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A MIDDLE IRISH NOTE ON BOETHIUS’S
DE INSTITUTIONE ARITHMETICA

Anicius Manlius Torquatus Severinus Boethius (c. A.D. 480-524) is best known as the author of De consolatione philosophiae, but among his other works are treatises on the four mathematical disciplines (the quadrivium) intended to lay the foundations for the study of philosophy within a liberal arts education. The first of these four treatises, De institutione arithmetica (DIA), attained a unique status in the Middle Ages as the standard textbook on mathematics. It was also studied in Ireland – and from a very early date – as evidenced by its use in Hiberno-Latin computistical works of the seventh century as well as in the Old Irish glosses on the St Gall Priscian. In addition, a ninth-century fragment of DIA in Irish script and containing Old Irish glosses has survived, which offers direct evidence for the study of the work in Ireland; while another copy, one of the libri scottice scripti that belonged to the library of Sankt Gallen in the mid-ninth century, could conceivably have originated in Ireland. To these manuscript witnesses can be added a much neglected fragment now preserved in Dublin, Trinity College Library, MS 1422 (olum H. 2. 12, part 7), which contains the present note in Middle Irish.

Since this fragment has been only summarily described, a fuller account follows.

1 See Maura Walsh and Dáibhí Ó Cróinín, Cummian's Letter De Controversia Paschali and the De Ratione Computandi (Toronto 1988) 122, n. 11.
3 See Maartje Draak, ‘A Leyden Boethius-fragment with Old-Irish glosses’, Mededelingen van de Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen, afd. Letterkunde, N.R. Deel 11, no. 3 (1948) 115-27. The manuscript fragment is now Leyden, University Library, MS. B.P.L. 2391a.
4 The list of books in Irish script is contained in St Gallen, Stiftsbibliothek, MS 728, p. 4, which describes the present manuscript as ‘Arithmetica Boetii, volumen I’. See Michael Richter, ‘St Gallen and the Irish in the early Middle Ages’ in Ogma: essays in Celtic studies in honour of Próinséas Ní Chatháin, ed. Michael Richter and Jean-Michel Picard (Dublin 2002) 65-75 (at p. 68), who suggests, however, that some of these manuscripts may have been written in the scriptorium of Sankt Gallen.
Foliation
Six folios (unbound), with foliation 1-6 added in pencil. The first and last folios form a bifolium which apparently served to enclose the gathering. Both of these outer folios are clean, showing no evidence of having ever been used as cover pages or as part of the binding of another book. The text of DIA begins *in medias res* (Bk II, ch. 19) and ends abruptly with an incomplete chapter (Bk II, ch. 44), suggesting that the present gathering was separated from a manuscript of the full text, perhaps at a relatively late stage in its history.

Physical description and condition
Dimensions of c. 270 x c. 202 mm (written space c. 235 x c. 160); text in two columns, normally 41 lines per column. The vellum is not of especially good quality and is damaged by at least two insect holes, some water staining in the lower part of the final three leaves, and some loss of parchment on the bottom right. Ink of the main text is black; ruling in dry-point.

Decoration
Consists of simple filling in of colours in important initials. Only two colours are used, yellow and red; usually one or the other is sustained for a sequence. Sometimes, where the form of an initial has two discrete parts (e.g. the letter ‘S’) the two colours alternate within the same initial.

Script
Irish (formal) minuscule, s. XII; a competent though hurried hand. The scribe generally used triangular *a* with occasional instances of open *a* (also his normal form when that letter is superscript). The abbreviations and contractions agree in the main with those found in other twelfth-century Irish manuscripts. Interesting are: *semr* for ‘semper’; *s* with superscript *b* for ‘sub’; ‘per’ always in the form *p* with the attached hook, never with the cross bar through the descender. The most distinctive feature is the superscript symbol for -ur

---

which resembles a \( w \), rather than the usual symbol of a hook. The symbol for the *spiritus asper*, in both Latin and Irish words, has the form of an inclining (leftwards) ‘2’.

**Contents**

*DIA*, Book II, chs. 19-44. In addition there are some 42 glosses on the text, all in Latin, except for the present note in Irish. Most of the glosses are in the same black ink, and minuscule hand (though much reduced), as the main text; a few are in a lighter, brownish ink and a different hand. Most of the Latin glosses offer clarifications of the text; for example, *ET HIC NUMERUS*: .xxu (fol. 6v, col. b, line 7). A few of the glosses offer alternative readings, introduced by ‘uel’; e.g. *RESURGET*: uel ‘se suggerit’ (fol. 3r, col a, line 26), where the gloss (in a different hand) corrects a corrupt reading in the text. There are also at least two diagrams in dry-point on the margins of fol. 3r, col. b, illustrating respectively the terms ‘sphera uel circulus’ and ‘semi-circuli’ in the main text (Bk II, ch. 30).

**The Irish note**

It begins on the left margin of fol. 5ra, line 8, adjacent to the final section of Bk II, ch. 34.7 It is very much a contextual comment that can only be understood by reference to the principles of geometry and their numerical representation as explained in earlier chapters of Book II of *DIA*. There Boethius had discussed different geometrical forms, paying special attention to the triangle because ‘triangles produce all other forms’ of plane figures.8 Among these other plane figures he gave special prominence to ‘squares’ (defined by four right angles and by equal sides) and to rectangles with one side longer than the other by one unit (*figurae parte altera longiores*, which Masi translated as ‘figures longer by one side’).9

---


9 See Masi, *Boethian number theory* 149, n. 29.
Boethius also explained in these earlier chapters (9, 10 and 26, respectively) how all three types of figures have numerical expression. Take the triangle: the first and simplest triangle is based on the first natural number, unity (unitas), as the measure of its (equilateral) sides and produces a triangular number of ‘1’; the second triangle, which has the binary number as its side produces a triangular number of ‘3’ (2 + 1); the third triangle with three as its side has a triangular number of ‘6’ (3 + 2 + 1); the fourth with four as its side has the triangular number of ‘10’ (4 + 3 + 2 + 1); and so on in a progressive (and infinite) series of triangular numbers. However, since Boethius regarded the unity triangle as a triangle only in power but not in act or operation, he characterized the next triangle in the series, which has for its sides the binary number (‘2’), as the first ‘real’ triangle.

In contrast with triangular numbers, which are based on a figure of three angles, squared numbers are based on a figure defined by four right angles and having equal sides. The same natural numbers, 1, 2, 3, 4, now applied to the square figure, produce the squared numbers 1, 4, 9, 16. The third type of figure, that which is longer by one side (than a square), gets its first numerical value from multiplying the first natural number (1) by the second (2), to make ‘2’; likewise, its second numerical value from 2 x 3 = 6; its third from 3 x 4 = 12, and so on. Thus, the first four triangular numbers are 1, 3, 6, 10; the first four square numbers are 1, 4, 9, 16; the first four longer by one side numbers are 2, 6, 12, 20.

To return to the note in Irish. Its immediate context is DIA, Bk II, ch. 34, which has the heading, Quod ex quadratis et parte altera longioribus omnis formarum ratio consistat, ‘that all numerical reckoning of [geometric] forms takes its being from squares [tetragoni] and figures longer by one side [figurae parte altera longiores]’. Actually, the heading is misleading since the focus of the chapter is triangles which, as Boethius mentioned earlier, form the basis of all other plane figures, including squares and figures longer by one side.

10 Oosthout and Schilling, De arithmetica 164, lines 1-2.
Then follows a demonstration of one such relationship between triangular numbers and the numerical values of squares and figures longer by one side, with the following conclusion:

Disponantur enim alternatim inter se tetragoni et parte altera longiores, qui ut melius pernotarentur, prius in duobus eos uersibus disposuimus. Post autem eosdem permiscuimus et, qui exinde trianguli nascerentur, adscripsimus.\(^{11}\)

\begin{align*}
\text{i } & \text{i ii i iii i iiii i } \\
\text{ii } & \text{ui x ii xx xlii xii xxii xiiii xiiii xu } \\
\text{iii } & \text{x xu x xi xiiii xxii xxxui xu } \\
\text{i i } & \text{ii iii i iii i ii iui iui } \\
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
\text{i i iii i ii iui iuxi xui iuu iui } \\
\text{ii ii ii iui ii iui iui iui iui } \\
\text{iii iii iii iii ii u ii xii x } \\
\text{i iii iii i ii iui iui iui iui iui } \\
\end{align*}

The first row represents the sequence of numbers (1-9) that result from squares (\textit{tetragoni}); the second row, numbers generated by figures longer by one side (\textit{parte altera longiores}); the fourth row represents a combination of the numbers of the first and second rows, taking one from each in a sequence of alternation (\textit{eosdem permiscuimus}). The adding of the first two contiguous numbers from the fourth row produces the triangular numbers in row 3 (\textit{qui exinde trianguli nascerentur}); in other words, the sum of any two contiguous numbers in row 4 produces the triangular number immediately above in row 3.\(^{13}\)

The Irish note, connected to the fourth row by means of a \textit{signe de renvoi}, reads as follows:

\(^{11}\) ‘Let the squares and figures longer by one side be arranged alternating among themselves. These figures we previously arranged in two rows so that they could be better noted. Then we mixed them [sc. the two rows] and we have written down the triangles produced thereby’. The text given here is that of the Trinity fragment manuscript, which differs from Oosthout and Schilling’s edition in omitting the headings for the first three rows of numbers – though headings for all four rows were subsequently supplied by the Irish glossator on the margin. The translation is my own.

\(^{12}\) The manuscript incorrectly reads ‘lxuiii’.

\(^{13}\) Visually indicated in Oosthout and Schilling’s edition by means of converging lines that connect individual pairs of numbers in the fourth row with their corresponding sum in the third row.
tetragoni 7 par ał longiores.
7 is uadaib
asait na
treuillig
fil7 ua
saib. ü.
.g. i. 7 bť
air, tef 7 .lő.
is uadaib
asas ĵ
fuilleč
fil uas
aib .i. iii.

I expand as follows:\(^{14}\)

Tetragoni et parte altera longiores. Ocus is uadaib asait na
treuillig filet uasaib; uerbi gratia, i ocus binair (tetragonus et
longior) – is uadaib asas in treuillech fil uasaib, ed ón, iii.

(Tr. ‘Squares and figures longer by one side. And it is from
them derive the triangles which stand above them [sc. in the
third row]; for example, 1 and 2 , a square and a figure longer
by one side – it is from them derives the triangle that is above
them, that is, 3’.)

This note first identifies the numbers of row 4 as a mixture of
squares and longer-by-one-side numbers, tetragoni et parte altera
longiores.\(^ {15}\) Then, switching to Irish, it points out that from the two
combined (uadaib) come the triangular numbers above them
(uasaib) in row 3. Finally, it supplies an illustration: in row 4, the
first number is 1, a squared number (tetragonus); the second number,
2 (Ir. binair), represents the first longer-by-one-side number (the
product of 1 x 2); and the summation of these two numbers produces
the triangular number, 3. No doubt this example was borrowed from
the main text: Namque ex uno primo tetragono et binario primo
parte altera longiore ternarius triangulus copulatur\(^ {16}\) (‘and so from

---

\(^ {14}\) Expansions are indicated in italics.
\(^ {15}\) This part of note linked to row 4 by means of signe de renvoi (see above).
\(^ {16}\) Oosthout and Schilling, De Arithmetica, 164, lines 7-8.
the one of the first square and the two of the first longer by one side
a triangle of three is joined together’).

It seems likely that this note was composed – not merely copied –
by the scribe of the main text. Not only is it written in his hand but
its ad hoc arrangement in the narrow space of the left margin, with
some words broken into syllables and others arbitrarily contracted,
suggests the work of someone composing on the spot. Also, the lan-
guage of the note is consonant with the twelfth-century date of the
manuscript. A significant linguistic indicator is the verb filet, a
Middle Irish formation based on O.Ir. fil with 3rd person plural
ending. First attested in Saltair na Rann, it occurs thereafter quite
frequently in later Middle Irish texts of the eleventh and twelfth cen-
turies, such as Aislinge Meic Con Glinne and the Book of Leinster
Táin.17

Since the Irish note contains nothing original or insightful, one is
led to ask what purpose it served. Evidently its composer’s first con-
cern was to identify the nature of each of the four rows of numbers,
which he did by inserting four marginal glosses in Latin above the
Irish note, namely, ‘tetragoni’, ‘parte altera longiores’, ‘trianguli’,
and ‘tetragoni et parte altera longiores’. He also felt the need to make
clear that the final row was not only a series of numbers taken from
the first and second rows, but more importantly that the sum of any
two of its numbers would agree with the triangular number immedi-
ately above in the third row. Hence his illustration, based on a para-
phrase of Boethius’s example.

Such concerns suggest a pedagogical purpose, as does his decision
to comment on a passage where Boethius himself played the peda-
gogue, explaining a numerical relationship between triangles,
squares and figures longer by one side. At the same time the note
also bears witness to the fact that an Irish scholar could comment
competently on mathematics, armed with a well-developed technical
vocabulary of Irish mathematical terms, as indicated by words such
as treillech ‘triangle’ (apparently otherwise unattested in Irish as a
substantival) and bináir ‘binary number’. More broadly, the note and
the accompanying glosses in Latin testify to the continued study of
Boethius’s De Institutione Arithmetica in Ireland in the twelfth

17 See Liam Breathnach, ‘An Mheán-Ghaeilge’ in Stair na Gaeilge in ómós do
Pádraig Ó Fiannachta, ed. Kim McCone et al. (Maynooth 1994) 323 (§12.191); and
century alongside other mathematical works – perhaps preparatory to a study of Boethius’s *De Institutione Musica*.  

*University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill*  

**PÁDRAIG P. Ó NÉILL**

---

18 For other mathematical works current in Ireland at this time, see Ludwig Bieler and Bernhard Bischoff, ‘Fragments zweier frühmittelalterlicher Schulbücher aus Glendalough’ *Celtica* 3 (1956) 211-20.

19 This work was apparently known in twelfth-century Ireland; see C. Meyer, ‘Le Diagramme Lamboide du MS Oxford Bodleian Library Auct. F. III. 15 (3511)’ *Scriptorium* 49 (1995) 228-37.

I am grateful to Éigse consultant-reader Dr Daniel McCarthy for valuable suggestions and corrections.
ASPECTS OF THE TEXTUAL TRANSMISSION OF
SEX AETATES MUNDI AND DRUIMM CETTA CÉTE NA NOEM

It is the purpose of this paper to illustrate the importance of a comprehensive analysis of all the relevant extant sources in the study of textual transmission, and the pitfalls of a partial examination of such sources, by reference to the transmission of two texts, Sex Aetates Mundi and the poem Druimm Cetta céte na noem.

1. The transmission of Recension I of Sex Aetates Mundi

The text of Sex Aetates Mundi (SAM) is to hand in two editions, one by Dáibhí Ó Cróinín and the other by Hildegard Tristram.1 Whereas both editors identify three recensions of the text, the former alone provides a stemma codicum.2 The four manuscripts which belong to his Recension I, together with the sigla adopted by Ó Cróinín, are as follows:

(1) Oxford, Bodleian Library, Rawlinson B. 502 (R)3
(2) National Library of Ireland (NLI), G 2-3, 14th-15th cent. (G)
(3) British Library, Egerton 1782, A.D. 1517 (E)
(4) NLI, G 131, 17th cent. (P)

Ó Cróinín outlines the relationship between these manuscripts in his stemma codicum as follows:

![Stemma diagram]

---

1 Dáibhí Ó Cróinín, The Irish Sex Aetates Mundi (Dublin 1983); Hildegard L. C. Tristram, Sex Aetates Mundi (Heidelberg 1985). Both editions were the subject of pertinent criticism by Máire Herbert, ‘The Irish Sex Aetates Mundi: first editions’ Cambridge Medieval Celtic Studies 11 (Summer 1986) 97-112.
2 Ó Cróinín, The Irish Sex Aetates Mundi 48; for Tristram’s view that the construction of a stemma codicum is inappropriate and relevant criticism see Herbert, ‘The Irish Sex Aetates Mundi’ 101.
3 All references to R in what follows will be to the second vellum part of that codex written in the twelfth century.
2. The version of SAM in P

P was written by Cú Choigcríche Ó Cléirigh and four other unidentified scribes, one of whom wrote SAM and also collaborated with Ó Cléirigh in a number of other manuscripts. The text of SAM in P has been regarded by Ó Cróinín, Tristram and Herbert simply as a transcript of R. But although P often agrees very closely with R, it is clearly not solely dependent on that manuscript. One noteworthy difference occurs in the first line of the third quatrain of the poem Mathusálem, Noé cen lén in §21 of Ó Cróinín’s edition. The text and translation of the quatrain and the relevant variant readings for the first line given by the editor are as follows:

Sesca, noí cét, dá bliadain,
    má beith nech fora iarair,
    ar cach taidbsine ní chél,
    forair aimsire Iaréth.

‘Nine hundred and sixty (and) two years –
    if any should be seeking it
    I will not conceal it from every exposition –
    that was the sum of Jared’s time.’

*Line a:* do bliadnaib R; da bliadain P

What is striking here is that the text of the first line, giving the age of Jared, is based on P, supposedly a transcript of R. Furthermore, as indicated in a note on this line by Ó Cróinín, P’s reading is supported by Genesis 5:20: *et facti sunt omnes dies Iared nongenti sexaginta duo anni.* The source for P’s reading here may well have been a version of a poem dealing with the same topic in *Lebor Gabála Érenn* (LG), the second quatrain of which reads as follows:

---

5 Ó Cróinín, *The Irish Sex Aetates Mundi* 72, 114.
6 ibid. 147.
Tricha ar noi cetaib can ail
saegal airmidnech Adaim;
a dó sescat noi cet cain,
saegal Iareth abrad-chain.

‘Thirty over nine hundreds without reproach
the venerable life of Adam:
nine hundred sixty and two fair,
the life of Iareth of the fair brows.’

Another important modification in P occurs in §14 of Ó Cróinín’s edition. In this passage there is reference to the life-span of Malaleel (the relevant variant reading from P is in parentheses):

Saégul Malalel acccc (dccc.xc. u. P)

‘Malaleel’s life, 900 (years).’

Instead of R’s 900 years, P has 895 years, which, as noted by Ó Cróinín, is supported by Genesis 5:17. The authority for P’s reading in this instance is again likely to have been LG as indicated, for example, by the following:

Ocus doridnit uili laitheada Malalel cuic bliadna nochat ar ocht cetaib

‘And all the days of Malalehel were made eight hundred ninety and five years.’

Yet another example of textual modification in P can be found in the second line of the first quatrain of the poem Gairthigern ainm in bérlai in §7 of Ó Cróinín’s edition (the relevant variant from P is again in parentheses):

---

8 Ó Cróinín, The Irish Sex Aetates Mundi 70, 112.
9 ibid. 144.
10 LG I, 98-9, §48 (macrons omitted).
Gairthigern ainm in bérlai
ro-buí ic Mac Dé dagṣegdai (daighergna P)
ocus oc síl Ádaim huair
ria cumtuch in Tuir Nebruaid.

‘Gairthigern was the name of the language
that the proud and noble son of God had,
and the race of stately Adam,
before the building of Nemrod’s Tower.’

The reader, led to believe that P is simply a copy of R, would naturally assume that daighergna is an erroneous transcription of dagṣegdai on the part of the scribe of P. It has been noted by Tristram in the variant readings of her edition, however, that the reading of P is also found in the Book of Lecan version of SAM and in a version of the same quatrain contained in LG.

It is clear from the evidence discussed above that the text of SAM in P is not solely dependent on R but was modified on the basis of other authorities, most notably LG. It may well be the case that the modifications in the text of P were made in an earlier source. Another possibility is that the scribe of P himself was responsible for the changes. Evidence illustrating Cú Choigcríche Ó Cléirigh’s expertise as a redactor of chronological and hagiographical matter has recently been discussed by Professor Pádraig Breathnach.

11 Ó Cróinín, *The Irish Sex Aetates Mundi* 67, 111.
12 Tristram, *Sex Aetates Mundi* 211, where, with reference to P’s reading, it is noted ‘vgl. Le und LG degergna’ (precise references are Book of Lecan, f. 22rb35 and *LG* II, 122). For omission of variant readings from the recension of SAM found in the Book of Lecan in Ó Cróinín’s edition see Herbert, ‘The Irish *Sex Aetates Mundi*’ 102-3. A further example of P’s reading can be found in *Auraicept na n-Éces*, ed. George Calder (Edinburgh 1917; repr. Dublin 1995) 178 (cf. Ó Cróinín, *The Irish Sex Aetates Mundi* 31).
13 In this regard attention may be drawn to the version of the poem *Rédig dam, a Dé, do nim*, ascribed to Dublittir ua hUathgaile, which follows the text of SAM in R and P. The version in P contains an additional nine quatrains written in margins by another scribe. As indicated by Ó Cróinín in the variant readings of his edition of this poem ( *The Irish Sex Aetates Mundi* 97-108), the additional quatrains agree with the corresponding quatrains found in the Book of Lecan and Book of Ballymote.
examples discussed above from the text of SAM in P may point to similar expertise on the part of one of Cú Choigcríche Ó Cléirigh’s scribal colleagues in the seventeenth century. (I hope to examine fully the text of SAM in P in a separate study.)

3. Material relating to SAM in G and E

Attention may now be focused on the other manuscripts supposedly belonging to Ó Cróinín’s Recension I of SAM. We may firstly look at G which contains five non-continuous sections of SAM.15 Ó Cróinín points out that the Book of Glendalough is cited as a source for some textual items in G and suggests that, in the case of sections of SAM, the scribe of G’s immediate exemplar was R:

Speaking of the poem Ádam ocus Eua án (§11), which is found in G 3, [James] Carney suggested that the text of R (fol. 41rb 1-10) was ‘possibly the immediate exemplar’; we might expand that remark to cover the other SAM items in G 3 as well. Ó Cianáin elsewhere in the manuscript says that he has copied from the Book of Glendalough, but the sequence of texts in G seems to me to indicate that R was his immediate exemplar.16

The Ó Cianáin referred to here is Ádhamh Ó Cianáin, the main scribe of G, who died in 1373.17 There are a number of problems with

---

15 Ó Cróinín’s discussion of the sections of text of SAM in G in his edition is difficult to follow. On p. 14 he states that G contains copies of §§2, 9, 11 of SAM. On p. 53 he says that it contains four sections. On p. 35 he states: ‘The G text opens with an abbreviated version of §9, on the children of Adam, and follows immediately with the poem Adam ocus Eua án (§11), omitting the list in §10 (doubtless because the scribe thought it superfluous to the list in the poem).’ In the variant readings for §§10 and 11 cited on pp 68-9, however, readings from G are included for §10 but none are cited for §11. Both §10 and §11 are, in fact, found in G 3, f. 18va. Part of §69 is also found in G and its readings are cited among the variant readings for this section by Ó Cróinín (97).

16 Ó Cróinín, The Irish Sex Aetates Mundi 35.

regard to Ó Cróinín’s discussion of the relationship between R and G. He implies, for instance, that all the sections of SAM in G were written by Ó Cianáin; however, as Nessa Ní Shéaghdha has suggested, ff 20-25r of G 3 and the intercalated leaves of G 2 may in fact be in a fifteenth-century hand. One of the textual items from SAM is found in this part of G 3, and another is found on one of the intercalated leaves of G 2 (f. 28va). Furthermore, examination of the latter seems to invalidate Ó Cróinín’s suggestion that R was the immediate exemplar for all the sections of SAM in G. This particular item corresponds to the following part of §69 of Ó Cróinín’s edition:

Assia dano, ingen Neir 7 na bandia, dianid ainm Doridis, is uaidi-sin ro-ainmniged inn Assia .i. Neptún mac Ióib, dia mara, tuc grád di corbo hé tinscra ro-gellad di .i. tress rann in domuin do ainmnigud huaidi ara hógi do lot 7 ar inbuth fri Neptúin. 19

As indicated in the variant readings for this section of the text cited by Ó Cróinín, G agrees with two other manuscripts, viz. Oxford, Bodleian Library, Rawlinson B. 486 and Laud 610, against R in its omission of dano, sin (after uaidi), mac Ióib, dia mara, and 7 ar inbuth fri Neptúin and also in reading conad, ro geall and in tress for corbo, ro gellad and tress respectively. G agrees with Rawlinson B 486 against R in reading log for tinscra (om. in Laud 610). 20 It is clear therefore that G does not derive directly from R in this instance.

We turn now to examine the textual item from SAM which is found on f. 24r of G 3 and is contained in that section which was written seemingly by a later hand. Significantly, this is also the section of G 3 in which the Book of Glendalough is twice cited as a source. 21 Since Ó Cróinín holds that R was the immediate exemplar

---

19 Ó Cróinín, The Irish Sex Aetates Mundi 97.
20 ibid. 97. Ó Cróinín notes that Rawlinson B. 486 adds is anlaidh seo focaemh-nacair sain after ro ainmniged inn Assia. This additional text is also found in G and Laud 610.
21 The Book of Glendalough is cited as a source on ff 22va and 23r; see Ní Shéaghdha, NLI Cat. I, 25. It may be added that neither of the two specific references to the Book of Glendalough concerns an item found in R; see Pádraig Ó Riaín, ‘The Book of Glendalough or Rawlinson B 502’ Éigse 18 (1981) 161-76 (at p. 170).
for the textual items from SAM found in G, the citing of the Book of Glendalough as a source in the latter would arguably constitute strong evidence that R was to be identified as this source.\textsuperscript{22} The item of text in question is a chronological poem which was also discussed by Professor Pádraig Ó Riain and was one of the items which he believed furnished evidence for the identification of R as the Book of Glendalough.\textsuperscript{23}

In R, SAM is preceded by two chronological poems on the subject of the Six Ages, the first according to the Septuagint, beginning \textit{Cétna-amser bethad bind}, the second according to the ‘Hebrew Verity’ or Jerome’s Vulgate, beginning \textit{Cétaimmser in bethad bind}.\textsuperscript{24} The corresponding text in G points to some confusion between the two poems, presumably because of the similarity of the first lines. Here we find a single poem which consists of the opening line of the first poem as found in R and the remainder of the second poem. Attempts to explain this discrepancy have been made by both Ó Cróinín and by Ó Riain. Referring to the scribe of G, Ó Cróinín argues, not altogether logically, as it seems to me, that the fact that the text in G consists of the first line of one poem and the remainder of the other poem ‘proves that, in fact, his exemplar contained both poems’. He continues: ‘Thus the argument for that exemplar having been R is reinforced.’\textsuperscript{25} Ó Riain’s explanation of the discrepancy between R and G is as follows:

\begin{quote}
\ldots the first line in G 3 does not correspond exactly to that of Rawl. which reads \textit{Cétaimmser in bethad bind}. It does correspond exactly, however, to the first line of the immediately preceding poem in Rawl. Evidently, the scribe had allowed his eye to wander before correcting himself.\textsuperscript{26}
\end{quote}

It will be observed that analysis by Ó Cróinín and Ó Riain of the relationship between R and G with regard to this poem is influenced by what in both cases is a preconceived view that R and the Book of Glendalough are one and the same manuscript. Such a stance will only allow for the scribe of G being responsible for the discrepancy in the first line. In order to resolve the issue of the origin of the

\textsuperscript{22} Ó Cróinín, \textit{The Irish Sex Aetates Mundi} 35.
\textsuperscript{23} Ó Riain, ‘The Book of Glendalough or Rawlinson B 502’ 170-1.
\textsuperscript{24} Ó Cróinín, \textit{The Irish Sex Aetates Mundi} 64-6 (§§ 2-3).
\textsuperscript{25} ibid. 35.
\textsuperscript{26} Ó Riain, ‘The Book of Glendalough or Rawlinson B 502’ 171.
discrepancy in G, however, other available evidence cannot be ignored. There are, for example, a number of other significant differences between the poem as preserved in R and G, the most notable of which occurs in q. 8. The following is the text of that quatrain as edited by Ó Cróinín from R, together with the text of G as cited among the variants for this section of his edition:

\[
\begin{align*}
R & \quad G \\
\text{INd ochtmad ó shain imach,} & \quad \text{Agus laithe bratha buan} \\
\text{is í-side int sírsaéglach.} & \quad \text{ní rofitir gach roshluagh} \\
\text{Innisimm, is ní bréc dam,} & \quad \text{isi sen in tochtmad oll} \\
\text{ná bia crích ar a cétmad.} & \quad \text{romsaera ara rochomlond.}^{27}
\end{align*}
\]

It is quite clearly the case that the text of this particular quatrain is very different in the two manuscripts. It is difficult to understand, therefore, how Ó Cróinín, although including the text of G among his variant readings, can nevertheless claim that the scribe of G was copying directly from R. Ó Riain explains away this serious discrepancy by suggesting that here again (as was argued in the case of the first line) the scribe of G may have allowed his eye to wander.\textsuperscript{28} In this case, however, we are not told what it was to which the scribe’s eye wandered. Quatrain 8 as found in G is not found anywhere in R. This quatrain is in itself clear evidence that the scribe of G could not have been copying from R. A number of other significant differences between R and G in the case of this poem are cited among the variants by Ó Cróinín but are not commented upon.\textsuperscript{29} Some of the variant readings from G are also cited by Ó Riain, but their import is not discussed.\textsuperscript{30}

Since R does not seem to have been the exemplar for this poem in G, we may now reconsider the discrepancy in the first line of the poem as found in the latter manuscript. If it is to be safely argued that the scribe of G was responsible for this discrepancy, it must first be established, if possible, that the discrepancy had not arisen in an earlier source. One obvious means of investigating such a possibility is to search for and examine other witnesses to the poem. Ó Riain does not mention any such witnesses, but, as pointed out by Ó Cróinín, another copy of the poem is found in the fourth manuscript of

\textsuperscript{27} Ó Cróinín, \textit{The Irish Sex Aetates Mundi} 66 (§3).
\textsuperscript{28} Ó Riain, ‘The Book of Glendalough or Rawlinson B 502’ 171.
\textsuperscript{29} Ó Cróinín, \textit{The Irish Sex Aetates Mundi} 65-6.
\textsuperscript{30} Ó Riain, ‘The Book of Glendalough or Rawlinson B 502’ 171.
Recension I cited above, viz. E. Significantly, the same discrepancy in G is also found in E. According to Ó Cróinín, ‘the implication of this parallelism between the texts of G and E is extremely difficult to work out’. As can be seen in the section of his stemma codicum cited above, E, like G and P, is taken by Ó Cróinín to derive directly from R; but, whereas the descent of G and P from R is denoted by an unbroken line, E’s descent from R is denoted by a broken line, the purpose of which is not made clear.

It is clear, however, that Ó Cróinín was of the opinion that E and G derived independently from R. But this would imply that the error in the first line of the poem was made independently by the two different scribes of these manuscripts, surely a remote possibility. The only way to ascertain the actual relationship between the copies of this textual item as contained in R, G and E is, of course, to examine the manuscripts themselves, a task which, surprisingly, was not undertaken by Ó Cróinín. Such examination reveals that G and E ultimately derive from a common exemplar which is not R. Thus G and E agree with regard to the discrepancy in the first line. E is later in date than G, but as it is essentially in agreement with R against G, for example in the case of q. 8 discussed above, it cannot be a copy of G. The text of q. 8 in E (f. 44rb) reads as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{In .uiii.mad o sin amach} \\
\text{budh hísín in sirshaeglach} \\
\text{innisim is ni bréag damh} \\
\text{ni bia crich ar in céirmadh.}
\end{align*}
\]

In addition to their sharing the discrepancy in the first line of q. 1, evidence that G and E derive from a common exemplar which is not R is provided by examination of q. 3 and the first two lines of q. 4. The relevant text as edited by Ó Cróinín from R is as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{q. 3} \\
\text{ÌN tress amser, féig co fír,} \\
\text{óthá Abrám co Dauíd;} \\
\text{a dó cethrachat, cen ail,} \\
\text{ar nof céttaib do bliadnaib.}
\end{align*}
\]

\[31\] Ó Cróinín, The Irish Sex Aetates Mundi 35.
q. 4ab
IN chethramad chubaid chóir,
ó shain co brait mBabilóin.\textsuperscript{32}

In the variant readings for 4b it is noted by Ó Cróinín that \textit{shain} is linked to \textit{Dauíd} in the preceding quatrain by a construe mark.\textsuperscript{33} The readings of 4b in G 3 (f. 24rb) and E (f. 44rb) are as follows:

- \textit{o Daibhidh braid Baibealoín G}
- \textit{o Daibid broid Babiloin E}

The two points worthy of note here as regards the corresponding text in R are that \textit{shain} has been replaced by forms of the name \textit{Dauíd} and the preposition \textit{co} has been omitted in both G and E. Again, it is unlikely that both of these changes were made independently by the respective scribes. The most plausible explanation here and in the case of the shared discrepancy in the first line of the poem is that the changes were already present in an earlier source common to G and E.

