crown of twelve stars’. I am not completely convinced that the gan chaói in the normalised text is correct either, even though the expression gan chaói occurs on p. 66 and in the same poem. In the latter case gan chaói ‘without weeping’ refers to the soul of the believer. Here we are speaking of the glory of sinless Mary. Might it not be better to understand gan cha i to be a mistake for gan cháim ‘perfect, sinless, immaculate’? I am also unhappy with the normalisation of Rarc do mhic i ngloir. Rarc I take to be for i radharc, a compound preposition meaning ‘in the presence of’. I should translate the whole: ‘O crown of stars in the sky, sinless above the angels, in the presence of thy son in glory seated at his right hand arrayed in gold.’
The diplomatic text here reads: *agus aoramh na Straoghdaigh, agus na trí Ríthe*, which is normalised as: *agas adhradh na dtréadaighe agus na trí ríthe* ‘and the adoration of the shepherds and the three kings’. It is difficult to see how *dtréadaighe* can be derived from *Straoghdaigh*. I should prefer to read here *adhradh na sréadaighe*. *Sréadaidhe, sréadaí* ‘shepherd’ has already occurred in SR: *Iosa, fhírthréadaigh* (12.13), which McKenna normalises: *A Íosa, a fhírthréadaighe*. *Sréadaidhe, sréadaí* for *tréadaidhe, tréadaí* is well attested in Irish; see both *DFGB* and *FGB* s.v. The editor on p. xlviii seems to think that *sréadaighe* is a nonce form at 12.13 rather than a separate and well established variant.

The section of SR on pp 83-4 is a translation into Irish of a hymn to the Holy Family. At the end of each stanza the three names *Íosa, Muire agus Ioseph* occur. At 83.11-14 the diplomatic text reads: *O maighdion ghormhar eagrum thú, Agus goir oram a measg na bhféin, Go raibh hainmsé an mo bheol go buan, Iosa, Muirre agus Joseph*. This is normalised as *Ó, a Mhaighdion ghlórmhar, agram thú, Go raibh na hainm sé go cinnte a mheabhradh. Agas stiúraigh mé air uair mo bháis, Íosa, Muire agus Joseph*. The editor has assumed that *hainmse* refers to the names of the Holy Family in the next line. I question this. It seems to me unnecessary to understand *hainmse* as an anomalous plural as the editor does (see also his glossary s.v. *aimm*). I would normalise: *Go raibh hainmise as Go raibh h’ainmise* and would translate the whole: ‘O glorious Virgin, I invoke thee, and do thou call me among the elect, that thy name may be for ever upon my lips—Jesus, Mary and Joseph!’
of the nominative singular for the nominative plural, just as he believes
hainimse at 83.13 to be in the plural. If this second example of the singular
ainm is indeed for the plural, then the lines must be translated: ‘O my
Saviour, I beseech thee, certainly to meditate upon these names. And direct
me at the hour of my death – Jesus, Mary and Joseph.’ I take Na haini<ms>i
here to be what it appears to be, namely the singular. I would translate: ‘O
my Saviour, I beseech thee, in her name [i.e. the Blessed Virgin, addressed
in the preceding stanza] certainly to remember it [i.e. his passion, just
alluded to] and do thou guide me at the hour of my death – Jesus, Mary and
Joseph.’

87.15 The diplomatic text reads: an chroin fhuilita Spin which is normalised
an choróin fhuileachta spin ‘the bloody crown of thorns’. Indeed, fuilita
and its variant spellings are normalised as fuileachta throughout, e.g. at
88.9, 88.11, 89.16 and 130.27. The editor is assuming that the consonant
group -cht- has been everywhere reduced to -t-. The development -cht- > -t-
is well attested in other words in this text, but I wonder whether the simpli-
fication of *-eachta is really necessary here. As well as fuileachta, modern
dictionaries cite the variants fuileachtach and fuileata. I suspect that
fuileata is what is meant by fuilita and its variants in SR, i.e. an adjective formed
from fuil ‘blood’ and the adjectival suffix -(e)ata seen also in bunata ‘basic’,
mileata ‘military’ and samhrata ‘summery’. There is no need to invoke the
-cht- > -t- rule here.

88.1-2 The diplomatic text reads: le coinsias ciorath cuir thu fein sa mbara,
a ir son a lircht [sic] uair as chuir tu fearag air Dhia. The editor does not
venture to render sa mbara in his normalised text, replacing the phrase with
ellipsis. The expression occurs again at 138.23-5 in the Irish version of
‘Dies Irae’, a poem on the Day of Judgement: cread a dearraid, / No cia he
da ’udeanud [sic] carraid, / Sa fiorean fein go mbeidh sa mbarrs [sic], where
again the editor has replaced the expression with ellipsis in his normalised
version. In both passages the context is that of the Day of Judgement. I
would normalise both as sa mbarra ‘at the bar, in the dock’. At 88.1-2 we
would then read: le coinsias coireach cuir thú féin sa mbarra ‘with a guilty
conscience put yourself in the dock for as many times as you have angered
God.’ At 138.23-5 I would normalise line 25 ‘s a’fíréan féin go mbeidh sa
mbarra and I would translate the three lines: ‘(What shall I say, or who is
there of whom I will make a friend), when the righteous man himself will
be in the dock?’

97.4-7 The passage here is a meditation on the sixth Station of the Cross, i.e.
the apocryphal story of Veronica, who was believed to have offered Jesus
her kerchief to wipe his face. The diplomatic text reads: Smuanaigh an sa
croghat na mua beannaigh so nar ghaibh eagla no uathlas fana bheit
lathar na geasaoidairaigh neamhthrcroairch. The editor normalises:
Smuainigh ann so cróidhacht na mná beannaighthe so när ghabh eagla nó
uathbhás i fána bheit in láthair na gcéasadóiridhe neamhthrcroairch. It
will be seen that he has added the object pronoun i after uathlas/uathbhás where it is absent in the original. The verb gabhaim in Irish when talking of mental states is used in two quite different ways: (a) the mental state appears as the subject and the person experiencing the mental state is the object, e.g. tuc a adaigh siardeas 7 do gab gengairi 7 subaltaige móir é ‘[Columcille] turned his face to the south-west, and smiled and was exceeding merry’ (Betha Colaim Chille, ed. A. O’Kelleher and G. Schoepperle (Chicago 1918) §98); (b) the person experiencing the mental state is the grammatical subject and the state itself is the object of gabhaim, e.g. an mhuintir bhios teasaíghé nó ar n-ndéanamh do cháilíbh teasaíghé as iad ghabhas fearg go hofann ‘People who are fiery or made of fiery dispositions are those who become angry suddenly’ (PnB II 3484-85). DIL s.v. gaibid §1, tells us that (b) is a later idiom than (a). FGB cites both usages under gabh 1, giving both Ghabh fearg, brón, éad, é ‘he got angry, sad, jealous’, and [Lit.] Ghabhadar eagla roimhe, formad leis ‘they became afraid, envious, of him’. The text of SR makes perfect sense here without the addition of i. I would emend the spelling slightly: Smuanaigh anso croghat na mná beannaigh so, nár ghabh eagla nó uathfás fána bheith ‘láthair na gcéasair neamhthrócr-ai trách; and I would translate: ‘Ponder here the courage of this holy woman, who was neither afraid nor appalled to be in the presence of the pitiless executioners.’

99.4-7 This passage is a meditation on the Seventh Station of the Cross, where Jesus falls for the second time. The diplomatic text reads: Smuanaighgur [sic] be duabhó, agus do straic abharc a leaco;agus [sic] ulaigh sios fuath agus gráin a thabhairt da do cailíocht uabhrach. This is normalised as: Smuinigh gurb é d’uabhar agus do stráic adhbhar a leagtha agus ... sios fuath agas gráin a thabhairt do do cailíocht uabhrach. The last word here should perhaps be uabhrach ‘proud’, with a slender internal consonant group; the variant uabhrach is not usual in Modern Irish. In his note on p. 296 the editor suggests that ulaigh sios of the diplomatic text should perhaps be rendered umhlaigh sios as an (imperative) verb meaning ‘stoop’. Since he leaves a gap in his normalised version after leagtha agas, it looks rather as though he has not fully understood the passage. The diplomatic text itself can be re punctuated and edited very slightly to give excellent sense: Smuanaigh gurb é d’uabhar agus do stráic adhbhar a leaco agus ‘ulaigh sios; fuath agus gráin a thabhairt do do cháilíocht uabhrach ‘Consider that it is your pride and your conceit that are the cause of his stumbling and his being brought low; hate and detest your proud nature.’ There is no imperative verb as such. The verbal noun, as so often in Modern Irish, is functioning as an imperative. The words ulaigh sios are for *a umhlaighthe sios ‘of his being humbled, of his being brought low’, where *umhlaighthe is the genitive singular of the verbal noun umhluighadh. Note incidentally that the prayer addressed to Christ in the next section on this page (99) uses the same two verbs umhlaighim and leagaim when speaking of Christ’s fall: As se m’uabhar, m’fhearag agus
It is my pride, my anger and my contempt of everybody else that brought thee low and caused thee to stumble.

The diplomatic text here reads *Uan ceansaigh De* which is normalised as *Uan ceannsaighthe Dé*. Indeed whenever the text has *ceansaigh* (or a variant spelling of it) the editor has normalised to *ceannsaighthe*, e.g. at 11.24, 89.24, 90.9, 91.14, 100.4, 107.10 and 130.1. His normalisation is, I believe, mistaken. *Uan ceannsaighthe Dé* can only mean ‘the tamed Lamb of God’, which is not what the author intended. The author clearly had in mind what in standard Modern Irish would be *Uan ceansa Dé* ‘the gentle Lamb of God, the meek Lamb of God’. *Ceansaigh* in SR is a spelling for *ceansa* ‘gracious, meek’; cf. DFG’s *ceannsadh*. In Ulster and eastern and northern Connacht today *préachta*, *sásta*, *sona*, etc., are often pronounced *préachtai*, *sástai*, *sonaí*, etc. I should normalise here as *Uan ceansaighthe Dé*.

The diplomatic text reads *Aireacha nimhe* ‘Vipers’. The normalisation is *Naithreacha nimhe*, which is questionable. The variant *athair neimhe* for *nathair neimhe* is well attested in literature, and indeed *athair neimhe* is cited by DFG s.v. *nathair* as a variant of *nathair neimhe*. Similarly, FGB cites *athair* as a variant of *nathair*. The normalisation of *Aireacha nimhe* to *Naithreacha neimhe* is all the more perplexing when one remembers that at 64.15 the diplomatic text reads *Chreanaighus a tarnimhe*, which the editor himself normalises as *Chriothnuigheas an t-athair neimhe*.

The diplomatic text reads: *Sna toda aige polladh a chollataigh fior leisg*. McKenna does not appear to understand *Sna toda* and replaces the words with ellipsis in his normalised version. *Toda* is the plural of *tód* ‘toad’, a word well attested in devotional works when describing the effects of mortal sin and the torments of the damned. *Tód* is used four times, for example, by Aodh Mac Aingil, e.g. & *do-chonairc ré gach peacadh dá n-inniseadh go ttigeadh tód (beadhadhach gráná nimhe) amach as a beol* ‘and he saw at every sin which she confessed that a toad (a horrible poisonous beast) emerged from her mouth’ (SSA ll 2718-19); see also ll 2719-20, 2731-32, 2746-47. The normalised text should therefore read: ‘s na tóda aige polladh a ’chollataigh fhiorleisc ‘and the toads piercing the indolent sluggard’.

The following occurs in the diplomatic text in a series of meditations upon Christ’s Passion: *thug siad le scig is mogamh slacht cuiscirt mar bhatta riogha an do laimh*, which is normalised: *Thug siad lá scige is magadh slat coscairt mar bhatta riodha ann do láimh*. The editor also lists the expression *slacht cuiscirt* in his glossary on p. 324 under the word *coscraim* ‘I defeat, destroy.’ He presumably understands *slat coscairt* to mean ‘a destroying rod, a destructive rod’ or the like. I should prefer a different interpretation. *Slacht cuiscirt* I take to be a bad spelling for, or corruption of, *slacht cuiscrirge* or *slat cuiscrioich*. *Cuiscreach* is a collective noun meaning ‘reeds’ and *slacht cuiscrighe* therefore means ‘a rod of reeds, a single reed’. The allusion here is to the gospel narrative: ‘and plaiting a
crown of thorns they put it on his head, and put a reed in his right hand’ (Matt. 22: 29).

138-40 These pages contain a version of ‘Dies Irae’ translated into Irish by Rev. Bernard Callan. ‘Dies Irae’ is a Latin poem on the Day of Judgement, usually ascribed to Thomas of Celana († c. 1255) (see, for example, F. J. E. Raby, The Oxford book of medieval Latin verse (Oxford 1969) §259). The Latin poem is written in stanzas of three rhyming lines, each having four stressed syllables. Callan’s Irish version imitates the metrical scheme of the Latin, with the three lines of every stanza rhyming with one another and having four stresses in each line. Since Callan’s line is effectively that of the Irish metre known as caoineadh, he usually provides as is customary in caoineadh an internal rhyme in every line. Given the exigences of the metre, Callan’s Irish follows the Latin fairly closely.

Stanza 14 in the Latin reads as follows:

Preces meae non sunt dignae
sed tu, bonus, fac benigne
ne perenni cremer igne.

Callan’s Irish text reads here:

Mo urnaigh bhocht ni fiú tu heistacht
Acth os tu ta maith na déana eircois
Agus seachuin me air phiantaigh daora.

This McKenna normalises:

Mo urnaighthe bhocht ní fiú tú a héisteacht
Acht ó’s tú tá maith ná déana scrios
Agas seachain mé air phiantaidhe daora.

The second line is not happy here. The Latin says: ‘but thou, being good, ensure kindly …’. This is a far cry from ná déana scrios ‘do not destroy’. Moreover, this version lacks rhyme, since the fourth stressed syllable is scrios, which does not rhyme with héistach and daora below. I take na déan eircois to be a bad spelling for ná déan *éarachas, where *éarachas is an otherwise unattested abstract noun on the basis of the verbal root éar ‘deny, reject’. I would translate ‘do not reject [me]’, a reasonable rendering of fac benigne. This reading has the advantage of rhyming with héistach and daora.

The first line of stanza 15 in the Latin reads: Inter oves locum praesta ‘Grant [me] a place among the sheep’: which Callan renders, Air thaobh na nuan deluan biobh maiste. This is normalised as: Air thaobh na n-uan Dé Luain biobh m’aistear, where aiste is emended to aistear. The emendation is unnecessary. The word aiste means, inter alia, ‘state, condition’ and fits the context perfectly here. If we edit Callan’s text, we get: Air thaobh na n-uan Dé Luan biobh m’aistear which can be translated: ‘Let my state be
among the lambs on Judgement Day’, which renders *Inter oves locum praestā* fairly accurately.

Stanza 16 in the Latin reads:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Confutatis maledictis} \\
\text{flammis acribus addictis,} \\
\text{voca me cum benedictis.}
\end{align*}
\]

Callan’s text reads:

An tan do bheidh aig gul ’s aig eagchion \\
Lucht na mallacht air gach taoibh dhiom \\
Orduibh mise a measg do rochlion.

This McKenna normalises:

An tan do bheidh ag gul is ag éagcaoine \\
Lucht na mallacht air gach taoibh dhiom, \\
Ordaigh mise i measc do rochlann.

There are two problems here. In the first place, it is apparent that each line ends with é + unstressed syllable. McKenna’s éagcaoine is hypermetric and should be replaced by éagcaoin, a well-attested variant (see *DFGB* and *FGB* s.v. éagcaoin and s.v. éagao in respectively); éagcaoin is what is meant in the text by the spelling éagchion. Rochlion is the second problem. The editor takes this to be a compound of ro- ‘too’ and clann ‘children’, and in his glossary s.v. rochlann he glosses the word ‘pre-eminent children’. This interpretation cannot possibly be correct, because we require é + unstressed syllable, which we do not get with *rochlann*. The Latin is of help here. *Voca me cum benedictis* means ‘Summon me with the blessed’. The blessed are those who have been elected by God to salvation. Ro here is not a prefix at all, but the noun rogha ‘choice’. The expression do rogha clann is an idiomatic one meaning ‘thy choice of children’ (cf. *Pósadh sé a rogha bean* ‘Let him marry whatever woman he chooses’ *FGB* s.v. roga). *Do rogha clann* written *dō ro c(h)lion* here, means ‘whichever children thou chosest, thine elect children’ and is a fairly accurate translation of benedictis ‘the blessed’. Because rogha is normally pronounced raeigh in Ulster, *dō roclion (> dō raeigh clann)* rhymes perfectly with éagcaoin and taoibh dhiom.

SR is an extremely interesting text both for its content and its language. The inaccuracies in this edition are disappointing. Nevertheless, a large and comprehensive edition such as this is naturally welcome.

N. J. A. WILLIAMS

*An Coláiste Ollscoile, Baile Átha Cliath*

Bá sa tréimhse 1974-94, nó mar sin, a bhíodh ábalair an leabhair seo, ó chainteoirí a bhain ó dhúchas le seanpharóistí Dhún Chaoín agus Dhún Urlann le imeall iar-tharach leithinis Chorca Dhuibhne. Tá na cainteoirí a bhfuarthas faisnéis uathu roinnte ina dhá n-aicme ag an údar. Sa cheap aice tá deichnúir a ghlac páirt go feasach sa cheistíúcháin agus sa taifeadadh; tá a n-ainneachá leo sin, chomh maith lena n-áitreachbh agus tuairim dá n-aois. Sa dara haicme tá tríocha duine a mbíodh caidreamh rialta ag an údar orthu agus, ar a shon nár chuir sé ceisteáilghean go follasach orthu, a mbíodh solaoidí dá n-urlabhra á mbreacadh sios i ndiaidh an ama aige; de bhun cúirtéise, níl ainneachá leo sin, ach tugtar eolas ar a n-áitreachbh agus tuairim dá n-aois. Nó raibh ach duine amháin den chéad aice fós ina bheatha le linn don leabhar a bheith ag dul faoi chló agus, ar an meáin, ba shine baill na haicme sin ná baill an dara haicme. Níor mhór a bhí eatarthu, áfach, agus ó thaobh stádas na faisnéise de tá an dá aicme i dteannta a chéile le samhlú go hárithreach leis an gcéad leathan den fhichiu céad. Is í Gaeilge na tréimhse sin, má tá, faoi mar a bhíodh sí á gnáthú ag dea-chainteoirí i riarthar Dhuibhneach, atá go bunúsach a tuarascáil sa chuntas seo. Tá ann: faisnéis chrúin föneolaíochta, paraíomhí críochnúla ar ainmfhocail agus ar bhriathra, agus léiriúcháin fairsing ar na ranna eile cainte, go hárithreach le hghnasanna do bhriathartha. San iomlán, tá breis agus 6,000 de sholaoidí barántúla cainte sa leabhar (lch 2) de bhreis ar an bhfaisnéis pharaidímiúil. Is mó an mórshaothar é.

De réir gnáis, tosaítear leis an bhfóneolaíocht; go háirithe le fónfoineolaíocht an fhocal, agus bémíocht an fhocal go críochnúil san áireamh. Is í an anailís chlasaiceach fóinéimíochtacha an bhonn atá leis an gcúis seo den chuntas ach, ina dhiaidh sin, is mó de chomharthaíocht leathan foghraíochta nó de chomharthaíocht bheachta fóinéimíochtacha a úsáidtear chuain foirmheacha a chur i láthair. Ní miste sin, dar ndóigh, mar doimeann sé gur féidir d’ilchineál léitheoirí earráfocht neamharráideach a bhaint gan móran dua aisti. Níl aon solaoid sa leabhar nach bhfuil sa chló foghraíochta seo, agus sa ghnáthtargafaíocht ina theannta sin. Ní beag an méid sin féin d’fhaisnéis ar thréithe na canúna. Is scoláire é Diarmuid Ó Sé a mbíonn bunmhachnamh á dhéanamh aige ar ghradhadh na Gaeilge agus, cé gur ‘de réir na ranna cainte’ (1), mar is eol go traidisiúnta iad, atá rangú gramadúil déanta ar a chuid faisnéise aige, is beag
duine a shílfeadh gurb é leagan amach na mBráithre Críostaí a lean-fadh sé. Ceithre phátrún déag, i.e. ceithre cinn déag de dhíochlaonta, atá aitheanta aige san ainmfhocal uatha. Ní cuí leis foirmeacha an iolra a cheangal go paraidíúil leis na haicmí uatha, ach iad a liostúil go neamhspleách mar phátrún iontu féin. Seacht gcinn fhích-ead de phátrún iolra atá aitheanta aige. Ina dtéannta sin go léir, ní móir sé ainmfhocal déag eile a aithint nach mbaineann go cruinn le haon cheann de na pátrún uatha ná iolra sin, is é sin go bhfuil sé cinn déag d’ainmfhocail ‘neamhrialta’ ann (123-4), más ceart a leithéid sin de théarmaíocht a thagairt in aon chor do ghnás an ainmfhocail sa Nua-Ghaeilge. Is ar éigean atá an rud a dtabharfaí córas air ann, ach ar an leibhéil is teibí. Ní hé go bhfuil gnás an ainmfhocail go speisialta crosta, ach nach bhfuil aon mhórophátrún ag baint leis. Tá an méid sin léirithe go grinn ag Ó Sé anseo.

Cheal aon mhórophátrún, níorbh ionadh roinnt mhaith ilghnéitheachta a eascairt sa ghnás. Tá sin le sonrú sna foirmeacha iolra go háirithe; cúig cinn d’foirmhreacha iolra atá ag an bhfocal guala (118), mar shampla, agus iad inmhialartaithe go saor ar a chéile is cosúil. Bíonn an deis ann, gan amhras, chun foirmeacha difriúla a cheangal le brónna ar leith. Sa Nua-Bhéarla fein, nach bhfuil ach mórphátrún iolra amháin san ainmfhocal ann, ní hionann brí do na foirmhreacha brothers agus brethren. Dá réir sin (118), i nGaeilge na dúthai seo, is í an fhoirm ceathrúna a úsáidear nuair a is codáin a bhíonn i gceist, agus is ceathrúintí adeirtear le ranna véarsaíochta, mar a d’aithin Máire Mhac an tSaoi go cruinn. Mar an gcéanna, tá an dá iolra glúine agus glúinte ann (112); glúine adeirtear leis an mbhall coirp, ach glúinte nuair a bhíonn brí ghinealaigh a bhíonn i gceist. I gcás an fhocail margadh (117), is margáintí a bhíonn mar iolra air sa chéill ‘socruithe, aontuithe’; margáin i mbríonna eile. Go stairiúil, tharlódh gur ó eiteamóin eile, margáin, a shíolraigh an fhoirm margáinté. Is léir go raibh margáin dulta i léig in iarthar Dhuibhneach, ach an fhoirm margán ag an Duinnínneach, agus í atógtha i ndiaidh a hheidh a mhair deachainteoirí ann, e.g. ar an láthair sin tarraingeadh margáin ‘deineadh socrú láithreach bonn’ (Béaloideas 15 (1945) 28). Tá an fhoirm margán ag an Duinnínneach, agus í atógtha ar an bhfoirm iolra b’fhéidir, faoi mar a bheadh amhrán < amhráintí ann; is margáine atá ag Caoilfhionn Nic Pháidín (Cnaasach Focal ó Úbha Ráthach); níl an focal margáin ag Ó Dónaill, ach tá an fhaisnéis atá aige ar an iolra margáintí ag teacht go cruinn leis an ngnás Duibhneach, rud a dheimhnnigh Pádraig Úa Maoileoin is dócha. Ní bhacann Ó Sé ina chuntas lena leithéid sin de scagadh stairiúil, mar
is é a phrionsabal diongbhálta cloí leis an bhfianaise shioncrónach agus í sin a bheith chomh slán inti féin agus is féidir. Is é an prionsabal cóir ina leithéid seo de shaothar é.

Toradh eile ar an ilghnéitheacht foirmeacha san iolra is ea nach mbíonn cainteoirí de ghnáth sása iolraí a cheapadh d’fhocail anaithnide, ná d’fhocail nach samhlófaí iolra leo. Coitianta, ní bhíodh cainteoirí in Éirinn ná in Albain sása an focal grian a chur san iolra, mar shampla; déarfaidís nach mbeadh a leithéid ann. Tá liosta sa chuntas seo (130) d’fhocail nach samhlófaí iolra de ghnáth leo. Níl an focal grian orthu, cé nach dtugtar foirm iolra in aon áit sa chuntas ach an oiread dó. Gan amhras, le hathru tuisceana, tagann claochlú ar an ngnás, agus craimsítear a fhocail iolra nuair a bhíonn gá léi. Tugtar an t-iolra suipéarach ar an fhoirm iolra nuair a bhíonn gá léi, mar shampla, cé gur focal é nach samhlófaí iolra tráth leis: tabhair dó a shuípear ~ tabhair dóibh a suipéar. Daichead bliain ó shin, ní raibh Bríd Grainfil (cainteoir 5 sa chuntas seo) sása go gcuirfí suipéar san iolra (‘caint ná húsáidimíd’); ach is ionú claochlú atá tagtha ó shin ar nósanna bia agus cuideachta, agus tá an teanga tar éis athrú dá réir ní foláir.