Examination of \textit{Cétaimmser in bethad bind} in G and E shows that the relationship of these manuscripts to R is not accurately represented in the \textit{stemma codicum} of Ó Cróinín’s edition. From the evidence discussed above it is clear that the scribe of G was not responsible for the discrepancy in the first line of the poem, as Ó Cróinín and Ó Riain argue, but that this had already occurred in an earlier source. As it is not present in R, this cannot have been the source in question. It will also be recalled that the poem is found in that section of G in which the Book of Glendalough is twice cited as a source and that neither of the texts for which it is directly cited as a source is found in R. Contrary to previously held views, therefore, this particular section of G furnishes telling evidence against the identification of R as the Book of Glendalough.

4. Previous discussion of the poem \textit{Druimm Cetta cétie na noem}

Another text which is crucial in determining the relationship between R and the Book of Glendalough is the poem \textit{Druimm Cetta cétie na noem}. As James Carney has pointed out, there are four

\textsuperscript{32} ibid. 65.
\textsuperscript{33} ibid.
known copies of this poem, two of which are to be found in the commentary on *Amra Coluim Chille* in R and NLI, G 50. Two independent versions, ‘doubtless deriving from manuscripts of the commentary’, are to be found in the fifteenth-century manuscript RIA 1236 (C iii 2) and in the sixteenth-century Oxford manuscript Bodleian Library, Laud 615.\(^{34}\) As also noted by Carney, the poem in C iii 2 is immediately preceded by the following introductory words:

> don logaimsir so sis do reir lebuir Glinn da Lacha

> ‘concerning time and place [i.e. of the composition of *Amra Coluim Chille*] here according to the Book of Glendalough.’\(^{35}\)

It is noteworthy, in the light of this information, that five consecutive quatrains of the poem in R are absent in C iii 2 (and in G 50). According to Carney, the five quatrains ‘have been dropped, obviously by homoioteleuton’. Carney goes on to argue as follows:

> ‘The same mechanical fault is found in G 50. This points to the following: the mechanical mistake was not made by the scribe of C iii 2 but was already present in his exemplar, the Book of Glendalough ...’.\(^{36}\)

This matter has been discussed also by Ó Riain.\(^{37}\) As he points out, if what Carney says is true, ‘this, needless to say, would preclude any possibility of Rawl. B 502 and the Book of Glendalough being one and the same codex’.\(^{38}\) Accepting Carney’s explanation for the omission of the five quatrains, Ó Riain argues on the basis of the evidence of a second poem, *Colum Cille co Dia domerail*, contained in both manuscripts, that C iii 2 and G 50 ‘belong to the same line of transmission’. Consequently, according to Ó Riain, ‘the omission in *Druim Ceta Céte na Náem* could have occurred at any point along the line and need not have been present in the Book of Glendalough.’ He

---

34 James Carney (ed.), *The poems of Blathmac*, ITS vol. 47 (Dublin 1964) p. xii. The reading of the first line of the poem is based on R, f. 55rb.
35 ibid. p. xii.
36 ibid.
38 ibid. 172.
goes on to assert that *Colum Cille co Dia domerail* in G 50 ‘is clearly dependent on a C iii 2-type exemplar, if not on C iii 2 itself.’ 39

Ó Riain failed to test the veracity of the latter statement either by examining in detail the versions of *Colum Cille co Dia domerail* in both manuscripts or by examining the versions of *Druimm Cetta céte na poem*. Had such an examination been carried out in the case of the latter poem, it would have become evident that the version in G 50 cannot have been copied from C iii 2. This can be seen, for instance, in the case of q. 26 of the poem. The following text is from R with some variant readings from C iii 2 (f. 10b):

```
Im Goan coarthach cen chacht
o tát coemchlanna Ciannacht
Fidchad Sabarnach Sáergus
Ech echen Fiacc is Fergus. 40

Line a: cen chacht R; Saorgus C iii 2
Line c: Sáergus R; cin cacht C iii 2
```

The words at the end of lines *a* and *c* have been confused with one another in C iii 2. This error is not found in G 50 (p. 21):

```
Im Ghoan coarthach cen cacht
oa ttád caomhclanna Ciandacht
Findcadh Sabharnach Saorgus
Eich eichen Fiac is Fergus.
```

Other cases where G agrees with R against C iii 2, thus indicating that it cannot have been copied from the latter, are these:

```
q. 4c
co ro rann Rudraigi ind raith R
co ro rann Rughraige an raith G 50
co ro rand rudraige raith C iii 2

q. 24c
a rath maroen ruind riar la R
a rath maraon ruinn riar la G 50
a rath maraon linn ler la C iii 2
```

39 *ibid.* 173.

40 The text in R has been edited by Whitley Stokes, ‘The Bodleian Amra Choluimb Chille’ *Revue Celtique* 20 (1899) 140.
The poem in R is preceded by the heading ‘Do tathmet na rig 7 na noeb batar sin mórdail inso sis’. A similar heading is found at the beginning of the poem in G 50 (p. 21). In C iii 2, however, this heading is found not at the beginning of the poem but after q. 7. Accordingly, the version of Druimm Cetta cète na noem in G 50 cannot have been copied from C iii 2. It agrees with the latter primarily in its omission of the five aforementioned quatrains.

5. Manuscript references to the Book of Glendalough

Before dealing specifically with the five omitted quatrains, attention may be drawn to Ó Riain’s discussion of the transmission of Druimm Cetta cète na noem in the overall context of his identification of R with the Book of Glendalough. The latter is stated in one manuscript, C iii 2, to have been the source for this poem. There is, however, a marked discrepancy between the poem in this manuscript and the poem as it is in R. To account for this, Ó Riain posits that the scribe was not actually copying from the Book of Glendalough, even though he mentions it as his source, but from some intervening copy. The wider import of this viewpoint may be epitomised as follows. If the scribe of a later manuscript cites the Book of Glendalough as a source for a text which agrees very closely with a copy of the same text in R, then, according to Ó Riain, that scribe was definitely copying from the Book of Glendalough and the latter is to be identified as R. If, on the other hand, a scribe of a later manuscript cites the Book of Glendalough as the source for a text which does not agree closely with the same text as found in R, then it is to be assumed that he was not actually copying from the Book of Glendalough, but from an intervening source. This must surely qualify as a very insecure

---

41 Text of R, ibid. 136, 140; text in G50 at pp. 21-2 (for q.30a cf. Carney, The poems of Blathmac, p. xi); text in C iii 2 at f. 10.
basis on which to argue in favour of identifying R with the Book of Glendalough.  

6. The transmission of *Druimm Cetta cét na noem*

We turn now to examine the transmission of the poem *Druimm Cetta cét na noem* in greater detail. Reading the contributions of Carney and Ó Riain on the subject, one could be forgiven for assuming that the five quatrains wanting in later copies of the poem are omissions caused by scribal error and, consequently, that these quatrains definitely formed part of the original poem. As we have seen, Carney stated that the absence of the quatrains in certain later copies was as a result of homoioteleuton. He is followed in this by Ó Riain, who does not allow for the possibility that the five quatrains were an addition in R. However, examination of the quatrains in question undermines the view expressed by Carney. The five quatrains in R are as follows:

Aed Dub rí Ulad na n-ech.  
rí Muman Aed Bendnan bil.  
Aed Bolgc rí Duin Chermna chaiss  
Aed mac Flaind cathrach curad.  
Aed mac Echdach, ard a smacht.  
mac fir luid a Cruachain chain.  
Aed Slane rí Breg na mbla.  
rí Airgial Aed Guaire gle.  
Cethrí rig fo thri trena.  
doruachtar druim na noeb n-an.  
Aed Cerr rí laechda Laignech,  
rí Dessi Aed mac Fingin.  
Aed mac Grillini glanmais  
ardrí tairbpech Tuadmuman.  
ri crichi teora Connacht.  
co Loch nEchtra fo thalmain.  
Aed mac Brenainn rí Tethba,  
Aed Gabran coemri Carpre.  
Aed ainm cech fir ardsegda,  
im Aed ocus im Aedán.  

Homoioteleuton arises where similar endings occur in two neighbouring words, clauses, or lines of writing, and it is a frequent source of omissions in copying. A scribe copies a particular word, his eye then strays to a similar ending and he continues copying from this

---

42 It has also been seen in the discussion of the transmission of SAM above that there are a number of instances where the Book of Glendalough is cited in some manuscripts as a source for items of text which are not found in R. The explanation advanced by Ó Riain in these and other instances is that the items were once present in R but are now lost (‘The Book of Glendalough or Rawlinson B 502’ 170, 171).

43 Stokes, ‘The Bodleian Amra Choluimb Chille’ 138, qq 15-19. I have deliberately reproduced the quatrains here as found in the manuscript for reasons which will become clear below.
second word onwards, thereby omitting the intervening text. An example of homoioteleuton resulting in scribal omission can be found in another version of our poem which is available in Oxford, Bodleian Library manuscript Laud 615, pp. 111-12. Quatrains 9 and 10 of the poem read as follows:

Tri fothai fritha don dáil. ardaig fuaslacthe Scanlain,  
im Dal Riadda, rigda in tress. is im dichor na n-écess.

Tri coecait fer feochair féig. d’eicsib Herenn fo oenchleir,  
im Senchan, im Dallan dess. is im Eochaid rigeccess.44

Quatrain 10 of the poem is omitted in Laud 615 as a result of homoioteleuton (the two occurrences of the same word, viz. écess, are marked in bold). The scribe copied the first example of écess at the end of q. 9 and his eye then strayed to the second occurrence of that spelling at the end of q. 10. Mistakenly believing that this was the écess he had just copied he proceeded to copy from this point on, thus omitting all of q. 10.

It may be asked how this definition sits with the loss of the five quatrains of the poem discussed by Carney. His assumption that the five quatrains were omitted by a scribe copying from R as a result of homoioteleuton falls down on a number of counts. Firstly, Aed (the opening word of the first of these quatrains) and Aedán (the last word of the fifth quatrain) do not have the same endings. Secondly, in scribal errors caused by homoioteleuton one of the two words spelt similarly is always written and the second is always omitted, as exemplified in the case of écess in the Laud 615 version of the poem. This is not so in the quatrains omitted in C iii 2. Even if we were to allow for scribal confusion between Aed and Aedán, both words should not be omitted as a result of homoioteleuton. A further obvious flaw in Carney’s argument is that errors caused as a result of homoioteleuton occur in cases where words with similar endings are found relatively close together, as in the quatrain omitted in Laud 615. In addition, we must bear in mind that the layout and arrangement of texts are not the same in all manuscripts. In the present context, particular attention may be drawn to the high quality of the script, layout and decorative features of R, a manuscript which was described by the late Brian Ó Cuív as being ‘undoubtedly the most

44 ibid.
magnificent of the surviving manuscripts containing for the most part material in the Irish language.’ Ó Cuív went on to say: ‘In addition to the neatness and regularity of the script and of the overall layout, it is distinguished by the amount, variety, and structured order of its decoration.’\(^4^5\) The five quatrains at issue here occupy ten finely written and well laid out lines of text on f. 55rb of R. The text in Stokes’s edition, cited above, follows the layout of the quatrains in the manuscript. Furthermore, the initial of each quatrain is written as a large decorated capital. The words \textit{Aed} and \textit{Aedán} are clearly not found in close proximity to one another, and the former is found at the beginning of a line with a large decorated initial, whereas the latter occurs at the end of a line.

When one takes all the points above into consideration, it is very difficult to see how any scribe copying from R could omit all five quatrains in error. The only scribal omission arising as a result of homoioteleuton that could reasonably be envisaged in a copy of this section of the poem from R is that of one, or possibly two, of the quatrains beginning with \textit{Aed}.

The evidence discussed here suggests that we must seek an alternative explanation for the inclusion of the five quatrains in some versions of the poem and their omission in others. To this end we may consider the subject-matter of the quatrains. They mention twelve kings all called Áed who purportedly attended the convention of Druimm Cetta together with Áed mac Ainmirech and Áedán mac Gabrán. Now in other sources there are conflicting accounts of those who attended this convention. In Adamnán’s \textit{Vita Sancti Columbae}, for instance, the only kings mentioned are Áed mac Ainmirech and Áedán mac Gabrán and there is no mention of the twelve additional kings named Áed as found in the poem in R.\(^4^6\) The list of kings in R is also at variance with the list mentioned in Geoffrey Keating’s \textit{Foras Feasa ar Éirinn}.\(^4^7\) Ryan regards neither list as trustworthy, and he points out that whereas all the kings named Áed in the list in R seem to be real persons, ‘the absence of all kings who did not bear the name Aed, excites suspicion.’\(^4^8\)


\(^{47}\) ibid.

\(^{48}\) ibid.
Another important consideration with regard to the subject-matter of these five quatrains which has hitherto gone largely unnoticed is the existence of a separate poem, Aodh mac Ainmirech na n-all, consisting of ten quatrains, which deals exclusively with the same subject-matter and which is to be found in some versions of the commentary on Amra Coluim Chille. Versions of this poem are found in the following four manuscripts (the first line as found in the respective versions is also given in parentheses):

(1) RIA MS 1230 (23 P 16 – Leabhar Breac), p. 238 c (Aed mac Ainmirech cen fell)
(2) Oxford, Bodleian Library, Laud 615, p. 49 (Aodh mac Ainmirech na n-all)
(3) British Library, Egerton 1782, f. 1, col. 1 (Aedh mac Ainmerech na neall)
(4) NLI, G 50, pp 1-2.49

The first five quatrains of the poem have been edited by Kuno Meyer from Laud 615.50

The transmission of Druimm Cetta céte na noem and Aodh mac Ainmirech na n-all is evidently quite complex (and is made more difficult by the fact that the commentary on Amra Coluim Chille is found only in fragmentary form in some manuscripts). Copies of both the former poem (including the five additional quatrains) and the latter are found in one manuscript, Laud 615. G 50 also contains copies of both poems but does not include the five additional quatrains in the case of the former. R and C iii 2 contain only copies of Druimm Cetta céte na noem (R including the five additional quatrains). The remaining two manuscripts, Leabhar Breac and Egerton 1782, now contain copies of Aodh mac Ainmirech na n-all only. Whether or not the five quatrains of the poem Druimm Cetta céte na noem are based on Aodh mac Ainmirech na n-all or vice versa is a matter for future debate. With regard to the possibility that the five quatrains represent an interpolation in R, it will suffice here to note

49 The first leaf of this manuscript is now fragmentary and the opening quatrain of our poem is lost; see Nessa Ní Shéaghdha, Catalogue of Irish manuscripts in the National Library of Ireland II (Dublin 1961) 67.
50 ZCP 13 (1921) 8-9. There are several differences in detail between Aodh mac Ainmirech na n-all and the five corresponding quatrains of Druimm Cetta céte na noem. The two poems (both of which are found in Laud 615) have been confounded in Diarmuid Ó Murchadha, ‘Dún Cermna: a reconsideration’ Éigse 34 (2004) 71-89 (at p. 78).
a recognised tendency on the part of that manuscript’s compiler to extend other texts by interpolation and further means.\textsuperscript{51}

The evidence discussed above has shown that it can no longer be sustained that the five quatrains of \textit{Druimm Cetta céte na noem} pertaining to the twelve persons named Áed were omitted in certain sources as a result of scribal error. As they are not found in C iii 2, which quotes the Book of Glendalough as its source for the poem, it can reasonably be assumed that they were not in the version of the poem in that source, irrespective of whether the scribe of C iii 2 was copying directly from it or from an intervening copy.

The possibility that the transmission of \textit{Druimm Cetta céte na noem} is even more complex is suggested by examination of the quatrain immediately preceding the five aforementioned quatrains:

\begin{center}
\textit{Da epscop dec isin dail. doruactatar in mordail, na dá Aed dec, aebda a ndrech. im Aed n-ardmac nAnmerech.}
\end{center}

‘Twelve bishops in the assembly, who came to the convention, (and) the twelve Aeds, – beautiful their faces – including Aed, Anmeres high son.’\textsuperscript{52}

It is to be observed that the word \textit{and} in the translation is in parentheses as it represents an editorial addition, influenced, no doubt, by the subsequent five quatrains. If these five quatrains are an interpolation, could it be that the twelve Áeds in the original poem were actually intended to refer to the twelve bishops mentioned earlier in the quatrain?

\textbf{7. Conclusion}

Study of the transmission of \textit{Druimm Cetta céte na noem} and SAM reinforces the importance of examining all the extant evidence for any given text and of not imposing preconceived views on a selective and limited range of such evidence. Failure to analyse rigorously all the available data inevitably leads to a false impression of the transmission of texts and can result in a distorted understanding of their original form.

\textit{University College Dublin}

\textsuperscript{51} See Herbert, ‘The Irish \textit{Sex Aetates Mundi}’ 105-6.
\textsuperscript{52} Stokes, ‘The Bodleian Amra Choluimb Chille’ 138-9.
ELEGY OF AODH RUADH Ó DOMHNAILL (d.1505)

INTRODUCTION

THE SUBJECT of the elegy edited here, Aodh Ruadh (son of Niall Garbh) Ó Domhnaill, was chief of the O’Donnells from 1461 to 1505 (apart from a brief interruption in 1497).¹ Modern historians credit him as a remarkable soldier, politician and innovator whose principal legacy was the consolidation of the O’Donnell lordship during his lifetime into ‘an effective force outside Ulster in the west of Ireland’.² That assessment is borne out by traditional chroniclers for whom he qualified as ‘the greatest man of Clann Dálaigh to extend his power over neighbouring territories’ (an té as mó do chuir a neart ar choigcríochuibh do Chloinn nDálaigh)³ and who claim it as ‘no exaggeration to say that there was not in his time any Gall or Gael who had more power in Leth Cuinn than he’ (ní ró linn re rádha nach roíbe re a linn Gall na Gaoidel dobad tresi ar Leith Cuinn inas he).⁴ His career as dynast had a cultural dimension that is well known. The recovery by him of possession of Leabhar na hUidhre from the O’Conors on taking Sligo Castle in 1470 was regarded as a noteworthy achievement, for example.⁵ The following long and informative obituary concerning him by the Four Masters mentions the enduring legacy that his construction of Donegal Castle represented,⁶ and likewise his endowment of the Franciscan monastery of Friars Observant in Donegal (1474). According to this account, Aodh Ruadh’s death occurred on Friday 11 July 1505 in the seventy-eighth year of his age.

O Domhnaill Aodh Ruadh mac Neill Gairbh mic Toirrdhealaigh an Fhíona ticchearna Tíre Conaill, Insi hEoghain, Cenél

¹ His career is copiously documented in the annals as follows (source is AFM unless otherwise stated) s.a. 1420 (AU), 1429 (ALC), 1445 (AU), 1452, 1456, 1460, 1461, 1462 (AU), 1464 (AC), 1467 (AC), 1468 (AC), 1469, 1470, 1471 (AC), 1472 (AU), 1473 (AC), 1474, 1475, 1476 (AC), 1477 (AU), 1478 (AC), 1480 (AU), 1483, 1484, 1485, 1486, 1487, 1488, 1489, 1490, 1491, 1492, 1493, 1494, 1495, 1496, 1497, 1498, 1499, 1502 (AU), 1503, 1504, 1505.
² D. B. Quinn, ‘“Irish” Ireland and “English” Ireland’ in NHI II 619-37 (at p. 621).
³ Cf. Paul Walsh, ‘Short annals of Tír Conaill’ in BAR II 86-97 (at pp 92-3).
⁴ AC 610; ALC II 204.
⁵ AFM IV 1068; on the background see Tomás Ó Concheanainn, ‘Textual and historical associations of Leabhar na hUidhre’ Éigse 29 (1996) 65-120 (at p. 72).
⁶ For reference to a sixteenth-century description of the castle see MD II 208.
Moain, 7 Iochtair Chonnacht fear dár ghialattar Firmanach, Oirghialla, Clann Aodha Buidhe an Rúta 7 Cathánaigh. Ro ghiallsat d'na Goill, 7 Gaoidhil Connacht ó Mac Uilliam Cloinne Riocaird anuas dó, 7 gidh eisdhe am do dhíoghaíl Ó Domhnaill a anumhla fair a leith re dol ina dhúthaigh dá aimhdheón co meicnic cona baí aen cethrarmhne fhearainn ó Shinua anuas 7 o Sliabh O nAedha don taobh thiar nach raibh fó chrioschain d’Ua Dhomhnaill. An tUa Domhnaill sí tra esce iomlan einigh 7 uaisle an tuaisceart, fear bá mó greann, 7 gaisceadh, fear bá fearr ionsacchidh 7 anadh, fear rob fearr smacht, reacht, 7 riaghail baí i nErinn ina aímsir do Gaoidhealaibh, ar ní dántaof do choimhíd i tTír Chonaill ré a linn acht iadhadh dorais na gaoithe nama, fear bá fearr do chiond ecclusi, 7 eiccsi, fear ro thiodhlaic almsana aídhble i n-onóir an Chomhdhe na ndúil, fear las ro turcebhadh 7 las ro cumhdaigheadh caiślén cétus i nDun na nGall fó daigh gomadh inneoin fhoasaighti dia clannaime ina dheadmhaide, 7 mainistir bhrathar de obseruantia in tTír Conaill i. Mainistir Dhúin na nGall, fear las a ndearnaidh liomat do chreachsluaigheadh timchill fó Erinn, fear dá díleas August iartheimhth thuaisceirt Eorpa do rádh fris, d’fhaghail bháis iar mbuaidh ó dhomhan 7 o dheamhan, iar n-ongadh, 7 iar n-aithrighe tocaighhe ina longport fein i nDún na nGall dia hAoine do shonnradh isin cuíccidh Íd. Iulii, isin ochtmadh bliadhain seachtmoghat a aoisí, 7 isin ceathramhadh bliadhain ceathrachat a fhlaitha, 7 a adhnacal i Mainistir Dúin na nGall.7

Two poems have survived with Aodh Ruadh as subject.8 The earlier Cia rer fuirgheadh feis Teamhra (55 + 2 qq.) is attributed in two

7 AFM V 1282-3; cf. AU III 474 (ending isin ochtmadh bliadhain seachtmoghat a aisi 7 isin 4 bliadain cethorchad a fhiathiuasa, Sexta feria 7 a adhnacal Dia Sathaírn a mainistir Duín na nGall); for other obituaries concerning him, not including reference to his age, see AC, ALC s.a. 1505; his birth is recorded variously in entries s.a. 1420 (AU) and 1429 (AC).
8 Aodh Ruadh was also a figure of literary legend, as witness some versions of the popular tale known variously as Eachtra an Cheithearnaigh Chaoiltriabhaithe or Ceithearnach Uí Dhomhnaill, which according to T. F. O’Rahilly is to be ‘ascertained with fair certainty to the mid-sixteenth century’ (review of Ceithearnadh Uí Dhomhnaill (Ó Muirgheasa, 1912) in Gadelica I/3 (1913) 206). These open with a visit by the principal character (an ceithearnach) to the castle of Aodh Ruadh Ó Domhnaill at Béal Átha Seanaigh; other versions give the party visited as Aodh Dubh (i.e. Aodh Ruadh’s son and successor in the lordship of Tír Conaill), however.
extant copies to ‘Ó Dálaigh Breithfne (Í Raghallaigh) .i. Seaán,’ who is probably to be identified with a poet who died in 1490. This runs as follows: ‘Who is it for whom Tara’s nuptial feast has been delayed? Aodh Ó Domhnaill is the one to whom Ireland looks to be her spouse; destiny and all of nature acclaim him as Tara’s king; all five provinces designate him; he is another Conn Céadchathach who vanquished his rival Mogh Nuadhat in the battle of Magh Léana’ (qq. 1-29). Then follows a caithréim recording a long series of battle encounters, including such datable events as the ousting by Aodh of Toirrdhealbhach Cairbreach (son of Neachtan) from the O’Donnell lordship (1461), the capture by him of Sligo Castle (1470), his burning of Dundalk (1483), and other campaigns conducted over a widely extended area (Íochtar Connacht, Íbh Eachach, Fir Mhanach, Bréithfne, Iarbar Midhe, Dealbhna, Cairbre Laighean and Uachtar Connacht) (qq. 30-55).

Cionnas tig Éire gan Aodh, Ó Domhnaill’s elegy, is the work of Conchubhar Ruadh (son of Fearghal) Mac an Bhaird, known also as ‘Conchubhar Ruadh Mór’, a poet whose death annalists record for 20 December 1541, and whose son Cú Uladh and grandson Maol Muire (mac Con Uladh) are known also as poets. At his death Conchubhar Ruadh was both head of his name (Mac an Bhaire Tíre Conaill) and ollamh in poetry to Ó Domhnaill (sc. Maghnus s. of Aodh Dubh s. of Aodh Ruadh). It was probably in the latter capa-

---

9 The text from Oxford MS Rawlinson B 514 is given by J. G. O’Keeffe, ‘Poems on the O’Donnell’s (1200-1600)’ Irish Texts 2 (1931) 96-103 (= no. 21); another copy in National Library of Ireland MS G 167 p. 89.

10 Ua Dálaigh Breifne, Sean mac Uilliam mic Aodha saoí le dán ... décc (AFM IV 1180). The identification must remain tentative pending full analysis of the poem’s references to actual events and their date (see below).

11 The evidence for the double sobriquet is found in headings accompanying a composition Fuigheall formaid fuil Dálaigh attributed to the poet’s son Cú Uladh, for notice of which see P. A. Breathnach, ‘A poem of protest’ Celtica 17 (1985) 91-100 (at p. 92 n. 5).

12 Cú Uladh (see foregoing note) was the father of Maol Muire, notable as the author of a number of compositions addressed to Aodh Ruadh (mac Aodha mic Maghnasa) Ó Domhnaill; for details see Breathnach, ‘A poem of protest’ 91.

13 (AFM V 1464-66) Mac an Bhaire Conchobhar Ruadh mac Fearghail ollamh Uí Dhomhnaill lé dán oide scol 7 saoi gan urdubhad i fflghlim an dána 7 i n-ealadhnaibh oile, fear tughe aoídhedh coitcinn do chongmhail 7 d’fhothuccadh d’ Réir n-ongadh, 7 iar n-aithrighe an 20 December [1541]; (ALC II 332) Mac In Baird Tíri Conaill .i. Conchobhar Ruadh mac Fergail .i. saoi fhéir dána a fhocclaim ocus a
city that we find him acting as a signatory and guarantor of an agreement drawn up between Maghnas Ó Domhnaill and Tadhg (son of Cathal Óg) Ó Conchobhair concerning the custody of Sligo Castle in June of 1539. The fact that he outlived the subject of the present elegy by some thirty-five years indicates that Conchubhar Ruadh was Aodh Ruadh’s junior by a considerable margin. Although his earlier career cannot be traced in detail, the nature of this composition and its frequent references to the status accorded by Ó Domhnaill to the author (qq. 5, 12-14, 17, 21) allow us to conclude that his tenure of the office of ollamh Uí Dhomhnaill dated from Aodh Ruadh’s lifetime when the poet was still a young man. That he enjoyed the esteem of his contemporaries is evident from the fact that two citations from Cionnas tig Éire gan Aodh occur in the Irish Grammatical Tracts (IGT II exx. 1637, 1754); these qualify among the very latest citations to be accommodated in that source which dates from the first half of the sixteenth century in its extant form.

The poem begins with an apparent literary reference to the opening quatrains of Cia rer fuirgheadh feis Teamhra whereby Ireland is depicted as a widow sorrowing after the death of her spouse and the deceased is lamented not as king of Ulster merely — ná cí ’na rígh Uladh é! — but as one to whom all five provinces gave allegiance

\[\text{bferacht dána, ocus fer thighe n-aoidhidh do commail (sic) suas da cach ndae archena d’ecc in bliadain sin [1541]; (AC 720) Mac an Baird Tiri Conoild .i. Conchobar Ruad mac Fergail, saí re dan 7 re fóghlaim 7 fer tighe oiged coichinn, d’fagbail bais iar n-ongad 7 iar n-aitrighe [1541].}\]


15 On the topic of internal evidence for ollamh status in such poems see P. A. Breatnach, ‘The poet’s graveside vigil’ ZCP 49/50 (1997) 50-63 (at pp 53-5); see further the note on moirn (q. 5b).

16 See qq. 20cd, 16cd respectively (variae lectiones); the former citation is transmitted in two vellum manuscripts of the 16th century, referred to by Bergin in the edition as C (= RIA MS 1218 (C II 3) (sect. B), dated 1552, see IGT I p. ii) and C² (= RIA MS 1218 (C II 3) (sect. C) (cf. RIA Cat. 3267 ff.)); the latter citation is transmitted in the 17th century paper manuscript copy P (= RIA MS 752 (24 P 8)). Cf. P. A. Breatnach, ‘The metres of citations in the Irish Grammatical Tracts’ Éigse 32 (2000) 7-22 (at p. 14).
The ensuing elegy leaves an impression of a deeply felt personal sorrow (see in particular qqs. 5, 8, 12-14, 16-18, 21-25, 28, 31-37, 40-42, 46-51), while embodying also many of the themes and motifs commonly associated with the genre:

- The breaking news, later confirmed (sgéal gan orraidh 19; dear-bhadh sgéal 24, 31; sgéala an chéidhflir 32; sgéal oile 44)
- The feast of grieving (fleadh orchra, f. bhróin 11, 24, 35, 38)
- Sorrow’s potion (deoch bhróin 24, 35, 37, 38, 41, 49)
- Tear-shedding (déar 5, 12, 18, 19, 23, 24, 25, 31, 35, 37, 44, 46) and tears of the colour red (dath na gcaor/caor dhearg 10, 20, 30, 34)
- Communal weeping (comaidh chaoi 4, 13, 32, cf. 51)
- The keening (caoine 15, 40, 43, 44, 46, 51; caoi/gol 17, 29, 33, 34, 36, 40, 46, 21; cumha 7, 29, 48)
- The poet must learn to keen (5, 34, 36)
- His sorrow is contagious (37)
- His vigil at the grave (loighe 16, 22, 27; uain 21, 27; uille 28)
- He reads the name inscribed (23)
- Others vie for a place at the grave (22, 39)
- The keening women (19, 22, 29, 41, 43)
- Clapping of hands (30).

**METRE**

The metre is *rannaigheacht mhór* (7\(^1\) 7\(^1\)). Assonance instead of perfect rime occurs in one or both of the two internal correspondences in the opening couplet in up to one-half of all quatrains (viz. 2, 4, 6, 7, 11, 16, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 28, 29, 31, 32, 34, 38, 39, 41, 43, 45, 50, 51). This usage conforms with the rules for *rannaigheacht* (*r. mhór* and *r. bheag*) described in the later metrical handbooks by Ó hEódhusa and Ó Maolchonaire, according to which the internal requirements of the opening couplet (*seóladh*) are met either by perfect or broken rime (*comhardadh slán nó brisde*) or by assonance (*do réir amuis*).

However, compositions in *rannaigheacht* metres of earlier
date than the present one tend to show perfect internal rimes in both the first and second couplets of the quatrain. Accordingly, Cionnas tig Éire gan Aodh arguably marks a stage in the development of the metre in this respect.20

Two apparent anomalies relating to the practice of rime in opening couplets in this poem may be observed. (1) According to the rules of the later handbooks, the final words of lines b and d make perfect rime and a and c make consonance with them, but perfect rime between a and c is not permitted.21 However, in the present poem ac make final rime in a half-dozen quatrains (qq. 9, 13, 17, 29, 32, 47), and in one further case this rime is of a word with itself (q. 36).22 It is perhaps significant that in all but two of the affected quatrains (17, 47) the assonantal device known as breacadh is present.23 Breacadh is commonly employed to offset the effect of the metrical fault known as caoiche in which a word rimes with itself.24 Although the issue clearly requires further study, it seems plausible that a compensatory function may be indicated by breacadh in the present context also. (2) The repetition of one or more words in the first couplet is a rhetorically motivated feature common in opening quatrains as here (q. 1 Cionnas tig an dtig);25 it is also of frequent occurrence in the body of the poem (qq. 7, 10, 20, 25, 30, 39, 47, 48).

TRANSMISSION AND EDITION

The poem is transmitted in the following manuscripts:

(N) National Library of Ireland G 992, f. 9r (‘Nugent manuscript’) (16th cent.)

---

20 A full analysis of the evidence for this will appear elsewhere. For editorial policy governing such internal correspondences in opening couplets see below.
21 Cf. GBM 135 (ll. 3688-89): ní dhligh uaithne na cédcheathromhan don tseoladh coinhtheacht a ccomhardadh re haonfhocal don rann uile.
22 See textual note on q. 36a.
23 Thus breacadh is given in qq. 9, 13, 29, 32 by repetition of the vowels i, é, u, é, respectively. (On special circumstances attending the use of breacadh in q. 36 see textual notes.)
24 According to GBM 92 (ll. 2531-33) caoiche is excused in cases where the repeated word is used differently or where compensation is made in the quatrain in the form of breacadh (Ní cőir focul do chomhardadh ris féin muna rabh claochládh céille san dara hionadh aige, nó muna rabh breacadh ann).
Significant divergences among the manuscripts are rare, and all copies share a series of unclassical readings (9b, 12a, 16c, 22b, 27a, 29c, 33a, c, 34a). Only N and D appear close enough to be directly related. D’s dependence on N or a copy of it appears in readings throughout the text (e.g. 13a, 17d, 20b, 23b, 24c, 29a, 30d, 37b, 38b, 42a, b, 45b, d, 47b, 49b), most notably, however, in instances in which the form otherwise unique to N is copied and later corrected by the scribe to conform with other copies (29a, 32b, 41b). (D does not follow N’s error at 13d; minor variants unique to D are in 6b, 8b, 10a, 14d, 25a, 33a, 36c, 39b, 49a, 50b, 51b.) N (usually with D) apart from being the oldest witness occasionally preserves older grammatical usage and includes a number of other superior readings against the remaining manuscripts (e.g. 2d, 3c, 4a, 5a, 6a). B furnishes a small number of superior readings (5d, 16c (= IGT), 26a (= G), 47b), others that are faulty (2d, 24d, 28d, 29a, b) and numerous additional independent variants mainly of a minor kind (5a, 11a, 13a, 14a, 16a, 22a, b, 23b, 28b, 44a, d). It also shares some readings with C of which few are significant, however (e.g. 21b, 37a). C itself has some errors unique to it (19a, 20d, 48b, 49d) as well as a short series of other minor variants (e.g. 7b, 10a, 14cd, 35a, 38a, 41a, and the corrected readings at 15a, 43c); apart from variants in common with B (above), it also shares a few superior readings in common with G (6b, 21d, 29a). G stands apart among all manuscripts as the only copy to include q. 18 which is clearly integral to the poem.26

Apart from the superior readings shared with B and C (above), others are unique to it (33b, 39d, 44a); G’s remaining unique readings are for the most part inferior, however (e.g. 1b, 2b, 8d, 10c, 15a, 22a, c,

---

26 See textual note on q. 18.
28a, 34a, 36a, 37c, d). A has the final ten quatrains only; the majority of variant readings unique to it are inferior (43a, b, 44a, 45c, 46b, 49a).

The N copy provides the basis for the edition, with readings from other witnesses and classical forms substituted for unclassical as appropriate. It may be noted that since perfect rime in opening couples is optional (see above) it has not been supplied editorially unless supported by one or other of the manuscript copies, even in those instances in which recourse could have been had to a recognised alternative form not supplied by the manuscripts (see q. 14b n.); on the other hand, where such a form is present in one or more copies it has been adopted (e.g. 20b, 26a, 33b, 41a, 49b). In the absence of perfect rime, assonating forms are supplied as required (e.g. 22a, 41b).

NOTE

This edition was begun by the late Professor R. A. Breatnach, who brought both text and translation to an advanced stage of completion. These have here been revised and introduction and notes have been added.

27 See Cat. FLK 69.
28 I am grateful to Dr Katharine Simms for helpful comments on a draft of this article.
1. Cionnas tig Éire gan Aodh?  
   An dtig re céile ar n-a crádh?  
   Sgíth le croidhe ciall na sgéal,  
   léan riamh is goire don ghrádh.

2. An chéadtoil mharas ag mnáoi  
   a tréagadh ní lamhthar lé;  
   dá mbeith fear lér dhéanta dhí,  
   bean Da-Thí ní fhéacfa é.

3. Tárraidh Éire d’oighre Néill  
   céile nach foighbhe go fóill;  
   tug gan fhear Thulaigh an Trír  
   ag rígh nár chubhaiddh bean bhróin.

TRANSLATION

1. How fares Ireland without Aodh? Can a spouse in torment go on? The import of the tidings grieves the heart, sorrow ever being nearest to love.

2. The first enduring love a woman has she dare not forswear. Should a man be to hand who might warrant her doing so, the spouse of Da Thí will not countenance him.

3. It has befallen Ireland that because of the descendant of Niall she will not gain a consort for now; since a woman in mourning is not a fitting spouse for a king Tulach an Trír must be without a husband accordingly.
4. Five provinces bewail him in unison in the kingdom he did not divide; lament not as a king of Ulaidh a king to whom Da Thí’s land gave allegiance.

5. The favour Ó Domhnaill showed (towards me) will force me to learn how to shed tears, if that is a fitting return for it; until it taught me the art of keening the people’s envy did not deflect from me.

6. New tidings in which she (i.e. Ireland) will put meaning came ashore with a strange wave; the wave did not come on land before perceiving that the land of Fál was without a king.

7. The grief of the people and of the elements is grief that no-one could think to suppress. Not my sorrow alone was of account; the weather reacted in sympathy with it.


5 a fhodhlaim N: fo. cet. dheor B b i CG: a NBD mu. G ui G d tnúth NDCG

6 a ce. DBCG b haoidhídh dtuinne N: háoibhe tuinne D: háoidhe tuinne CG: haoidhígh tuinne B traidh N c thataidh B: tháthuigh C a mss d athain BC

7 b sháoílti C c bhúdh N bróidh N: brígh B d -roinne BC tsín báigh B lem C
8. Annamh fear nach fill a shéan – 
ní rinn nachar bhean a bhriogh;  
ó so amach ní fheadar m’eól;  
do leagadh seól don rath riogh.

9. Mairidh cuimhne a luisne lé,  
an tuirse gé duilghe dhí;  
brón falaigh ar Thulaigh dTé,  
cumhain lé gur adhain í.

10. A rath ní chreidinn do chlódh,  
do chreidinn don rath fa-ríor!  
do bhí a dath ar dheóir an druadh  
gomadh tuar leóin an rath riogh.

11. Tearc fear i n-easbhaídh a hiúil,  
an fhleadhsóin nachar fhleadh shuain;  
ní fhuil teagh acht ’na thoigh óil,  
fleadh bhróin in gach toigh badh thuaidh.

8. ‘Rare the man whose good fortune does not falter’ – the saying has relevance 
indeed for me. Henceforth what I know I know not; the sail has been lowered for the 
king’s good fortune.

9. The memory of his glowing countenance still lives with her although the grief 
is distress to her; for Tulach Té it is a hidden sorrow – she remembers that he gave 
his fire.

10. I did not believe his good fortune would change. Alas! I put faith in good for-
tune. The colour of the druid’s teardrop foretold that the royal good fortune would be 
an omen of grief.

11. Few were unaware of that feast that was no feast of slumber; there is no 
dwelling but is a house of drinking; in every house to the north is a feast of sorrow.

8 a bhfill G  b linn B: sonn D  brí. B: bhrígh C: bhriodh N  c fheadair N: fheadamh 
(?) G  mheól BD

9 b do. mss  c falaidh B  tu. G  thé B: té C  d hi B

10 a an (r.) D  chreidind BG: creidinn ND: creidim C  cl. B  b creidind B  fá-. ND 
c a om. G  dhath BC

11 a fheair C  a ne. mss  heoil B  b fí-. C: fhleagh-. B passim  –sin G  c fu. C 
to. BC  d bróin BD  bhadh B
12. In return for Ó Domhnaill’s love for me, I do not restrain the flow of my tears; I will not constrain the eye to conceal tidings that are in every mouth.

13. The honour I experienced warranted continuance of grief day after day; no fitting return is it for the favour shown an ollamh if I suffer in a communal weeping.

14. He was ever exhorting my high spirits; with my dejection I requite it. He benefited from the great exhilaration until I became the king of sorrow.

15. People stay away from Dún na nGall because of awareness of the keening that awaits them; the harbour where the wave of ruin struck us deserved not its being chosen as a haven for ships.
16. Ciodh fá bhfuighinn toil do thriall
don chloich ar a gcuirim taobh?
seacht dtroighe is uaisle don úr
fúm ag loighe ar th’uaighse, a Aodh.

17. Tuirse ar leith do mheabhraigh mé
le beith ‘na leanmhain gach laoi;
ó nár caitheadh ribh mo ré,
do dlhagh mé a caitheamh réd chaoi.

18. Ní lamhaim mo dhearc do dhón,
ó bhar bhfeart ní fhaighaim eól;
bréagthar leanb ar th’fhior, a Aodh,
i riocht gur caor dhearg mo dheór.

19. Go ndiongnadh caoi tar a céill
do mhnaoi níor iongadh ar h’uaigh;
níor chongaibh dearc ar a deóir
ar dteacht sgeóil gan orraidh uaibh.

16. How should I conceive a desire to leave this gravestone upon which I rest my side? Seven feet of the most noble earth are beneath me as I lie on your grave, o Aodh.

17. Exceptional sorrow gave me the mind to continue it day by day; since you did not live for my life-span, I was bound to spend it in lamenting you.

18. I do not dare to cover my eyes; from your grave I find no escape; a child is drawn to your burial mound, o Aodh, as though a tear-drop of mine were a red berry.

19. It was no wonder that a woman should weep beyond her control on your grave; when an unvouched report came no eye held back its tear.

---


17 a tuirris C  mheabhraigh B  b re B: lé na C  beith N, (lenition point added later over b) B: bheith cet.  c libh C  d dl. BC  chaitheamh ND  ca. B

18 Quatrain in G only  c a om.  a (r.)

19 a che. C  b nírbh B  thú. BC: tuaigh D  c ni B: nír D  chonnuimh NDB  d urraidh B: orruigh C
20. It is not a natural colour for tears to be made the colour of berries; never did a teardrop take on a colour (lit. form) that poets did not behold over your grave, o Aodh.

21. They themselves appreciate that they are obliged not to compete with your poet for the vigil; the order of rising before poets the soldiery of Éirne practised is observed by them on your grave.

22. Although I am not allowed on it, my desire does not waver from that grave-stone; it is not the only grave that is within, o women, and you are (all) on it together!

23. Reading your name, o descendant of Niall, has caused my rush of sorrow; the eye that beheld your golden goblet has affected my response of tears.
24. No eye awaited confirmation of the tidings; grief is a feast that has got under-
way (?). A single tear fell from me: ‘it is proper to test a feast before drinking’.

25. The heart makes its due offering of tears; that is indeed a service from me that
is owing. Is stock in return for music more worthy? From me my tear is its equivalent.

26. What better claims are there to the tributes of all for the descendants of Dálach
after you? The empty fetters he has inherited are sufficient for your successor to bind
together the land of Brian.

27. Poets did not get the vigil they desired, but could only access your grave like
everyone else. Poets were accustomed to having their demands granted; they would
readily approach your burial mound, o Aodh.
28. How strange a matter for envy was the bed that is no place of slumber! Should one of their number be envious, what will I do with my elbow resting on your grave?

29. This is not mourning that is not sustained; which of us does it least engage? Not by a day’s weeping should his passing be worthily marked; one woman was weeping (even) as she slept.

30. A gravestone that causes every tear to change colour is a stone of special quality indeed! None of the warriors of Eamhain emerges from your grave whose palm retains its normal colour.

31. I open the doors that hold back my tears before grief’s intent falters; only a portion of my tears had been shed when the final outcome was confirmed for me.
32. Sgéala an chéidfhir níor chreid mé; 
éligean a bheith mar do bhaoi; 
go gluinim ó orraíd é, 
do fhuing mé i gcomaidh chaoi.

33. Ar feadh caoi Í Dhomhnaill dúinn 
do bhaoi m’fhoghlaí ag gach aon; 
do chúir mé mo ghal i ngníomh, 
gur ghabh dhíom an té rem thaobh.

34. Ní re a cleachtadh is fhéarr í, 
an cheard dá leantar gach laoi; 
ar dheóir ndeirg ní fhuighinn é, 
cuirim lé nach ceird an chaoi.

35. Do léig fear ar dhéanamh ndéar 
an fhleadh ina héanar uadh, 
neach as mo láimh ní bh fhíon 
ní fóth an ndigh nach ál uam.

32. I did not credit the first man’s message; it had to be so. Until I heard (lit. hear) from a vouched source I endured weeping in communion.

33. While I wept for Ó Domhnaill everyone could learn from me (?); I gave vent to my weeping and the person beside me took off from me.

34. The art pursued day after day is none the better for practising it; I could not do it for a red teardrop; besides (?), keening is no art.

35. One man moved away from the drinking for the sake of shedding tears; one refuses wine out of my hand; I will not drink the draught he declines to accept from me.
36. Do-ní an t-osnadh d’éigin é
nach éidir cosnamh re caoi;
’na bhrón chéillidh is fhearr é
ní éirigh sé leam gach laoi.

37. Rem fhaicsin ag dálí mo dheór,
ní háil an faidsin an fion;
maírge lé bhfaghair mh’uille ag ól,
gabhaidh brón gach duine dhúim.

38. A bhfleadh orchra um éighir Néill
leigid ortha ó láimh do láimh;
níor fhearr an teagh do thoigh ól,
an fhleadh bhróin a-moigh ag mnáibh.

39. Iomdha fear agá bhfuil grádh
ar an bhfeart fá bhfuil ar dtnúdh;
fuair an uaighse don fhuil ríogh
síol do chuair an uaisle i n-úr.

36. The force of the sobbing is such that there is no contending with keening;
restrained sorrow is preferable, (yet) not every day do I achieve that.

37. For as long as he sees me shedding my tears he has no desire for the wine: pity
the one who is seated at my elbow when drinking, (for) everyone is affected by my
grief.

38. They set about (?) their mourning feast for Niall’s successor one and all; the
house was no better as a place of drinking, women held the feast of grieving outside.

39. Many persons of high rank are on the mound which is the object of my yearn-
ing: this grave has taken a scion of the blood of kings who has put nobility (itself)
into the clay.
40. Re Dún na nGall do bhaoi ar mbáidh, 'na bharr ar an gcáoi do chóidh; an tonn mheanma do fhíll uaim, do chuaidh linn go bearna an bhróin.

41. Magh Murbhaigh d’fhéaghadh gan Aodh, cungaomh do-bhéaradh dom brón; na tolcha ar a n-ibhinn fhion díobh dhlighim an orchra dh’ól.

42. Do-rinne an céadcrádh díoth dúnn; ní fríoth acht an t-éanghráadh uann; ní thoillfe im chroidhe an dá chrádh, ní foigthe grádh oile uam.

43. Beag ré n-adhain brón na mban; tós ná gabhaidh ar an ngul! biaidh déar ar do bhreith, a bhean, feith re fear na sgéal do sgur!

40. Dún na nGall was dear to us; that added more to the keening; the wave of feeling that turned away from me accompanied me to sorrow’s breach.

41. To look at the plain of Murbhach without Aodh would lend support to my sorrow; I owe it to the hillocks where I was wont to quaff wine, that I drink of sorrow’s cup.

42. The first affliction left me bereft, one love only was ever got from me; you will not find room in my heart for two torments; you will not get another love from me.

43. It takes little to kindle the grief of the women – do not take the lead with the weeping! You will have a tear at your bidding, o woman! Wait for the man of the news to finish!

40 a ré C bhí NDB  b an: in B: ar G

41 a madh N dfhechain NDB  b congnamh mss dom NCG: don DB bhron G, (mark of lenition added) B: bhróin N, (with i expunged) D c fion CD d dhiobh G dl. BCG an urcra C dól ND


43 a lè N: le DB: re CG naidhaint A  b ghul A  c bhreith: dhreich (with l breith written above) C  d feich DCG  ar NDG fhear G  scur B
44. The tale whose end is a flood of tears: no one wished to credit it; the heart hides its secret teardrops while seeking other tidings from Aodh.

45. It was not the power of the small spears themselves that defended the northern country; they are spears like other spear-shafts; not on them alone did victory depend.

46. It would be no fitting lament for Ó Domhnaill if I were to restrict weeping to a single bout; a tear and my tear of tears (?) is the tear to music of the person at my side.
47. Because of you Ireland has not been united; her hope that we should prevail has perished; o you who knew the fruit of envy, do you think it is timely to turn away your face from us?

48. Grief for Ó Domhnaill as is natural is not grief I keep under cover; long am I concerned to keep my eye in check; that is the reason for my silence.

49. The potency of the liquor has affected me and grieves the heart; o man for whom I make a draught of sorrow, I see you have left the drink untouched.
50. Since the pang of sorrow that went through me is not likely to recede (in my cup no more than its fill is fitting), I defy grief from henceforth!

51. The weeping that is the counterpart of mine is sustained; it is matched in every house; any dwelling you see where there is no weeping is (lit. was) a house without people.

NOTES

2ab The proverbial character of the couplet is evident from comparison with similarly proverbial lines, e.g. gibé cédtoil do-bhir bean / toil sin nach édtair d’fhilleadh (tr. ‘whatever the first love a woman gives is love that cannot be deflected’) (Cia ré gcuirfinn séd suirghe, ed. P. A. Breatnach, Celtica 16 (1984) 70, q. 17cd, and consult references there cited). For other proverbials see qq. 3d, 8a, 10d, 24d, 50c.

c dá mbeith The predicate is here elided as often. The absence of tense sequence (dá mbeith … ní fhéacfa) is a syntactic anomaly; similarly qq. 13cd, 28cd.

3a oighre Néill The subject of the elegy was son of Niall Garbh (see Introduction).

cd This evocation of the sovranty motif rests on the idea that a woman in mourning is disqualified as a potential spouse; compare the couplet go dtuigeadh féin nach bhféadar / bréagadh croidhe i mbí toirrse (tr. ‘in order that she might understand that a heart full of sorrow cannot be won’) (Cridhe so dá ghoid uainne = DG no. 49, q. 2cd).
4 The quatrain contains a literary reference to section of the earlier composition *Cia rer fuirgheadh feis Tenhre* in which Aodh Ruadh is represented as being assured of the support of the five provinces in claiming the title of ‘Rí Teamhra’ (qq. 12-19) (see above p. 30).

5a The theme of ‘learning to shed tears’ is common, e.g. *Déanaid feasda foghlaim guil l ós é is énobair d’Ullaibh* (tr. ‘let the men of Ulster learn to weep henceforward since that will be their sole occupation’) (*Do caitheadh aoibhneas Uladh*, Book of O’Conor Don, f. 239v, q. 5ab).

déar We should expect ndéar.

b moirn For the connotation of special status attaching to this term and its synonyms *grádh* (12a), *anáir* (13a), see Breathnach, ‘The chief’s poet’ 44 f.

c *gur chuir fúm* An idiomatic expression of uncertain meaning.

cd For a similar juxtaposition of the poet’s mourning with that of common folk see below q. 33.

6 Panegyrical imagery often evokes the dryness of beaches owing to the calm of the sea and the shallowness of lakes and rivers from the heat of the sun as tokens of prosperous rule (e.g. *DDána* no. 109, q. 11; O’Keeffe, ‘Poems on the O’Donnells’ no. 21, q. 22). Here the converse imagery occurs of the sea in turmoil and waves thrown up on the shore marking the death of the ruler (see also q. 15d). The pathetic fallacy is pursued further in the following quatrain.

a *gcuirfe* The verb (3 sing. fut. dep.) agrees anticipatively with nom. *fonn Fáil*.

8c Cf. the Socratic saying ‘I know that I do not know’; expresses the poet’s utter desolation.

d *rath ríogh* ‘royal good fortune’ (also q. 10d); *séan* is a synonym (8a).

9b gé More correctly *giodh*, cf. *Éigse* 15/1 (1973) 49, q. 11 n.

10c a *dath* The proleptic feminine possessive pronoun *a* anticipates *deó(i)r*; the masculine alternative of some manuscripts (*a dhath*) anticipates the phrase *gomadh tuar* etc.

deór an druadh The motif of the druid’s teardrop as a presage of death occurs elsewhere albeit without reference to its colour, e.g. *do aithin mé ar dheóir an druadh / tuar an leóin is sé slán* (tr. ‘I knew by the druid’s tears that sorrow was in the offing while he was (still) alive’) (*Cumhaídh iocas onóir ríogh*, Book of O’Conor Don, f. 360r, q. 15cd). A possible origin for it may be the story told in the genealogies of the Airghialla concerning the prophecy of Dubh Comair, the druid of Fiacha Sraibhtine, who foretold that Fiacha would be slain by ‘the three Collas’ in the battle of Dub Comair (Book of Leinster ff. 332c-333a = *LL* VI 1454-55; see the later version in *LCAB* 48). While no reference to tears shed by Dubh Comair occurs in that narrative a version recounted by Tadhg Óg Ó hUiginn in the course of an apologue in the elegiac composition *Aois do tuigfidhe Tadhg* (= *AithD.* no. 10, qq. 18-26) represents the druid as tearfully bringing the results of his divinations before Fiacha: *Ar Thadhg aithintear gur fhíor / sgéala an druadh*
The aspect of the teardrop’s colour evoked in our text is linked to the well-documented elegiac imagery of ‘tears of blood’ (see below qqs. 18, 20, 30, 34).

14a ar roimheadhra For the application of the term meadhair in this context cf. anóir riogh as meadhair mhór (tr. ‘a king’s approbation is a (great source) of exhilaration’) (Cumhaidh íocas onóir riogh, Book of O’Conor Don, f. 360r q. 1d).

b sinn Since perfect rime in opening couplets is optional, it has seemed advisable not to supply it editorially even in cases such as the present one where recourse could have been had to a recognised alternative form (sionn), which however is not present in any of the manuscript witnesses (see Introduction, p. 32).

18 Although preserved in G only, the quatrain’s authenticity is secure as evidenced by the fact that by means of a powerful image it continues the representation of the poet as being on the gravestone of the deceased from q. 16, and carries forward the direct address to the deceased of the preceding and following quatrains.

21d uain Lit. ‘turn’; for the connotation ‘vigil’ applying here see Breatnach, ‘The poet’s graveside vigil’ 55 f.

22a leigthir The passive reading with short vowel (leig-) is chosen for assonance with leic-sin. B’s reading leigthe (2nd pers. plural) has the merit of suiting the context of the address to the women in the second couplet.

c is-tigh The reference would appear to be to the graveyard; compare bím ar uainibh thall is-toigh / eidir uaighibh Chlann gCarthaigh (tr. ‘I am there inside by turns among the graves of Clanna C.’) (Leaba charad i gCorcaigh q. 35cd, ed. P. A. Breatnach, Éigse 21 (1986) 37-52 (at p. 49)).

23a This points to a custom of inscribing the deceased’s name on the gravestone; for other evidence see: (1) feart í Chonaill isin chill / re tteacht a oghaim aithnim (tr. ‘I recognise the grave of C.’s descendant in the graveyard before his inscription is written’) (Leasg an adhuighsi ar Eas Ruaidh q. 17cd, ed. Lambert McKenna, ‘Some Irish bardic poems no. 94’ Studies 39 (1950) 187-92 (at p. 189)); (2) cuid dom thoisg fán leic línigh / roisg do bheith ar na mbeóghuin (tr. ‘part of my visit to the inscribed stone is that (my) eyes are a living agony’) (Dá néll orchra ós iath Uisnigh, RIA 23 D 14, p. 89, q. 4).

d do fhéagh t’easgar óir The verb as transmitted by B seems better suited to the context. The vessel was presumably a treasured possession, mention of which underlines the personal nature of the poet’s grieving.

24b ar bearnadh The verb bearnaim (with obj. n. fleadh) is attested with the meaning ‘I partake of, have a share in’ (DIL s.v.); the sense here appears to be that the feast of grieving has begun even before death has been confirmed, in which case we should expect to read ar mbearnadh (or alternatively reflexive ar n-a bearnadh, but this gives a syllable too many; omit cop is?).

25a cridhe The reading of B is preferred for assonance.
26a cairte The plural form seems the superior reading; apart from giving full rime (\(: maicne\)) it also suits the context of apposition with \textit{geimhle} in the following phrase.

27 The sense of the quatrain in the context is evident when taken in conjunction with that which follows. The author is drawing a distinction between the mass of poets (\textit{sgol, cliar}) who have not had the opportunity of a lone vigil, and his own privileged vigil resting on the grave of the deceased.

33b \textit{do bhaoi m’fhoghlaim ag gach aon} Translation uncertain. The line appears to foreshadow what is expressed more clearly in the second couplet (and is reaffirmed in the second couplet of q. 37), which is that those surrounding the poet followed his lead in the mourning.

34cd Translation tentative here also; the wording of the final line seems to conflict with the earlier reference to \textit{iúl na caoine} (q. 5c).

36a \textit{d’éigin} The feminine inflection adopted here is more usual.

38b leigid ortha The short vowel in the verb (B) is preferred for assonance. The expression seems reflexive but the translation is tentative (‘they set about’?). Dr Simms suggests that the context might favour ‘they set aside’ (cf. \textit{leigid uatha}), which would continue the theme, struck up in q. 35, of grief so intense as to leave no one with the heart to partake of drink.

40a \textit{Dún na nGall} The castle of Donegal was built by Aodh Ruadh (Introduction p. 27).

41b \textit{cungnamh} Assonance requires the alternate form (sanctioned \textit{IGT} II §47).

44d \textit{oile} More correctly \textit{n-oile}.

45a \textit{briogh} (v.l. \textit{brígh}) Assonance being the only requirement, either form will suit.

51 A number of bardic elegies have the same quatrain-total as the present one (fifty-one), but whether a particular significance attaches to this has not been determined.
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PÁDRAIG A. BREATNACH
SEÁN AGUS TADHG Ó NEACHTAIN:
CLEAMHNAS AGUS GAOL

1. ÚNA DE NÓGLA


Nós de chuid Thaidhg ab ea é nótaí den sórt sin a bhreacadh: tá móran díobh le fáil i lámhscríbhinní éagsúla dá chuid agus soláthraíonn siad fráma tagartha dá bheatha féin agus do bheathaí a mhuintire. Mar shampla, i bhfianaise an chinn dheiridh sin thuas is eol dúinn gur rugadh Tadhg idir 16 Bealtaine 1670 agus 15 Bealtaine 1671, agus is féidir an aois a bhí aige nuair a tharla imeachtaí éagsúla a shaoiil a dhéanamh amach. Ach go bhfios domsa ní thugann sé le fios in aon nótá mar sin gur phós a athair aon bhean seachas Úna Ní

1 I ngeall ar a mhírialta atá an ortagrafaíocht sna lámhscríbhinní as a bhfuil ábhar á thógáil agam san aiste seo, agus ón uair nach cúrsaí teanga atá faoi chaibidilil agam, tá caighdeán litirthe na linne seo curtha i bhfeidhm agam (os íseal de ghnáth) ar na dréachtá as na lámhscríbhinní. Aon athrú beag a rinne mé ar an gcomhréir agus aon litir a bhí in easnamh agus a sholáthair mó, tá sé sin léirithe le lúbíní cearnacha.
2 ‘trithibh’ (LS).
Bhroin ná go raibh aon duine eile clainne aige seachas Tadhg féin, Lúcás agus Anna.3 Mar sin féin tá sé luaite ag mórán scoláirí gur phós sé bean eile, Úna de Nóglá, cuíd acu a deir gurbh í an chéad bhean í a phós sé agus duine amháin a deir gur i ndiaidh bhás Úna Ní Bhroin a phós sé í. Iarracht atá san aiste ghearr seo an fhíanaíse ina thaobh sin a scagadh agus a mheas.

Sa bhliain 1820 d’fhóilsigh Edward O’Reilly tuairisc ar Sheán Ó Neachtain faoin mblaí 1715 ina chatalóg de scríbhneoirí na Gaeilge:

John O’Neaghtan, or Norton, lived at this time in the county of Meath, a man much advanced in years. He was author of many original pieces, and translated several others from the Latin language into Irish. (O’Reilly 1820, lch ccxiii)

Níor nocht an Raghallach foinse an eolais sin i dtaobh Seán a bheith ina chúis i gCo. na Mí thart ar an mblaí 1715, ach ghla AI Seán Pléimeann (IG 3:27, 35)4 agus Dúghlas de Híde leis go raibh sé fíor agus bhain de Híde de mhíthuisceasc as gur Mhíoch é an Neachtanach (Hyde 1899, 597). I bhfad na haimsears rinne Eoghan Ó Neachtain tuilleadh taighde foin eolais agus thug sé an tuairisc seo ar Sheán sa bhrollach lena eagrán de Stair Éamuinn Uí Chléire:

Is cosmhuil gur i gCluain Oileáin i gcontae Roscomáin a rugadh Seán Ó Neachtain … Ba mhac fir dúithche é … Thug Seán cuairt ar chúige Laighean uair, ag spailpínneacht, agus phós sé cailín de na Nógláigh. Ba iad na Nógláigh sin na daoine a raibh sé ar aimsir acu an uair sin. Ní innsightear


4 Foilsíodh sraith de dhréachtaí as Stair Éamoinn Uí Chléirigh in imleabhair 3-4 (1887-91) de Irisleabhair na Gaedhilge, ach ní raibh ainm eagarthóra ar bith ag ghabháil leo. Ghlaic R. I. Best (1913, 270) leis gurbh é eagarthóir IG, Seán Pléimeann, a chuir na dréachtáis in eagar agus tá leideanna thall is abhus tríothu gurgh amhlaidh a bhí (e.g. IG 4:36, 51; 4:37, 68; 4:39, 110).
dhúinn an dtug sé an bhean ar ais go Roscomáin, nó ar chuir sé faoi i gcúige Laighean, ná fós an fada gearr an saoghal a fuair an bhean…(Ó Neachtain 1918, lgh v-vi)

Deir Eoghan Ó Neachtain (1918, lch vi) go bhfuil fhanais againn ó bheirt ar a laghad gur Chonnachtach é Seán Ó Neachtain: a mhac féin Tadhg, duine acu, agus Brian Ó Fearghail an duine eile. Ag tagairt sa chéad cháis a bhí sé do lín as dán Thaidhg ar scoláirí na Gaeilge i mBaile Átha Cliath inar thug sé mar thuairisc ar a athair gur ‘seanóir ársaigh a chrích Connacht’ é (O’Rahilly 1912-3, 158), ach is ar fhianaise Uí Fhearghail atá an cuntas sin thuas uaidh ar Seán Ó Neachtain bunaithe. Sa bhliain 1774 (RIA Cat. 132) bhreac Ó Fearghail dán de chuid Seáin Uí Neachtain, *Rachainn fón geoill leat, a mhaighdean na n-órfholt*, sa lámhscríbhinn RIA 55 (23 O 35), 48-9. Chuir sé dhá cheannteideal ar an dán sa lámhscríbhinn sin (lch 48), ceann acu i nGaeilge agus an ceann eile i mBéarla: ‘Aisling Seáin Uí Neachtain, más fíor do Bh[rian] Ó Fearghail’ agus ‘John Naughten of Cloonillane in ye parish of Drum prope Athlone …’ (lch 49); agus bhreac cuntas ar na himeachtaí a spreag an dán, má b’fhíor:


iad agus do chum na raimh thuas, agus d’fhág gan mhothú do chách i bhfuinneog an pharlú[s] íad. Do rinneadar cáth in-adh de, agus ba éigean do Sheán a léamh (lch. 48).  

I ndiaidh an dáin scríobh Ó Fearraoil: ‘Finit – agus fuair Seán an bhean’ (lch 49).

Ainneoin gur chuir Robin Flower amhras ann mar scéal nuair a dúirt sé: ‘There seems to be no other evidence for this marriage’ (1926, 89), glac mórán den lucht tráchtaireachta ar litríocht na Gaeilge feasta le cuntas Bhríain Uí Fhearghail ar imeachtaí Sheáin Uí Neachtain i gCo. na Mí agus chuir a mbreacaireacht féin air. Scríobh Aodh de Blácam go rómánsúil:

Seán was born in County Roscommon, but lived most of his life in Meath. There he won his bride, Winifred Nangle, with that song of Wordsworthian sweetness, *Rachainn fón gcoill leat*, ‘I’d go to the woods with you, golden-haired maiden,’ which rehearses the songs of the many birds and the delights of the greenwood. *Finit – agus fuair Seán an bhean*, notes the scribe … Seán has an ardent and winning spirit; as a poet, he has the gentleness of his beloved Meath … (1929, 286-7)

Ba é an scéal céanna a bhí le ríomh ag Piaras Béaslaí:

Rugadh Seán Ó Neachtain i gCluain Oileáin i gCo. Roscomáin timcheall na bliadhna 1655, nó roimhs, bheidir …

Daoine acfuinneacha ab eadh a mhuinntir, do réir gach tuairisge, agus mórchuid talmhan aca, ach, pé cúis a bhí leis, chuaidh sé ‘na ‘spailpín’ go dtí Conndae na Midhe nuair a bhí sé óg, agus do thuirt sé i ngrádh le hinghin a mháighistir, le hÚna de Nógla. Do cheap sé amhrán gleoite grádha dhí ‘Rachainment fón gCoill leat’ do bhualadh croídhce an chailín agus do phós sí é. Ní fada m[ha]ir sí aige. Do phós sé arís, Úna eile, Úna Ní Bhriain [sic]. Do chaith sé an chuid eile dá shaoghal i gConndae na Midhe, i dtreo is gur shíl móran daoine gur Mhidheach ó dhúchas é … (1934, 31)

Agus ba é a fhearacht sin ag Tomás Ó Raghalláigh é freisin:

I gCluain Oileáin i bparáíse Drumma (Condae Roscomáin) a rugadh agus a tóigeadh Seán Ó Neachtain …

5 Tá cóip dhioplómaithiúil den mhéid sin in Risk 1975, 53-4.
Más cóir Seán a mheas ón méid dá chuid saothair dá bhfuil ar faghláil, fear aerach a bhí ann – fear spóirt agus grinn – ach fear san am céadta a raibh diadhantacht agus daonnacht a’ baint leis. Deirtear linn le hughdarás gur mac fir dúit[che] a bhí ann; agus marach go raibh sé aerach nar ghádh dhó a dhul a’ spáilpínteacht go Condae na Midhe mar chuaidh sé. Ach bhí[nd] go ndéac[he]idh sé ar aimsir níor chuair an sglábhuidheacht briosbrón [sic] ná duibhteann croidhe air, mar tá an t-amhrán a rinne sé do Úna Ní Nógraigh [sic] inghean a mháighistir, ar an gcéad phíosa filidheachta dár chum sé. (Ó Raghallaigh 1938, 313)

An ‘le húdarás’ (mar a dúirt Tomás Ó Raghallaigh) a scríobh Brian Ó Fearghail faoi Sheán Ó Neachtain agus faoina shuirí le Úna de Nógla i ndáiríre?