Aicme spéisiúil eile is ea an líon nach beag d’ainmhfhocail nach mbíonn ar fáil ach i bhfoirm iolra; b’fhéidir gurb é an focal smidiríní is aithnidiúla orthu. Tá liosta maith anseo díobh (131), ina measc an fhocail gadraí, a samhlófaí gad mar uatha leis i gceantair eile; tá gad sa chuntas seo (30) mar sholaid ar chontrárthacht fhoinéimiuil, ach níl aon mhíniú theairis sin air. Ar na foirmeacha nach luaitear sa liosta tá: giúirléidí / giúirléadaí, creithnisí, agus b’fhéidir roinnt bheag eile atá ar eolas ó áiteanna eile, ach nár casadh sa líon anseo.

Tá córas an bhrithair i bhfad níos rialta ná córas an ainmhfhocail. Is é sin le rá go bhfuil dhá mhórophátrún in fhillte briathar ann agus, theairis sin, dornán beag de bhriathra neamhríala agus de bhriathra uireasacha. Tá cuntas soiléir ar gach gné doibh sin ag Ó Sé ina leabhar. Tá a anailís neamhspleách fein ar an ábhar aige, gan amhras, ach sa chás seo ní gá dó dealú rómhor ó rangú seanbhunaithe na réimnithé, i. Réimníú 1 agus Réimníú 2. Tá anailís néata aige ar an gcomhthreormhaireacht atá eatarthu sin, mar leanas:

| LÁITHREACH | 1 glan | + | 0 | + | -ann |
| 2 bun | + | -i- | + | -ann |
Níl feidhm mhór leis an anailís sin sa chuntas seo, áfach, mar gur leis an TAMHAN, i.e. {glan+ 0}, {bun + í}, a chloítear sna paraidímí a ríomh. Chomh maith leis an faisnéis iomlán ar na paraidímí sin, tá trácht eolachtaí sa leabhar ar an ainm briathartha, ar an aidiacht bhriathartha, agus ar réimse na bhfoirmeacha tiomchainteachta.

I dteannta a bhfuil d’fhaisnéis ar na príomhanna cainte, .i. an t-ainmfhocal agus an briathar, tá fáirisingeacht eolais sa leabhar ar an aidiacht, ar an bhforaíocht, ar an réamhfíocal, ar an gcórais uimhreacha agus caintíochta, agus ar iarmbeárlaí, á thaispeáint gur mhíreanna agus ar chónaíse. Níor fágadh aon easnamh air.

Is dócha gur beag duine dá léifidh an leabhar seo nach mbeidh láineolais riamh ar gheografaíocht an cheantair, agus nach bhfeadfaidh an t-Seantóir nó Gleann Loic nó a leithéid eile a aithint gan cheist. Mar sin féin, ba mhaise bhreise ar an leabhar léarscáil a mbeadh suíomh na gcainteoirí i leith a chéile, go háirithe cainteoirí Aicme 1, á thaispeáint go soiléir uirthi. Ba léiriú cuítaí amháin í ar choihbneas a n-urlabhra le chéile. Ní hé go bhfuil ilghnéitheachthshaithinseach i nGaeilge na dúthaí seo, ilghnéitheacht gheografaíocht ar an buachla, ná aon réamhfhocal a thugtar i leith a chéile, go háirithe cainteoirí Aicme 1. Ba léiriú cuítaí amháin í ar choihbneas a n-urlabhra le chéile. Ní hé go bhfuil ilghnéitheachthshaithinseach i nGaeilge na dúthaí seo, ilghnéitheacht gheografaíocht ar an buachla, ná aon réamhfhocal a thugtar i leith a chéile, go háirithe cainteoirí Aicme 1.
Mheas sé cloí le ‘caint laethúil amhán’ (3). I gcoitinne, d’éirigh sin leis. Munab ionann agus an chuid eile de na cainteoirí a bhfuil faisnéis sa leabhar uathu, níor chuiri sé féin go pearsanta aithne mhóir ar chainteoir 5 d’Aicme 1, Bríd Grainfil ó Bhaile an Chalaidh. Is ó thaispeáint faoise atá á gcoimeádadh i dteanglann Ollscoil na hÉireann, Corcaigh, a tharraing sé formhór a bhfuil sa chuntas seo uaithe sin (3-4). Ba chainteoir ard-líofa í Bríd Grainfil a raibh tuiscint an-deimhnitheach aici den cheart gnáis. Cé nach dócha go raibh liathreachta na Gaeilge aici, b’fhéidir aon bhfoirm aoibhíonta a bhí ann i gcoimeád i dteanglann Ollscoil na hÉireann, Corcaigh, a tharraing sé formhór a bhfuil sa chuntas seo uaithe sin (3-4). Ní raibh aon ghlasacadh aici leis an bhfoirm aoibhíonta mhór. Is féidir go mór a bhfuil d’fhaisnéis scagtha isteach sa leabhar seo uaithe. Tá cruthaithe go soiléir ann, áfach, go mbíodh sí go minic ar an taobh coimeádaí den ghnáis (323). Is léithéid an chumán seo, ní call gur comhartha neamhchoimeádachais í a bheith ar an té ba mhoi solaoidí a bheith ar fhoirmreacha scartha den bhríathar i gcásanna ar ghnáth aoin foirmeacha táitite; mar shampla, bheadh síad seachas bheidh a bheith aici (311), ag teacht le leithéid rachaidh mé a bheith ar fáil coitianta sa véarsaíocht sa dúthaigh (301). Scéalaíaithe aithint féin ar a hathair, agus bhí ar a cumas féin tarraingí an stró a bheith aice a bhfuil an léithéid san ainmchainn i gcoimhneáil leis na leabhair sa chuntas seo faoi dá stíl ar a laghad, do d'fhásamhairse a fhandú leat, do ghlac an ainmchainn a chur chugam leis an gcheart. Tá dhá stíl faoi dhá stíl, do dhéanamh, a dh'insint (351); nó cén stracaire nó stróire a d'ardaigh chun iomlán a chur leis a chur a bhfuil an phós faoi dhéanamh, nó a chur leis. Tá sách mór a bhfuil an leabhar sa chuntas seo faoi dhá stíl, do dhéanamh, a dh'insint (351); nó cén stracaire nó stróire a d'ardaigh chun iomlán a chur leis a chur a bhfuil an phós faoi dhéanamh, nó a chur leis. Tá sách mór a bhfuil an leabhar sa chuntas seo faoi dhá stíl, do dhéanamh, a dh'insint (351); nó cén stracaire nó stróire a d'ardaigh chun iomlán a chur leis a chur a bhfuil an phós faoi dhéanamh, nó a chur leis. Tá sách mór a bhfuil an leabhar sa chuntas seo faoi dhá stíl, do dhéanamh, a dh'insint (351); nó cén stracaire nó stróire a d'ardaigh chun iomlán a chur leis a chur a bhfuil an phós faoi dhéanamh, nó a chur leis.
litríocht fhairsing foilsithe inti, ní beag na focail agus na dultaí cainte a bhfuil taifead sa chuntas seo orthu nach dtuigfear go héasca, agus ar beag an cúnamh a bheidh ar fáil ó fhoclóir Úi Dhónaill leo. Níor mhór gluais chomh maith chun gurbh fhéidir forimreacha nach mbeadh coinne leo a mheas i gceart. Gan ghluais, is deacair a bheith deimhnitheach i gcás /kur’1pax/ (36), mar shampla, an é an focal a chiallaíonn ‘criminal’ é; más é, ní foláir nó shíolraigh an fhoirm fóneolaíochta atá anseo air ó mhíléamh, nó ó mhífhuaímiú a chualathas go seachtrach air; is litriú neamhstairiúil atá sa nuachaighdeán air; /kιr′ıpax/ a bhíodh ag cainteoirí in iarthar Mumhan tráth air. Mar an gcéanna, ní mór a thuairimiú gur dul cainte atá leata san aimsir dhéanach ó Chonnacht atá san fhoirm in ann (214), ach ní thugtar an t-eolas a dheimhneodh sin. Chomh maith le hinnéacs críochnúil agus gluais leis, theastóidh crostagaintí mínitheacha a bheith níos fluírisí tríd an leabhar. Mar shampla, luaitear (178-9) gur minic nach mbíodh s idir réamhfhocal agus alt iolra ag cainteoirí 5 agus 11, e.g. lé na blianta, ach níl aon tagairt don fho-ghnás seo sa chuntas ar an ngnáis coiteann (191-2), e.g. leis na púcaí; mar a luadh roimhe seo, mínitear (90) gur ‘knees’ is brí le glúine agus gur ‘generations’ is brí le glúinte; ina dhiaidh sin (227), luaitear go bhfuil an fhoirm speisialta comhairimh glúine ann, e.g. cúig glúine, gan tagairt don ráiteas roimhe sin ná a mhíniú go soiléir conas tá an dá ráiteas le réiteach le chéile, gurb amhlaidh nach gcaomhnaítear an t-idirdhealú idir an dá bhri sa chomhaireamh. Níl amhras ná go mbeadh a leith-éidí sin d’easnamh aitheanta dá mbeadh breis dua caite leis an innéacs agus, ar deireadh, is nithe beaga gan aird iad is furasta a cheartú san atheagrán a thuillfidh an dea-shaothar seo.

MÁIRTÍN Ó MURCHÚ

Institiúid Ard-Léinn Bhaile Átha Cliath


BIRLINN continues its series of anthologies of the verse of the Scottish Gaelic centuries with this handsome collection of sixty-three compositions, a majority of them in modern song metres and probably composed as songs: but no tunes are provided in this collection. The wide
variety of themes is paralleled by a wide variety of metrical forms and by the large number of poets whose works have been selected. In the popular view the Scottish eighteenth century is perhaps dominated by six major figures, Alasdair mac Mhaighstir Alasdair (MacDonald), Donnchadh Bàn (MacIntyre), Rob Donn (Mackay), Dùghall Bochanan, John MacCodrum and Uilleam Ros, and the anthologist must inevitably agonise about whether to let those six dominate the collection or to reduce the contribution made by them and include examples from a much larger number of poets. Black’s decision, which we cannot reasonably object to, favours the latter choice, seeking to convey, as he tells us in the Preface, ‘the kaleidoscope of eighteenth-century life’, and we have selections from the works of many less well-known poets. There are also anonymous song texts, including some waulking songs, but as the editor points out (p. 377) it is extremely difficult to date a waulking song to the eighteenth (or any other) century: even one with a clear Jacobite reference may well, for all we know, have had that reference inserted at a late date in the history of the song’s evolution.

If Jacobitism dominates Gaelic Ireland in the eighteenth century, it dominates Gaelic Scotland to an even greater extent. The big difference is that the main Jacobite battles were fought in Scotland and mainly by Scottish Gaels, while their Irish counterparts were (with some exceptions) outside observers, whose idealised aislingí have no real counterpart in the songs of the Highlands; though Black does detect something like the Irish aisling in a few Scottish texts (426-427, 462). These political songs, in the Scottish vernacular, carry on a tradition which stretched back unbroken through the seventeenth century and the classical period of syllabic verse, where the politics is closely tied to the praise of the clan and its chief. Here we have songs of lament for heroes ranging from the Clanranald chief killed at Sheriffmuir in 1715 to Seumas Bàn, James Macpherson of Ossianic fame, who died in 1796. Born the son of a tacksman (a minor land-holder), Macpherson became wealthy enough to buy himself an estate and become a generous, respected and lamented landlord in the Highland tradition, as Black’s notes explain. It is from another lament (no. 47) for a deceased Macpherson chief that the title An Lasair derives.

In addition to its politics, the poetry of the eighteenth-century Highlands is perhaps best known for the great strides forward it made into nature and seasonal poetry, as well as love poetry, the former best known through the published works of Mac Mhaighstir Alasdair
and Donnchadh Bàn, the love poetry with important roots in the waulking song but best known from Uilleam Ros. Mac Mhaighstir Alasdair also contributes greatly to love poetry, sometimes (as in no. 36) slipping over the line into bawdry, and one has the feeling that the editor here does not entirely disapprove: the collection contains most, if not all, of the printable naughty verse of the eighteenth century. Religion, too, has an important place in eighteenth-century poetry, and not only in the work of Bochanan; and the range of themes here includes also various kinds of comedy and mockery (some of it, like no. 4, perhaps not very funny to every modern ear), a mouse satire (no. 41) and a wonderful satire on a pair of misers (no.42).