Rugadh Brian Ó Fearghail i mbaile fearainn Chnoc Sciatháin i bparóiste Thigh Eoin i mbaile Átha Luain, 5 Aibreán, 1715 (RIA Cat. 154) agus mhair sé in áiteachá éagsúla i gCo. Ros Comáin (ina measc Baile Thomáis, mar ar chaidh sé ceithre bliana déag agus mar ar phós sé Neillí Ní Cheallaigh) nó go bhfuair sé bás thart ar 1788-9 (Mac Enery, 1943-4, 133; 1945-7, 158). I gcéad d’Eoghan Ó

6 Sa dán fada ‘Teist agus aithrí Bhriain Uí Fhearghail 1786’ a bhreac sé sa LS RIA 56 (23 E 7), 119-136, tugann Ó Fearghail go leor sonraf faoi imeachtaí a shaol féin. Is i línte tosaigh an dáin atá an t-eolas i dtaoibh áit agus dáta a bhreithe:

‘I mbarúntacht Bhailé Átha Luain do rugadh mé ar thaobh Chnoc Sciatháin na sean-scéal, i bparóiste Thigh Eoin an eolas gríonn is na gcomharsana suairc salmbhinn.

Trí chúig de bhliantaibh ar seacht gcéad déag ba haois do Christ – ní chanfadh bréag – an lá a rugadh Brian go soirbh gan gráin an cúigíú lá déag den Aibreán.’

Neachtain, ní fios cén áit ar rugadh Seán Ó Neachtain, ach is cinnte gur bhain sé féin agus a mhuintir le barúntacht Átha Luain agus le Co. Ros Comáin faoi mar a bhain Brian Ó Fearghail. Is cinnte, dar liom, go raibh Seán Ó Neachtain ag cur faoi i mBaile Átha Cliath i mblianta tosaigh an 18ú céad (Ó Háinle 1992, 11) agus is é is dóichí go raibh sé tar éis teacht go dtú an ardcathair agus Úna Ní Bhroin a phósadh chomh luath le 1670-1, nuair a rugadh a mhac Tadhg. Is cinnte mar sin go raibh Seán Ó Neachtain tar éis Co. Ros Comáin a fhágáil i bhfad sular rugadh Brian Ó Fearghail.

Deir May H. Risk (1975, 48) gur ‘intimate friend of the Ó Neachtuins’ (.i. Seán agus Tadhg) ab ea Brian Ó Fearghail, agus ní foláir gur i ngeall air sin a thug sí ‘definite information’ (1975, 53) ar chuntas Bhrhain ar shuirí Sheáin Úi Neachtain le hÚna de Nógla. Níor thug sí aon fhianaise leis an gscarad sin idir Ó Fearghail agus na Neachtanaigh, áfach, agus go deimhin, fearacht Robin Flower, chuiri sí amhrais i scéal Uí Fhearghail, á rát, ‘We know of no other reference to his employment as a spailpín nor is there any record of his marriage to Winifred Nangle’ (1975, 54). Sílim gurb é an chaoi ar 58 C ATHAL Ó HÁINLE

7 De réir Bhriain Úi Fhearghail, mar a luadh thuas, b’as Cluain Oileáin i bparóiste an Druma (i gCo. Ros Comáin) i ngar do Áth Luain Seán Ó Neachtain agus dá réir siúd freisin is cosuíil gur bhain athair Sheáin leis an gparóiste céanna. Sa bhliain 1729 bhreac Tadhg Ó Neachtain nóta sa lámscríbhinn RIA LS 439 (3 C 19), f 1v⁰ (RIA Cat. 1168), a thugann le fios gur bhain seanathair Sheáin leis an gparóiste céanna. Ba ábhar pléite ag an Athair M. Ó Connalláin agus Marcus Mac Énery cá raibh cuid de na háiteacha a bhaineann le húbharr anseo, go hárithir Baile Thomáis agus Cartún Fiarach (Mac Énery 1943-4, 133; 1945-7, 161, n. 8; Ó Connalláin 1945-7, 65; 1951, 106-7). Ghlac Eoghan Ó Neachtain (1918, Ich viii) agus Marcus Mac Énery (1945-7, 161, n. 8) leis go raibh Cluain Oileáin agus Baile Thomáis sínte le chéile, agus is fíor go bhfuil ‘Cloonilan’ (atá ar bhileog 51 de Léarscáil Ordanáis na bliana 1838, Ros Comáin) teoranta le ‘Thomastown Demesne’ (atá ar bhileog 52 den léarscáil chéanna) agus taobh ó thuaidh de. Tá mé buíoch de Paul Ferguson agus Simon Fernandez, Leabharlann Glucksman na Léarscáileanna, Coláiste na Tríonóide, as ucht a gcabhrach i gcúrsaí léarscáileanna. Maidir leis an nóta taobh istigh de chlúdach tosaigh na lámscríbhínne LNÉ G 132 (Ní Sheaghdha 1977, 56-7), ní fios cé a scriobh é agus ní léir gur do Sheán Ó Neachtain, file, a thagairiom sé.

8 Tá fianaise ann go raibh Seán i mbun saothair liteartha i mBaile Átha Cliath faoin mbliain 1688: féach Ó Háinle 1983, 390, n. 2c ‘teagasc dé’.

9 Ar an gcasaí chéanna, deir William Mahon (2000, 15-16): ‘There is no evidence besides Ó Fearghail’s story for the marriage of Seán Ó Neachtain and Winifred Nangle, and one wonders if he got it wrong …’; agus deir Máirín Ní Dhonnchadha (2002, 453-4): ‘[T]his tradition is probably spurious as Winifred Nogle and her putative marriage to [Seán] Ó Neachtain are otherwise unknown.’
thóg sí Séamas Ó Fearghail in amhlachas Bhriain. Ba as Co. an Longfoirt é Séamas agus bhí sé ina chónaí i mBaile Átha Cliath thart ar 1728 nó tamall gearr roimhe sin (O’Rahilly 1912-3, 156), agus é ar dhuine de na scoláirí Gaeilge sin a raibh aithne ag ag Tadhg Ó Neachtain orthu – rud a d’fhág go bhfuil sé luaite i ndán Thaidhg Sloatin scothadh na Gaoidhilge grinn (O’Rahilly 1912-3, 160, línte 85-8). Ní raibh na ceithre bliana déag slán ag Brian Ó Fearghail faoin am a bhfuair Seán Ó Neachtain bás i Márta na bliana 1729, rud a d’fhágfadh go raibh sé ró-óg le go meadhú aithne aige ar Sheán; agus ní heol dom aon fhianaise a thabharfadh le tuiscint go raibh aithne aige ar Thadhg.

Ní móide mar sin go raibh aon eolas díreach ag Ó Fearghail faoi imeachtaí Sheáin Uí Neachtain, agus más mar sheanchas a fuair sé an cuantas a thug sé ar chumann na Neachtanaigh agus Úna de Nóгла, is ar éigean a fuair sé é go dtí thart ar an mbliain 1730, ar a luaithe (nuair a bhí sé féin cuíg bliana déag d’aois), is é sin trí scór bliain ar a laghad i ndiaidh ó phós siad, má phós. Ní hamháin sin é, ach níor scríobh sé a thuaireisc fén ar an himeachtaí sin go dtí an mbliain 1774, tuilleadh maith agus céad bliain, is dócha, i ndiaidh an ama ar tharla siad, má tharla. Ón uair nach bhfuil aon fhianaise a thacódh le scéal Bhriain Uí Úaithigh le fáil in aon fhoinse eile, ní féidir a leagadh agus a thuilleadh de a bheith ina fhinscéal, ach ba dhóigh liom gur cumadóireacht de chuid Uí Úaithigh féin an chuid is mó de. Níor leasc le Brian Ó Fearghail dul i mbun na cumadóireachta agus an eachtra a spreag dán á cur i láthair aige. Mar shampla, i dtaca leis an dán Aithris dom agus ná can gól, ‘Ceist Shéamais Uí Chatháin ar an gcraonn agus freagra an chráin air’, scríobh sé:

10 Tá gach seans ann, dar liom, go raibh Brian Ó Fearghail níos sine fós faoin am ar chuail sé trácht ar Sheán Ó Neachtain. Tá Cnoc Sciatháin, aith ar rugadh é, thart ar fiche cilimeádar díreach trasna na tíre ó Chluain Oileáin, agus ní féidir talamh slán a dhéanamh de go meadhú eolas ag muintir Chnoc Sciatháin faoin Neachtanaigh. B’théidir gur le linn do cheathair ag cur faoi i mBaile Thomáis i ngar do Chluain Oileáin a chuailt sé trácht na Neachtanaigh, is é sin, agus é ina fhearr lánta hí a bhí ag saothrú a choda mar threádaí nó. Deir Brian go raibh ta-life i gCluain Oileáin i seilbh ‘Thos. Naghten of Tho[m]a[stown, Esq.’ lena linn fein (RIA LS 146 (23 O 5), 49). Ba é sin an Captaen Naughton, ar Phrotastúnach é, ach, más fáir don Bhrian Ó Fearghail, a d’iompaigh ina Chaitliceach sular bhásaigh sé (‘Agus d’iompaigh ó earráid te hucht éag’, Mac Enery 1945-7, 161, v.16). Ní móide gur uaidh siúd a fuair an Fearghailché a chuid seanchais faoi Sheán Ó Neachtain.
One James Cain composed the above, whom I well remember to see, and as he was coming from Lord Dillon’s, who then lived in Mounttalbut, to Sir Edward Crofton’s in Mote, the day suddenly changed with thick dark clouds, thunder and lightning, accompanied with prodigious heavy rain, which occasioned said Kein to shelter himself in the trunk of a withered huge oak, on the lands of Tobberciogh, now Rocksavage. *He drew forth pen, ink, & paper* [liomsa an bhéim anseo], and whilst the storm continued was rhiming the above.’ (23 O 35, 26; féach *RIA Cat.* 134-5)

Ina theannta sin níor luaigh Tadhg Ó Neachtain riamh go raibh a athair ina bhaintreach nuair a phós sé Úna Ní Bhroin. Go deimhin, mar atá áitithe ag William Mahon (2000, 26 n. 44), ghlac sé leis gur d’Úna Ní Bhroin a chum Seán an dán *Rachainn fón gcoill leat, a mhaighdean na n-órpholt*. Ar lgh 79-82 den lámscríbhinn LNÉ G 135 (a bhreac sé sna blianta 1739-52) scríobh Tadhg tríd dhán a chum a athair dá mháthair, dhá cheann acu á caoineadh nuair a fuair sé bás, *A théagair, is é m'éagsa is mé beo do bháis* (faoin gceannsteideal ‘Ar bháis Úna Ní Bhroin, bean Sheáin Uí Neachtain, seó amhrán do rinne sé i gerá croí’) agus *Thug mé searc mo chléibh is mo ghrá* (faoin gceannsteideal ‘Amhrán iar mbás Úna Ní Bhroin. S. Ó N.’), agus eatarthu sin *Rachainn fón gcoill leat, a mhaighdean na n-órpholt*, is an ceannsteideal seo ag gabháil leis: ‘Ag seo na héanlaith darbh eol páirt dá deise seo ina n-óige mar dhearbhhas Seán ag suirí re hÚna aga mealladh.’

11 Ón uair gur phós Tadhg féin faoi cheathair (féach Flower 1926, 98-9; Ó Háinle 1992, 13), ba dhóigh leat nár leasc leis a lua gur phós a athair níos mó ná bean amháin, dá mb’fhíor é sin. Is iad na mná a phós Tadhg: Cáit Nic Fheorais a fuair bás 12 Aibreán, 1714; Máire Ní Chomáin a fuair bás 29 Samhain, 1715 (féach Flower 1926, 99); Máire Ní Reachtagáin (féach thíos lch 65); agus Bett / Betty / Bess Meares ón Muileann gCearr, Co. na hfarmhí, a phós sé 3 Samhain, 1733, agus a fuair bás 23 Iúil, 1745. Iséibl Ní Láithrín / Larrach / Lairín a thug Tadhg ar an gceathrú bean seo i nGaeilge (maidir leis na leaganacha éagsúla dá hainm is dá sloinne i mBéarla is i nGaeilge a d’úsáid Tadhg, féach LS LNÉ G 135, 128-32, agus Flower 1926, 99).

Cúig véarsa dhéag atá sa leagan de Rachaimn fón gcoill leat, a mhaighdean na n-órfholt atá i lámhscríbhinn Thaidhg Úi Neachtain .i. an leagan a d’fhhoilsigh Úna Ní Fhaircheallaigh (1911, 3-9), ach go bhfuil línte 73-96 (= trí véarsa) in easnamh air. Tá leagan eile den amhrán ar marthain a bhfuil an chóip is sine de i lámhscríbhinn a bhreac Risteard Tuibear sa bhliain 1717, mar atá RIA 111 (23 L 32). Seacht véarsa dhéag atá sa leagan sin (atá ar lgh 22-3) .i. an leagan a d’fhhoilsigh Úna Ní Fhaircheallaigh ach go bhfuil línte 65-72 (= aon véarsa amháin) in easnamh air. Cóip den leagan fada seo a bhreac Brian Ó F fearghail in 23 O 35, 48-9, ach ní ó lámhscríbhinn Risteard Tuibear a d’athscríobh sé í. An leagan amach a bhí i lámhscríbhinn an Tuibearaigh ar an gcuid den ábhar a bhaineann le hábh ar an gcuid, is é atá iontu aithris ar an gcoillteal atá i lámhscríbhinn an Tuibearaigh, mar atá, ‘Ag seo cuide de shuir Seán Úi Neachtain.’ Ina theannta sin, tar éis nach aisling é an t-amhrán seo, is é an chéad ceann teideal a chuir Ó Fearchail air, ‘Aisling Sheáin Úi Neachtain,’ mar atá, ‘Aisling Sheáin Úi Neachtain, más fior do Bh[rian] Ó Fearchail.’ An t-amhrán a leanann Rachfainn fón gcoill leat, a mhaighdean na n-órfholt i lámhscríbhinn an Tuibearaigh .i. Tar, a bháis, tráth is beir máthra leat, tá na focail sin ‘Aisling Sheáin Úi Neachtain’ mar ceann teideal air. 15 Ní foláir nó

13 Meadaracht le ceithre aiceann in aghaidh na líne atá sa lá. Is í deilbh
na chéad líne ann: x ~ ~ ai ~ ~ ai ~ ~ ó ~
Bhris Úna Ní Fhaircheallaigh gach líne ina dhá cuid ina heagránas agus rinne véarsa
as gach leathéarsa.

14 Mar fhianaise leis sin féach, mar shampla, go bhfuil an léamh botúnach ‘ascreithé’
sa cheathrú líne den tríú véarsa ag Tuibeair, áit a bhfuil an léamh ceart ‘ahega’ (= a
théagair) ag Ó Fearchail.

15 23 L 32, 24. Tá an t-amhrán seo curtha i geló ag Úna Ní Fhaircheallaigh (1911, 16-
20). Tugtar ‘Aisling Sheán Úi Neachtain’ air i lámhscríbhinn eile freisin, mar atá, RIA
518 (23 D 39), 87 (1753) is 628 (23 A 25), 75 (1770, 1780) agus MN M 105, 64 (1816). Bhí
cuntas Edward O’Reilly ar an amhrán seo ag teacht leis an tuiscint gur aisling é
freisin. Dúirt seiseán agus é ag trácht ar dhán dar tús Gluais a bháis trath ‘sheir me leat’
gur chum Seán Ó Neachtain é ‘on seeing his wife, Una or Winifred O’Brian [sic], in a
dream, after her death’ (1820, 216). Is cinnti gurb é an dán atá faoi chaoibidil agam
anseo a bhí i gceist ag O’Reilly, mar níl sa chéad líne sin aige ach leagan leasaithne den
chéad líne den chóip den chéad tríocha líne den dán seo a bhreac Tadhg Ó Neachtain
in LNÉ G 135, 139-40, mar atá, Gluais a bháis go trath bir me leat. Bhíodh gur dhoigh le
O’Reilly gur i ndiaidh d’Úna bás a fháil a chum Seán an dán seo, is é an ceann teideal
a chuir a mhac, Tadhg, air: ‘Seán Ó Neacht[aín] cecinit ag suirí re Úna Ní Bhroin, a
bhean pósta.’ Is dóigh, mar sin, gur ghlac Risteard Tuibear leis gur cúpla (.i. dhá dhán
ghrá) an dán seo de chuid Sheán Úi Neachtain a bhreac sé in 23 L 32, 22-25.
gurbh amhlaidh a bhí i gcás na lámhscríbhinne a bhí mar eiseamláir ag Brian Ó Fearghail freisin, agus gur cheangail seisean an ceann-teideal sin go hiónmhrallach leis an aon dán amháin le Seán Ó Neachtain a chóipeáil sé.

 Bhí teacht ag Brian Ó Fearghail ar ainm an fhíle i gceann-teideal an amhráin, mar sin; agus bhí teacht aige air sa dara líne den séú véarsa déag den amhrán freisin. Sa véarsa sin ‘freagraíonn’ an bhean an fhíle agus tugann ‘… a Sheáin bhig Uí Neachtain’ air (Ní Fhaireachalleagh, líne 124). Bhí teacht aige ar ainm na mná dá cumadh an t-amhrán i. ‘Úna inín Shéamais’ sa dara líne den deichiú véarsa den amhrán (Ní Fhaireachalleagh, líne 76), véarsa nach bhfuil i leagan Thaidhg Uí Neachtain de ach atá i leagan Risteaird Tuibear agus i leagan Bhriain Uí Fhhearghail féin.

Ní luaitear slóinne na mná dá cumadh an t-amhrán in aon áit i lámhscríbhinn Risteaird Tuibear (23 L 32). Tharlódh gur chuir scríobháil éigin idir 1717 agus 1774 ceann-teideal leis an dán Rachaimn fón goill leat, a mhaighdean na n-órfholt, inar tugadh de Nógra ar an mbean sin; ach tharlódh sé freisin nach raibh an slóinne sin luaithe leis an amhrán sa chóip ón a dearn Brian Ó Fearghail a leagan féin, agus gur thug sé sin caoi dó dul i mbun na cumadóir-eachта. Níl aon fhianaise inmheánach i náisiúin an aon chóip dá maireann den

16 Deir Brian Ó Fearghail sa cheannteideal a chuir sé leis an amhrán seo gur ‘mac fir dúiche, [a] bhí ina chónaí i bparóiste Druma’ ab ea Seán Ó Neachtain. Sa leagan den amhrán bhreac Ó Fearghail tá ‘fianaise’ leis an eolas sin sa cheathrú líne den cheathrú véarsa déag: in ait ‘Ag tafann mar choileán gan fhiáin gan fhiatacht’ (féach Ní Fhaireachalleagh, línte 111-2) tá ‘sa bporraisde drumma ta fortún da thrial duit’. Tá mé san amhras, áfach, gurb é Brian Ó Fearghail féin a chuir an líne sin mar chomhoain ar an amhrán mar níl sí le fáil i leagan Thaidhg Uí Neachtain ná i leagan Risteard Tuibear, ní réidhionn sí leis an dtagann roimpi sa véarsa agus tá sí bacach i dtaca le meadaracht is cáiliúil de.

17 I leagan Bhriain Uí Fhhearghail den amhrán tá an ceann-teideal ‘Freagra Úna, más fior’ roimh an tríú véarsa ón deireadh (.i. roimh líne 121 in Ní Fhaireachalleagh). Níl sé sin sa chóip a bhreac Tadgh Ó Neachtain ná sa cheann a bhreac Risteard Tuibear, sa tsli go gceapfainn gurbh é Ó Fhearghail féin a chuir mar chomhoain ar an amhrán é. Mar sin féin, is é atá sa véarsa sin den amhrán (Ní Fhaireachalleagh, línte 121-4) agus b’fhéidir sna trí véarsa dheiridh de (Ní Fhaireachalleagh, línte 121-44) freagra na mná. Ní raibh a bhac ar Sheán Ó Neachtain an chuid sin den amhrán a chumadh chomh maith leis an gcoinne eile de; áitíonn Máirín Ní Dhonnchadha, áfach, gurbh í Úna Ní Bhroin a chum na véarsaí sin (2002, 422-3, 453).
dán sin i dtaoibh ‘Úna de Nógla’ agus, mar atá luaite agam cheana, tugann mac Sheáin, Tadhg, le fios gur dá mháthair féin, Úna Ní Bhroín, a chum Seán é. Dá bhrí sin, pé ar bith bunús a bhí le scéal sin Bhriain Uí Fhearghail, is cosúil nach raibh aon bhaint aige le Rachainn fón gcoill leat.

An bhféadfaidh sé a bheith i gceist gur phós Seán Ó Neachtain bean darbh ainm Úna de Nógla i ndiaidh bhás Úna Ní Bhroín sa bhliain 1706/7? Deir Alan Harrison gurb amhlaidh a tharla (1988, 52), ach ní thugann sé aon fhianaise leis an tuairim seo. Má phós, is cinnte nach leis an bpósadh sin a bhairn scéal Bhriain Uí Fhearghail, mar is é an tuairisc a thug sé ar an Neachtanach ann gur ‘ógánach’ ab ea é nuair a bhí sé ag suirí le hÚna de Nógla, agus ní raibh sé óg a thuilleadh faoin mbliain 1706/7.18 Agus ar aon chaoi, níor luaigh Tadhg Ó Neachtain gur phós a athair aon bhean i ndiaidh Úna Ní Bhroín, ach oiread le roimpi.

2. BROTHER TOM

Sa lámhscríbhinn TCD 1361 (H.4.20), 597, bhreac Tadhg Ó Neachtain liosta de leabhair agus de lámhscríbhinní a bhí tugtha ar iasacht aige ag amanna éagsúla thath ar an mblaíin 1736.19 Seo cuid de:

The books lent abroad.
Foresith has Clarindon.20

18 Ar an gcaoi chéanna deir Tadhg Ó Neachtain go raibh a athair agus a mháthair ‘ina n-óige’ nuair a bhí siad ag suirí (féach thuas, lch 60). Ní fios cén uair a rugadh Seán Ó Neachtain, ach déanann May H. Risk amach (1975, 48) gur dócha gur rugadh é roimh 1654 agus gur féidir gur rugadh é chomh luath le 1640. D’fhágadh sé sin go raibh sé ar a laghad dó bhliain is leathchéad d’aois sa bhliain 1706/7 agus go bhféadfaidh sé a bheith sí bliana is trí scór d’aois. Faoin mblaíin 1728 nó b’fhéidir tamall roimhe ‘seanóir ársaigh’ ab ea Seán de réir Thaidhg, mar a luadh cheana, lch. 55 thuas.

19 Féach Harrison 1988, 39-40; féach freisin Ó Háinle 1986, 114, n. 38. Tá cuid de na hiontrálacha sa liosta scriosta amach ag Tadhg ar shíl a thabharfadh le fios go raibh na leabhair / lámhscríbhinní sin faighte ar ais aige. Tá roinnt ainmneacha agus teideal nua curtha leis an liosta aige freisin: tá siad seo curtha idir lúbíní cruinne agam. Baineann an iontráil faoi ‘brother Tom’ leis an mbunliosta. Iontráil bhreise is ea an ceann deireanach sa liosta a bhfuil an dáta 1736 ag gabháil leis: thabharfadh sé sin le fios gur uair éigin níos túise ná dáta an hiontrála sin (pé dáta é) sa bhliain 1736, nó fú roimh an mblaíin sin, a breacadh an bunliosta. An iontráil dheireanach sa liosta ag Alan Harrison (1988, 40), níl sí sa liosta seo a léirtear i gceart ar bith: i measc nostaí éagsúla ag bun an leathanagh (598) i ndiaidh an chinn ar a bhfuil an liosta seo atá sí, ait a bhfuil an dáta ‘1736, June 30’ ag gabháil léi.

Oliver French a Virgil and *The hind and pant[her],*21 *The man on the glib, Malart an ghreimsig.* (John Heydon22 has the Irish survey.)

Brother Tom: *The garden of health, Criathar meala, agus *Eochair Pharthaís.*23

Stephen Rice:24 an English *Metamorphoses.*25 (Has *Farmaltas*26 and another book.)

... (1736 Mr Tipper27 has naor,28 *Imeacht cúигir, Gleacaí,*29 *Leabhar an reacht,* agus leabhar eile.)

Agus é á lua go ndearna Tadhg an tagairt sin don duine seo ar a dtug-ann sé ‘brother Tom’, labhraíonn Alan Harrison faoi ar shlí a thabh-arfadh le tuiscint gur ghlac sé leis gur deartháir de chuid Thaidhg ab ea é,30 ach tá mise geall go bhfuil sonraí freisin gur deartháir céile, seachas deartháir, dá chuid ab ea é.

---

21 Dán fada le John Dryden a foilsíodh den chéad uair sa bhliain 1687 is ea é seo. Ní heol dom cé na saothair atá i gceist leis an dá theideal ina dhiaidh sin.
23 Leabhar urnaithe a chuir Seán Ó Neachtain le chéile agus a ndearna Seán Ó hÉidéin cóip de in 1735, ab ea *Eochair Pharthaís*; féach Ó Háinle 1983, 391, n. 6a. Glacaim leis gur leabhair chráifeacha freisin an dá cheann a luaíonn don chéile agus donthaí gur é an dá cheann sin. Ní léir dom féin do dhéanamh obair freisin de thionchar den chuid leabhar a bhí ann i leith an leagan de *The garden of health* agus go bhfuil seachtain agus de chuid de a sheas. Ní féidir liom a thabhairt chuig tugann é sin go bhfuil seachtain freisin i leith an leagan de *A godly garden out of which most comfortable herbs may be gathered for the health of the wounded conscience of all penitent sinners* a d’fhios sé liom sin.
28 Tá smúid ar an bhfocal seo sa lámhscríbhinn, ach sélim gur ‘naor’ (= ‘An aor’, b’fhéidir) atá ann. Níl a fhios agam cé níos saothar atá i gceist.
29 Dhá shaothar a chum Seán Ó Neachtain iad sin, *Imeacht an Chúigir* agus *An Gleacaí Géaglónnach*; féach Ó Háinle 1983, 393, n. 7d, agus 391, n. 6c.
Phós Tadhg Máire Ní Reachtagáin, an tríú bean aige, i bhFeabhra na bliana 1716/17, rud a chuir sé féin i gcuntas sa lámhscríbhinn MN B 9 (a), 1 (féach Ó Fiannachta 1967, 130-1; Ó Háinle 1992, 15). Fuair deartháir de chuid Mháire, Seoirse,31 bás 15 Samhain, 1725 (féach Flower 1926, 99; Ní Shéaghdha 1977, 62), agus cuireadh é i Laithreach Cora, Co. na Mí, mar a luaitear sa chéad líne den chaoineadh a cumadh faoi, Faoi liag sa Láithreach, crá mo chroí is mo chléibh.32 Fuair Máire bás, 11 Aibreán 1733 (Flower 1926, 99),

‘Thomas Norton’ éigin i nótá doiléir a breacadh ar an taobh istigh de chlúdach lámhscríbhinne a bhreac Tadhg Ó Neachtain idir 1723 agus 1741, i.e. RIA 24 D 39: ‘Thomas Norton – i beg pardon John Heydon.’ ‘A later addition’ a thuig Tomás Ó Conchheanainn (RIA Cat. 3610) ar an nótá sin, ach ní fhéadfadh sé a bheith mórán nóis deireanaí, más é Seán Ó hÉidéin, cara Thaidhg Uí Neachtain, an dara duine a luaitear sa nótá. I gcáipéisí Laidine agus Béarla de chuid na bliana 1709 tugtar ‘Naghten’ ar Sheán agus ar Thadhg Ó Neachtain (féach Ó Cléirigh 1939a, 104; 1939b, 196), ach tugtar ‘Norton’ ar Thadhg i gcáipéisí Béarla de chuid na mblianta 1724 agus 1731 (Flower 1926, 103, Ó Cléirigh 1939a, 106) agus d’úsáid sé féin an fhóirm bheanna i nótá Laidine agus Béarla oifigeach. Ní fhéadfadh sé a bheith mórán nóis deireanaí, más é Seán Ó hÉidéin, cara Thaidhg Uí Neachtain, an dara duine a luaitear sa nótá. I gcáipéisí Eolaíochta, thálonch ‘Laithreach Cora’ an leagan a bhí ag Thaidhg Ó Neachtain, 1739/5, Ó Cléirigh 1939a, 104; 1939b, 196. Béarlaíocht Eolaíochta, Thaidhg Ó Neachtain, 1739/5, Ó Cléirigh 1939a, 104; 1939b, 196. D’fhéadfadh gael a bheith ag an Thomas Norton sin an beaga agus an bheith agus a thúsaigh chéanna, dar leis, ‘[lathreach] bruin’, tugann sé freisin ‘laitheacht bruin’ agus mar mhalairtí air sin ‘Lâthrach B.’ agus ‘Láthrach B.’

Cumadh caoineadh eile faoi bhás Sheoirse, mar atá, Is mise a chaill an planda dílis. Leag Thadhg é sin ar a athair sa lámhscríbhinn chéanna sin G 132 mar a bhfuil sé le fáil díreach a chur i bhféin féin, 111-5. Ach i lámhscríbhinn eile, RIA 410 (23 I 23) (1758-9; scriobhaí, Wítear Ó hEasiaun) is ar Mháire Ní Neachtáin, bean THaidhg, a leagtar é (Ich 66). Bíodh gurb é ‘Laithreach Cora’ atá molta mar cheartlagnostic ag Coimisiún na Logainneacha. ‘Laithreach Corra’ an leagan atá ag Hogan (1910, 476), ach má thug an logainm eile ina bhfuil e imimint thosaigh chéanna, dar leis, ‘[lathreach] bruin’, tugann sé freisin ‘laitheacht bruin’ agus mar mhalairtí air sin ‘Lâthrach B.’ agus ‘Láthrach B.’


32 Ba é Tadhg Ó Neachtain a chum an caoineadh sin, is costúil, agus tá cóip de i lámhscríbhinn bhreac Tadhg Ó Neachtain, G 132, 109-11. Maird leis an logainm, ‘lairéacht’ atá a lámhscríbhinn, ach éilíonn an mheadarachtá sa chéad siolacha. Tá mí buioch den Dr. Seán Ó Ceartaigh faoi a deheinmitú dom gurb é ‘Láithreach Cora’ atá molta mar cheartlagnostic ag Coimisiúin na Logainmeacha. ‘Láithreach Corra’ an leagan atá ag Hogan (1910, 476), ach má thug an logainm eile ina bhfuil e imimint thosaigh chéanna, dar leis, ‘[lathreach] bruin’, tugann sé freisin ‘laitheacht bruin’ agus mar mhalairtí air sin ‘Láthrach B.’ agus ‘Láthrach B.’

Cúramph caoineadh eile faoi bhás Sheoirse, mar atá, Is mise a chaill an planda dílis. Leag Thadhg é sin ar a athair sa lámhscríbhinn chéanna sin G 132 mar a bhfuil sé le fáil díreach a chur i bhféin féin, 111-5. Ach i lámhscríbhinn eile, RIA 410 (23 I 23) (1758-9; scriobhaí, Wítear Ó hEasiaun) is ar Mháire Ní Neachtáin, bean THaidhg, a leagtar é (Ich 66). Bíodh gurb é Thaidhg atá ag caint sa dán, d’aithiteach Mary Risk (1951, 479) gurbh e Seán Ó Neachtain údar an dán, agus dúirt gur ar éigean a leagfadh Thadhg an dán ar a athair dá mba í a bhean féin a chum é i ndáiríre. Tá dath ar an aitidh sin, dar liom. Glacann Máirín Ní Dhomhchadh (2002, 424, 454) leis, afach, gurb é Máire Ní Neachtáin a chum Is mise a chaill an planda dílis. Tá an chóip den dán atá in 23 I 23 sách truaillithe agus agus é gairdeóireacht súch an dáonta uirthi freisin ag scriobh/hscriobhaithe éigin. Dhadhársas atá ar na breiseanna a chuir Tadhg lena dhán féin faoi bhás Sheoirse, tá siad curtha sa lámhscríbhinn seo le deireadh Is mise a chaill an planda dílis.
agus cuireadh ise freisin san áit chéanna mar a luaigh Tadhg i ndán a chum sé á caoineadh, mar atá, Och, och, gan mo cheann ina linn déara:33 ‘… mo chéile/ tá anocht sínte faoi líg, mo léanchreach/ i Laithreach Cora na gcorp naofa.’34 Thabharfadh sé sin le tuiscint gur bhain muintir Reachtágan le paróiste Laithreach Cora.

Is cosúil go rabhthas ag súil leis go dtabharfadh deartháir Sheoirse, Tomás, aire dá bhaintreach, Eastair Ní Bhreasail, agus dá gclann óg, ach gur tháinig an galar dubhach ar Thomás i ngeall ar bháis Sheoirse agus go raibh sé ag déanamh trua dó féin in áit dul i gcúram na bpáistí sin a bhí ‘taobh leis mar athair’, mar a dúirt Tadhg Ó Neachtain (Ó Cléirigh 1939b, 200). Mheas duine uasal darbh ainm Mac Ulron go raibh iompar Thomáis míréasúnta ar fad, agus, dá bhí, sin, nuair a bhí sé i mBaile Átha Cliath chuir sé fios ar Thadhag agus d’iarr air scríobh chuig an Ath. Proinsias Laighneach lena impí air comhairle a chur ar Thomás (Ó Cléirigh 1939b, 200), rud a rinne 6 Feabhra, 1725/6.

Rugadh Proinsias Laighneach i mí Dheireadh Fómhair, 1651, más fíor do Burke (1762, 588); oirníodh ina shagart é i Tuy sa Spáinn sa bhliain 1686 agus cláraíodh é mar shagart paróiste Laithreach Cora sa bhliain 1704 (Ireland. Privy Council, 1705).35 Nuair a bhí sé tar éis tuilleadh agus triocha bliain a chaitheamh mar shagart pobail (Burke 1762, 588), thart ar an mbliaín 1720, dar le Fenning (1962, 30), chuaigh sé in ord N. Doiminic in Áth Troim, Co. na Mí. Ní in Áth Troim fén a bhí teach na nDóiminiceach na fadhb an uaidh, áit a raibh locus refugii acu ar bhruach thuaidh na Bóinne.
siar ó dheas ó Áth Troim, agus ar an taobh thall den Bhóinn ó Laithreach Cora agus tuilleadh agus dhá chiliméadar déag díreach trasna na tíre uaidh.

Ní raibh an tAth. Laighneach ina shagart paróiste i Laithreach Cora a thuilleadh, mar sin, nuair a fuair Seoirse Ó Reachtagáin bás sa bhliain 1725,36 agus bhí a fhios ag Tadhg Ó Neachtain nach raibh. Go deimhin is cosúil go raibh a fhios aige go beacha go raibh an sagart lonnaithe taobh thall den Bhóinn ó Laithreach Cora mar scríobh sé ina litir chuig an Ath. Laighneach: ‘mo thuá an tsean-Bhéinn do beith eadraibh …’ (féach Ó Cléirigh 1939b, 199-200). Shílfeá freisin gur thuig sé go mbeadh ar an sagart turas acharach nach a chur de le teach comh fada le Laithreach Cora, sa chaoi, siúd is gurbh fhéarr leis gur ó bhéal a chuirfeadh sé chomhairle ar Thomás, gur ghlac sé leis gurbh fhéidir gur i litir dheanadh sé amhlaidd: ‘né ba cadh bháithín, móin, ná sliabh síbh ón gcumhacht tug bhur nDia féin daoibh, ag cur a aithne in eagar i do bhriathraibh béal, más féidir, nó i do scríbhinn’ (féach Ó Cléirigh 1939b, 200).

Rinne an tAth. Laighneach rud ar Thadhg agus scríobh litir fhada gan mhoill (12 Feabhra, 1725/6) chuig Tomás á chomhairliú go dian, ach go cneasta, i mBéarla bláfar. Gach uair dar labhair sé leis ina ainm ‘Tom’ a thug sé air.37

Ní foláir nó go raibh teagmháil ag Tadhg le Tomás uair éigin ina dhiaidh sin, tráth a bhfuair sé leis an Ath. Laighneach uaidh agus ar bhreac sé an chóip di atá i LS H. 4. 20, 15-21. Is dócha, fad a mhair a bhean, Máire, go raibh caidreamh ag Tadhg lena muintir-se agus gur thug sé cuairt ar Laithreach Cora ó am go chéile. Ní foláir nó go ndeachaigh sé ann ar aon nós ar shochraid Mháire sa bhliain 1733. Nóforbh aon iontas é, más ea, go mbeadh sé fós i dteagmháil le Tomás roinnt blianta ina dhiaidh sin agus, dá mbraithfeadh sé go raibh sólás agus cabhair spioradálta ag teastáil ó Tomás faoi mar a theastaigh


sa bhliain 1725-6, go dtabharfadh sé roinnt leabhar cráifeach dó le léamh. Más mar sin a bhí, ní foláir gurb é an duine céanna é an ‘Tom’ ar scríobh an tAth. Laighneach chuige, i.e. Tomás Ó Reachtagáin, agus an ‘Tom’ atá luaite ag Tadhg Ó Neachtain sa liosta de daoine ar thug sé leabhair agus lámhscríbhhinní ar iasacht dóibh. Níorbh aon iontas é go dtabharfadh Tadhg ‘brother’ ar dheartháir céile dá chuid; tar éis an tsaoil thug sé ‘mo dheirfiúr dhíl’ ar Eastair Ní Bhreasail, bean Sheoirse Úi Reachtagáin,38 a raibh a ghaol léi níos faide amach ná an gaol a bhí aige le Tomás Ó Reachtagáin.
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*Coláiste na Tríonóide, Baile Átha Cliath*
THE VERBAL ENDING -IDH/ -IGH IN MUNSTER DIALECTS

1. In most of the spoken dialects of Irish the verbal ending which is written -idh/-igh is subject to the variation in form illustrated here for a Munster dialect (1) and for an Ulster dialect (2); the modified spelling follows Ó Sé (1995, 43) and Ó Baoill (1996, 30, 31, 54) respectively.

(1)

cuirhig Seán ~ cuirhe sé  ‘Seán will put/send ~ he will put/send’
beig Seán ~ be sé  ‘Seán will be ~ he will be’
cheannaig Síle ~ cheanna sí  ‘Síle bought ~ she bought’

(2)
cuirhí Seán ~ cuirhe sé
béy Seán ~ béy sé ~ be sé
cheannaí Síle ~ cheanna sí

The rightmost examples above are so called ‘analytic forms’ – closely bound phrases or even wordlike units consisting of a verbal form followed by a subject (personal) pronoun. The leftmost examples show the form of the ending before full (i.e. non-pronominal) noun phrase subjects, and also before demonstrative pronouns, e.g. cuirhig san ‘that one (or he) will put/send’ (Ó Sé 2000, 80). The additional option in the case of beidh sé in north Donegal will be noted. A number of works on Ulster dialects which I have consulted shed no light on O’Rahilly’s statement (1932, 55) that ‘sometimes in Northern Irish’ one hears mhíne Seán é for mhíní Seán é ‘S. explained it’, but it is not necessarily to be discounted for that reason; in any event he indicates that the phenomenon in question is uncommon.

2. In each alternating set in (1) and (2) it is the leftmost example which shows a direct reflex of the historical endings -idh and -igh. O’Rahilly (p. 53) states that: ‘Final -idh in Irish became everywhere -igh, in sound, in the course of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries.’ This merged -igh became -ig in Munster and -í in dialects from the northern reaches of Co. Galway northwards. In an intermediate zone extending from the west Galway littoral to south Leinster the reflex was a neutral vowel, so that cuirfidh is pronounced as cuirhe and cheannaigh as cheanna in all contexts. It is for this reason that the alternation in question cannot be exhibited for the Cois Fharraige,
Co. Galway, dialect described by de Bhaldraithe (1953). Since the leftmost forms in (1) and (2) show the regular reflexes, the rightmost forms cuirhe, be and cheanna must be due to some special development. Bergin (1904, 143) and O’Rahilly (1932, 55) put forward a phonetic explanation whereby the original fricative gh was deleted before the slender s of the closely-bound pronoun subject, the verb and pronoun forming a wordlike unit. In more recent linguistic terminology we might say that the gh was deleted before a morpheme boundary but not before a word boundary. Greene (1973, 127) rejected a purely phonetic development and suggested instead that the verbal form in cuirhe sé/sí continues the older conjunct form cuirfe and that that in cuirhig/cuirhí Seán continues the older absolute form cuirfidh. Bergin (p. 143) had already dismissed this possibility as ‘unlikely’ and Ó Buachalla (1997, 178) points out that pronoun subjects could occur with both absolute and conjunct forms in the Early Modern language. Greene did not explain how the conjunct and absolute forms might have been redistributed so that the former would be used before personal pronouns acting as subject and the latter in all other contexts, and this is a serious difficulty with his proposal. Ó Buachalla (pp. 178-9) avoids these difficulties with his suggestion that 1 pl. fut. forms such as beimid ‘we will be’ and buailfimid ‘we will hit’ were reanalysed as be + mid and buailfi + mid respectively. The reinterpretation of the ending mid as a pronoun (Connacht and Ulster muid) would have facilitated the use of other pronouns with the new bases be and buailfi. Both Greene’s and Ó Buachalla’s proposals require the alternation -ig ~ -e or -í ~ -e to have arisen first in the future tense and subsequently spread to the past tense (Greene 1973, 128, Ó Buachalla 1997, 179). The purpose of this article is to consider the Munster data in (1) in more detail than has hitherto been done and to uphold a future tense origin for this alternation.

3. The schema given for West Kerry in (1) is of necessity simplified. It is well known that the deletion of g before subject pronouns does not occur with all monosyllabic verbal forms in Munster. In my description of W. Kerry Irish (Ó Sé 2000, 271-301) I note be sé ‘he will be’, geó sé ‘he will get’, geó sé ‘he will go’, ragha sé ‘he will go’ and chua sé ‘he went’, but retention of the g in all other monosyllabic past tense forms, e.g. shuig sé ‘he sat’, luig sé ‘he lay down’, dhóig sé ‘he burnt’ etc. According to Ua Súilleabháin (1994, 515-16) a similar situation obtains in West Muskerry, but those monosyllables con-
taining long vowels which retain the g may drop it in fast speech, e.g. dhó’ sé ‘he burnt’. From the same area, which he refers to as Mid-Cork, Bergin (1904, 143-4) reports g-deletion in do ni sé ‘he washed’, do lui sé ‘he lay down’, do dhó sé ‘he burnt’, retention of g in do shuig sé ‘he sat down’, and both possibilities in do ghuig sé ~ do ghui sé ‘he prayed’. Allowing for some differences between W. Kerry and Muskerry, and some local variation within the broader West Cork area, it is uncontroversial that there has been extensive retention of g in monosyllabic forms in Munster.

4. What remains to be clarified is the extent to which g may be retained in polysyllabic forms such as cheannaig ‘bought’ or d’fhoghlamaig ‘learnt’ when a personal pronoun subject follows. Unfortunately, none of the works which have mentioned this matter since Bergin (1904), including Ó Sé (2000), have dealt with it in sufficient detail; furthermore, some of the descriptions are unclear, or potentially misleading. The following are summaries of existing treatments of this point, in chronological order:

(a) Bergin (1904, 143), referring to Muskerry (p. 139), says that the ‘g-forms are very rarely used with personal pronouns except in the case of monosyllabic verbs.’

(b) O’Rahilly (1932, 55) states in a footnote: ‘In Munster mhíng sé and the like may also be heard, but only when the words are pronounced in a more or less slow and deliberate (and hence disconnected fashion)’, but he does not make it clear whether the g may also be retained in the future tense (giving e.g. cuirhig sé).

(c) Sjoestedt-Jonval (1938, 131), describing W. Kerry Irish, gives cheannaig sé as the type-example of the 3 sg. past in the 2nd Conjugation and does not report cheanna sé/sí.

(d) Ó Cuív (1944, 112), in a historical section on the sounds of Muskerry Irish, records deletion of historical slender gh in final position in a number of forms and contexts, including: ‘In verbs when a pronoun subject follows, except in slow speech, e.g. mhínigh sé > mhíne sé, cuirfidh tú > cuirfe tú’ [I have omitted the author’s phonetic transcriptions here]; it seems to be implied that g < gh occurs in both past and future tenses in slow speech, but one would have wished for a more explicit statement accompanied by examples.

(e) Sheehan (1944, 136), describing the Irish of Ring, states that ‘final -idh’ is not pronounced in future tense forms such as tiocfa’ mé ‘I
will come’ and *an raghai*’ sé ‘will he go’, and that ‘the same rule holds for final -idh, -igh, or -ig of the 3rd sing. past tense active, unless the verb is a monosyllable’; note that his example (3b) ‘Ar bhaili’ Seán …?’ – ‘Níor bhailig’ (‘Did Seán collect …?’ – ‘No’) is at variance with the rule which he has just given.

(f) Breatnach (1947, 133), in a historical section on the sounds of Ring Irish, says that: ‘In some cases final palatal dh, gh is lost. This happens (1) in verbal forms followed by a pronoun, e.g. *dh’ime sé, be sé*’ [examples transliterated here]. In a footnote he gives as counterexamples without commentary the verbal forms [transliterated here] *dhreoirg sé* ‘it decayed’, *luig sé* ‘he lay down’, *threig sé* ‘he ploughed’.

(g) Wagner (1959, 18), lists only *cheanna sé* for W. Kerry, directly contradicting Sjøestedt-Jonval, and he explicitly adds that the form *cheannaig* is the basic past tense form but that *cheanna* is used before pronoun subjects.

(h) Ó Súilleabháin (1994, 517), writing on Munster dialects in general, states that: ‘Is ionann cás é do -g deiridh na haimsire fáistiní agus do -g na haimsire caite maidir lena dhul ar ceal’ (‘The same situation arises with the final -g of the future tense and the -g of the past tense as regards deletion’); however, his elaboration of this point cites only the monosyllabic form *raghaig* ‘will go’.

(i) Ó Sé (2000, 309) describes the alternation in W. Kerry Irish as entailing synchronically the deletion of the final g of the verbal form before a subject (personal) pronoun, giving examples from both the future and past tenses, and further remarking that: ‘Uaireanta coinnítear an g´i gcaint cháiréiseach’ (‘Sometimes the g’ is kept in careful speech’). The only examples given are [here transliterated] *lonnaig sé* ‘he settled’ and *déarfaí gob anso a dh’fhoghlamaig sé é* (‘It would be said that it was here he learned it’) from one particular speaker, Julília Bean de Lóndra. I failed to add that all examples of this retention of g which I have heard in the area were in the past tense, and that with *lonnaig* and *dh’fhoghlamaig* g-retention seems to be the norm.

(j) Ó Buachalla (2003, 69), describing the Irish of Cape Clear, states that with 2nd Conjugation verbs such as *ceannainn* the gh of the past tense form *cheannaigh* is not usually pronounced before the pronouns sé and sí (‘ní fhuaímnítear an gh de ghnáth roimh na forainmneacha sé/sí’); for the future tense (p. 71) he indicates that the dh is never pronounced (‘ní fhuaímnítear an consan -dh roimh fhorainmneacha’).
I note with regret that my own treatment of the matter is among the least satisfactory, and a revised statement of the situation in W. Kerry Irish is required. More generally, an examination of the evidence for Munster as a whole indicates that g-retention is well attested in the past tense and marginal in the future. Sjoestedt-Jonval had clearly noticed this divergence, but exaggerated it by failing to mention cheanna sé/sí.

5. In many years study of the spoken Irish of W. Kerry I have no note or recollection of having heard a retained g before a subject (personal) pronoun in future tense forms, whether monosyllabic îeig ‘will be’ or disyllabic like cuirig ‘will put’. I have noted this phenomenon often enough in disyllabic or trisyllabic forms in the past tense, however. The distinguished folklore collector Seosamh Ó Dálaigh of Dún Chaoin (Dunquin) invariably pronounced the -g in lonnaig sé ‘he settled down’ and dh’fhoghlamaig sé ‘he learned’, as Bean de Lóndra did, and this was irrespective of rate of speech or other stylistic considerations. Indeed, this phenomenon seems particularly common in trisyllabic forms like the latter, and can also be heard in forms such as shocaraig sé and thosanaig sé in which the medial vowel is historically epenthetic. It seemed appropriate to calculate statistics for g-retention in a body of texts collected and transcribed by somebody other than myself, and of necessity one which uses either phonetic script or modified orthography. The stories collected (with three exceptions, p. 85) from the storyteller Peig Sayers in Jackson (1938) are suitable for this purpose. There are various errors and misunderstandings in Jackson’s rendering of these texts (e.g. már throughout for Peig’s invariable muar ‘big’, confirmed by sound recordings, and a bhí i ndise na leapa for i bhfíainise na leapa ‘alongside the bed’, p. 47), but the point which concerns us here is non-lexical and Jackson would probably have been aware of its significance from Bergin’s and O’Rahilly’s references to it. These stories were dictated to Jackson, who took them down in phonetic script; the rate of delivery will therefore have been markedly slow, but presumably consistently so. I have calculated figures for three polysyllabic types, and these are presented in (3). 1st Conjugation future refers to variants of forms such as cuirfidh sé, 2nd Conjugation future to variants of forms such as ceannóidh sé, and 2nd Conjugation past to variants of forms such as d’imigh sé; the pronoun sé ‘he, it’ stands for the entire set of personal pronouns.
There is clear evidence here for a divergent treatment of the future and past tenses with regard to \textit{g}-retention. Although in the future tense the alternation \textit{cuírigh Seán} \textasciitilde{} \textit{cuírhe sé} is consistent virtually to the point of fixity, in the past tense we have in fact \textit{d'imig Seán} \textasciitilde{} \textit{d'imig sé} \textasciitilde{} \textit{d'ime sé}, and \textit{g}-retention is approximately as common as \textit{g}-deletion in this slow narrative style. The sole exception in the 1st Conjugation future in (3) above is in \textit{níor bhuaig capall ráis fós air}, \textit{agus ní lú mar bhuaifig sé go deó air} ‘no racehorse has beaten him before, and it is no likelier that one will beat him ever’ (p. 45). This isolated exception may be due to an unmarked hesitation or, as Dr Seán Ua Súilleabháin suggests, to a particularly emphatic delivery. One notes also the presence in the previous clause of a past tense form of \textit{buann ar} ‘defeats’ with expected \	extit{-g}. Monosyllabic verbs in this volume generally behave as indicated in my monograph on the dialect, but note \textit{g}-retention in \textit{pé uair a bheig sé} ‘whenever it will be’ (p. 60) and \textit{do chuaig sé} ‘he went’ (p. 53). The latter occurs in a story collected from Peig’s son Micheál Ó Guithín.

6. As a cross-check on the data from Jackson (1938) I have noted all examples of polysyllabic past tense analytic forms in \	extit{-ig} in c. 100 minutes of tape recordings of Peig Sayers which were made available to me by the RTÉ sound archive (the only corresponding future tense form was in verse, and lacked the \textit{g} as expected). Of twelve examples, eight show \textit{g}-retention (\textit{do thosanaig sí} ‘she began’; \textit{do shocaraig sé} ‘he arranged’; two instances of \textit{do bheannaig sé} ‘he blessed’; \textit{chumhdaig sí} ‘she covered’; \textit{do dh'aimsig sé} ‘he hit (a target)’; two instances of \textit{do dh'fhoghlamaig sé} ‘he learned’), and four show \textit{g}-deletion (\textit{do dh'iompa sé} ‘he turned’; \textit{dh'árda sé} ‘he lifted’; \textit{dh'ime sé} ‘he went away’; \textit{tháine sé} ‘he came’). Although \textit{tháine sé} is analogical, and perhaps historically late, it is surprisingly consistent in its \textit{g}-deletion, both in these recordings and in Jackson (1938); Sjoeestedt-Jonval (1938, 147) and Ó Sé (2000, 298) report
only tháine sé. The overall number of examples is smaller than one would expect because several of the recordings are of reminiscences which are largely in the past habitual. I conclude that Jackson (1938) accurately represented the narrator’s usage in this regard. A further crosscheck is provided by a story entitled ‘Iníon an cheannaí’ (The Merchant’s Daughter) narrated by Peig Sayers in 1933 and given in phonetic notation by Sjoestedt-Jonval (1938, 188-92). All six past tense analytic forms of 2nd Conjugation verbs in this text retain the g of the ending -ig before the pronouns sé and sí. Sjoestedt-Jonval’s reporting of only cheannaig sé in her grammatical description was probably due to an excessive reliance on oral narrative as a source of examples.

7. Dr Seán Ua Súilleabháin has supplied figures from one of the published volumes of folklore collected from the West Muskerry storyteller Amhlaoibh Ó Loingsigh (Ó Cróinin 1971). This yields 150 examples of -ig sé and 209 examples of -a sé or -i sé in the 2nd Conjugation past tense. This is a less even distribution than in the stories which Jackson collected on the Great Blasket, the figures for which are presented in (3) above, but the sample is much bigger in this case, making comparison difficult. In any event it would be necessary to examine a wider range of texts before suggesting an inter-dialectal difference. The only examples of g-retention before sé or other pronouns in the volume of Ó Loingsigh’s stories are as follows, with figures: beig sé (3), as against 11 examples of be sé; raghaig sé (1), raghaig tusa (1), as against 46 examples of ragha mé/tú/sé. One wonders whether the occasional instance of g-retention in the future tense in Muskerry Irish is confined to irregular monosyllabic forms.

8. On the basis of the foregoing discussion, it is clear that the schema presented for W. Kerry in (1) above must be modified as in (4):

(4) (a) cuirhig Seán ~ cuirhe sé
(b) beig Seán ~ be sé
(c) cheannaig Seán ~ cheannaig sé ~ cheanna sé

The retention of g in polysyllables (type 4c above) in W. Kerry is determined by at least the following factors:
(a) trisyllabic forms such as dh’fhoghlamaig typically retain the g in all styles of speech (Ua Súilleabháin points out that this would not appear to be true of West Muskerry);
(b) certain disyllabic forms such as lonnaig ‘settled’ also tend to retain the g in all styles of speech;
(c) other disyllabic forms, especially common forms such as d’imig ‘went away’ and cheannaig ‘bought’, typically delete the g in normal speech but show a high rate of retention (approaching 50%) in oral narrative style.

Some of the works cited in section 4 above state that g-retention is more common in slow speech; O’Rahilly’s formulation (1932, 55) is that it occurs ‘only when the words are pronounced in a more or less slow and deliberate (and hence disconnected fashion)’. It is, however, difficult to reconcile this claim with the very slight evidence which I have found for g-retention in the future tense. If rate of speech is the factor causing g-retention why does it not affect the past and future tenses equally? I have therefore been reluctant to cite slowness of speech above, although it may have a role. The morphological effects of varying rate of speech have not been systematically studied for Irish and it is as well to leave this matter open for the moment. On present evidence, there is a more compelling case for pointing to register as a factor and regarding (c) above in that light. Perhaps ‘careful’ or ‘deliberate’ speech are indicators of a higher register. This is supported by Breatnach’s statement (1947, 133) that: ‘A more studied pronunciation may be heard, however, with dh, gh = g’, e.g. in reciting verse’. We may also have to reckon with interpersonal and intergenerational variation. (It is possible that a linguistic variable in Labov’s sense is involved in all of this, but I do not have sufficient statistics to take that suggestion further.)

9. It is likely that an analogical relationship with another ending has helped to maintain a substantial degree of g-retention before sé and sí in the past tense. Several 2nd Conjugation verbs have -imh instead of -ig in their basic past tense form (Ó Cuív 1958) and -imh does not undergo deletion of its final consonant, in W. Kerry at any rate, e.g. sheasaimh sé ‘he stood’, chomhairimh sé ‘he counted’. Ó Cuív (p. 154) has explained the ending -imh as deriving from the verbal noun in -amh on the analogy of chuir ‘put, placed’: cur ‘putting, placing’ etc. Where -imh occurs in the absence of a verbal noun in -amh we apparently have analogical spread, e.g. bhailimh sé ‘he collected’ in
W. Kerry (verbal noun *bailiú* ‘collecting’). Ó Cuív (p. 155) shows that these past tense forms in *-imh* are attested as far back as the seventeenth century at least.

10. The clear divergence between the future and past tenses as regards the alternating forms of the ending *-idh/-igh* has undoubted historical implications. First, it seems to argue against the phonetic development suggested by Bergin and O’Rahilly. If deletion of slender *gh* before the slender *s* of a 3 sg. pronoun were involved one would expect it to have applied equally to future tense forms such as (in modified spelling) *cuirfgigh sé* and past tense forms such as *mhínígh sé*. It is not clear why the past tense should have undergone less deletion of *gh* in Munster if a purely phonetic process were involved. This suggests that a morphological explanation is required. However, it lies outside the scope of this article to comment further on the historical origins of these alternations.
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DIARMUID Ó SÉ

University College Dublin
INTRODUCTION

Geoffrey Keating’s history of ancient Ireland, the first work of modern Irish literature to draw on such sources as Leabhar Gabhála and compilations of Irish annals, became a landmark in Gaelic scholarship. Written in the early 1630s when most of his learned clerical contemporaries had chosen to write in Latin or English, his magnum opus gave a new impetus to those who cherished the literary traditions of the Irish language. Almost from the time of its completion c. 1634, manuscript copies of Foras Feasa ar Éirinn were disseminated throughout many parts of Ireland, but the full Irish version did not appear in print until the Irish Texts Society published it in four volumes, edited by David Comyn (1902) and P. S. Dinneen (1908, 1914). These are the volumes (as reprinted in 1987) used in the present survey.

This contribution is in no way intended as a denigration of Keating’s prodigious achievement, carried out in difficult conditions. But while his mellifluous classical prose became the model for later generations of writers, the very excellence of his style tended to obscure the fact that he was not part of the close-knit familial Irish literary tradition. The presumption that he attended a bardic school at Burgess, Co. Tipperary, is attributable to Thomas O’Sullevane, a shadowy character from the fringes of literary circles in London. The same unreliable source names Burgess as Keating’s place of birth, whereas recent work (Cunningham, 2002) indicates that Moortown Castle in the parish of Inishlounaght was his probable birthplace. In her biographical study, The World of Geoffrey Keating, Cunningham refers to ‘the theory that Keating had been trained in the bardic tradition where placelore was an inherent part of the body of knowledge preserved in the bardic schools’ (pp. 71-2). This theory does not seem to fit the facts, however. Though acquainted with the Mac Craith and Mac Aodhagáin families of his native county, and admired by contemporaries such as Dubhaltach Mac Fhirbhisigh and Maoilín Óg Mac Bruaideadha, he does not seem to have put in the requisite years of training, and for readings of early manuscripts probably depended largely on others. Cunningham has noted that an early sixteenth-century Ó Maoil Chonaire manuscript (now British Library, Egerton 1782) contains a miscellany that corresponds very
closely to a range of sources used by Keating in his *Foras Feasa*, and also quotes Anne Cronin, who showed that the Book of Lecan contained all the *Leabhar Gabhála* material used by Keating (Cunningham 2000, 78, 65). In the 1630s the Book of Lecan was in the possession of Archbishop Ussher, but was on loan to Conall Mageogaghagan of Lismoyney, Co. Westmeath, who may have provided Keating with copies of extracts. One tract, almost certainly used by Keating (for his boundaries of Midhe, *FFÉ* I 114), was edited by Paul Walsh from two manuscripts, RIA 1223 (D iv 2) and Oxford, Bodleian Library, Rawlinson B. 512 (Walsh 1912). Keating’s version appears to be related more to Rawl. B. 512, but of the thirty placenames listed in the tract he misread or copied incorrectly about one-third. As a grandson of Lughaidh Ó Cléirigh remarked, these old writings were often corrupt even before they reached Keating, *nar thug 7 nar légh go romhaith iad* (Ó Cuív 1965, 122). Due allowance must, of course, be made for the fact that we do not have any autograph copy of his work, so that variants from the norm may not all be his fault. But as against that, the earliest copyists belonged to professional literary families such as Úi Dhuibhgeannáin and Clann Úi Mhaol Chonaire who would have had too great a respect for Keating to alter his versions.

The whole point about *Foras Feasa ar Éirinn* is that it was intended as a comprehensive historical survey, in the broad sweep of which details such as name forms were quickly – and sometimes incorrectly – copied. As Cunningham remarks, ‘He was a synthetic historian, not a scribe, and he was interested in interpretation not transcription’ (2000, 81). But such was his reputation that his lead in regard to placenames was followed by later scholars – John O’Donovan, P. W. Joyce, T. F. O’Rahilly – and in particular by Edmund Hogan in whose *Onomasticon Goedelicum* practically all the placenames listed below were accepted without question.

(A) MISREADINGS AND MISTAKEN FORMS

[The following is the system used in treating the placenames: (1) Name and text as given by Keating, *FFÉ* vols I-IV, with part and page numbers. (2) Form deemed more correct, with identification of site where possible. (3) Relevant quotations from earlier texts to justify form given in (2).]

**Abhainn Chara** Abhainn Chara, gus *(v.l. go soiche) an Sionainn*, I 114. Abha(nn) Charadh Coinche, a boundary of ancient Midhe, prob.
the Little Brosna r., a tributary of the Shannon, between Cos Offaly and Tipperary. *cusind abainn frisa raiter abann Chara Coinche 7 in tSinann, AH I 3.*

**Achadh Cuinnire** Cathfuidh easpog Achadh Chuinnire, III 56. Achadh Cinn, an eccl. site in N. Co. Antrim (see *HDGP* 14 and *PNNI* 4, 221). *Cathub mc. Ferghusa, epscop Achid Cinn, AU 555.1 (= MartG 70); epscop Achiadh chuín, ATig. 554; Episcop Achiadh Cuinn, CS 555.*

**Aibhle** A hiath Aibhle i Leitribh Craoi, II 320. This text on the birth of Fiacha Muillethan obviously derives from Lec. (167a) where *ahiath* is at the end of l. 37 and *aib lai* on l. 38. Stokes’s reading (*RC* 11 (1890) 42) is a *hiathaib lai il-leitrib Crai.*

**Ael na Míreann** Easpog na Midhe, *no do réir Chamden easpog Ael na Míreann i. Uisneach,* III 386. Ail na Midhreadh, the ‘Rock of Judgements’ on the Hill of Uisneach, Co. Westmeath. Keating was inclined to give undue weight to extraneous sources; his mistaken version (‘stone of divisions’) is derived from William Camden’s ‘Elamirand’ (*Britannia*, 1st ed. (London 1586); ed. used by Keating prob. 1607 – see Cronin 1944, 251). Cf. *Easboc na Midhe no easboc Ael namidreth* (from TCD MS 1309 (H. 2. 12, no. 9), *Éigse* 17 (1978-9) 454).

**Ard Bric** gur thuit le hEoghan i n-Árd mBric, I 222. (Ard) Inbhir was the cognomen of the Eoghan in question. *coros marb Eogan airdInbir, LL l. 14772; Docer Fiachna 7 Aí án / la Heogan Inbir imshlán / docer Eogan Inbir úair, LG IV 238.*

**Áth Crionna** Ó áth Crionna go hÁrd-Céin, II 292. Crionna was a battle site, not a ford, near r. Boyne. *o tá Crinna co hÁrd Céin, LL l. 43267 (= ot[h]á Crinna, CGH 328f54).*

**Áth Luain** go Maothail, *as sin go hÁth-Luain, I 114. Áth Dá Onn, a boundary of Midhe, prob. near tl./L. Adoon, bar. Mohill, Co. Leitrim. co Maothail 7 assin d’Ath da on (v.l. lon), AH I 3.*

**Athghort** Cath Athghuirt i Seimhne, II 129. Cúil Athghoirt, a battle site at Island Magee, Co. Antrim. *cath Chúile Athguirt i Semniu, LG V 204; Cath Cuile Athgoirt tiar tra, LL ll. 2062, 6015.*
Baltinglas mainistear an Bhealaigh alias Baltinglas, III 354. Bealach Conghlaís is the usual Irish name for the abbey site in Co. Wicklow (as in AU (1) s.a. 1163) but this name seems to have been avoided by Keating (who wrongly associated it with Cork – see below).

Beag an Bun san áit ré ráidhthear Beag an Bun (v.l. Beganbun), III 324. Baginbun, landing-place of Raymond le Gros in S. Co. Wexford, A.D. 1170. The site was originally named Dún Domhnaill (as noted in III 330). Keating’s use of outside sources was not always to his advantage. ‘Beag an Bún’ is an illconceived hibernicisation of Baginbun, which, according to Orpen, may derive from the names of two ships that made landfall there (IUN I 183-8).

Bealach an Luchaide ó Bheirn trí gCarbad ag Carn Fhearadhagh go Luchad i.e. Bealach an Luchaide, III 70. Áth Luchaid, at Lughid Bridge in b. Inchiquin, Co. Clare. (Go hÁth Luchad in accompanying quatrain is more accurate.) o Carnd Feradaich co hAth Luciait, CGG 66.

Beanncha(i)r Inis Teimhin is Beannchair is Cluain Uama, III 156 (= CGG 4-6). Beigéire, Begerin Island in Wexford harbour. The fault here lay not with Keating, but with the MS of CGG from which he copied; cf. CGG 6). The LL version (ll. 39337-8 = CGG 222) reads: Inis Temli 7 Becher inn 7 Cluain Úama.