The texts are presented with excellent face-to-face English translations and followed by lavishly detailed notes. And, as if that were not enough, a learned Introduction presents a historical and critical overview of the poetry. This includes a lengthy discussion of John MacInnes’ important 1978 article on the ‘panegyric code’ in Gaelic poetry, which identifies items of praise which turn up almost predictably in Gaelic eulogies, both classical and vernacular. Nine main points of MacInnes’ code are listed, analysed and exemplified here as a kind of appendix (525-27), and in the Introduction, where the code is called ‘the seventeenth century’s legacy to the eighteenth’ (p. xx), Black adds a series of interesting additional thematic and linguistic points which expand MacInnes’s list with examples from the poems here printed. MacInnes has clearly been the editor’s inspiration both in his editing and in his teaching of the poetry at Edinburgh University, and the exposition of the ‘panegyric code’ here is a helpful one – though it does not, of course, provide a comprehensive critical ‘code’ for all the poems in this book.

We have, then, an exciting collection of verse of enormous variety, with comprehensive elucidation in the Introduction and Notes. Though I tried to find fault, as a reviewer must, I failed to find anything beyond minor criticisms related to very Scottish details which would be of little interest to most readers of Éigse.

One day, doubtless, someone will produce an anthology of Irish verse of the eighteenth century, and certainly it will be welcomed. It may be as well edited and as learnedly annotated as this collection is; but we may wonder if there is enough Irish material for an anthology as varied as An Lasair.

Colm Ó Baoill

University of Aberdeen
It is well known that the Irish versions of classical epics are very different from their originals. The three texts analysed in this book, *Imtheachta Aeniasa* (*IA*), *In Cath Catharda* (*CCath*), and *Togail na Tebe* (*TTēbe*), are so different from the Latin originals, Vergil’s *Aeneid*, Lucan’s *Bellum Civile* or *Pharsalia*, and Statius’s *Thebaid*, that they are referred to now almost universally as adaptations. Each of these substantial compositions reflects similarly a tendency to excise, rearrange, add to, and embellish the original text, in a manner not encountered in Irish versions of works of other types. In terms of style the end-result is quite similar in all three texts. The same style is also reflected in two other compositions with classical themes, which can be assigned with certainty to the Middle Irish period: *Scéla Alaxandair*, the life of Alexander the Great, and *Togail Troí*, which is based on Pseudo-Dares’ *De Excidio Troiaei* (6th cent.) and is the subject of a recent book by L. D. Myrick, *From the De Excidio Troiae Historia to the Togail Troí*. Literary-cultural synthesis in a medieval Irish adaptation of Dares’ Troy tale (Heidelberg 1993).

Professor Harris argues strongly throughout this book that in adopting this style and all that goes with it the authors of *IA*, *CCath*, and *TTēbe* were guided primarily by traditional oral narrative technique (cf. p. 26), as reflected particularly in native tales of great deeds on the field of battle (35). The ‘oral flavour’ of their work (6) particularly fascinates him and is reflected in characteristics typical of traditional narrative: alliteration and synonymy, formularity, stereotypical characterization, and linearity. These features point to conscious imitation of oral tales, but the adaptations are, he suggests, works of literature: they are ‘too intricately tailored to the performer’s taste in phonetic repetition [and] synonymy … to have been generated by impromptu composition … but the effects are strictly and resonantly oral’ (19). The use of such effects, and many of the other ‘oral’ features of this style, he sees as evidence that the authors of these texts were making a particular effort to cater for listeners. Harris hints at a ‘slight shift’ in the manner of writing down ‘spoken lore’ (20) but avoids discussion of specific political or cultural developments as contributory factors. Nor is any period specified when he suggests that the ‘translations’ imply that the classically literate in
Ireland had ‘awakened (for whatever reason)’ to a pre-literate laity, an appeal to whose tastes demanded ‘imitation or reconstruction of oral-traditional style’ (21).

This study focuses almost entirely on style and on the principal argument that oral-traditional narrative was the model for these compositions. In Chapter 3 (33-79) Harris discusses in detail the features which he considers particularly to reflect such influence. For instance, formulas and ‘well-worn phrases’, which he aptly describes as having ‘epic experience compressed within them’ and which ‘appear to be a by-product of the distinctly oral penchant for synonymy and for alliteration’ (39): *a chatheirred catha o cus com- laínd, slúag o cus sochaide* etc. With this kind of much-used diction, he suggests, go other oral-traditional traits such as a tendency to produce tales with ‘type-scenes’, similar kinds of action, and stereotypical characters (40, 45). He cites examples of ‘type-scenes’ from *IA*, stock descriptions (e.g. of bodies lying on the battlefield: *bond fri medi o cus medi fri aroile, IA 2229*), similes, and metaphors which are common in Irish tales but have no parallel in Vergil (41). He appears to go along with Myrick’s reasonable suggestion that such material belongs to mainstream Irish narrative tradition (42).

In their structural linearity (65) and stereotyped, ‘flat’ characters Harris also sees the Irish versions following oral-traditional tales, which in Ong’s words ‘can provide characters of no other kind’ (46). In *CCath* Caesar and Pompey are cast in the straightforward role of the ferocious warrior, with none of the more literate elements of Lucan’s depiction, such as self-doubt or ‘second-guessing’. In *TTebe* all characters ‘don armour, make brave speeches, fight hard, and die a good death’ (48). In *IA* Rome’s founder (Aeneas) is treated ‘like another Cú Chulainn’ (84); he is reduced from Vergil’s ‘quasi-psychological hero to a two-dimensional superman of physical prowess’ (102).

Harris examines each text in turn in Chapters 4, 5, and 6. Of the three texts under discussion he suggests that *IA* was composed first (cf. 203). Throughout he refers to the author as redactor, translator, adaptor, scribe, emphasizing that he was a competent Latinist (102, 103, 108), that he had an authentic text of the *Aeneid* before him (85), and that he could not possibly have been working from memory (86). He gives examples where the Irish author meticulously preserved Vergil’s diction and structure (85 ff), but errors are also to be found (92) and, at one third of the length of the Latin text, *IA* clearly reflects much excising. This frequently involves material related to
Roman religion (88), but instances of tolerance of pagan texts are also to be found: ‘he lets slip many an opportunity to discredit the ancient pantheon by tampering with the story’ (91).

The translator-adaptor of *IA* paid particular attention to combat scenes, which among other things provided opportunities for the alliteration he so prized (96). Summing up his approach, Harris argues that he was ‘methodically adjusting rather than racing carelessly through his labours’ (94). He was not ‘an uncritical scribe blithely mingling popular variants and classic original’ (103). His adaptive strategy was geared to the expectations of a traditional Irish ‘audience’, the ‘Celtic listener’ (94; cf. pp 99, 108, 109 etc.). The *Bellum Civile* by Lucan, described as one of the most formidable of all Roman writers to translate (120), receives similar treatment in *CCath*, which makes plot, diction and heroic combat ‘suit the taste of a traditional native audience’ (120). It is, in Harris’ view, a ‘stunningly thorough integration of Latin literacy and Irish tradition’ (120). In Chapter 5 he provides a thorough account of this composition: the treatment of Lucan’s heroes and principal characters (130, 147); religion and the supernatural; errors, departures, suppressed (140f.) and compressed material (142f.); digressions (143); likely additions from other Roman authors (125, 129); incorporated Irish political (123) and other (127, 130) features; and the influence of the traditional native battle tale, which ‘develops an important epic aspect to the story in which Lucan has little interest’ (146; cf. p. 148ff.).

According to Harris native oral tales also exercised an ‘important influence’ (160) on the Irish adaptation of Statius’ *Thebaid*, a story ‘of cultural ruination’ (161). In composing *Togail na Tebe*, he argues, the medieval Irish scholar-author ‘threw away the map’ and began to depart very significantly from the original at a point corresponding to Book 4 of Statius, where he felt ‘the familiar tug of his native tradition’s gravity’ (161; cf. p. 175). From this point on alliterative runs and sweeping overviews typical of ‘traditional Irish narrative style’ are more common (177), similes are omitted (175f.), the mood and content of speeches are garbled, and places and characters misnamed. Once again the Irish author prefers *res gestae* to psychological nuance, and just as Lucan’s vituperative exaggerations’ (121) are excised in *CCath*, Statius’s ‘many lengthy flights of grandiloquent oratory are always trimmed’ (163). Conversion to a linear plot and two-dimensional characters (176f.; cf. p. 184) again reflect the oral-traditional tastes of the ‘editor’ (162). Examples of compression
(163; cf. p. 191) and cutting (165-6ff.), some quite massive, are cited, as well as omissions of scenes of ‘emotional sensitivity’ and intimate talk, which ‘can find no foothold in the extroverted, action-oriented oral world’ (164; cf. p. 168, 179). Again Harris finds the Irish author to be a good Latinist and, in this case, to have benefited from ‘extremely wide reading’, as numerous interpolations indicate (170f.). But he notes numerous errors in the later sections of *TTebe* (181-3) and argues that even errors and peculiarities in spelling can be attributed to the author-translator. He strongly emphasises the influence of oral narrative on the author of this composition, seeing him as ‘an oralist at heart’ and linking his adaptive strategies and changes to a ‘keen sense of traditional genre and an equally keen understanding that his audience will read or hear his work in the context of native heroic tales’ (184ff.).

With similar confidence Harris comments throughout on all aspects of the work of the original authors of these adaptations. However, he does so without at any stage dealing with the manuscript and textual tradition or the question of dating, which have never been discussed in a satisfactory manner. Nor does he take into account the evidence of *Togail Troí*, whose manuscript tradition began in the tenth century, but which had already in the eleventh century reached a similar stage of narrative development, as the twelfth-century Book of Leinster text indicates. Their similarity to *Togail Troí* suggests that *IA*, *CCath*, and *TTebe* may also be assigned to the Middle Irish period. But whereas the LL text of *Togail Troí* represents a relatively early stratum in its textual line, the surviving texts of *IA*, *CCath* and *TTebe* represent a late stage in a textual tradition stretching back possibly to the same period. Avoiding such considerations, Harris assumes these texts are more or less faithful representations of the earliest stages of the tradition and makes no allowance for contributions at various stages, cutting, supplementing, modernising, or borrowing from one adaptation to another.

Harris devotes little attention to *Togail Troí* as a possible source of influence on the adaptations. Nor does he adduce sufficient evidence in relation to issues which he raises: the political and cultural background, the likelihood of greater adherence to oral narrative models, the intended audience, etc. He refers hardly at all to the corpus of Old and Middle Irish tales, in which one also finds ‘oral’ narrative traits and which provides little evidence for ‘great battle tales’ with long descriptions of battle, such as he postulates on the basis of the adaptations.
This book shows, however, what a rich and important source the adaptations are and that in terms of the development of narrative style they represent a significant turning point in Middle Irish literature. Harris has made a valuable and stimulating contribution to the study of *IA, CCath* and *TTebe*, which have long been neglected by scholars. More particularly, his comparison of the Irish and Latin texts reveals, as I hope this review has already indicated, many hitherto hidden details of the work of the Irish adaptors. It provides a good model for a further, even more detailed analysis, which now seems desirable.

---

**St Patrick’s College, Dublin**

**UÁITÉAR MAC GEARAILT**

---

**Ar Chreag i Lár na Farraige.** Lillis Ó Laoire. Cló Iar-Chonnachta 2002. 389 lgh.

Is í Toraigh, Oileán Thoraí, oileán beag caol sceirdiúil ar dhéanadh ríbe róibéis, atá breis is naoi míle amach ó chóstó altta thiar thuidh Cho. Dhún na nGall, ar a bhfuil cónaí ar níos lú ná dhá chéad duine, an chreag seo i lár na farraige; bóithrin siar soir intí, í roinnte i ndá bhaile, an Baile Thiar agus an Baile Thoir. Mar ba nós ag muintir mhórán chuile áit faoin tír fadó, muintireacha ar bhain dlúthphrae ar bith leo, b’éigean do mhuintir Thoraí cur ar a son féin, b’éigean di a bheith neamhspleách cuid mhaith ar chomhluchaí eile. De bharr a scoite amach is a bhí sí uathu, b’éigean di a siamsa féin sólais a sholáthar di féin: amhránaíocht, damhsa agus ceol uirlise, ar riachtanais bhunúsacha de chuid na daonnachta iad. Is é an siamsa nó ‘an caitheamh aimsire a chuireas feabhas ar an saol agus a chuireas só ann’ (315). Bhíodh amhráin á rá, á gcleachtadh agus á sealbhú ag baile. Chlóisfeadh duine amhráin agus chuirfeadh sé/sí dúil ann. Bhíodh dreasa ceoil á mbualadh agus á sealbhú mar an gcéanna agus b’amhlaidh don damhsa. Ach go mb’iad na hamanta poiblí, oícheanta ar leith a chruinniodh an pobal, idir shean is óg, i dteach na scoile, b’iad seo na hócáidí móra. Ar na hócáidí móra seo a thugtaí an scóid cheart do na hamhráin, don cheol agus don damhsa. Go nádúrtha, docht, muinteartha, ar na hócáidí seo thugtaí an t-aitheantas cuí don tallann. Ba é seo an t-ardán, an institiúid a rinne an ‘ceart’ nó an ‘ciotach’ a mheas. ‘Institiúid de chuid an phobail … ina ndéanadh muintir an phobail léiriú ar an tallann a bhí
Ina measc doibh féin agus do dhaoinne eile’ (177). Formaith thart le bal-lá, lampai ar lasadh, an pobal ag bailiú, an sagart ann, tinneall is bíis, scairt á tabhairt ar dhuine, an té sin ag cur amhráin i láthair. ‘Smeáir mhullaigh’ (254) na hócaide ba dh’e a na hamhráin, a ‘áiritéar … ar na gnéithe is cumhachtaí i gcaithreamh aimsire an phobail’ (206). Aird an phobail go gær orthu seo agus ba acu a bhí an tosáfocht, na damhsaí níos deireanaí. Le linn na n-amhrán go háirid a bhí an ‘teas’ le mothú sa teach arae bhí an slua in éineacht an t-am sin. Ach nuair a bhí na hamhráin críochnaithe ba nós ag an seandream, arbh iad na saineolaithe iad, an teach a thréigean, agus d’éirigh an teach ‘fuar’. Ar ball, mar leighis airseo, meascadh damhsaí le hamhráin.

Staidéar eitneagrafaíochta ar mhuintir Oileán seo Thoraí é an leabhar seo ag Lillis Ó Laoire ina bhfuil mionscagadh déanta, sna deich gcaibidil aige, ar shealbhú, ar sheachadh agus ar láithriú na coda thuas dá gcaithreamh aimsire. Coincheapaí ríathábhachtacha sa leabhar seo is ea ‘teas’, ‘fuacht’, ‘ceart’, ‘ciotach’, ‘cumha’ is eile agus déanann Ó Laoire iad a chur ar fáil in éineacht an t-am sin. Ach nuair a bhí na hamhráin críochnaithe ba nós ag an seandream, arbh iad na saineolaithe iad, an teach a thréigean, agus d’éirigh an teach ‘fuar’. Ar ball, mar leighis airseo, meascadh damhsaí le hamhráin.

Agus tugtar focail na n-amhrán. Amhráin bhronacha den chuid is mó. B’iad na hamhráin bhronacha ba chumhachtachtaí, agus ba múth an ciúns agus an éisteacht a d’fhairghheadh siad. B’iad ‘na hamhráin chumhúla buaicphointe na hócaide’ (262), arae ‘labhraíonn amhráin bhronacha choscracha le daoine aonair’ (280). Ceanglaíonn an t-éisteoir tragóid an amhráin le tragóid a shaoi féin agus ‘to participate in it is not a matter of choice’ (Gadamer). Is é an t-amhrán ‘A Phaidí a Ghrá’, amhrán faoi fhear óg a chuaigh ar imirce agus a cailleadh go huaigneach i gcéin, a roghnaíonn Ó Laoire mar phríomheiseamlár, amhrán a déanadh a ionannú ar an oileán le bás Phádraig Dhonnchaídh Eoin, fear óg dá gcuid féin, agus a mbíodh an-tóir air dá thoradh seo. ‘Gné fhiospéisíúil é an t-ionannú seo’ (271), a deirtear linn, ‘meafair an ghrá, an scartha agus an bháis á snadhmadh ina cheile’ (274).

Ach ní mian le hÓ Laoire a mhaíomh Toraigh nó a pobal a bheithe eiscceachtúil i dtaca an chineál seo ruda, agus, ar sé ‘… ní mithid dom anois, agus an cáis sin ciortha agam ina choimhthéacs sóisialta agus cultúrtha, m’aír dhíríú ar roinnt ócáidí eile ar baineadh leas as amhráin le mothúcháin lándre a chur in úil, le claochlú a dheanamh ar imeacht de chuid an tsaoil agus brí agus uaisleacht a thabhairt dó.
trí mheán an athláithrithe mhíméisigh’ (265). Chuige seo luann sé tarlachain le hamhráin an mBlascaod, i gCo. an Chláir, in ‘The Dead’ le Joyce, i gcás bháis an bhанphrionsa Diana is eile. Taispeáintear an chaoi ar féidir le hamhrán leanacht air ag athchur mar ‘nach bhfuil aon teora leis na léamha is féidir a dhéanamh ar théacsanna’ (269), ach ‘gach téacs lomlán le brónna arb é an léítheoir a fháisceas as iad’ (313). Ach ‘dá thábhachtaí iad cúrsaí cumha agus tragóide i gcás na-amarbhna an mhaise dúinn é neamairt a dhéanamh sa taobh eile den scéal agus an greann a fhágáil as an áireamh’ (283), araí is annamh nach ngabhann an dá ní in éineacht ach iad fite fuaithe mar a d’fhícheárdí ar fháirí agus ar thórraimh fadó. Ní dhéantar an neamairt sin ach oiread mar gur plé ar an gceangal idir an greann agus an gol atá i gcaibidil 9.

Staidéar scoláirthe é an leabhar seo. Saothar trom anailíse. Treabhadh agus crúbadh. Is léir an-taighde, an-léitheoireacht déanta ag Ó Laoire. Luaitear tuairimí an draoi daoine idir scoláirí, fhealsaimh, shocheolaithe is antraípeolaithe, agus déantar scagadh ar a gcoincheapa: daoine ón iasacht ar nós Ricoeur, Gadamer, Bourdieu agus Zumthor, agus lucht baile mar Ó Crualaoich, Ó Madagáin, Mercier, Ó Tuama, Burke (Partridge) is eile. Zumthor ag trácht ar próiseas fisicúil na hamhránaíochta. Brodovitch mar an gcéanna. Ó Laoire ag tuairimíocht go dtagann ‘prescience’ Zumthor faoi réim na hointeolaíochta, ‘is é sin go dtéann an guth ceoil i bhfeidhm ar leibhéal an choirp i dtosach agus nach mar eolas théid sé i bhfeidhm ach mar mhothuchán. Maíonn sé gur ar an leibhéal feiniméanaíochta a fheidhmhíos sé beag beann ar choineacha de chineál ar bith’ (249-50).

Saothar ceannródaíochta sa Ghaeilge é an leabhar seo. An do speisialtóirí go speisialta é? Cluiche? Súgradh intleachtúil? Baill club ag spraoi le bréagáin? Cé gur mór an chomhaoín atá curtha ag na scoláirí seo ar fad ar Ó Laoire agus gur chuidigh siad leis le fráma a chur ar fáil dá shaothar, i ndeireadh báire is ar a thaithe féin agus ar fhianaise a chuid oide, ‘daoine eolacha a d’fhás anfós ar an oileán agus a ghlac páirt ina shaol sóisialta mar oirfidiugh aitheanta in imeacht na mblianta’ (311) atá an leabhar tógtha. Agus cé go bhfuil téarmaí coimhthíocha go loth tugtha tá aistriú dúchasach déanta ag Ó Laoire orthu agus iad mínithe sa Ghluais aige. Cé gur trom, sách teibí, mar leabhar é seo tá sé scriofa go ríchúramach. Go fiú’s an phoncaíocht inti tá sí ar deil. Géaraítear intinn an léitheora agus uaisleitar é. Is beag nótaí a ghabhann leis an leabhar, gníomh ar gur mór don phléisiúr é, agus an beagán atá ann is ag deireadh caibidle a
thugtar iad. I gcorp an téacs a thugtar na foinsí. Chomh maith céanna is minic Ó Laoire ag léiriú umhlaíocha leis an bhfrása ‘is dóigh liom’, nó ‘sin, ar a laghad ar bith, an bhri a bhaíntim féin as an scagdach atá déanta agam’ (312). I gcaibidil 7, ina bpleitear brí na n-amhrán, arb í an chaibidil is cumhachtaí sa leabhar i, admhaíonn Ó Laoire nach bhfuil gach eolas aige féin. ‘[N]í láithriú ioilán go ceol …’ a deireann sé. ‘Tá deacracht an-mhór ag baint leis seo ar an ábhar nach ceol-eolaí oílte mé féin agus nach bhfuil agam ar an chuaidh is fearr ach breacolas tanaí ar na scileanna atá de dhíth le hanailís cheart a dhéanamh ar chur saol ceol’ (248). Agus críochnaíonn sé a shaothar leis an umhlaíocht mhór ina n-abraíonn sé go ndéanann ‘an cuntas seo iarracht fhánach ar thuiscint a bhaint as na modhanna saibhre, ilsraitheacha, éagsúla a d’úsáid pobal Thoraí agus iad ag tóraíocht na spriocanna sin ar a gcraic in lár na farraghe’ (315). Ach nach umhlaíocht uilig é. ‘Dá choimhrollaí agus dá theoranta é mar chuntas b’fhiú an tairbhe an trioblóid …’, a deir sé. ‘Mheas mé go raibh mé go bhliain leis an eolas a bhítear leis an cheol-eolaí oilte féin agus nach bhfuil leigheas dó a bheith i bhfearlú as an-chumas a bhí sé atá i bhfeidir a dhéanamh ar chúrsaí ceoil’ (180). Is léir gur ócain speisialta a bhí agus an leas ar an saothar a dhéanamh de haghaidh na saol atá agus a bhí aige atá i bhfeidir a bhí agus a bhí ar an oileán seo. Is léir é atá i gceist san obair seo. Is léir Ó Laoire istigh leis féin san obair seo. Is léir an scéal ag Ó Laoire san abhar atá idir camáin aige agus dá bhri sin is féidir leis a bheith umhálaíocht. Arae is ríleir Ó Laoire istigh leis féin san obair seo. Is ríleir é i dtiún léi. Is ríleir a ghrá dá abhar. Cré gur saothar trom é seo a chaithfear a léamh go mall, agus a bheith umhálaíocht. Is léir an-scéal ag Ó Laoire san abhar atá idir camáin aige agus dá bhri sin is féidir leis a bheith umhálaíocht. Arae is ríleir Ó Laoire istigh leis féin san obair seo. Is léir Ó Laoire istigh leis féin san obair seo. Is ríleir é i dtiún léi. Is ríleir a ghrá dá abhar. Cré gur saothar trom é seo a chaithfear a léamh go mall, agus a bheith umhálaíocht. Is léir Ó Laoire istigh leis féin san obair seo. Is léir Ó Laoire istigh leis féin san obair seo. Is léir Ó Laoire istigh leis féin san obair seo.
A folksong is worth a thousand pictures for it expands our engagement with meaning beyond the visual plane,’ a scriobh B. Tolkien.

Cuirtear punann eile i stáca léinn na heitneagrafaíochta leis an saothar seo.

**PÁDRAIC BREATHNACH**

**Coláiste Mhuire gan Smál, Luimneach**

*Cuimhní ar Dhourchair Ghleann Fhinne.* Pádraig Ó Baoighill. Coiscéim, Baile Átha Cliath 1994. 43 lgh. 6 phlátá.

I gcaogaidí na haoise atá caite, le linn dó bheith ag obair ag Gael-Linn i nDún na nGall, a chéadchuir an t-údar aithne ar John agus ar Mhicí Simey Ó Dochartaigh, na fidleirí aitheanta. John Simey is mó atá faoi thrácht sa leabhar seo mar aon le beagán cur amach ar a dheartháir, Mící, ar nocht Cairdeas na bhFidéilí leacht chuimhneacháin dó i 1990. D’eirigh leis an Bhaighilileach mórán cuimhní cinn a chuasach ocht John is óna chairde, a ghaolta agus ó lucht a aitheantaí sa dóigh gur ón taobh istigh a chuireann sé léargas aírithe ar shaol na gceltíochtaí ann inár láthair anseo. Cuirtear síos dúinn ann ar an ghaol cleamhnais a bhí ag na Dochartaigh le teaghlach cheoil iomráiteach eile eile an réigiúin, e.g. muintir Mhic Conaill agus na Gallchóirigh, agus léirtear an pháirt a bhí ag na mnaí i muidh each díreachth an cheoil. Ar fud lár agus dheisceart an chontae a bhíodh camchuairt na nDhourchair seo agus déanann an Bhaighilileach amach go raibh tionchar nach beag agus ar fhobarraí an cheoil, idir fhidile agus phíbhe, in áiteanna mar Rinn na Feirste, Teileann agus Gleann Cholm Cille.