Beatha Fiachaidh mac Baodáin … gur thuit an tráth-so i gCath Beatha le Fiachaidh mac Déamáin, III 76-8. Leithead Midhinn, battle site in Ulster. Bellum Leithet Midind in quo cecidit Fiachna Lurgan. Fiachna m. Demmain victor erat, AU s.a. 626; Cath Lethid Midhínd in Druing, ATig. s.a. 625.

Bróin Bhearg Bróin Bhearg is Craobh Dhearg is Craobh Ruaidh, II 198. Téite Brecc, hospital at Eamhain Mhacha. in Chroebíud 7 in Téite Brecc 7 in Chroibderg, LL 1. 12495; dom sergligu .i. don Tetti Bricc, LU 1. 3294 (see Êigse 15 (1973) 107-9).

Brú Bhriodáin ag Brú Bhriodáin ag tóchar idir da mhagh i dtuath Ghéisille, II 104. Brí Dhamh, battle site in Úi Fhailgle. for Tennus in Uib Failghe, ar brí Bri Dam, hic Tóchur-etir-dá-magh, LG V 160 (= AFM I 28; LGen. 100.1); Iugulatio ... i mBrí Dam for Suaniu, AU s.a. 600 (= ATig., CS, AFM).
Camchluain Laighin féin do mharbh Brandubh i gCath Camchluana, III 114. Damhchluain (? recte Slabhra), where Brandubh, king of Laighin, was slain. Bellum Slaebhre in quo uictus est Brandubh ... Iugulatio Branduibh regis Laegen a genere suo per dolum [interpol.: a cath na Damcluana ro marbhadh], AU s.a. 605; Cath Slabra, ATig. s.a. 604.

Caoininis Ó bhFathaidh tángadar Gaill i gCaoimhínis (v.l. a gCaoimhínis) Ó bhFathaidh, III 156. A good example of Keating’s difficulty with clusters such as mm – which he (or perhaps his exemplar?) read as inin. Cam(m)as was prob. in south Co. Tipperary. tang-adar Goill i gCamas ó Fothaid Tíre, CGG 4; a Cammus Hua Fathaid Tíre, LL ll. 39331-2.


Ceall Mhic Creannáin I gCill mic Creannáin do gairthí Ó Domhnaill, III 12. Ceall Mac nÉanáin, Kilmacrenan, Co. Donegal. Teach Coluim Cille i Cill Mc. nEnain, AU s.a.1129; i cCill Mac Nénáin, BAR I 38.

Cealla Sáile Sláine is Cealla Sáile, III 156. Ceall Ausaille, Killashee near Naas, Co. Kildare. Sláín, ocus Orllasailli, CGG 6; Sláin 7 Cell Ausailli, LL ll. 39352-3; abbas Cille Ausailli, AU s.a. 829.

Cealltair/Cealltrach do marbhadh Ceannfaolaidh ... i gCath Cealltrach, III 138. Airchealtair, battle site in bar. Kells Upr, Co. Meath (see HDGP 34). i Cath Airceltra / Ailcheltra, LG V 380; do uathbás i nAirceltrú, LL ll. 1324-5; a hAirceltraibh, Ériu 4, 163.

Cloch Mhionnuirc cath idir Dhál Riada is Bhreatnaigh san áit dá ngairthear Cloch Mhionnuirc, III 144. Perh. Manner in Peebles, Scotland (see VC (1) 381; also CPNS, 387). in lapide qui uocatur Minuirc, AU s.a. 717 (= ATig. s.a. 716).
Cloch na Cinneamhna see Lia Fáil.

Coill Lamhruidhe Coill Lamhruidhe i bhFearaibh Rois ghoirthear don mhuine choille sin, II 202. (Wood where Conchubhar mac Neasa died.) ‘Coill’ is not found in earlier sources: I Maigh Lámrighe atchuaidh dó ... dia ro[sh]lecht lerg Lamraidhe, DTUH 18; For Lettir Lámraigi luimm, DTUH 20; Ri toeb Leitreach Lamraighi. i. Dia ro selaidh Concobar Fidh Lamraige ..., MM 643. (Perhaps this is another example of replacement of fiodh by coill, for which see Nicholls 2004, 228-9.)

Corcach lucht Corcaighe, III 56. Recte Corca Oiche (see Cúil).


Crionna Cinn Chomair go Brugh mic an Óig i gCrionna Chinn Chomair, II 290. Two separate names here; see Crionna under ‘Áth Crionna’ above. combadar a mbruig meic in og i crich chrindo 7 i cind chomair, Lec. 221ra41-2.

Cúil Cath Cúile, áit ar thuineadar iomad de lucht Corcaighe, III 56. Cuilleann / Cuillne, battle site in W. Limerick (see Ainm 7 (1996-7) 11). Bellum Cuilne (Cath Cuillne, ATig.) in quo ceciderunt Corcu Oche Muman, AU s.a. 552 (see Corcach).

Cumar go Snámh Eugnachair; go Cumar; agus ó Chumar go Life, I 114. Ghost-name; recte ‘co muir’ (?). co Cuan Snama Aigneach (?) 7 assin cusin muir ocus assin co habainn Life, AH I 3.

Dá Fhearta do thuit Aodh Uairiodhnach ... i gCath dá Fhearta, III 116. Áth Dá Fhearta, battle site in N. Co. Louth; see HDGP 126. Mors Aedha mic Nell Frosaigh ic Ath da ferta i Muigh Conaille, CS s.a. 819; ag Ath dha Ferta, AU s.a. 819; ag Ath da fhearta, AFM I 428. (Áed Uairidnach did not (according to LG V 374) die in battle.)

Daimhliag Chiaráin III 156. Duleek, Co. Meath. Cian(n)án (not Ciarán) was its founder-bishop (see IV 246, Index). Quies sancti Ciannaini Daim liag, ATig. s.a. 488; i nDaimliac Chiannan, AU s.a. 1123.

**Doire Dá Bhaoth** ag dul go Doire Dá Bhaoth dó, II 202. Áth D. D. B., where Conchubhar was felled with the brain of Meis Geaghra. *For brú Átha Daire da Báeth is and do rochair Conchobor*, LL II. 14334; cf. *co hAth Daire Da Baeth*, LL I. 19344.

**Druim Conna** thugadar Lochlonnaigh maidhm mór ar Laighnìbh i nDruim Chonne, áit ar thuit Conuing mac Con Choingiolt, III 162. Doubtful name for battle site in Laighin. AU (s.a. 827) does not name the site: *Coscraidh dunaidh Laighen do gentibh ubi ceciderunt Conall m. Con Congalt*; AFM (s.a. 825) has *Coscraidh aonaigh i nDruim la Geintibh* (but, according to O’Donovan (I 440), a line has been omitted between aonaigh and i, coalescing two separate entries). Also ‘Conuing’ from AFM is incorrect (‘Conall’ in AU s.a. 827, and CGH 120b17). No other source has ‘Druim Conna’.

**Druim Dá Chon** dá fhichid déag ag Druim dá Chon le Tighearnach rí Locha Gabhair, III 174 (a repetition of III 170, where it more correctly appears as *Doire Dhisirt dhá Chonna*). Díseart Da-Chonna, a battle site which O’Donovan placed in par. Dysart, near Dunleer, Co. Louth (AFM index). Cf. AU s.a. 848: *i ndairiu Disirt Do-Chonna (= AFM I 476)*.

**Dubhghlaise** Colum Cille ... ag Dubhghlaise i dTír Luighdheach i gCinéal Chonaill, III 100. Tulach Dubhghlaise, tl. Templdouglas, Co. Donegal, traditional site of Colum Cille’s baptism. *o Thelaig Dub-glaissi hi Tir Lughdach i Cinel Conaill*, LH II 121-2. Tulach Dubglaissi, a cinel Conoill, BCC 42; *ó Thelaig Dubglaissi*, MartO 144.

**Dubhloch Leasa Cuile** losceadh Ughaire ann ag Dubhloch Leasa Cuile, III 288 (see IV 266 Index n.). Dubhloch (in Laoighis Chúile), Co. Laois. Ughaire ... tech do gabail forra ic Dubloch, AU s.a. 1024 (= ATig. s.a. 1024; AFM II 806); *ac Dubloch i lLaigis Chule*, LL I. 5480.

**Duibhir** go Mágh Cnoghba, go Duibhir, I 114. Dubhdhoire, a boundary of Midhe. *co clár Dubdhaire*, AH I 3.
Dún Creige  Aonghus ... gur loisc Dún Creige, III 148. Creag, prob. in Argyll, Scotland. Oengus ... combussit Creic, AU s.a. 736 (= ATig. s.a. 735).

Fán Mic Connrach  i bhFán Mic Connrach, do bhris Brian do Lochlonnaibh, III 240. Fán Con(n)rach, site of Brian’s victory over Lochlannaigh. tuc Brian cath Fain Conrach (v.l. Dún fáinconnrach), CGG 106.

Feart  Cath Feirt, III 136. Feartas, battle site, prob. at Belfast. Bellum Fertsi, AU s.a. 668; Cath Feirtse, ATig. s.a. 665 (= AFM I 278).

Fréamhainn  lé hÉireamhón i gCath Breoghain i bhFréamhainn, II 106. Feimhean, prob. that in Breagha (see Ó Corráin 1971). i cath Breogain hi Femen, la hÉiremón, LG V 160; i cath Breogain i bhFemhean, AFM I 32.


Iardobhar  go Dobhar agus go hIardobhar i dtuaisceart Albain, I 186 (also I 204). Irdhobhar, a place in N. of Scotland (see CPNS 40-1, n.). co Domon 7 co Herdomon i tuascirt Albain, LG III 124 (= LL l. 648); co Dobur 7 co Hirdobur a tuaiscert Albain, LG III 144; co hIrrdobur, Book of Ballymote 27a33.

Iarthair, na h-  Magh Foithin sna hlartharaibh, II 116. Oirthir, bar. Orior Lr / Upr, Co. Armagh. Mag Fáithne la hAirtheru, LL l. 1896; Mag Fáithne las na hAirthera, LG V 188; Magh Faithne la hAirthera, AFM I 34-6. (DIL (I 34.49) cites sna hlartharaibh from Keating.)

Inis Locha Cé  Do tógbadh iomorro lé Brian ... Inis Locha Cé is Inis Locha Gair, III 262. Inis Locha Ceann, at Loughkent, Co. Tipperary (see O’Rahilly 1933, 208-10). Inis Locha Cend, CGG 140; Orgain Locha Ceand, FAI 855 (270).
Lannraidhe Lanna ó ráidhtear Lannraidhe, II 216. Lámhraighe, a tribal group. ro bendach a láma ... Lamaed ... is húad atáat Lámraige, BP ll. 2343-4; Lama a quo Lamraigi, CGH 158, 1; ri Lámraidí Ulad, GT 148; Cath Lamraige, AcS l. 5876.

Lia Fáil ó chloich tugsad leó innte, d’á ngairthí an Lia Fáil; agus ‘Saxum fatale’, eadhon, Cloch na Cinneamhna, ghaireas Hector Boetius di, i stair na hAlban, I 100. Fáil/Inis Fáil, an alias for Ireland. (The belief that it signifies ‘destiny’ has, as E. J. Gwynn pointed out almost a century ago (JIS 2, pt 7 (1910) 153), ‘no higher authority than the Scotchman, Hector Boetius’ (or Boece).)

Loch mBreunainn Loch mBreunainn ar Magh n-asail i n-Uibh Nialláin, I 176. Loch Cál, Loughgall, Co. Armagh. Loch Cál in Hu Niallain, LG III 130; Loch Cál la Hú Nialláin, LG III 120 (= LL 614); Loch Cal i nUibh Nialláin, AFM I 10. I cannot explain from where Keating may have taken ‘Loch mBreunainn’.

Mágh, an go Druim Leathain, go soiche an Mágh, I 114. Feabhal (Fabhall), a river in Co. Cavan. co Druim Leathain 7 assin co roich an Febal (v.l. co Febhal), AH I 3. Cf. co ndechaidh isin Febail, ATíg. s.a. 1054; isin Fabaill, AU s.a. 1054.


Magh Laighne Magh Laighne agus Magh Luirg i gConnachtaibh, II 124. Magh Aidhne, Co. Galway. Mag nAidhe 7 Mag Luirg la Connachta, LL ll. 2173-4 (= LG V 214); Magh nAidhne, AFM I 46.

Oiléain, na h- Maghnus mac Arailt, rí na nOiléan / lucht na nOiléan, II 72 / III 308. The Western Isles of Scotland, usually ‘na hInse’ (as in III 258). Cf. for Gallaibh Atho Cliath 7 na nInsedh, AU s.a. 980; rí Lochland 7 na n-Indsi, ATíg. s.a. 1103.

Ráith Eoamhain do tógbhadh lé hÉibhear féin Ráith Eoamhain i Laigheannmaigh, II 98. Ráith Beoain in the plain of Laighin. clas la hÉber, erccad gal, / Ráith Beoain hi Laigenmuig, LG V 128.

Rathfonn/Cnoc Rathfonn go Ráith Naoi ré ráidhtear Cnoc Rathfonn ... (quatr.) Go Ráthfonn réil go Ráith Naoi, II 320. Faffann,
in Úí Fhailghe (see Faffand, MD II 66-70). *co fáfaind reill co rath nai*, Lec. 167rb39.

**Ros Maolaidh** *is gur hairgeadh ... Cluain Úama is Ros Maolaidh*, III 156. Ros Nialláin (? nGialláin), prob. eccl. site in par. Rostellan, E. of Cork harbour, about two miles from Cloney (cf. Ros Gi[alláin], *MartO* 202). *Cluain Úama.* 7 Ros Nialláin, *LL* 1. 39338; *Cluain Uamha*, *osus Ros Maeláin*, CGG 6.

**Sliabh Caoin** *ó Shliabh Uidhe an Ríogh go Sliabh Caoin nó Gleann Caoin*, III 304. These are boundaries of the diocese of Killaloe, but Sliabh Caoin (Ballyhoura Hills between Cos Limerick and Cork) was never one. Gleann Caoin (Glenkeen) is the correct reading; Keating was apparently undecided whether to read Sl- or Gl-.

**Sliabh Musaigh** *Cath Sléibhe Musaigh*, II 262. Mosadh/Magh Mhosaidh, a plain in mid-Tipperary. *cath Seigi Mosad*, ZCP 19 (1933) 60. (For trad. origin of name, see LL II. 22364-73).

**Sliabh Ughmhóir** *gabháil ... mic Ughmhóir a Sliabh Ughmhóir*, I 162. Sliabh Éamhóir, prob. a mythical place, said to be in the East. *meic Gúmóir a Sléib Émóir/meic Húathmóir a Sléibh Émhóir*, LG III 10/14; anair, a tírib Émóir, LG III 74.


**Tóchar Cairbre** *as sin go Tóchar Cairbre, ó Thóchar Cairbre go Crannaigh Ghéisille*, I 114. Corr-Chairbre, a boundary of Midhe in

(B) SOME MINOR ERRORS

[Only Keating’s placenames are cited here, with part and page number, followed by more reliable versions taken from earlier sources. Some of the discrepancies may be due to Keating’s modernising efforts, others perhaps to errors of transcription.]

**Abha Lorcaighe** III 68. _for abaind Lorgaid_, _LL_ l. 1612; _ZCP_ 7, 306.

**Brugh mic an Óig** II 290. _a Bruig meic ind Óc_, _LU_ l. 2927-8.

**Ceall Ealchruidhe** III 68. _acallich Cilli Elgraige_, _LL_ l. 1612.

**Cinéal Lodhairn** II 382. _genus Loairrn_, _AU_ s.a. 678; _ATig_. s.a. 677.

**Cluain Connraich** I 114. _Cluain Conaire_, _AH_ I 3 (= III 302; also _AU_ s.a. 783).

**Cluain Créamhuidh** III 150. _Mors ... espuic Cluana Crema_, _ATig_. s.a. 751.

**Comhnuidhe** II 120 _Cath Codhnaighe_ (v.l. _Congne, Congnaige_), _LG_ V, 204.

**Críoch Chonaill** III 190. _i crich Conaille_, _AU / CS_ s.a. 879.

**Dainfhir** III 154. _Na Danair_, _AU_ s.a. 986; ó _dhanaraibh_, _CGG_ 3.

**Dún Cliach** III 262. _Dún Cliath_, _CGG_ 140.

**Dún Deargmuighe** III 156. _Dún Dermaigi_, _LL_ l. 39349; _Dún Dermuighe_, _CGG_ 6.

**Dún Iasc** III 262. _Dún Iasgaigh_, as in I 120. ó _dhún iasccaigh_, _AFM_ s.a. 1581 (V 1758).

**Dún Inn** II 98. _rogab Dún nInni_, _LG_ V 128. _cumtach Dúin Fine_ (v.l. _Finne_), _LG_ V 154.

**Dún Leogh(dh)a** III 310, 366. _Dun Leoda_, _ATig_. s.a. 1120; _Dun Leodha_, _AU_ s.a. 1114.

**Dún na mBreathnach** II 68. Cf. _PND_ 137: *Dún na mBreatan._

**Gallah** II 126. _Cath Gatlaigh_ (v.l. _Gathlaigh_, _Cathlaig_), _LG_ V 218.

**Inis Teimhin** III 156. _Inis Temli_, _LL_ ll. 39337-8. _Inis Temni_, _CGG_ 4.

**Inse an Ghaill Duibh** III 262. _inis in Gaill Duib_, _CGG_ 140; _Inis Gaill Duib_, _AI_ s.a. 1012.

**Lithfe** II 284. ós _lind Life_, _MD_ IV, 266.

**Loch nGasáin** II 128. _Loch na nGasan_, _LG_ V 222; _Loch na ngasan_, _AFM_ I 48.

**Magh an Chosnamhaigh** I 114. _Magh in Chosnama_, _AH_ I 3.

**Magh Luinge** II 116. _Magh Lugna_, _LG_ V 188, 192 (= _LL_ ll. 1868, 1898).
Ráith Cheannait III 94. Ráith Chennaig, MD III 440; co Raith Cennaigh, AU s.a. 1114.

Ros na Ríogh III 262. Rosach (v.l. Rosach na riogh), CGG 140.

Seiridmheadh III 148. i cath Seredmaige, LG V 390; Bellum Serethmaighe, AU s.a. 743.

Tuath Eibhe II 120. i Túaith Eba, LG V 206; i nEabha, AFM s.a. 1051 (II 860).

(C) MISPLACED LOCATIONS

[Here the name and text as given in FFÉ are followed by what I believe to be the correct location with other relevant texts or details.]

Áth Fuaid ris an bhfuad nó ris an gcróchar, gonadh de sin atá Áth Fuaid ar Bóinn, II 348. There was an Áth Fuaid (also called Áth Fraoich) near Sliabh Fuaid in Co. Armagh (HDGP 134). Keating placed another on the Boyne, named, as he asserts, from Cormac’s bier. He may have confounded it with Áth (n)Iomfhualaid (see HDGP 157).

Áth Troistean ag Áth Troistean ré ráidhtear Áth Í ag Bearbha, II 308. Prob. ford on r. Greese, Co. Kildare; not equiv. to Áth Í (Athy) (see HDGP 157).

Bealach Conglais ó Bhoinn go Bealach Chonglais lámh re Corcaigh, I 106. Baltinglass, Co. Wicklow. Keating followed LG which posited a second place of the name in west Munster, but he moved it to near Cork (see Ó Murchadha 2002).

Beanncha(i)r Ceannfaolaidh mac Bláithmhic ... is n-a fhlaiteas do loisceadh Beannchair, III 138 (where Keating assumes it to be Bangor, Co. Down (see Magh Beannchair)). Bangor, Wales. Cenn Faeladh m. Blathmaic regnare incipit / combustio Bennchair Brittonum, AU 672.5/6.

Buas Buas, idir Dhál nÁruidhe agus Dál Riada, eadhon an Rúta, I 164. R. Bush in N. Co. Antrim (in Dál Riada). This error is attributable to LG III 16. It was the r. Fregabhail (Ravel) which divided Dál nAraide from Dál Riada (as Keating correctly states at II 116).

Ceall Bhéacáin go rángadar Cill Bhéacáin don leith thuaidh do Shliabh gCrot, III 68. St Béacán’s church near the Galttee Mts was named Cluain Aird Mobhéaga (as in III 156), now Peakaun church
in tl. Toureen, par. Killardry, Co. Tipperary. Ceall Bhéacáin (Kilpeacon par.) is in Co. Limerick. Cf. Beccan Cluana Aird, CGSH 199. (The site is not named in the original story; see LL l. 1612.)

**Ceann Beara** Feircirte ... ar rochtain in Ulltaibh dó, fuair Conchubhar is Cú Chulainn is Blánaid go gcomhhdáil umpa ag rinn Chinn Bhéara, II 226. Kerry Head in north Co. Kerry. Cf. Al(l)traighe (Cinn Bheara), HDGP 54-5. In this story (Aided Chonrói) the Ulstermen travelled to Sliabh Mis in Co. Kerry to kill Cúrói and abduct Bláthnaid, but it is not evident that they had returned to Ulster before Feircheirte cast Bláthnaid and himself over the cliff. (See YBL 125a12-19; MD III 254; Best 1905.)


**Críoch na bhFuineadhach** An dara hainm, Críoch na bhfuineadhach, ó bheith i bhfuineadhach, I 98. Signifies ‘land of the westerners’, said by Keating to be an old name for Ireland. Cf. na Saxain fun-edcha, Anecd. III 68.6. ó oirrther an domhain co Críchaib na Fhuinedhach, CF ll. 491-2.

**Dionn Ríogh** i nDinn Riogh ar bruach na Bearbha, II 160. This site, near Leighlinbridge in Co. Carlow, was named by Keating as the place where Cobthach Caol mBreagh slew Laoghaire. An earlier source puts the slaying at Carman: co torchair la Cobthach Cóel Breg hi cath Charmuin, CGH 133b40 (see Éigse 33 (2002) 63).

**Druim Abhradh** a earradh is a each ag Druim Abhrad .i. Ard Phionáin, III 198. Prob. at Kilfinnane, Co. Limerick, rather than at Ardfinnan, Co. Tipperary (see Éigse 29 (1996) 155 n.).

**Dún Cearmna** Dún Cearmna, ris a ráidhteir Dún mic Pádraic, i gcríoch Cúirseach i ndiúl, I 110 (also II 124). Prob. at Dunmore East, Co. Waterford, rather than at the Old Head of Kinsale, Co. Cork (see O Murchadha 2004).

**Fiadh mic (mac) nAonghusa** An chéadchomhdháil i bhFiadh mic nAonghusa ... comhhdáil oile ... go Ráith Breasail, III 356. Site of 1111 synod, also known as Ráith Breasail. Keating thought both
places were separate, unaware that the synod had been held in his native county of Tipperary, prob. in par. Drom, near Borrisoleigh (see *THJ* 1999, 151-61).

**Fir na Craoibhe** Eochaidh Feidhlioich ... Tug do Fhidheac Fir na Craoibhe ó Fhidheac go Luimneach, II 184; Tug d’Fhidheach mac Féig, d’fhearaibh na craoibhe, I 118. Normally ‘Fir na Craoibhe’ denotes part of Ua Catháin’s terr. in what is now north-east Co. Derry (see *GUH* 48-9). Cf. Eachmarcach hUa Cathá[í]n, *ri Cianacht 7 Fer-na-Craibhe*, *AU* (1) s.a. 1247. Perhaps Keating confused them with ‘Fir Ól nÉcmacht’, an early name for the Connachta; we are told that Meadbhb, daughter of Eochaidh Feidhleach, brought Fir Ól nÉcmacht with her to carry off Ailill from the Laighin (*CGH*, 118b10-11).

**Inbhear Domhnann** in nInnbhear Domhnann (i n-iarthuidaidh re cúig-eadh Chonnacht) ... gurab uathu gairthear Innbhear Domhnann, I 194. An east-coast estuary so named in the Tripartite Life of Patrick (*BP* 23) was identified by O’Curry (*MM* 485) with Malahide Bay (estuary of the Broadmeadow Water), Co. Dublin. Keating (who sometimes took *inbhear* to denote a river – cf. II 88, 92, 126) confused it with Iorrus Domhnann (bar. Erris, Co. Mayo), as pointed out by Comyn, who changed *Innbhear* to ‘Iorrus’ in his translation, I 195 n.

**Life** Plain of r. Liffey, used correctly in III 164: dá fhíchid long ar abhainn Lithfe, gur aírgisiod an loingeas soin Magh Lithfe, but more often incorrectly as a river name: *Cairbre Lithfeachair ... láimh ré Lithfe i Laighnibh do hoileadh é*, II 354; ó Chumar go *Líf*, I 114. (In original: *cuisin muir ocus assin co habaínn Life*, *AH* I 3.)

**Loch Dá Chaoch** Niall Glúndubh ... do thabhairt chatha do Lochlonnaibh Locha dá Chaoch i nUlltaibh, III 214. Waterford harbour. Both Hogan (*OnomG*) and Dinneen (index) repeated Keating’s error here by putting it in Ulster. Cf. *Slogadh Locha Dá Cáech la Niall*, *LG* V 398. This is prob. the battle in Magh Fheimhin referred to in *AU* s.a. 917.

**Loch Muinreamhair** Loch Muinreamhair ar Magh Sola i Laighnibh, I 176. L. Ramor, in S. of Co. Cavan, near Co. Meath. *Loch Munreamair hi Luignib Sléibí Gúairi*, *LG* III 130. (Slieve Gorey is also in Co. Cavan; Luighne gave name to bar. Lune, Co. Meath.)
Lochmhagh (? Recte Lóchmhagh) Lochmhagh i gConnachtaibh, II 118. In Conaille, a district in N. Co. Louth. Lochmag la Conailliu, LG V 184 (= LL ll. 1915-16).

Magh Beannchair go ráinig Magh Beannchair d’ainm ar an áit ... do thógaibh an t-abb naomhtha Comhghall mainistear san áit chéadna, III 138. This plain was near Banagher, Co. Offaly; cf. ‘Greate warr stirred in Delbha Eathra … and went they both parties to Magh Beannchoir’, MIAS 20. Keating wrongly connected it with Comghall’s Bangor, Co. Down (see Beanncha(i)r above).

Magh gCéidne go Magh gCéidne idir Drobbaois agus Éirne, I 180. Plain in bar. Carbury, Co. Sligo; that between r. Drowes and r. Erne was Magh Eine (see Éigse 27 (1993) 35-46).

Móin Doire tugadh Cath Móna Doire in Albain, III 56. Battle site in Ulster. Bellum Mona Daire Lothair for Cruithnui re nUib Neill in Tuaisceirt, AU s.a. 563. Keating was perhaps misled by Adamnán’s reference to the battle ‘in Scotia’ (i.e. in Ireland) as opposed to ‘Brittannia’ (VC (2) 224).

Ráith Breasail See Fiadh mac nAonghusa’.

Ráith Naoi go Ráith Naoi ré ráidhtear Cnoc Rathfonn … [quat.] Go Rathfonn réil go Ráith Naoi, II 320. A rath near Morett, Co. Laois. The first name in the verse should read ‘Faffann’ (see Rathfonn above); cf. Nuí o fail Ráith Nuí i mMaig Reichet, LL l. 21174; Nue. a quo Rath Núi i lLaigis, ibid. ll. 39643-4.

Toirinis/Tor Conaing ag Fomhóirchadh ... Tor Conaing i n-imeal Éireann thuaidh ... i dTor Conaing, d’á ngairtheach Toirinis, I 180. A rock off the coast of Co. Mayo, correctly located by Keating in go Toirinis i dtuaisceart Chonnacht, I 106, but later confused with Tory Is. (Torach / Toraigh) Co. Donegal (see Éigse 27 (1993) 43).

**ABBREVIATIONS**


AH Archivium Hibernicum. 1912-21; 1941-.


DIL  Dictionary of the Irish Language. Dublin 1913-76.


GUH  Séamus Ó Ceallaigh, Gleanings from Ulster history: Punann ó Chois Banna. Cork 1951.


PLACENAME MATERIAL FROM FORAS FEASA AR ÉIRINN


MM Eugene O’Curry, Lectures on the manuscript materials of ancient Irish history. Dublin 1861; repr. 1995.


RC Revue Celtique 1870-.


THJ Tipperary Historical Journal. 1988-.


ZCP Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie 1897-.
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Bun an Tábhairne, Co. Chorcáí

DIARMUID Ó MURCHADHA
CANÚINTÍ AGUS COILÍNEACHTAÍ: FIANAISE Ó ALBAIN NUA

1. Ní rómhinic a thagtar ar thuairim á nochtadh i ngnáthlitríocht na teanga ag cainteoirí Gaeilge ná Gàidhlig faoi chanúint nach leo féin í.1 Tá a leithéid ar fáil i bhficséan na Gaeilge sa ghearrscéal le Máirtín Ó Cadhain, Aisling agus aisling eile (1970: 65-100). Sa chás sin is foróin neamhaithnidiúla iolra san aimhfhocal a aithnítear ina sainchomhartha ar chanúint choimhthíoch. Le cois na tagartha sin tá tuairisc fhíorshuimiúil ar taifead sa Ghaedhlig ag fear as Inse Gall a chaith seal ama ag obair i measc lucht labhartha canúna de chuid oirthear na Gaidhealtachd, chanúint a bhí scartha amach ó shaghanna eile cainte an réigiúin (cf. Gillies 1993, 146-7). Tá an cur síos atá i gceist le fáil i ndirbhheataiséis a cuireadh síos ó aithris bhéil an údair a chuir de dhua air féin an chanúint strainseachta úd a fhoghlaím agus a sholáthraíonn ina chuntas samplaí de théarmaí nárth iónann iad sa dá chanúint. Dar leis féin gur éirigh leis a chur ina luí ar an dream a mbíodh sé ag plé leo gurbh fhéarr mar chaint a chanúint féin ná an ceann s’acusan agus, go fiú, gur mhúin sé dóibh conas í sin a thuiscint:

Mun do dh’fhàg mise, thuigeadh iad a h-uile facal a chanainn, agus bha iad gu math deònach air a h-ionnsachadh [a’ Ghàidhlig agam], cuideachd. Bha iad ag radha gura h-i a b’fheàrr na a’ Ghàidhlig a bh’acasan, cus (Mac ‘Ill-Fhialain 1972, 47-8).

Tugtar faoi deara, lena chois sin, mar a chuireann an t-údar an sliocht atá i gceist inár láthair lena bhreith dhhamnaitheach féin ar chaint na háite sin: ‘Bha a’ Ghàidhlig a bh’ann, gu dearbh cha robh i math.’

2. De bharr m’oibre sa ghort ar chanúint eile i oirthear na Gaidhealtachd i. Machair Rois, tá cleachtadh agam ar dhearcaidh

1 I dtaca le heolas atá bunaite ar thaighde sochtheangeolaíochta, cf. Dorian 1981, 90-1, ina dtugtar tuairimí cainteoirí duchas as ceantar eile in oirthear na Gaidhealtachd faoi shaghanna eile Gaidhlig. Tugtar cuntas ann fosta (86-9) faoi iomáfocht sa réigiún céanna idir iad seo agus chanúint na háite.

Cuireadh leagan den pháipéar seo i láthair na Comhdhála a tìonoladh in onóir an Ollaimh Tomáis Ó Con Cheanainn sa Choláiste Ollscoile, Baile Átha Cliath (Nollaig 2003). Táim buíoch d’Eagarthóir Éige agus don léitheoir comhairleach as a gcuíd moltaí a cuireadh i bhfeidhm ar an leagan seo. Mise féin, cibé sin, is ciontach le lochtanna ar bith dá bhfuil ann.

Tugtar faoi deara, lena chois sin, mar a chuireann an t-údar an sliocht atá i gceist inár láthair lena bhreith dhhamnaitheach féin ar chaint na háite sin: ‘Bha a’ Ghàidhlig a bh’ann, gu dearbh cha robh i math.’

2. De bharr m’oibre sa ghort ar chanúint eile i oirthear na Gaidhealtachd i. Machair Rois, tá cleachtadh agam ar dhearcaidh

1 I dtaca le heolas atá bunaite ar thaighde sochtheangeolaíochta, cf. Dorian 1981, 90-1, ina dtugtar tuairimí cainteoirí duchas as ceantar eile in oirthear na Gaidhealtachd faoi shaghanna eile Gaidhlig. Tugtar cuntas ann fosta (86-9) faoi iomáfocht sa réigiún céanna idir iad seo agus chanúint na háite.