Stíl fhidléireachta na gCruach Gorm a bhí ag na teaghlach agus ar na tionchair a chuaidh i bhfeidhm orthu, de réir mar a mhaítear, bhí poirt a thug uncaill abhaile leis ó Mheiriceá, agus ceol James Scott Skinner, ar chuir muintir an chontae eolas air i gcaithreamh sealanna ag ‘spailpínneacht’ dóibh in Albain. Leagann an Bhaighilileach bheim mhór ar an cheangal seo le hAlbain ach baintear bonn dá thuairimfócht faoin gné sin, ar an drochhuairt, san áit a ndearbaítear leis ceangal ó ré na scoil. Tá roinnt áirithe athrá sa chuntas tríd síos nár cuireadh i ndiaidh chéile ar fad ó thaobh imeacht aimsire de agus níl litriú na sloinntse – ná na logainmneacha – atá ann saor ó locht ach
an oiread. A dhála sin, is mór an mhíbhuntáiste don léitheoir gan léarscáil an cheantair ná clár geinealaigh na clann seo le ceol a bheith ar fáil againn. Os a choinne sin tá dornán beag grianghraf suimiúil sa leabhrán, mar aon le focail dhá amhrán caointe ar John Simey – ceann acu ó pheann an údair féin agus tá moladh tuillte aige seo as an phictiúr seo den seansaol Conallach a athchruthú dúinn anseo, pictiúr ar chuidigh sé féin lena bhuanú tríd an tiomsú dícheal-lach atá déanta aige.

Ní furasta a chreidiúint, cuir i gcás, le linn do na Dochartaigh a bheith ag seinm i dteach i mbaile fearainn de chuid Ghleann Cholm Cille go raibh suas le 200 duine ar an taobh amuigh agus iad ag déanamh sealaíochta ar an mhuintir a bhí ag damhsa istigh. Cé a chreidfeadh, ach oiread, in éamais an chuntais seo, gurbh annamh a bhí fidil ina sheilbh ag an rífhidléir úd, John Simey, ach, ina ainneoin sin, gurbh é a bhíodh beadaí i gceart agus é ag déanamh rogha den fhidil a glacadh sé ar iasacht le dul a sheinm i lúb cuideachta.

SEOSAMH WATSON

An Coláiste Ollscoile, Baile Átha Cliath


This volume of ZCP presents a broad range of subject matter relating to topics on Irish, Welsh, Breton and Manx, along with material of more general Celtic interest. Among the Irish material is an article by Anne-Marie O’Connell, ‘L’oiseau surnaturel : approche narrative et figurative’ (46-65), in which she discusses the theme of magical birds as reflected in Irish literature. She supports her arguments with lengthy extracts from a variety of Old, Middle and Modern Irish texts. There appears to be an unwarranted assumption on the part of the author that the general reader is linguistically competent in all stages of the Irish language. Of the nineteen extracts in Irish contained in this article, none is accompanied by a translation or annotation. A second contribution with a literary theme is that by James P. Mackey, ‘Mythical past and political present: a case-study of the Irish myth of the sovereignty [sic]’ (66-84), which purports to investigate ‘the nature, function and persistence of myth in human...
society’ (68) as exemplified by the Irish myth of sovereignty. Given its semiological bias and references to (among others) the works of Karl Marx and Bertrand Russell, the relevance of this piece to the student of Celtic philology is questionable, to say the least.

Paul Russell, ‘Laws, glossaries and legal glossaries in early Ireland’ (85-115) provides an interesting analysis of the relationship between the Cormac group of glossaries and the law texts from the Senchus Már and Bretha Nemed schools, along with the status-text Míadshlechtae. The author attempts to trace the method of compilation of these glossaries. He suggests that the law texts themselves were not the immediate sources of works such as Sanas Cormaic, but rather a series of texts which he terms glossae collectae. He concludes: ‘Small glossaries or glossae collectae on specific texts seem to be the necessary intermediate stage between the texts themselves and the glossaries’ (114). David Rankin discusses the phrase Bennacht dé 7 andé fort (116-24). These words are uttered by the Mórrigan in the saga Táin Bó Cúailnge when Cú Chulainn unwittingly heals her of the wounds he had previously inflicted on her (TBC Recension 1, ed. C. O’Rahilly, Dublin 1976, ll 1996-2025). Curiously the discussion is largely based on the version of the text as it occurs in TBC LL (ed. C. O’Rahilly, Dublin 1967, i.e. Recension 2) where, as Thurneysen had previously noted, the episode has been condensed (‘wird ganz kurz erzählt’ Die irische Helden- und Königsage (Halle 1921), 175). This leads to some confusion on the part of the author. Thus he states: ‘There is no explicit indication that Cú Chulainn knows who she is, but we have no grounds for presuming his ignorance’ (118). This may be true of the version in Rec. 2. However, Rec. 1 contains the unambiguous statement ‘Acht rofessin[d] combad tú,’ ol Cú Chulaind, ‘nít ícfaínd tria bith sír’ ‘Had I known that it was you,’ said Cú Chulaind, ‘I should never have healed you’ (ll 2052-3). Hildegard L. C. Tristram provides a research report on a project entitled ‘The oral and written in the text and transmission of the Cattle Raid of Cuailnge (Táin Bó Cuailnge [sic], TBC)’ (125-29). The importance of Táin Bó Cuailnge in the history of the development of early Irish literature hardly needs to be emphasised. Therefore it is surprising to find the results of this project summarised as follows: ‘The study of the oral and the written in TBC has helped to clarify, therefore, its textual structures and narrative patterns; our examination has striven to demythicise TBC’s origins and to show its cultural and political contribution to the making of the Irish Free State (Saorstát Éireann) in 1921’ (128). The
report concludes with a list of works published by the research group
during the course of the project – a period of some ten years.

In an article entitled ‘The Book of Glendalough or Rawlinson B
that the so-called Book of Glendalough and Rawlinson B 502 were
in fact alternative names for the one manuscript. This view was sub-
sequently challenged on a number of grounds by Caoimhín
Bretnach (Éigse 30 (1997) 109-32). In a contribution here entitled
‘Rawlinson B 502 alias Lebar Glinne Dá Locha: a restatement of the
case’ (130-47) Ó Riain rejects Bretnach’s arguments, all of which,
he claims, ‘fail to stand up to scrutiny’ (130). The tradition of robust
debate amongst scholars has long been a feature of Irish studies.
However, the tenor of the presentation of the arguments contained in
this article may be gauged against the author’s concluding remarks.
The final paragraph begins as follows: ‘The acceptance of the valid-
ity of my conclusion by many scholars might have encouraged
Bretnach to adopt a more professional approach to the presentation
of his own case’ (146). It should be pointed out that Bretnach is not
alone in questioning Ó Riain’s thesis regarding Rawlinson B 502 and
Lebar Glinne Dá Locha, the validity of which was also challenged
by the late Brian Ó Cuív (Catalogue of Irish language manuscripts
in the Bodleian Library at Oxford and Oxford College Libraries I
(Dublin 2001) 175-9). Bretnach has since published a further con-
tribution to this debate entitled ‘Manuscript sources and methodol-
ogy: Rawlinson B 502 and Lebar Glinne Dá Locha’ in Celtica 24

There are three articles dealing with Welsh material. Anne E. Lea,
‘The nightingale in medieval Latin lyrics and the Gorhoffedd by
Gwalchmai ap Meilyr’ (160-9), provides evidence that the motif
which associates the nightingale with longing and sadness, found in
the twelfth-century gorhoffedd, is also to be found in many medieval
Latin love lyrics. The occurrence of this motif in early Welsh poetry
had previously been thought to be of Provençal origin. Thus, the
author argues ‘the attribution of Provençal influence on the work of
the early gogynfeirdd needs to be re-examined’ (169). Graham R.
Isaac, ‘Trawsganu Kynan Garwyn mab Brochuael: a tenth-century
political poem’ (173-85), provides a fresh edition, with text, transla-
tion and notes, of a poem ascribed to Taliesin. This eulogy to the
Powysian leader Cynan Garwyn was previously edited by Ifor
Williams and dated to the sixth century. However, Isaac concludes
his analysis by claiming that the poem ‘seems consistent with history
and politics in the second quarter of the tenth century’ (178). Andrew Breeze, ‘Old English lærig ‘shield rim’ in Exodus and Maldon: Welsh lloring in Culhwch Ac Olwen’ (170-2) discusses the meaning of the Welsh word lloring. While apparently a borrowing from Old English lærig, it has been frequently mistranslated as ‘shield boss’, but the correct meaning, the author claims, is ‘shield rim’.

Manx is represented by a single contribution. Patrick Le Besco, ‘A propos de ZCP 38, 39’ (148-59) provides a series of corrections to the transcriptions and translations of Manx material published by George Broderick in the above-mentioned numbers of the Zeitschrift under the title ‘Manx stories and reminiscences of Ned Beg Hom Ruy’. Likewise, there is one contribution on the subject of Breton. Hans Schwertek, ‘Was sind Ar Rannoù?’ (186-9) attempts to provide an explanation for the meaning of the word rann in the title of the aforementioned composition. He rejects earlier suggestions ‘frog’ and ‘verse’. Noting that the composition consists of verses ‘in denen Begriffe aufgezählt werden, die fest mit bestimmten Zahlwörtern verbunden sind’ (187), he proposes the meaning ‘Teil’ (‘section, set’). He concludes: ‘Die Art, wie rann im laufenden Text verwendet wird, stützt die Annahme, dass es im Titel als “Teil” zu verstehen ist’ (189).

Three articles deal with topics of general Celtic interest. Bernhard Maier, ‘Beasts from the deep: the water-bull in Celtic, Germanic and Balto-Slavonic traditions’ (4-16), discusses the tradition to be found in a variety of cultures concerning mythical bulls dwelling in aquatic environments. The author adduces evidence from Manx, Scottish and Germanic folk-tales. He posits that these European traditions have their origin in the Near East and notes that ‘they would seem to have been introduced into Europe at a very early stage with the westward spread of the Neolithic revolution’ (16). The English translation provided for a citation from the seventeenth-century novel Der abenteurliche Simplicissimus contains a number of odd renderings: dem (i.e. Stier) ‘a dwarf pursued after the bull’ and Auf welches Wort er und das Männlein sich wieder in den See begeben hätten ‘Upon which the bull and the dwarf are said to have returned into the lake’ (4). The various words for the narcotic henbane in the Celtic, Germanic and Slavonic languages are examined by Peter Schrijver, ‘On henbane and early European narcotics’ (17-45). He concludes that ‘all formations … can be traced back to or derived from purely Indo-European n- and s-stems (*bhel-(e/o)n-, *bhel-e/os-’) (28). The author also allows for
the possibility, however, that the word is not of Indo-European origin. He then discusses possible cognates in Celtic and Italic including Irish Beltaine ‘the month of May’ and the hitherto obscure word belletus (36-7). Noting that henbane has been connected to rage and insanity, he speculates that the phrase belletus cach réta, which occurs in a gloss in the Old Irish law-text Gúbretha Caratniad (ZCP 15, 356 = Corpus Iuris Hibernici 2198.26), may be translated ‘destructive insanity with regard to every object’. This would explain, according to Schrijver, the inclusion of the phrase in the list of valid grounds on which a husband may divorce his wife in accordance with the provisions of early Irish law. Alexander Falileyev, ‘Celto-Slavica’ (1-3), considers the etymology of Old Cornish cudin ‘hair, lock’, a word cognate with Modern Breton kuden(n) and Modern Welsh cudyn. He claims that these words derive from the root *keu- ‘to bend’; speculates that Common Slavic *kyka, Serbo-Croatian kika are cognates also; and suggests that Irish cúach ‘hook, fastener, lock of hair’ may in turn be based on the same root.

The volume also contains two review articles by the editor Karl Horst Schmidt dealing with publications on the subject of Celtiberian, namely A new interpretation of Celtiberian grammar by Francisco Villar (190-202) and Kleinere keltiberische Sprachdenkmäler by Wolfgang Meid (203-10). Page 211 contains a supplementary note from D. R. Edel to her article ‘Caught between history and myth? The figures of Fergus and Medb in Táin Bó Cúailnge and related matter [sic]’ published in the previous volume of ZCP. The volume concludes with a lengthy section of reviews and notices of publications (212-376).

**GÉRALD MANNING**

*University College Dublin*


This volume begins with an article by Wilson McLeod (1-20) in which he discusses the exact meanings of the terms Galldachd, Gàidhealtachd and Garbhchriochan in the Gaelic languages. Instances of all three terms are cited using written sources from the medieval period onwards. Galldachd is medieval in origin, whereas
the term *Gàidhealtachd* first appears in Robert Kirk’s edition of the Irish New Testament (1690), which was intended for use in Scotland. Kerry Cardell and Cliff Cumming, ‘Gaelic voices from Australia’ (21-58), quote from letters, poems and articles in journals and newspapers in Gaelic written during the nineteenth century. It is clear from their material, that these Gaelic sources are an important if neglected source for the history of large-scale emigration from the Highlands to Australia. The emigrants’ writing is often poignant. One Donald McKinnon in Australia still yearns for Coll of his youth:

Fad air falbh o tir mo ruin  
Thall an seo ’n taobh eile ’n t-saoghall,  
Australia, ged’s mòr do mhaoin,  
Gum b’annsa leamsa tir an fhraoich.

Michelle NicLeòid, “‘Smuaintean an eilithrich’: Leòdhas agus Fànas ann am bàrdachd Ruaraidh MhicThòmais’ (59-65), discusses Lewis in the poetry of Derick Thomson. Thomson demonstrates an ambivalent attitude to his native place, being both an exile from Lewis and at the same time unable to extricate himself from it. NicLeòid quotes the Irish critic George O’Brien who says ‘exile is a movement of the mind, a cultural reaction, a metonym for the restlessness, disaffection, isolation and self-respect of the aesthetically or spiritually committed Irish writer.’ Hugh Cheape gives an account of a notebook or diary of Rev. Dr Archibald Clerk (1813-87), which he kept irregularly between 1858 and 1864 while he was minister in Kilmallie, Lochaber (66-82). The notebook, now preserved in the West Highland Museum in Fort William, contains rhymes, proverbs, sayings and superstitions collected by Dr Clerk from his parishioners. Nancy R. McGuire describes a manuscript collection of Gaelic songs made by the American musician and collector, Miss Amy Murray (1865-1947) in Eriskay (83-93). Murray and two other women visited Eriskay in the summer of 1905 where Fr Allan McDonald acted as their host. It was then that Miss Murray collected her songs. It was thought that her collection had been irretrievably lost, but it has recently come to light in the National Library of Scotland. Given that there are over 100 songs in it (though not all are in her neat and legible hand), it is likely that the study of Gaelic folk-song will be greatly enriched by the rediscovery of her work.

Damhnait Ní Suaird offers a fascinating discussion of Jacobite rhetoric and terminology in the political poems in the *Fernaig*
manuscript (1688-93) (93-140). This source was compiled by Donnchadh Mac Rath of Inverinate in Kintail and other Gaelic noblemen to express their Jacobite and Episcopalian views at a time when the Stuarts were losing their crown and the Presbyterians were in the ascendant. The various elements in the Jacobite understanding of their position are clearly set out here under such headings as ‘Divine Right’, ‘Indefeasible Right’, ‘Righteous Kingship’, ‘Providence’, etc. Ní Suaird ends her discussion with a section on the rhetoric of vituperation. The Jacobites were called rebels by the Williamites, but the term was thrown back at them by the Jacobites, who quite rightly accused them of rebelling against their legitimate king. There has been much interest in the whole question of Jacobitism in recent years and this is an important and lucid addition to the study of the ideology of the Jacobites.

William Lamb, ‘Gaelic news-speak’ (141-71), discusses the development and expansion of Gaelic in radio news bulletins. The use of Gaelic in such broadcasts began very modestly in 1923. It was not until after the Second World War that news broadcasting in Gaelic began with a ten-minute weekly bulletin. The first national Gaelic radio service, Radio nan Gaidheal, began in 1985 and broadcasting in Gaelic has now increased both in terms of the number of hours broadcast as well as the depth and variety of programming, news included. Lamb uses the news scripts broadcast during the years 1959, 1965 and 1997 to describe the developments in Gaelic news bulletins over the years. The lexicon is of particular interest. When terms were not available in Gaelic, the writers of the scripts assimilated into Gaelic (bombaichean atom, bileichean, grant-aichean). Words are also borrowed from Irish (ceapairean, deugaire). Some neologisms are calques on English (saor-chlachairean ‘freemasons’). Noteworthy in the scripts studied is a certain inconsistency in inflection (e.g. taic airgid and taic airgead ‘financial support’). One also finds confusion of the forms of the definite article (suidheachadh na boireannaich for suidheachadh nam boireannach). In the earlier broadcasts the autonomous form of the verb was not uncommon (e.g. Rinneadh oidhirp eile air an t-seachduinn so ‘Another attempt was made this week’). In more recent broadcasts such expressions are rare, and passivity is now indicated by periphrasis (Chaidh taic a thoirt do ‘was supported’). It is noteworthy also that the newsreaders themselves have a strong tendency to
lessen their own dialectal features and to unite round a ‘station style’ in their Gaelic. This is an illuminating article and it would be good to see the various topics in it discussed in greater detail.

Colm Ó Baoill, ‘Moving in Gaelic musical circles’ (172-94), discusses the root lu- in Gaelic musical terminology. The Gaelic word lùth is identical with Irish lúth ‘vigour’, seen most commonly in the expressions lúth na gcos and Cumann Lúthchleas Gael. In SG the word lùth survives in terms for various movements in piping, e.g. lu chrodh ‘a shake or cutting in piping’ < lùth chrobha ‘hand movement’ or lùth a’ chrotha ‘lùth of the shake’. Most commonly the word occurs as the second element in compound nouns having to do with music, e.g. taorlùth ‘the second main variation in modern piping’. The obsolete term barrlùth refers to an unnamed movement in piping, while the Irish word barrlúth refers to a feature in harp playing. Irish lua ‘to mention’ and SG luadh, luadhadh ‘waulking of cloth’ are also related. All these words and others are fully discussed by Ó Baoill with reference to their occurrence in literature.

Roibeard Ó Maolalaigh, ‘Transition zones, hyperdialectalisms and historical change’ (195-233), discusses the development of final unstressed –igh/–ich and -idh in Scottish Gaelic using returns in the Survey of the Gaelic dialects of Scotland. The development of the two endings has hitherto been regarded as chaotic and not susceptible to coherent description. Ó Maolalaigh shows, however, that as far as this feature was concerned there were three areas in Scottish Gaelic. In the first, which covered Skye, the Outer Hebrides and most of mainland Scotland –igh /–ich is pronounced /ix/’ and -idh is pronounced /i/. In a small western area including Jura, Colonsay, Mull, Tiree, Coll, Eigg and Canna -idh is more frequently realised as /ix/’ than as /i/. In a third area including Arran, Kintyre, Gigha and Islay -igh /–ich is more commonly /i/ than /ix/’. Interestingly, south Islay represents a transitional area in which both -igh /–ich and -idh are most frequently realised as /ix/’. Ó Maolalaigh suggest some reasons for the various developments. This article with its detailed and indeed subtle statistical analysis is an important one and shows how the raw information in the Survey of the Gaelic dialects of Scotland can be used to elucidate apparently intractable problems.

David Dumville discusses the identity of ‘Cusantín mac Ferccusa, rí Alban’ (234-40) and the late Molly Miller discusses the various sources for the death of the Norse king Amlaíb (Olaf) while gathering tribute in Scotland (241-45). Andrew Breeze suggests Gaelic etymologies for the three Scots words pippane ‘lace, cord’, ron ‘seal’
and *trachle* ‘bedraggle’ (246-52). Richard A. V. Cox discusses the Lewis toponym *Leumaragh*/*Leumrabhagh* (253-55), while Robert A. Rankin has a short note on the place-name *Druim a’ Chaoín* in the *Comhachag* (257). This is an addendum to the article in *SGS* 18 (1998) 111-30. The rest of the volume is devoted to reviews.

This issue of *Scottish Gaelic Studies* contains much of great interest and of solid scholarship. The editors are to be congratulated on producing such a fine volume.

N. J. A. Williams

*University College Dublin*


Two of the articles in this volume aim to correlate elements in ancient Roman historical sources with Early Irish texts. Christophe Vielle, ‘Matériaux mythiques gaulois et annalistique romaine’ (123-149) (for an earlier version see Vielle 1994), compares three episodes in military encounters between Romans and Gauls in the third and second centuries B.C., as described by Livy and some other historians, with certain features ascribed to the Irish heroes Cú Chulainn and Find mac (C)Umaiill, respectively. In the first episode a Gaulish warrior, in the course of challenging a Roman to single combat, performs various physical contortions, and these find detailed parallels in the supernatural *ríastrad* ‘distortion’ which Cú Chulainn is said to have undergone on the point of engaging in battle in *Táin Bó Cúailnge*. The second episode describes how a Roman warrior receives decisive help in defeating a Gaul from a raven that suddenly alights on his helmet and distracts his opponent by terrifying and attacking him. This is compared to scenes in the *Táin* in which the war-goddess *Némain = Badb* (‘scald-crow’) attacks the Connacht army, and is sometimes said to terrify men to death with her shriek, according to Vielle in order to help Cú Chulainn. It should be noted, however, that a connection with Cú Chulainn (or any individual warrior for that matter) is apparent only in three of the five passages adduced (*TBC I* 210 f., 2084-7, 3942-4, vs. without any direct connection with Cú Chulainn, 3537, 4033-5). Moreover in the sixth, the *Fer Diad* episode, there are only a few isolated and vague references in both Recensions I and II to the *Badb* and other
supernatural beings, and Vielle merely reconstructs these as reflexes of an original full-scale intervention on behalf of Cú Chulainn. Both phenomena described in the annalistic accounts above – the contortions and the intervention of a raven in combat – are then shown to have correspondences in other ancient sources such as depictions on Gaulish coins and Etruscan urns (pp 137f.; also bird-crest helmets, cf. p. 139). Vielle argues convincingly that the annalists adapted these observations among their Gaulish enemies by inverting their function and thus exploiting them in favour of Roman propaganda (139f.).

In view of the convincing Irish parallels particularly in the case of the first episode, Vielle plausibly defends the possibility that these features may reflect elements borrowed from inherited Gaulish mythology, corresponding to ‘the Celtic hero “of the tribe”: Cú Chulainn’ (Vielle 1994, 217). In the absence of more extensive native Gaulish mythological documents, such a background cannot be proven conclusively, however. (Birkhan (1997, 108f.) expresses vague criticism of this position, but does not take account of the probability of Roman propagandistic transformation.) A more complex transformation has to be assumed of aspects of ‘the Celtic hero “outside” the tribe: Finn’ (Vielle 1994, 223) in order to show the derivation of the third annalistic episode (Livy), in which a wolf pursues a deer and then joins the Roman troops, while the opposing Gauls kill the deer and are subsequently defeated. Vielle compares lycanthropic aspects of Fíanaigecht tradition and especially typical episodes (also found in the Middle Welsh Pwyll) concerning the hero who kills an animal belonging to a supernatural being and in return has to fight on the latter’s behalf. The main difference here is that it is not the wolf but the Gauls who kill the deer.

Olivier Szerwiniack, ‘Des traces d’un archétype du Lebor Gabála Érenn dans un recueil de gloses à Orose?’ (205-217), examines six ninth-century Hiberno-Latin glosses to Orosius’s Historiae adversus paganos and finds some points of contact with the laterpseudo-historical Irish compilation Lebor Gabála Érenn (= LG). Among these similarities are Isidore’s etymological association of Hibernia with Iberia, which by the time of LG had been developed into the legend of immigration from Spain to Ireland, and also the fact that a pharaoh, otherwise known only as C(h)encres, appears both in a gloss and in LG with different vocalism as Cin(g)cris. However, as the author himself cautiously points out repeatedly (e.g. summary p. 346), this proves no more than the mere possibility that ‘these
glosses may have contributed to the dissemination in Irish monastic circles of some of Orosius’s ideas, that were later taken over in the *Lebor Gabála*.