Cuireadh leagan den pháipéar seo i láthair na Comhdhála a tìonoladh in onóir an Ollaimh Tomáis Ó Con Cheanainn sa Choláiste Ollscoile, Baile Átha Cliath (Nollaig 2003). Táim buíoch d’Eagarthóir Éige agus don léitheoir comhairleach as a gcuíd moltaí a cuireadh i bhfeidhm ar an leagan seo. Mise féin, cibé sin, is ciontach le lochtanna ar bith dá bhfuil ann.
chainteoirí an iarthair ar a leithéidí de chanúintí oirthearachta atá aisteach, dar leo. Cuireann an lean már buntreithe a thuigtear a bheith in ghcoitinne idir canúintí an iarthair mar ghrúpa tacaíochta ar fáil don dearcadh ar a dtráchtar anseo, tréithe a bhí mar bhonn ag an teanga liteartha sa tréimhse iarchlasaisceach agus a aithnítear i gcónaí i gcineálacha na teanga labhartha atá faoi mheas lenár linn féin (cf. Thomson 1983, 91-5). Is eol do mhuintir Mhachair Rois, cuir i gcás, conas a bhí ag ministeir iomráiteach de chuid na hEaglaise Saoire – an sanachreideamh is láidre san áit – ar a raibh cúram an pharóiste sa chéad leath den fhíchú haois. B’as Machair Rois féin an phearsa eagalaise chéanna, a raibh cáil mhóir air mar sheanmóirí ann, agus bhí de nós aige a chanúint dhúchas fén a sheachaint ní amháin nuair a bhíodh aitheas ac thabhairt aige do phobal ceantair eile ach ar fhód a dhúchas fén chomh maith (Phillips 1986, 119). Bheadh dearadh dá mhasamhail ag teacht le barúil comhfhreagrafágra urramaigh eile a sholáthraigh sa 19ú céad iontráil an pharóiste a bhí i gceist don New Statistical Account. Dhearbaigh sé seo canúint an phobail áitiúil a bheith ‘... not classical, though it cannot be said to be bad’ (cf. Withers 1984, 321). Bealach amháin dá ndearnadh feidhm i gcaitheamh na haoise sin le feabhas canúna a bhí faoi scrúdú a mheas a mhínice a thugtaí faoi deara focail isachta Bhéarla a bheith á n-úsáid inti. Ach, faoi mar a thuigtear ó iontrálacha éagsúla san fhoinse a luaadh anois beag, ní annamh a thit am ude thairbhe a leithéid de chur chuige (Withers 1984, 313).

3. Tarlaíonn uaireanta, lena chois sin, go gcáineann pobal Mhachair Rois canúint nach bhfuil mórán cur amach ag cainteoirí an limistéir féin uirthi mar ‘Ghàidhlig nan Ceàrdan’ (Gàidhlig an Lucht Siúil). Bhí an chanúint sin mar an gcéanna, dar le bean de m’fhaisnéiseoirí san áit, le ‘Gàidhlig Loch Abair’. Bhíodh sin mar atá, is é a thabhar-fadh taighde atá déanta agam féin le hionadaí de chuid an Lucht Siúil san oirthear2 le fios gur suntasaí i gchuidsean Gàdhlíg tríthte atá ag teacht leis an taobh thoir ná le Loch Abair san iarthar. Go deimhin, dhearbaigh an duine seo féin dom gurbh í canúint Mhachair Rois ab fhusa leis de chanúintí na Gàdhlíg go léir. Tá an téalmaí dispeagtha ceannann céanna a bhí ag an bhean thuasluaite i leith canúna aiste ar m’eolas fosta i gcéas pobail Gàdhlígh in Oirthear Cheanada, áit eile a bhfuil obair sa ghriot déanta agam. Sa chás seo, cibé ar bith, níor

dhóiche é ná a athrach roinnt de na tréithe incháinte céanna a bheith le haithint ina gcanúint féin ag an dream a bhíonn i mbun an cháinte seo. Is minic a ghlaioitear ‘Abraich’ ar lucht labhartha na gcanúintí ar a n-aithnítear a leithéidí de thréithe ‘achrannacha’, rud a thagraíonn do Loch Abair in iarthar na Gàidhealtachd mar áit dhúchais shinsearach na ndaoine céanna. Tá mé barúlach, de bharr mo thaithse in oirthear na Gàidhealtachd go dtiocfadh dó gurb é rud a bhí an drochcháil a thug muintir an iarthair air Ghàidhlig Loch Abair mar chanúint ‘neamhreidh’ i ndiaidh leathnú chuig cainteoirí Gàidhlig ar oirthir. Tá canúintí eile i gceist fosta, ar ndóigh, as a n-eascraíonn deacraicraí do chainteoirí Gàidhlig limistéir eile agus, ar feadh m’eolais féin, ní annamh i gcás dá leithéid a luaitear canúint Leòdhais i dtuaisceart Inse Gall.3 Rud annamh é, cé bith sin, go ndéanann lochtu den sórt a luadh thuas ar an chanúint áirithe sin: ní amháin mar gur cóngaraí í do shaghsanna eile an iarthair, m.sh. sa deilbhíocht, ach, chomh maith leis sin, b’fhéidir, mar go bhfuil dluithbhaint ag Oileán Leòdhais le ministreacht na hEaglaise Saoire. Maireann pobail de chainteoirí Gàidhlig an oileáin sin mar choilíneachtaí in Oirthear Cheanada le taobh sliocht coilínithe as réigiún eile agus tá fúm plé a dhéanamh sa staidéar seo ar ghnéithe áirithe de chanúintí dhá cheantar, dhá cheantar agus an chumhacht eile de chainteoirí Gàidhlig na n-Eaglaise sa cheantar. Ar lámh amháin tá mórphobal acu, an mórphobal Caitliceach.

4. Sa dara leath den 18ú céad a cuireadh tús le himirce ón Ghàidhealtachd go dtí an limistéar a aithnítear sa lá inniu mar phroibhins na hAlban Nua in gCeanada. Lean an imirce chéanna faoi lán seoirí gcaitheamh an dara leath den aois ina dhiaidh sin mar thoradh ar an tréimhse uafáis úd ‘Fuadach nan Daoine’ (Hornsby 1990, 50-69). Bhí tarraingt ar leith ag na Gàidheil ar oirthear phroibhins na hAlban Nua le linn an ama sin agus, go háirithe, ar Oileán Cheap Breatainn nós faide ó thuaidh, sa dóigh gur bunaíodh coilínachtaí leo ar fud an oileáin sin go léir. Cinnitear cuimhne ar áiteanna dorchais mórán de na chéad coíilínithe i logainmneacha an lae inniu: Gleann Bharrraidh, Gleann nan Sgitheanach, Abhainn Mhuile, Baghasdail, Inbhir Nis, Gleann Comhann, Gleann Garadh, Creignis, etc. Ina dhá bpobal a aithnítear Gàidheil na hAlban Nua ó thaobh dílseachta creidimh ar theacht isteach san fhichiú haois dùinn (Donovan 1990, 1-29). Ar lámh amháin tá mórphobal acu, an mórphobal Caitliceach.

3 Tuairiscíonn faisnéiseoir de chuid Dorian (1981, 91) Gàidhlig Steòrnabhaigh a bheith ina canúint a bhí deacair thar an choitiantacht dar le muintir Mhachair Chataibh.
Rómhánach a lonnaigh den chuid ba mhó i gCo. Inbhir Nis – a bhfuil coillíneacht bheag thabhachtach breise aige timpeall ar Iona sa chontae atá buailte leis, Co. Victoria. Ar an lámh eile tá na dreamanna ann ar shíolraigh a sinsir ó phobail Phrotastúnacha sa Ghaidhealtacht ar sna contaetha eile de Cheap Breatainn, a bheag nó a mhóir, a thagtar orthu. Ó thaobh saoil chultúrtha is saol an chreidimh de ba é an leagan amach a bhí ar chúrsaí go mbíodh freastal á dhéanamh ar an phobal Càitliceach ag an institiúid a ndearnadh ollscoil Íosánach dí le himeacht aimsire in Antigonish. Is í seo príomhionad na deoise ar tír móir in aice lámhthe agus mar thoradh an chomhchabhachtachtaí Ghaelach an limistéir muintear ar Ghàidhlig i gcónaí i Roinn na Ceiltise san oileán. Ábhar suntais, lena chois sin, gurb ann d’iaras malann tuaithe de dhéanamh baile bhig (An Clachan Gàidhealach), i gceantar úd Iona a luadh an Bhreatain. Bhí páirt lárnach ag muintir an cheantair seo i mbunú an fhóras chéanna a bhfuil cur chun cinn na teanga agus an chultúr Ghaelaisg ina chuid thabhachtachtaí dá aithne anois. Ábhar sin, lena chois sin, tá an pobal Protastúnach i ndiaidh a n-iarraachtái cultúrtha a dhíriú ar an Chladach-a-Tuath i gCo. Victoria, aít at ar bunaidh coláiste ina muintear idir Ghàidhlig agus cheirdeanna agus ealaíona dúchasacha (Dunn 1953, 146, 147). Tá comhoibriú leanúnach á léiriú ó thosach idir an da phobal creidimh agus is gnách leo i gCónaí sárthacaíocht a thabhairt do thionscnamh chultúrtha a cheile san oileán.

5. Bíodh nár tugadh faoi staidéar cuimsitheach a chur i gerch riamh ar Ghàidhlig Oilean Cheap Breatainn, is leir gurb iomaí sin ábhar spéise a gheofa ina leithéid agus nach nach a chuirfeadh sé lenár gcuid eolais ar chuanúntí na teanga trí chéile. Ar an chéad dühl síos suíomh ilteangach a bhí san oileán ón ochtú haois déag anall agus pobail de chainteoirí Mi’q-mak, Fraincise, Béarla agus Ghàidhlig ann. Bíodh gurb beag fionaise atá ann go raibh tionchar ag an chéad teanga ar an cheann deireanach, caomhnaítear inti seo i gcónaí leaganacha bunaidh Fraincise de loinge logainmneacha, cuir i gcás: Ceap Nòr ‘Cap du nord (Cape North)’, Seastago ‘Chéstico (Port Hood)’ (leagan truaillithe den téarma justes au corps ‘ionar’), Loch Bhradòir ‘Bras d’Or (Bradore Lake)’ Seadagong ‘Chéticamp’. Is leir, cé leith sin de, go raibh baint nach beag ag an Ghàidhlig le cineálacha Béarla Mhèiriceá Thuaidh. Réimse taighde é seo nach

---


6. Mar a luadh cheana, ba é an nós a bhí ag coíliníte as réigiún ar leith de chuid na Gàidhealtachd go lonnaíodh siad le taobh dream eile as an cheantar céanna a bhí bunaithe i gCéap Breatainn cheana féin (Dunn 1953, 26-7). Cinnfiodh cuimhne ar áit dhúchas shinsir na gcoílíníte sin. Hearagaich, cuirim i gcás, a thugtar as a n-áit dhúchas orthu siúd arbh as na Hearadh dá sinsir; Glaisich ar an dream ar bhain a muintir le Srath Ghlas; Muiceanaich ar phobal arbh as Oiléan Mhuice dóibh ó dhúchas; agus Aillsich a ghlaoití orthu sin a shíolraigh ó inimircigh ó Loch Aillse. I gcás na nUibhisteach, daoinp ar bhain a muintir leis na hUibhishte, bhí ar chumas ag faisnéiseoir de chuid an oileáin a casadh orm sna 1980í idir dheanamh a dheanamh idir í féin mar bhean de na Deasaich ‘lucht na taoibh ó dheas’, arbh as Uibhist-a-Deas dá muintir, agus dream eile ar Thuaithaich, ‘lucht na taoibh ó thuaidh’, iad agus ar bhain a sinsir le Uibhist-a-Tuath. Ní amháin sin ach chuir sí ar fáil samplaí de thréithe lena bhféadfadh sí an dá chanúint a aithint tar a chéile. Ba látair an choilíneacht a d’éirigh le sliocht na Hearadh a bhunú in Oirdheisceart Cheap Breatainn, timpeall ar Ghabarus, le taobh an ionaid ní ba lú a chuir inimircigh ó Leòdhas ar bun ag an Chaolais Beag i láir an oileáin. B’ inimircigh ón dí ‘oileán’ sin ar na lónaigh ag taobh a chéile in áit eile agus bhí sé i ndán doibhsean an pobal Gaelach Protastúnach ab ainitheanta, mharthanaí dá raibh in Albain Nua a bhunú ansin sa cheantar ar a dtugtar an Cladach-a-Tuath (Cladach ó Thuaidh).
7. Is é an taithí atá agam ar chainteoirí Gàidhlig ár linne a shíolraigh ó na ceannródaite sin, cibé pobal a maireann siad ann ar fud an oileáin go léir, gur as na ceantair dhúchais úd in Albain a éilíonn siad aitheantas dóibh féin. Ní annamh ach oiread a bhronnann na pobail máguairt a leithéid d’aitheantas orthu. Cuireadh ar na súile dom go soiléir, is mé ag dul do thaighde i gceantar Ghabarus i 1983, gurb amhlaidh a bhí an scéal. Ag iarraidh teacht suas leis an mhuintir a shíolraigh ó choilínithe de chuid Loch Aillse a bhí mé agus, gan aon nó-dhhu, chuaird daoine ar an eolas mé conas iad siúd a bhaint amach. Ba chúis suntais dom é gur bhain na daoine na threoraigh leis na Hearadh ó thaobh sinsireachta de – an dream ba lónmhaire ar fad san áit. Mar sin, má tá an t-oileáin uile ina limistéar thar a bheith spéisíuíil do chanúineolaithi na Gàidhlig eacraíonna deacraictaí éagsúla dóibh seo chomh maith. Tá an scéal amhlaidh thar an chuí eile mar go bhfuil sé furasta go leor le roint glúinte anuas taisteal ó pháirteanna d’Oileán Cheap Breatainn chun a chéile agus dul chomh maith. Tháinig uaidh sin go bhfuil bac a bhi ar na cantúintí meas-cadh le chéile. Léiriú an-mhaith é ar an phróiseas céanna mar a leathnaih tríthe canúna de chuid chanúintí Cho. Inbhír Nis anall isteach i gcaint cheantar Iona, m.sh. [θ] → [w], [ŋ] → [m]. Luaim iad sin go speisialta mar gur tréithe iad a aithnítear go minic mar chomhharthaí ar chaint Loch Abair. Ní gan fáth a chuireann cainteoirí an lae inniu i gcás in amanna dá mbeadh canúint ar dhuine inbhe a leith i lín í do cheantair Cho. Inbhír Nis a bheadh ann.

8. Ó tharla go raibh ábhar bailithe agam cheana sa taobh thoirtheas i gceantar Ghabarus ó chainteoirí a bhí ionadaíoch do phobal na Hearadh chuir mé romham samplaí a chuirmniú ar an Chladach-a-Tuath a bheadh ionadaíoch, mar a mheas mé, do chaint shliocht choillínithe Leòdhais. Ní raibh sé chomh héasca agus a shíl mé a leithéid d’aidhm a chur i gcrích i ndeireadh na dála, mar ba limistéar é a ndearna inimircigh ó Leòdhas agus ó na Hearadh ar aon linn ann. Leis na deacraictaí a tháinig chun cinn a léiriú pléifidh mé
anseo ábhar a fuarthas ag dá phointe ar an Chladach-a-Tuath. Drochaid na h-Aibhne-a-Tuath (Droichead na hAbhna ó Thuidh),
arbh as faisnéiseoir T dó, ab ainm do phointe sa cheann theas den réigiún; agus b’as an dara pointe, Còbh na Raice (Camas na Raice),
faísnéiseoir W, c. 30 Cm níos faide ó thuaidh. Is láir cén tábhacht a bhí ag tionchar na Hearadh i gcomharsanacht an phointe ó dheas nuair a chuirtear san áireamh logainmneacha mar Tarbotvale agus, go háirithe, Tarbot a roghnaithe in aonghónó as an phhort aithniúil sna Hearadh, de réir faisnéiseora san áit, mar ainm le haghaidh oifig an phoist. Ar ábhar a bhailigh mé ó chainteoir amháin ag gach ceann den dá phointe faoi seach atá an staídéar comparáideach a dhéanaim anseo bunaithe. (Cuiradh faisnéis bhreise ar fáil ón dara cainteoir ag an dá phointe, i.e. T1 agus W1, agus tagrófar don mhéid sin fosta ó am go chéile.) I bhfianaise a bhfuil ráite aige faoin scéal tá roinnt heitreaglas san áireamh anseo atá aitheanta mar thréithe idirdhealaithe idir Leòdhas agus na Hearadh ag Carl Hj. Borgstrøm (1940, 167):

The system of preaspiration and the various treatments of the groups $R +$ dental consonants are the chief sources of differences between Lewis and the other dialects as regards groups of consonants.

9. Bhí mé faoi chomaoin ar leith, is mé ag dearadh ceistneora do m’obair sa ghort, ag liosta na heitreaglas a d’fhloisigh Borgstrøm (1940, 236-43) chomh fada sin ó shin ina shuirbhé ar chanúintí Inse Gall (féach Tábla 1). Ba staídéar é sin nach raibh ag brath ach ar dá phointe i Leòdhas. Cibé sin de, is leithne an t-eolais atá anois againn ar chanúintí Leòdhais, agus ar an chuid eile chomh maith, de bhall na faisnéise atá le fáil in Survey of the Gaelic dialects of Scotland vols 1-5 (1994-97) [SGDS]. Ag naoi bpointe ar fud Leòdhais a fuarthas ábhar don saothar seo, mar aon le ceithre cinn sna Hearadh, cé gur thart faoi fhiche bliain in ndiaidh obair Borgstrøm a rinneadh é sin a bhailiú. Is fíor le ró i gcás Ghàidhlig Cheap Breatainn go bhfuiltear ag plé le caint siocht coilmínithe a d’fhág tír a ndúchas roinnt glúinte sular tugadh faoi na suirbhéanna ar a dtaráchtar anseo, ar le linn an 20ú haois a rinneadh iad. Ar an lámh eile, caithfear a chur san áireamh gur sochaí choimeádach go maith ag bhí i gceist sa dá thír. Léiríonn scéilín a d’inis W1 dom faoi dhifriocht a d’aithin sí féin a

7 Patterson 1978, 80: ‘… the great bulk of the inhabitants [of North River Bridge] are, however, from the Island (sic) of Lewis and Harris’.
bheith idir a canúint féin agus caint mhuintir T an pointe seo go héifeachtach, dar liom. Mar bhean nuaphósta a tháinig sí seo ó cheantar Chòbh na Raice chun cónaí i nDrochaid na h-Aibhne-a-Tuath agus thosaigh sí an uair sin, de réir a cuntas féin, ag baint úsáide as malairt téarmaí i gcás focal áirite. *Uachdar* (*uachtar bainne*) an téarma a bhí aici féin ó dhúchas ach is é rud a chuireadh sí focal mhuintir a fá chéile, *bàrr*, ina áit. Is féidir a dheimhniú go bhfuil an tríth atá i gceist ansiúid le haithint mar phointe idirdhealaithe canúna idir na Hearadh agus Leòdhas i saothar scoláirí eile, cf. Borgstrøm (1940, 71, 164); agus san aguisín atá ag *LASID* IV (1969, 249). San fhoìnse seo luaitear *bàrr* mar aistriúchán ar ‘cream’ ag Pointe (e) (Leòdhas) agus ag costa thiar mhórbhfrí na hAlban, Pointí (f,g), san áit a dtugtar *uachdar* mar théarma ag na pointí ab fhaide ó dheas (b,c). (Ní áiritear pointí an fhíordheiscirt sa chás mar a luaitear téarma eile ar fad sa fhreagra.)

TÁBLA 1: Foirmeacha ó liosta focal Borgstrøm (1940) a léirionn pointí atá faoi chaibhidil

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEÒDHAS Pt1</th>
<th>LEÒDHAS Pt2</th>
<th>NA HEARADH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>triúir</strong></td>
<td><strong>mac</strong></td>
<td><strong>faicinn</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tʰrɯ:ɟ</td>
<td>maʰk</td>
<td>fek ən</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEÒDHAS Pt1</td>
<td>LEÒDHAS Pt2</td>
<td>NA HEARADH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>peacadh</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pʰɤkʰakey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEÒDHAS Pt1</td>
<td>LEÒDHAS Pt2</td>
<td>NA HEARADH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>faicinn</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feik ən</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEÒDHAS Pt1</td>
<td>LEÒDHAS Pt2</td>
<td>NA HEARADH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>peacadh</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pʰɤkʰakey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Tras-scriobh leasaithe atá ar fáil anseo ach gur coinníodh comharthaíocht thraidisiúnta na gconsan caol viz. d’, t’, etc – diomaite de n.*
LEARSCAIL 1: A L B A
LÉARSCÁIL 2: OIRTHEAR CHEANADA
10. [ü] Diomaite den tonaíocht aithnidiúil a luaitear a bheith le fáil iontu (Oftedal 1956, 25-31) tá mórrthréith eile a dtugtar suntas di mar chomhartha ar chanúintí Leòdhais. Tráchtar ar ghuta ard, cruinn a bheith le cluinstín ansiúd mar pháirmhóralafón ar /u/. Guta é seo atá mórán níos faide chu níosaigh ná a mhacasamhail fhoinéimeach sna canúintí máguaird agus b’fhéidir, go deimhin, sa cheol eile de chanúintí na Gàidhlig. Ina chuntas ar chanúint in oirthear Leòdhais is é an cur síos atá ag Oftedal (1956, 75) ar pháirmhóralafón /u/:

a high central rounded vowel ... more retracted than French u [y] in nu ... very similar to the highest varieties of Norwegian and Swedish u.

Cuirtear ar fáil samplaí den ghuta, idir fhada agus ghearr, i bhfocail mar *dubh* agus *cù* ‘madra’. Tugtar comharthaíocht dó sna foinsí atá i gceist mar seo a leanas:

[ü] (SGDS)  [û] (Borgstrøm)  [û], [ü], [ʌ] (LASID)

In ainneoin go léiríonn SGDS go soiléir go bhfuil an guta seo le fáil ag gach ceann de naioi bpointe Leòdhais níor aimsigh mé féin mar mhóralafón é i measc ánghialt a bhailigh mé ó fhaisnéiseoirí ar an Chladach-a-Tuath ná, go deimhin, in áit ar bith eile i gCeap Breatainn.

11. eó Le córas na ngutaí fosta a bhaineann an tréith a phléifear anois i.e. forás an défhoghair stairiúil eó. I gcanúintí Gaelge ár linne tá an chéad mhír den défhoghar stairiúil seo imithe ar lár ach tá léirithe ag suirbhé Borgstrøm cruthanna faoina bhfuil an mhír chéanna caomhnaite in Inse Gall. Dé réir na fíanaise sin maireann sí in gcónaí i ríochtar an chéad eilimint de dhéfhoghar sna Hearadh, ach i Leòdhas tá dhá rogha i gceist: (i) caomhnaitéar í ina leathghutha i dtosach focal nó ar long consain liopaigh; nó (ii) imíonn sí ar long consain chaoil (cf. eòin, Tábla 1 thuas). Is féidir scéal Borgstrøm sna Hearadh a dheartháire de réir fíanaise ó *SGDS*, s.v. beò, ceòl, eòin ‘éin’, gurb é an défhoghar amháin atá le fáil. I gcás an dá fhaisnéiseoir atá again ón Chladach-a-Tuath i gCeap Breatainn ní bhuair mé fíanaise ar bith den fhorás atá i gceist sna Hearadh; is é an ceann eile atá le fáil, cf. [i], cf. eòin [i:ə].

… an interdental fricative, normally voiced … often but not always slightly palatalized … very like English ð in these.

Ag a chuid pointí in Oileán Leòdhais amháin atá an cineál cuimiltigh atá i gceist anseo le fáil i suirbhé Borgstrøm ach is é an taithí atá agam féin ann dó i gcanúintí níos faide ó dheas in Inse Gall chomh maith. Deimhníonnaisneis SGDS an méid sin, áit a luaitear é sna hUibhiste, cuirim i gcás, i bhfoirmneacha de chineál idir 13-14, P'tí 18, 22-4) ‘ar chor ar bith’, nó stiùir (805, P’tí 18, 22-4). I dtaca le Ceap Breatainn de, gídh go bhfuil an déadach cuimilteach seo le cluinistin, gan amhras, i bhfocal mar tioram ‘dry’, cuir i gcás, a bhfuil sampla ar taifead agam ó W, is é a chúither dom, cibé sin de, nach bhfuil i gceist léi ar an Chladach-a-Tuath, ach oiread le háiteanna eile ar fud an oileáin, ach alafón annamh de r caol.

13. Réamhanálú roimh -(r/l)c(-) Tá fúm anois plé a dhéanamh ar an chéad point dé bhybhil luaite i liosta Borgstrøm. Heitréiglas fóineolafochta eile é seo lena ndéantar idirdhealú idir Leòdhas agus canúintí eile is faide ó dheas in Inse Gall. Baineann sé le réalú pléascach neamhghlóchar stairiúil i dtimpeallacht aiceanta ar lorg guta. Fuaim chuimilteach mar eilimint neamhspleách (Patrún 2) atá í ndiaidh teacht chun cinn sna canúintí úd ó dheas atá i gceist, san áit a léiríonn canúintí Leòdhais réamhanálú9 mar thréith dhílis den phléascach (Patrún 1). Tá an timpeallacht roimh phléascach cogusach roghnaithe agam anseo leis an idirdhealú a léiriú. Sa chás sin tagann chun cinn cuimilteach cogusach nó carballach taoibh amuigh de Leòdhhas, cf. SGDS 592 (mac: a mhic, Leòdhas: [ə vɨhk’] (Patrún 1) vs na Hearadh: [ə vɨʃ’k’] (Patrún 2). Chomh fada agus a

9 Thomson 1983, 104-05.
bhaineann le Ceap Breatainn, is é Patrún 2 is nós le faisnéiseoir W, mar a léirítear sna focail fiacail, mucan ‘muca’, smoc ‘toit’, aca ‘acu’, picil. Má léiríonn W1 Patrún 2 chomh maith i gcás focal áirithe, macasamhail mac, craiceann ‘croiceann’, aca ‘acu’, aice ‘aicí’, tumbaca ‘tobac’, tá teacht ina cuidse cainte ar Phatrún 1 fosta, i bhfocal áirithe eile mar acair ‘ancaire’, faciinn ‘feiceáil’, peacadh ‘peaca’.10 Is é Patrún 1 a thugtar faoi deara i gcaint faisnéiseoir T níos faide ó dheas, ceantar ar chaith an bhean thuasluaite mórchuid dá saol mar bhean fhásta ina cónaí ann. Ar shamplaí d’fhocal a léiríonn Patrún 1 i gcaint T atá le luas agam tá mac, craiceann agus peacadh. Timeallacht eile ina bhfaightear heitreaglas goelmar is ea na cairn chonsonachac -rc(-), -lc(-). Mar an gcéanna leis an chás atáthar dhreach i ndiaidh a plé, tá cuimilteach coguasach nó carballach i ndiaidh teacht chun cinn roimh an phléascach anseo sna canúintí ó dheas in Inse Gall. Is é a chuireann suirbhé Borgstrøm ó il dúinn nach ann dá leithéid de chuimilteach i nGaidhlig na Hearadh sna focail ólce, cearc, coirce. Ina áit sin is é rud a dhear an shíomh an -r-, nó -l- roimh an phléascach a dhéaghrú, faoi mar a tharlaíonn i gcanúintí Leòdhais. Tacaíonn faisnéis SGDS leis an mhéid sin ag bunús phointí na Hearadh mar, san fhoinsé seo, ní bhíonn samplaí de chuimilteach le fáil ach ag Pointe 12 agus i gcás -rc- amháin. Ábhar suntais é go ndéanann W feidhm de Phatrún 2 i gcás an fhocal adhairc ‘adharc’ [ø:rçk'] (mar atá le fáil níos faide ó dheas in Inse Gall), áit a bhfuiltear ag plé le carn a bhí le fáil i siolla neamhaiceanta stairiúil. Is fíú scéal an duine a thogh mé mar fhaisnéiseoir ionadaíoch do phobal traidisiúnta na Hearadh in oirdheiscceart Cheap Breatainn (Gabarus) a lua sa chás seo. Déanann sí seo úsáid de chuimilteach coguasach/carballach sna trí fhocal tástála úd atá ag Borgstrøm. Ní miste a lua, cé bith, go bhfuil an pobal lena mbaineann sí suite taobh le sliocht coilínite agus gur gnáth-thréith Uibhistean agus gur gnáth-thréith Uibhistean é an coguasach/carballach céanna sna cairn atá i gceist (cf. Borgstrøm 1940, 236-43).

14. Maird leis an dara pointe a luan Borgstrøm ar ar féidir idir-dhealulú a bhunú idir canúintí éagsúla de chuid Inse Gall, bainean sé sin leis an fhóras a tháinig ar charún chaola ina dtagann -r roimh chonsan déadach i siolla aiceanta, viz. -rd, -rl, -rn, -rt. De réir shuirbhí an scoláire chéanna tá de dhihríocht idir Leòdhais agus na

10 Féach Ó Maolalaigh 1999, 211: mar a dtugtar samplaí d’idirchanúint (interdialect) agus d’fhóirmeacha idirchanúnaí i gcanúineolaíocht na Gaidhlig. Pléann an scoláire seo san alt céanna tothaí éagsúla a thagann ó hyperdialectalism.
Hearadh i gcás an chairn -rn nach gcaolaítear i Leòdhas é. Bíodh sin mar atá, is léir, ach fainseís SDDS a chur san áireamh, go bhfuil eiscceachtaí ag pointí faoi leith i limistéar Leòdhas. Ar an ábhar sin ní chuirim an tréith áirithe seo san áireamh ar mhaithe leis an chomparáid atá á déanamh agam. Ní haon dochar a lua, mar sin féin, go léiríonn an bhfuil d’fhianaise agam ó Cheap Breatainn nach mbaineann caoluí don charn áirithe seo i gcás fainseiseoirí T agus T1. Ar an lámh eile, cé bith, tá fhanseise san ábhar a fuartha ó W ar chaolú a bheith i antriú ansiúd. Chomh fada agus a bhaíneann leis an charn caol -rl, is é an focal óirleach ‘orlach’ atá i dtreis ag Borgstrøm, nach bhfuil ar chlár foirmeacha SDDS. I gcás an tsampla seo tá leachtach caol le lua aige ní amháin sna Hearadh ach ag pointe amháin i Leòdhas fosta i.e. Beàrnaraigh. In ainneoin nach é a leithéid ach leachtach cuartha [‘retroflex’] a thugann LASID IV (Pointe (e) Ceist 360) agus Ofstedal (1956, 126) i gcás áiteanna in iar-thar agus in oirthear Leòdhas faoi seach, is léir ó thorthaí SDDS gurb ann do leachtach caol sa charn i gcás canúinti’ áirithe i Leòdhas fosta. Níl aon chaolú i gceist ag fainseiseoir W de chuid Cheap Breatainn sa sampla a léiríonn forbairt an chairn -rl, mar atá mèirleach ‘gadaí’.

15. Ar deireadh thiar ní beag an t-údar suime é cás na gcarn pléascach déadach. Is é atá taispeáanta ag Borgstrøm ina staidéar ar -rt san fhocal goirt ‘tinn’ go bhfuil teorainn idir Leòdhas, limistéar nár nocht pléascach caol ann, agus an chuid eile d’Inse Gall mar a mbíonn pléascach caol le fáil. Roghnáidh cuairt ‘cúrsa’ (267), agus fealírt ‘aire’ (411) mar fhocail samplacha in SDDS, agus féicithear sa chás seo dáileadh tíreolaíochtaí a bheag nó a thabhairt atá mar áit Mar gcéanna lena bhfachtas i gcás -r- caol stáiríúil á réitli mar churíleacht caol, [ð] (féach thuas, §12). Sa charn atá faoi chaibidil anseo fosta tá forás faoi leith de sonrú i.e. an caolú a imeacht den charn. Níor tharla sé sin sna Hearadh ach is saoréidhe chuitrech de chuid Leòdhas i agus tréith a mbuailtear léi ó uair go chéile níos faide ó dheas. I dtaca le forás an chairn chaol -rd de, is é atá ar an taifead i bhfoirmeacha na Hearadh ag Borgstrøm -s- sáiteach (nach ann dó i gcanúintí Leòdhas) ní amháin sa charn caol ach ina chomhchearn leathan. Deimhmíonn SDDS go bhfuil an scéal mar seo i gcás an chairn seo ar fhianaise na fóirme càirdean ‘cairde’ (152). Tugtar faoi deara an athuair go bhfuil an leagan amach ‘Leòdhasach’ i gceist ag dornán beag pointí níos faide ó dheas chomh maith mar ní fhaightear cairn-s acu seo. Is é a thugann an fhianaise atá agam ó Cheap Breatainn le fios ro ar an chéad dul síos nach ann don -s- sáiteach i
gcairn -rt, -rd i gcás T ná i gcás W – ná, go deimhin, i gcás m’fhasnéiseora eile ón phointe céanna i. W1. (Ní miste a lua nach bhfuil samplaí den chanúint atá agam ó ionadaf an phobail Hearagaigh in oirdheisceart an oileáin ag teacht leis sin.) Lena chois sin, ní bhaineann caolú leis an phléascach sa charn atá in goirt, ach oiread leis an cheann sa charn in bùird i gcás fhaisnéiseoirí uile an Chladaich-a-Tuath a luadh thuas. Ní mar sin atá an scéal, cibé sin de, nuair a scrúdaítear foirmeacha ildiollacha. I dtimpeallacht dá leithéid nochtann W caolú i bpléascaigh dhéadacha na bhfocal beartach ‘saibhir’ agus (nas) àirde ‘níos áirde’ agus ag an phointe ó dheas sa limistéar sin cuireann T1 fianaíse ar fáil go bhfuil a leithéid de chaolú sa charn pléascach in goirt ‘frithreacht’. Níl d’fhairseirgeacht agam anseo a cheart anchoite ar fhorbairt an phléascaigh i siolaí neamhaiceanta stiarthlú ach tá fianaíse ann, mar sin féin, dar liom, a thabharfadh le fios nach nochtann ceachtar de phointí seo an Chladaich-a-Tuath caolú i bhfoirmreacha mar tabhairt nó thubhairt ò dhúirt (cf.1, Ptí 10-13), timpeallacht ina dtagann caolú ar an phléascaigh déadach sna Hearadh.