Patrick L. Henry, *‘Amra Con Roi (ACR): Discussion, edition, translation’* (179-194), re-edits a text previously edited by Stokes in *Ériu* 2 (1905) 1-14. This tripartite Old Irish *amra* ‘eulogy’ is the lament, by his poet Fercheirtne, of the Munster hero Cú Roy after he has been killed by Cú Chulainn. In its longest, second section it provides a list of gifts which the poet had received from his lord. Only this middle part could justify Stokes’s verdict (p. 2) that ‘this obscure and corrupt composition … is valuable chiefly (indeed solely) for lexicographical purposes.’ Concerning the remainder of the text Henry states that ‘it is sad that Stokes … should have missed the poetry for the lexis’ (185 n. 14). Henry’s edition advances beyond that of Stokes in providing a translation with grammatical notes (as opposed to an annotated glossary). However, Stokes’s edition will still have to be consulted not only for ‘the expansion of normal contractions and suspensions in the text’ (185), but also, and more importantly, for the copious glosses which are contained in one of the three manuscripts and have, unfortunately, been omitted by Henry. Furthermore, his introduction and linguistic analysis contain some vagueness and inaccuracies. First of all, a few general statements concerning the date and character of the text might have been expanded upon. Thus the reader is not told why exactly ‘in regard to the date of composition … in general character and content the text appears archaic’ (182); this is quite apart from the more general objection to be made that the perceived archaic outlook of a text does not necessarily indicate an early date. Compare further (182f.): ‘archaic references such as …’, ‘the combined evidence of verbal forms such as …’, all cited without any support; the only evidence adduced in favour of the judgment that ‘archaic also is the dānastuti form of part II’ is a typological comparison with two Rigvedic hymns. In his metrical discussion Henry undertakes a detailed examination of alliteration and stress patterns. But his analysis of line 2a as consisting of ‘2 [alliterating] three-stress units *ni mad-bui + ben i tīrib toruais*’ (184) is clearly erroneous, as both *ni* and *mad* (with proclitic reduction from *maith*) are unstressed; and his translation of the first part as ‘would that the woman were not’ (189) is a step backwards from Stokes’s ‘would that she had not been’ (*Ériu* 2 (1905) 12). The introduction concludes with a largely unnecessary discussion of the ‘special problem’ of noun inflexion, as out of the more
than twenty cases listed only four show a clear nominative form for
a syntactically expected accusative (for which Henry refers to two
possible explanations), e.g. *trēith* for *tréithu*. The remainder could
have been simply accounted for by the reduction and merger of
unstressed final vowels in Middle Irish, which is reflected in origi-
nal texts as well as in manuscript copies of older texts, e.g.
*coire/*coiri for Old Irish *coiriui*. Regarding the treatment of the text
itself, it will suffice here to point to three more examples from the
first section (lines 1-8 in Henry’s division). In line 6, *aisndeí* is
regarded as 2 sing. pres. subj. of *as·indet* and rendered as ‘of whom
you may relate’ (190 with n. 6), without any explanation as to why
such a relative form should be prototonic. Rather it is to be taken as
an imperative beginning a new sentence; for the formal background
see Joseph (1989, 179f.), who should also have been referred to for
his edition of the whole passage lines 4b-6a. Finally, the two occur-
rences of *fìba* (lines 4, 7; recte *fìba*) are both regarded as 3 sing. fut.
of *foaid*, i.e. … *fìba* ‘(he) … will sleep’ and *dond oenfer fìba* ‘to the
one who will sleep’ (190), without explanation as to how they could
be conjunct (vs. *fìbaid* and rel. *fìbas*, respectively) in their contexts.
Henry refers (190 n. 8) to Thurneysen (GOI §644) who, however,
correctly identifies the form in this particular passage as (absolute) 1
sing. (see also Joseph 1989, 179). It is clearly possible therefore to
concur with the author that this ‘edition has the character of an
interim statement’ (186).

Paul Russell, ‘Notes on words in early Irish glossaries’ (195-204),
consists of three parts. (1) The first part offers an analysis of the rare
directional terms *íarus*, *túathus*, *airthius*, *desus* and *forthus*, referring
to the subdivision of Ireland as ‘in the west / north / east / south of
it’ and ‘over it [as a whole]’; these are said to comprise a postverbal
fem. suffixed pronoun -(th)us for which Russell ‘suppose[s] an arti-
ficial and *ad hoc* spread’ replacing expected postprepositional -i or
-e (197). An important implication of this explanation of *forthus* – as
against an earlier suggestion ‘in the centre’ – is a four-, not five-fold
division of Ireland. (2) The second consists of an edition of the entry
dealing with *imbas for·osnai* ‘comprehensive knowledge that illumi-
nates’ in *Dúil Dromma Cetta*, and a discussion of its relationship to
the longer version in Cormac’s Glossary. In Russell’s restored Old
Irish text, the following errors of normalisation should be noted:
dicétul (leg. *díchetal*); *ina* ‘in his’ (leg. *inna*); *inní is áil dó* (leg. *ání
as áil(l) dó*). In discussing his own translation of Cormac’s (Y 756)
*co cend nómaide nô a dóu nô a trî*, reference should not have been
made to the phrase *co nómad n(-)ó* (199 n. 18), as *nómaide* is a (non-nasalising) gen. sing. and *nó* here means (and is correctly translated as) ‘or’. (3) Thirdly, the author offers an explanation of the term *lúathrinde* (in the attestations more exactly *lúa(i)thrind(e)*) as ‘swift / vigorous carving’ (vs. ‘ash-engraving’ by folk-etymology) of a *triskele* pattern, on the basis of its use in Corm. Y 323. Note, however, that (*no-suigfedh*) *cidh Érind* does not mean ‘(would suck down) the whole (lit. whatever of) Ireland’ (202), as *Érind* is not a genitive; rather *cid* originally ‘though / even if it be’ > a mere particle ‘even’ (see DIL C 172.78-173.40; Thurneysen, GOI §909), as shown here by the fact that *Érind* is not in the nom. but in the acc., as the direct object of *no-suigfedh*.

Pierre-Yves Lambert, ‘Le complément du comparatif de supériorité en vieil-irlandais’ (167-177), examines, after a brief survey of comparative constructions in the British languages, (a) the Old Irish *dativus comparativus*; (b) the use of certain prepositions for ‘than’ (*ol, re, sech*); (c) *oldaas* etc. ‘than (is, etc.)’; (d) *indaas, ad(da)as* etc. in the same function, as well as the preposition *ind* (as distinct from *iN* ‘in’), and the adverbial particle *in(d)*; and finally (e) various other Celtic adverbial constructions. Re (c): Lambert remarks on the difference between relative endings in 3 sing. *oldaas*, 3 plur. *oldáte* and the conjunct ending in 2 plur. fut. *olambieid-si* (Wb. 26d26), but he fails to mention the absolute endings in 2 plur. *oldáthe*, 1 plur. *oldammit* also listed by Thurneysen (GOI §779); add further 2 plur. *indáthe-si*, Aisl. Óeng. §5 (*anda/thaisi*, ms); *indáthái*, SG I 408.33 : *iondáthísi* (Radner 1978, no. 158). These, together with the ambiguous (*pace* Thurneysen) 1 sing. *oldáu* and 2 sing. *oldaí* etc. as well as the above (absolute) relative forms, are far better attested and are, therefore, more likely to reflect the original construction, either with a mixed set of relative and absolute forms or, as seems structurally more attractive, with relative forms preserved or reflected even in those persons (1 sing., 2 sing. / plur.), which by the Classical Old Irish period have otherwise ceased to use their own special relative endings (see Thurneysen, GOI §493.1; cf. Ó hUiginn 1986, 81f.). The isolated *olambieid*, on the other hand, can be explained as an innovation based on confusion with the prepositional relative construction {prep. + -*s)aN* + dependent verbal form}, for which see Thurneysen (GOI §492). The confusion, however, is formal only, as Lambert’s tentative translation ‘au-delà duquel vous serez’ (172) yields the opposite of the intended meaning (‘au-delà de ce que vous serez’). Re (d): Lambert concedes that Thurneysen’s explanation of
in- in *ndaas as *nda-, dat. sing. of the article, ‘ne présente pas de faille visible’ (173), but opines, nevertheless, that he could be reproached for deriving too many constructions from the article (i.e. besides *nda- in *ndaas and *nda- forming adverbs). His only actual argument is that in that case *nda- should not show the attested nasalisation, but rather lenition; this leads him to posit that the difference between *ndaas and *ndaas is due to the otherwise well-attested alternation between the preverbs *ad- and *nda-, and that both forms were in turn modelled on *ndaas. This is impossible for the following reasons. Not only could *nda- and / or *nda- not have been understood synchronically as preverbs before a verbal form with a relative ending, but neither could *ndaas have served as a model for such an interpretation in the first place. This is because *ol-/al- has not actually lost its ‘emploi prépositionnel’ (173) completely, but rather fails to be employed as a preverb (see GOI §825). The lack of lenition after *nda-, on the other hand, is the natural consequence of homorganic delenition *ind-th- > *int-, and after that it is only necessary to assume that *intaas was changed to *ndaas on the analogy of *ndaas. Thus, whether one accepts his derivation (175) of adverbial *ndaas from a preposition (as opposed to the article) or not, Thurneysen’s analysis of *ndaas as containing the dat. of the article remains valid, and the literal meanings of *ndaas (< *ol-ndaas) and *ndaas, far from being ‘aussi divergentes’ (173), are ‘beyond that which … is’ and ‘than that which … is’, respectively.

Xavier Tremblay, ‘Études sur le verbe vieil-irlandais. I: La classe B·V de Thurneysen, II: Ro·laë et les parfaits de bases ultimae laryngalis’ (151-165), frequently not only disagrees with, but unfortunately also fails to refer to the argumentations, and sometimes even whole hypotheses advanced in previous contributions to the subject in hand (see, for example, the only occasional and very selective references to McCone 1991). Even more unfortunately, the article contains an inordinate amount of inaccuracies such as wrong references, misprints / misspellings, wrong forms and formally impossible reconstructions, which at times can even hamper efforts to follow and evaluate the author’s arguments. In the following a small representative selection of examples, together with a brief indication of the central hypotheses, must suffice. P. 152 gives the reference ‘*finnadar < *wi-n-d-ne/o- (Thurn. §151 & 458)’: both citations are incorrect (and cannot be taken as referring to pages either); §§552, 595 may have been intended, where, however, the verb is classified as B V. Tremblay may be right in rejecting this classification, but
·finnadar shows neutral -nn- in the 3 sing. and thus cannot be B I (his ‘c/0’, entailing *·finnedar). This leaves only (secondary) B IV *yindna- as posited previously (references in Campanile, Celtica 21 (1990) 101), but not mentioned here. Neither can dinid be B V, as the 3 plur. denait, adduced here also can only derive from a B IV pattern, as with almost all the forms quoted in DIL, where the verb is in fact lemmatised wrongly under ‘dinid’ (recte denaid; cf. McCone 1991, 14f.). For his main thesis deriving the B V class from roots ending in *-h₁ and *-h₃ (besides B IV from *-h₂), Tremblay omits to refer to its original proponent McCone (1991, 12-4, 21-3), and his principal new contribution beyond McCone’s model lies in resurrecting the idea that the archaic Indo-European mood injunctive should have survived all the way into (Insular) Celtic. There is no reference to previous substantial discussion of such a model, particularly the objections to it raised by Cowgill (1975, e.g. 46) in what has become the communis opinio. The purpose appears to be mainly to account for the only B V verb that continues a root in *-h₁ and *-h₃, ·gnin ‘recognizes’; McCone’s explanation of this verb is quoted incompletely, and on that basis is simply dismissed as ‘très improbable’ (151 n. 1). However, Tremblay then assumes exactly the same kind of analogical spread as McCone (cf. p. 153 with McCone 1991, 22, without recourse to an injunctive).

His second note (156-64) is based entirely on a misunderstanding. The author begins by misquoting both Watkins and McCone as having reconstructed ro·laë as a thematic aorist *·laë. Both, however, had explicitly posited an athematic root aorist (*lāt), which, according to McCone, was secondarily thematized to *lā-et, > ro·lá with late analogical s-preterite inflection. Tremblay then transforms McCone’s suggestion (1991, 126) of an Old Irish analogical change from ·lā to ·laë into a pre-apocope addition to the inherited preterite form of the perfect ending *-e and rejects this idea in favour of a thematic aorist *·laë. As this must have survived apocope intact in order to yield Old Irish ·laë, the author is then forced to posit the self-contradictory concept of a ‘quasi-diphtongue, valant une syllabe pour l’apocope et deux pour la scansion’ (157). The whole problem (as well as the ensuing discussion of hiatus and diphthongs) could have been avoided, however, by representing McCone’s explanation correctly: aorist *lāt > Old Irish (attested) ·lā, secondarily also ·laë [and ·ral(a)e] by analogy with the preterites of a-hiatus verbs like bebaïs/-bebae.

The remaining contributions are Sylvie Leconte, ‘Les agrafes de
ceinture ajourées à Ensérune, étude et comparaisons interrégionales’ (7-47); Michail Yu. Treister, ‘Celtic motifs in the late classical and Hellenistic Toreutics of North Pontic Area’ (49-66); Rosanina Invernizzi, ‘Testina celtica in bronzo da Casteggio’ (67-75); Gérard Aubin and Jean-Noël Barrandon, ‘Une série monétaire gauloise en or d’origine vendéenne’ (77-87); Eric P. Hamp, ‘Old Irish arbar n. “corn”’ (89-90); Michel Lejeune, ‘Notes d’étymologie gauloise, XI. Les «DIX-NUITS» de Grannos; – XII. L’intitulé de la deuxième quinzaine’ (91-97); Michel Lejeune, ‘Compléments gallo-grecs’ (99-113); Pierre-Yves Lambert, ‘Préverbes gaulois suffixés en –io–: ambío-, ario-, cantio- (115-121); A. J. Hughes, ‘Le toponyme breton Penhep’ (219-224); Patrick Le Besco, ‘Lettres de Yann-Ber Kalloc’h à sa mère’ (225-259).

The volume also contains an obituary of Jean-Baptiste Colbert de Beaulieu (1905-1995) by Brigitte Fischer (261-264), a review section (265-335), a list of abstracts in both French and English of all articles (337-346), an index of words from Celtic languages cited in this volume (347-353), a table of contents (355-356), and finally also a comprehensive index to volumes 21-30 of Études Celtiques (357-404).

REFERENCES


JÜRGEN UHLICH

Trinity College Dublin