TÁBLA 2: Comparáid idir T, W agus canúintí Leòdhais & na Hearadh

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>eòd</th>
<th>[ə]</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>= Leòdhais</td>
<td>≠ Leòdhais (annamh)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>= Leòdhais</td>
<td>≠ Leòdhais (annamh)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mic</td>
<td><em>adhairc</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>= Leòdhais</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>= Na Hearadh</td>
<td>≠ Leòdhais, Na Hearadh</td>
<td>= Uidhist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W1</td>
<td>± Leòdhais</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-irn</td>
<td></td>
<td>-irl</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T, T1</td>
<td>= Leòdhais (Borgstrøm)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>≠ Leòdhais (Borgstrøm)</td>
<td>½ ≠ Leòdhais</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-rt</td>
<td></td>
<td>-rd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>= Leòdhais</td>
<td>= Leòdhais</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W, W1</td>
<td>= Leòdhais</td>
<td>= Leòdhais</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-irt</td>
<td></td>
<td>-ird</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>= Leòdhais</td>
<td>= Leòdhais</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>= Leòdhais</td>
<td>= Leòdhais</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-irt + GUTA</td>
<td></td>
<td>-ird + GUTA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1</td>
<td>= Na Hearadh</td>
<td>= Na Hearadh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>= Na Hearadh</td>
<td>= Na Hearadh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
16. Tugann an cuntas thuas (ar a bhfuil suimiú i dTábla 2), dá achoimre é, le fios sa chéad chás de go bhfuil tréithe canúna an fhaisnéiseora T ag teacht go maith lena bhfuil ar eolas againn faoi chanúnintí Leòdhais. Léiríonn an t-eolas céanna an tionchar mór a bhí agcoilínithe ón oileán sin i gcruthú an phobail teanga lenar bhain an duine áirithe sin. I gcás an limistéir eile atá nós faide ó thuaidh ar an Chladach-a-Tuath (W), gídh go dtuairiscítear tréithe Leòdhasachá a bheith ag an fhaisnéiseoir ann, ar ndóigh, mar sin féin tugtar faoi deara go bhfuil go leor tréithe i gceist aige nach bhfuil ag réiteach le Gàidhlig Leòdhais. Léiríonn an t-eolas céanna an tionchar mór a bhí ag coilínithe ón oileán sin i gcruthú an phobail teanga lenar bhain an duine áirithe sin. I gcás an limistéir eile atá nós faide ó thuaidh ar an Chladach-a-Tuath (W), gídh go dtuairiscítear tréithe Leòdhasachá a bheith ag an fhaisnéiseoir ann, ar ndóigh, mar sin féin tugtar faoi deara go bhfuil go leor tréithe i gceist aige nach bhfuil ag réiteach le Gàidhlig Leòdhais. Léiríonn an t-eolas céanna an tionchar mór a bhí ag coilínithe ón oileán sin i gcruthú an phobail teanga lenar bhain an duine áirithe sin. I gcás an limistéir eile atá nós faide ó thuaidh ar an Chladach-a-Tuath (W), gídh go dtuairiscítear tréithe Leòdhasachá a bheith ag an fhaisnéiseoir ann, ar ndóigh, mar sin féin tugtar faoi deara go bhfuil go leor tréithe i gceist aige nach bhfuil ag réiteach le Gàidhlig Leòdhais. Tá fíannaíse eile agam (nach bhfuil de spás agam lena plé anseo) i gcatagoirí na fóinseolaíochta, an fhoclóra, etc, a léiríonn mar a bhí canúintí á meascadh ag an dá phointe atá i gceist, ach nach mbainfeadh dhiú agus chun cinn sa staidéal seo, i a laidre atá tionchar chanúnintí na Hearadh agus faoi deara go bhfuil an fhaisnéiseora W. Caithfear a dhéanamh i gcás an duine áirithe seo nárthfhéidir do féin cén ceantar dúchasach sa Ghàidhealtacht arbh as dá shinsir. I gcás T, cúlaí ar bith, mhaigh sé seo ceangal sinsireach le dearcas Tarbot (Tairbeart na Hearadh) a bheith aige, ceangal ar bhí éigean a réitíonn fíannaíse a chanúna leis. Is é rud atá an leagan amach a léirítear anseo ag teacht go maith leis an taithí ata agam féin in áiteanna éagsúla ar fud oileán Cheap Breatainn, mar atá, gur nós coitianta é duine a bheith ag maíomh gurbh as ceantar ar leith sa Ghàidhealtacht dá shinsir ach, san am céanna, tréithe áirithe dá chanúnint a bheith ag bréagnú an cheangail leis an limistéar atá i gceist.
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An Coláiste Ollscoile, Baile Átha Cliath
TWO NOTES ON NAMES

1. Crimthann Nia Náir

The epithet of Crimthann Nia Náir, one of the legendary forebears of the Dál Cuinn kings, is usually explained in medieval sources as meaning ‘champion of Nár’: the reference is to the fairy woman (bansídaige) Nár Thuathchaech (‘N. Blind-in-the-left-eye’), his wife or lover, who is said to have taken him with her on an adventure or echtrae from which he returned laden with treasures.\(^1\) Statements to this effect are to be found in Airne Fíingein,\(^2\) in Lebor Gabála,\(^3\) in the prose Dindsenchas,\(^4\) in Senchas na Relec,\(^5\) and in Cóir Anmann.\(^6\) In his poem Ádam oenathair na ndoíne (A.D. 1147), Gilla Mo Dútú ua Casaise proposed that Nár Thuathech was in fact Crimthann’s mother, whom he assigned to ‘the tribes of the Cruithni’: he then went on, however, to note the standard doctrine that Crimthann’s mother was named Clothru.\(^7\)

A conspicuous difficulty with this traditional etymology is that Náir appears to be the masculine rather than the feminine genitive singular of the adjective nár.\(^8\) In fact, a male figure named Nár Tuathchaech figures in the saga Togail Bruidne Da Derga:

---

\(^1\) For a thorough discussion of the references to Crimthann’s echtrae, and also of the various figures named Nár Thuathchaech, see now Jacqueline Borsje, ‘Über die Identität von Nár Tuathchaech aus der verlorengegangenen Erzählung Echtrae Chrimitainn Nia Naír’ in Keltologie heute: Themen und Fragestellungen, ed. Erich Poppe (Münster 2004) 169-93. The issues considered in this note are dealt with most directly on pp. 185-9.

\(^2\) Ed. by Joseph Vendryes (Dublin 1953) 8-9.

\(^3\) LL ll. 2898-902; LG V 302-5.


\(^5\) LU ll. 4108-10.

\(^6\) Whitley Stokes (ed. and trans.), ‘Cóir Anmann (Fitness of Names)’ Irische Texte III/2 (1897) 285-444: 332 §106.

\(^7\) LL ll. 16817-22.

\(^8\) Occasional instances of the epithet in the form Nia Náire (e.g. CGH 130; Stokes, ‘Rennes Dindsenchas’ RC 16,73) are evidently secondary. Otherwise, Nár appears to be attested exclusively as a man’s name: besides the figures discussed below, note Nár mac Airmora (CGH 97, 264), Nár mac Augein Aurgnaid (ibid. 20), Nár mac Bregoin (LL l. 1502), Nár mac Daigthi (CGH 97), Nar mac Edlicon (MD II 54), Nár
At-chonnarc fer and, túathchoech co súil milledaig. Cend mucci lais for tenid ossí o cí siréigem … Nár Thuathchaech sain. Muccaid Boidb a Síd ar Fémin. Nach fled oca roibi do-dortad fuil oce.⁹

I saw a man there, blind in the left eye, with a destructive eye. He had a pig’s head upon the fire, and it was shrieking continuously … That is Nár Tuathchaech, the swineherd of Bodb from Síd ar Fémin. Blood has been shed at every feast which he has attended.

As Edward Gwynn pointed out, Airne Fíingein associates the female Nár Thuathchaech with the same ‘síd of Bodb’ where her male counterpart is said to have been a swineherd: he suggested accordingly that she was in fact simply a secondary version of the figure in Togail Bruidne Da Derga. This conjecture formed part of an involved argument in which Gwynn maintained that the epithet Nia Náir was devised as part of an attempt to suppress the tradition that Crimthann had been incestuously begotten by Lugaid Riab nDerg upon Clothru, his own mother.

In order to cloak the incestuous birth of Crimthann … he is feigned to be the son of a fairy mother (unnamed), sister to Nár of Sid Femin (also called Sid Buidb): Nia Náir = Nár’s nephew. Next the name Nár is transferred to his fairy mother [as in Gilla Mo Dutu’s poem] … The next step is that the connection with the aes síde gives rise to the Echtra Crimthainn, the voyage of adventure over sea from which he brings back wonderful treasures. To suit the romantic story Nár becomes his wife ….¹⁰

There are useful insights here, but Gwynn’s scenario is not without its weaknesses. For one thing, there is no evidence that any effort was ever made to obscure Crimthann’s irregular parentage: even Keating, with his polemical aim of defending the Irish past against

---

⁹ Eleanor Knott (ed.), Togail Bruidne Da Derga (Dublin 1936) 42.
¹⁰ MD III 500.
foreign criticism, is entirely candid on the point.\textsuperscript{11} And even if such a whitewashing campaign be postulated, why should it have been an unnamed sister of the uncanny Nár who was made to replace Clothru as Crimthann’s mother?\textsuperscript{12} And why should the immediately subsequent development according to Gwynn’s scheme, whereby Crimthann’s mother was herself named Nár, be attested only in a source as late as Gilla Mo Dutu’s poem, and even then only as one of two alternative doctrines?\textsuperscript{13} Crimthann’s overseas adventure, which comes as the final link in Gwynn’s chain of mutations, is already alluded to (with no mention of a female companion) in the poem \textit{Reicne Fothaid Chanainne}, dated by Meyer to the eighth century.\textsuperscript{14}

I agree with Gwynn, however, that the tradition of Crimthann’s incestuous birth is crucial to the interpretation of his epithet. The story is a tangled one, involving even more than Lugaid Riab nDerg’s relations with his own mother. In the words of \textit{Lebor Gabála}:

\begin{quote}
Is é in Lugaid Ríab nDerg dorónsat tri meic Echach Feidlig ra síar .i. re Clothraind. & dano doróne in Lugaid-sin mac ria mathair fein .i. Crimthand mac Lugdech rí Herend.\textsuperscript{15}
\end{quote}

It is Lugaid Riab nDerg whom the three sons of Echu Feidlech begot upon their sister, i.e., upon Clothru. And then that Lugaid begot a son upon his own mother, i.e. Crimthann son of Lugaid, king of Ireland.

Some of the complexity of the resulting interrelationships is reflected in a quatrain of \textit{dian midšeng} cited by Keating:

\begin{quote}
Lughaidh Riabh nDearg do Chriomhthann chain fá athair is fa bráthair;

is Clothra an chrotha ghnáthaigh
da mac ro ba seanmháthair.
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{11} Keating, \textit{FFÉ} II 232-5.

\textsuperscript{12} It should be borne in mind that there is no direct evidence for this crucial stage in Gwynn’s reconstructed sequence.

\textsuperscript{13} It is also worth noting that Nár appears here not as a fairy woman at all, but as one of the Cruithni. The same idea is mentioned in the Book of Ballymote’s copy of \textit{Cóir Anmann} (Stokes, ‘Cóir Anmann’, loc. cit.).

\textsuperscript{14} Kuno Meyer (ed. and trans.), \textit{Fianaigecht: Irish poems and tales relating to Finn and his Fianna, with an English translation} (Dublin 1910) 14, q. 26.

\textsuperscript{15} \textit{LL} ll. 2895-8; cf. Macalister, \textit{LG} V 304.
Lugaid Riab nDerg to fair Crimthann was father and was brother; and Clothru of the pleasant shape was grandmother to her son.\footnote{Keating, \textit{FFÉ} II 232.}

The three sons of Echu Feidlech are named in other sources as Bres, Nár, and Lothar,\footnote{E.g. Joseph O’Neill (ed. and trans.), ‘Cath Boinde’ \textit{Ériu} 2 (1905) 173-85 (at p. 174).} and I suggest that it was Nár son of Echu rather than Nár the swineherd of Bodb who inspired Crimthann’s epithet. The word \textit{nia} means not only ‘champion’ but also ‘nephew, sister’s son’, and Crimthann is the son of Clothru sister of Nár.\footnote{In this connection, it is interesting to note Thomas Charles-Edwards’s argument that \textit{nia}’s Common Celtic ancestor *\textit{neu-ss} ‘meant “grandson”, “descendant” like Skt. \textit{nápa-t}’ (‘Some Celtic kinship terms’ \textit{Bulletin of the Board of Celtic Studies} 24 (1971) 105-22 (at p. 111)). Crimthann, as Lugaid’s son, is of course Nár’s grandson as well as his nephew.} That Crimthann was named with reference to Nár rather than to one of the other brothers can perhaps be explained in terms of alliteration with \textit{nia}; that a certain primacy attached to him, despite his being regularly mentioned second when the brothers are listed, may be reflected in the statement of \textit{Cóir Anmann} that Lugaid’s head resembled Nár’s, the middle and lower parts of his body Bres and Lothar respectively.\footnote{Stokes, ‘Cóir Anmann’ \textit{loc. cit.}} It may also be relevant that the adjective \textit{nár} ‘noble’ came to be used in the sense ‘shameful’.\footnote{Cf. Keating, \textit{FFÉ} II 234: \textit{Is as tugadh Nár air do bhrígh gur bha nár leis a gheineamhain idir a dhearbráthair is a mháthair}. But it may be that no more than coincidence is involved here. The semantic development in question is not clearly attested before the later Middle Irish period, and the epithet \textit{Nia Náir} appears already in \textit{Reicne Fothaid Chanainne} (cf. n. 15 above). For a possible instance of \textit{nár} in this sense in the Old Irish version of \textit{Mesca Ulad}, however, see the discussion below.}

While I agree with Gwynn that use of the name \textit{Nár} for Crimthann’s wife or lover is a secondary development, I see the path of derivation as having taken a trajectory different from that which he proposed. The story concerning Crimthann’s overseas adventure seems to have been the most prominent feature in his legendary profile.\footnote{To the references in nn. 3-7 and 15 above may be added the poem \textit{Madochód i n-echtra n-áin} (\textit{MD} III 120-7) and the Middle Irish tale-lists (Proinsias Mac Cana, \textit{The learned tales of medieval Ireland} (Dublin 1980) 45, 53).} The supernatural woman who lured him away from Ireland was probably originally nameless, like the fairy mistresses in
Echtrae Chondlai, Immram Brain, and Echtrae Nerai; when a name was sought for her, that of Nár Tuathchaech must have seemed suitable because it both echoed Crimthann’s epithet and had associations with the Otherworld.

If the explanation advanced here is the correct one, then other instances of the epithet, or of closely similar formulations, must be seen as secondary. I am aware of two examples. When in Táin Bó Cuailnge Fer Diad is made to say Ní hobair níad náire, rendered by Cecile O’Rahilly as ‘Diffidence is not the business of a warrior’, an almost identical collocation is produced by entirely different syntax. I take this to be a merely verbal reminiscence of our phrase. More puzzling is the mention of a Crumthand Niath Náir, said to belong to the Érainn, in the Old Irish version of Mesca Ulad. The epithet is only applied to this individual once in the episode in which he figures, and it could be supposed that it is an interpolation inspired by familiarity with the better-known Crimthann son of Lugaid. On the other hand, it is striking that this Crimthann seeks to attack Cú Chulainn when the latter has hidden his face from a woman who is exposing herself to him. A warrior who takes advantage of such a situation could indeed be called, in what I take to be an ad hoc pun, a ‘champion of bashfulness’.

2. Dercc Corra

In his translation of the curious little story to which he gave the title ‘Finn and the Man in the Tree’, Kuno Meyer rendered the name of the mysterious exiled servant who stands at the centre of the narra-

---

22 Thus the poem cited in the preceding note says only that Crimthann undertook his echtrae ‘on account of the falsehood and temptation of women’ (tre bréic ocus aslach mban; MD III 120.6). This misogynistic note is not found in other references to this adventure; it may conceivably be such a version of the tale which is alluded to in the gnomic couplet ‘Crimthann Nia Náir said: / “You should not give your secret to women’’ (Asbert Cremthann Nia Náir: / Ní tardda do rúin do mnáib), in Rudolf Thurneysen (ed.), Scéla Mucce Meic Dathó (Dublin 1935) 3.1.10.

23 TBC I, 1. 2852; cf. LL TBC, 1. 2822.

24 LU ll. 1527-43.

25 For a very different interpretation see the views of T. F. O’Rahilly as cited by J. Carmichael Watson in his edition Mesca Ulad (Dublin 1941) pp. xxxvi-ix. The Crimthann Nia Náir of Mesca Ulad is taken to be the same as the one who fetched treasures back from his echtrae in the dindsenchas of Luibnech (MD IV 220; Stokes, ‘Rennes Dindsenchas’ RC 16, 73).

26 Cf. LL TBC 1. 1192, where Cú Chulainn is constrained to hide his face lest he see nochta nó náre na mban ‘the nakedness or shame of the women’.
tive as ‘Derg Corra son of Ua Daigre’. 27 All interpretations of the
name known to me have followed Meyer in taking the first element
to be *derg* ‘red’. Thus Gerard Murphy translates it as ‘Red one of
Corr (?) of the race of Flame’, and finds in it evidence of another
manifestation of the ‘Magic Burner’ whom he took to be Finn’s
mythical enemy.28 Anne Ross, who proposes rendering it ‘Peaked
Red One’, associates it with the Otherworldly connotations of the
colour red and with ‘such cult heads as that found in Killavilla …
with its strange pointed head which may represent a hood, or a sup-
posed distortion of the skull.’29 And Joseph Nagy, who cites Ross’s
translation, suggests symbolic connections with fire and also, more
tentatively, with the phallus.30

In its five attestations in the unique manuscript, however, the name
is given as *Dercc* (four times) or *Derc* (once).31 While the sound [rg]
can be spelled *rc* in early Irish,32 this does not seem to have been the
practice of the scribe of our tale: in a quick look at the text of the
story as a whole, together with the pages immediately preceding and
following it in the manuscript, I have found no instances of such a
spelling, but a generous supply of counterexamples.33 I can see no

27 *RC* 25 (1904) 344-9: 347. *Mac hui*, here translated by Meyer ‘son of Ua’, is as he
subsequently realised a reinterpretation of the old gentilic term *moccu* (thus *Fian-
aigecht*, p. xviii). Dercc Corra accordingly belonged to a group which traced its
descent from an ancestor Daiger. Given the associations of this story, and of others
closely related to it, with locations in Co. Tipperary (see further below), it seems
possible that these were the Uí Daigre whose territory included Lettracha Odráin,
now Latteragh, in the northern part of the county (Pádraig Ó Riain (ed.), *Corpus
genealogiarum sanctorum Hiberniae* (Dublin 1985) 34 §200).

28 Eoin Mac Neill and Gerard Murphy (ed. and trans.), *Duanaire Finn* 3 vols.
(London and Dublin 1908, 1933, 1953) III pp. Lvi, lxiii-iv. Cf. Dáithí Ó hÓgáin,
*Fionn mac Cumhaill* (Dublin 1988) 47-8.


30 Joseph F. Nagy, *Wisdom of the outlaw* (Berkeley and Los Angeles 1985) 133,
278-9.

31 *CIH*, 879.34, 37, 39; 880.12, 13. The spelling *Dercc* is given by Ross, who does
not comment on its implications for the translation which she suggests. Other schol-
ars have preserved the manuscript spelling without attempting a translation (Gwynn,
‘Varia: 3. “Finn and the Man in the Tree”’ *Ériu* 11 (1932) 152-3; Vernam Hull, ‘A
rhetoric in *Finn and the Man in the Tree*’ *ZCP* 30 (1962) 17-20).

32 E.g. *derc* glossing *rufus*, Sg 37 a 5.

33 *argut* (*CIH* 881.6, 7), *Birgge* (ibid. 879.24), *con-airged* (ibid. 876.1), *derg* (ibid.
881.15), *do-erglus* (ibid. 876.3), *eirgg* (ibid. 879.38), *etargna* (ibid. 876.38; cf.
etargnaithi* 876.39), *laarg* (ibid. 880.21), *luirgnib* (ibid. 879.40), *oderig* (ibid. 881.8),
timaired* (ibid. 881.19). The treatment of [lg] is similar; *bolg* (ibid. 881.14, 15),
*condelg* (ibid. 881.17), *Gaidilge* (ibid. 876.28; cf. *Gaidhilg* 876.33).
good reason not to accept the evidence as it stands, and read *Dercc*: this would seem to be the noun *dercc* ‘eye; hollow, cavity, pool; berry’.

Murphy is probably correct in taking *Corra* to be a dependent genitive: genitive *Corra* appears in the collective *Uí Chorra*;35 and the pedigrees of the Éoganacht give *Corra* (v. ll. *Corr(a)e, Corrai, Cuirre, Corne*) as genitive of *Corr*.36 *Corra* is also genitive in such place-names as *Achad na Corra, Baile na Corra Móire, Carrac na Corra, Cethrama na Corra Drisighi, Cúl Corra(e),* and *Loch Corra*.37 *Corra(e)* in all of these instances is evidently a by-form of *cuirre*, the normal genitive singular of various *a*-stem nouns *corr* with the meanings ‘peak’, ‘heron, crane’, and ‘pool’.38

Where does this leave us in our efforts to interpret the name? The possibilities are as diverse as ‘eye of a crane’,39 ‘cave of a peak’, or ‘hollow of a pool’. In favour of taking *Dercc Corra* to have been originally a toponym of some kind is the circumstance that *dercc* and *corra* are respectively attested as the first and second elements in several place-names.40

It may also be significant that the story of Dercc Corra forms part of a small group of early Finn tales which are concerned with the geography of a restricted region in east Munster. The text to which Meyer gave the title ‘Finn and the Man in the Tree’ in fact comprises two anecdotes: the account of Dercc Corra is preceded by a tale of

---

34 *DIL* s.v.; that ‘eye’ was the primary sense emerges from the discussion in Joseph Vendryes et al., *Lexique étymologique de l’irlandais ancien* (Paris and Dublin 1959-), fasc. D 55-6.


36 *CGH* 213, 215.

37 *Onom.* s. nn. Some further instances of *Corra* as a placename element are given by M. J. Canon Connellan, ‘Miscellanea: 3. The placenames Cagála, Carna, Creaga, Corra’ *Éigse* 10 (1961-3) 317-18.

38 *DIL*, s.vv. For the occasional use of *a*-stems as masculine personal names see Rudolf Thurneysen, *A grammar of Old Irish* (Dublin 1946) §288.

39 For the image of a crane plucking out an eye see *TBC I* ll. 2256-8; Myles Dillon (ed.), *Serglige Con Culaimn* (Dublin 1953) l. 45; A. O’Kelleher and G. Schoepperle (ed. and trans.), *Betha Coluimb Chille* (repr. Dublin 1994) 176-8. Alternatively, there could be some connection with the destructive ritual of *corr-guinecht*, perhaps originally ‘crane-wounding’, which involved the closing of one eye: discussion and references in Liam Breantach (ed. and trans.), *Uraicecht na Ríar* (Dublin 1987) 140.

40 For *dercc* in this connection see *Onom.* 342; examples of *corra* are given in the preceding paragraph.
how Finn gained his prophetic powers in the course of slaying the thief Cúldub, from the síd of Slievenamon. Another version of the story of Cúldub appears separately in two manuscripts, juxtaposed in both instances with a third Finn tale with the title *Bruiden Ítha Í*. All three of these narratives deal with the same area, and with some of the same places. The river Suir, Cenn Cuirrig (now Kincurry, Co. Waterford), and a place named Badamair are all mentioned both in the story of Cúldub and in *Bruiden Ítha Í*, and Dún Iascaig (now Cahir, Co. Tipperary) appears both in *Bruiden Ítha Í* and in the story of Dercc Corra. It seems likely, moreover, that the unnamed woman captured at Dún Iascaig in the story of Dercc Corra is the same as the woman who becomes the eponym of Badamair, encountered by Finn at Dún Iascaig, in *Bruiden Ítha Í*. Interest in local toponymy is further reflected in the independent version of the story of Cúldub, which enumerates the places traversed by the warriors pursuing the thief, and seeks to account for the origin of the names Mag Tarra and Toeb Muicce. Might Dercc Corra have also been the name of a place in the same general vicinity – perhaps some natural feature of which the story, in its concluding tableau, gives a fanciful description?

This can obviously be no more than speculation, and the name’s real meaning may no longer be recoverable. I hope, however, that the preceding paragraphs have indicated the directions in which it can most profitably be sought.

**ABBREVIATED REFERENCES**


---

41 The stories of Cúldub and Dercc Corra form a narrative digression, in the course of a discussion of the qualifications of *fili*, in the legal manuscript TCD MS 1337 (H. 3. 18) (*CIH* 879.23-880.14; cf. n. 27 above).

42 These tales were edited by Kuno Meyer from RIA MS 1223 (D iv 2) as ‘Two tales about Finn’ *RC* 14 (1893) 241-9; Vernam Hull edited them from the Yellow Book of Lecan as ‘Two tales about Find’ *Speculum* 16 (1941) 322-33.


44 For humans or immortals transformed into pools of water cf. the fates of Étaine (Osborn Bergin and R I. Best (ed. and trans.), ‘Tochmarc Étaine’ *Ériu* 12 (1938) 137-96: 152), Odras (*MD* IV 200), and Aige (Stokes, ‘Rennes Dindsenchas’ *RC* 15, 306).

45 I am indebted to my colleagues Kevin Murray and Pádraig Ó Riain for many helpful references, and for the identification of several place-names. The toponymic resources of the Locus Project (University College Cork) have also been very useful.
CIH  Corpus iuris Hibernici, ed. D. A. Binchy, 6 vols (Dublin 1978).
DIL  Dictionary of the Irish Language and Contributions to a Dictionary of the Irish Language (Dublin 1913-75).
LL TBC Táin Bó Cuailnge from the Book of Leinster, ed. Cecile O’Rahilly (Dublin 1970).
LU   Lebor na hUidre, ed. R. I. Best and Osborn Bergin (Dublin 1929).
Onom. Edmund Hogan, Onomasticon Goedelicum (Dublin 1910).
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IRISH manuscripts in Oxford libraries were acquired through donation and purchase over four centuries. The collection thus is unplanned and random in content. Nevertheless, it incorporates works representative of the full spectrum of surviving vernacular manuscripts. If no other collection but that of Oxford survived, a history of Irish manuscript production between the eleventh and twentieth centuries could still be traced. Moreover, the range of material included in the present catalogue by the late Brian Ó Cuív allows us to view Irish-language scribal activity within a broad context. Thus we are reminded that in the period of the late eleventh and early twelfth centuries, contemporaneous with the great vernacular compendium that is Rawlinson B. 502, a Latin manuscript tradition also flourished. Latin and vernacular still share common ground in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, as witnessed in the Oxford hagiographical manuscripts. From the seventeenth century onward the co-existing manuscript languages are Irish and English. The Oxford collection not only holds a copy of the seventeenth-century history Foras Feasa ar Éirinn, it also holds its eighteenth-century English translation. Moreover, another kind of historical glimpse is provided by a seventeenth-century vernacular letter (with contemporary English translation) from Inghean Dubh, wife of Ó Domhnaill, to the Bishop of Derry. Manuscripts of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, moreover, reflect the use of English to mediate Irish-language scholarship.

As Professor Ó Cuív’s helpful bibliographical data indicate, the focus of scholarship hitherto has largely been on the manuscripts’ incorporated texts. However, these texts must also be viewed within their codicological contexts. Many manuscripts in the collection may be classed as miscellanies. Is the diverse content of a manuscript such as Rawl. B. 502 the result of chance or of choice? Is it possible to ascertain what governed the scope of thematically diverse codices,
or why certain content, such as medical material, is rarely combined with any other? In a Middle English context it has been suggested that when the supply of texts was uncertain, material was copied as it came to hand, rather than in a planned fashion. Such a scenario could be envisaged in Ireland in the era when learning interrupted by Viking-age warfare was being revived. Did a codex such as Rawl. B. 502 therefore function as a kind of library, open to the reception of whatever texts became available? Did this kind of circumstantially determined miscellany nevertheless set a pattern for Irish miscellanies of the era between the fourteenth and sixteenth centuries such as Rawl. B. 512? Renewed scrutiny of such matters is now facilitated by Professor Ó Cuív’s catalogue.

The catalogue not only opens up manuscript production to new examination, it also stimulates questions relating to manuscript use and study. The sixteenth-century collection of poetic material associated with St Colum Cille in the manuscript Laud Misc. 615 was probably assembled as part of the research for the compilation of the saint’s Life, a copy of which is also in the Oxford collection (Rawl. B. 514). Marginal additions on a sixteenth-century medical manuscript (Corpus Christi College MS 129) may reflect use by either student or practitioner. Perhaps the most poignant example of a manuscript for personal use is a sixteenth-century collection of Latin theology (MS e Mus. 156) which belonged to Fr. O Hely, a Franciscan who was hanged in Kilmallock by the Elizabethan authorities in 1579. Brian Ó Cuív’s careful noting of colophons and marginalia provides the data whereby we can trace, not only original manuscript purpose, but also changes in ownership and interest in the manuscripts over the centuries.

Another valuable aspect of the Oxford collection is that it offers insights into the work of scholars and antiquaries from the seventeenth century onward. Information in the hands of An Dubhaltach Mac Fhir Bhisigh and of Míchéal Ó Cléirigh is mediated in assemblages of material made by Sir James Ware. Notes by James Ussher, archbishop of Armagh, are found in MS Add. A. 91. Equally significant is the fact that an Irish scholar was in Oxford in the latter part of the seventeenth century, examining Irish manuscripts already acquired by the Bodleian. This was Tuileagna Ó Maolchonaire (who also styled himself Tully Conry), who left notes on Laud Misc. 610, Laud Misc. 615, and Fairfax 29 A. Indeed, he initiated a cataloguing process, continued by Plummer and Fraser, which reaches full fruition in the present publication.
The Ó Cuív catalogue has considerable added value in its companion volume of plates. Hitherto emphasis on textual content has been at the expense of the visual aspect of vernacular manuscripts. Now, however, we can see eye-catching illustrations and decorated capitals, observing in the case of the latter the affinities between Latin and vernacular twelfth-century examples, as well as the manner in which twelfth-century features are echoed in the later Middle Ages, such as in the fifteenth-century manuscript Laud Misc. 610. We can observe the manner in which illustration may characterise a book designed for a patron (as with the copy of *Betha Coluim Chille* in Rawl. B. 514). Page lay-out tends to vary according to textual genre, as the presentation of annals and law texts indicates. However, the appearance of the page may also reflect scribal engagement with the text. A particularly striking example is the cruciform arrangement of the writing in the opening page of a homily on Christ’s passion in the fifteenth-century Rawl. B. 513.

All in all, this final work of the late Professor Ó Cuív performs a signal service for Celtic Studies. It not only constitutes an invaluable research tool, it also opens a gateway to future studies of Irish manuscript culture. All who were involved in the production of these volumes deserve our best thanks, especially the publishers, the Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies.

MÁIRE HERBERT

*University College Cork*


Roinnt sleachta ón lámhscríbhinn a chuir Breandán Ó Conaire (1970) in eagair a tharraing aird i gclo den chéad uair ar na difríochtaí idir eagrán an tSeabhaic agus an rud a scréibh Tomás Críthin. Ina dhiaidh sin, dhein Seán Ó Coileáin scagadh luachmhar mar scríobh na téacs agus ar an stair eagarthóireachta a bhainean leis (Ó Coileáin 1974, 1979, 1989). In iarfhocal a chuir sé le cuntas ar an blé a bhí ag Tomás le Brian Ó Ceallaigh agus an Seabhac duírt Seán Ó Coileáin (1979, 183) go raibh ‘dóthain fúnaíse ar fáil cheana ar an laitiméireacht atá déanta ag na heagarthóirí go dtí seo’; agus d'udradh linn i níota beathaisnéise i ndeireadh an imleabhair sin (ar lch 294) go raibh an Coileáin eagarthóireachta de An tOileáinach ‘beartaithe ar eagrán deifnídeach de An tOileáinach a chóiriú’. Sin is atá déanta anso aige, agus réamhrá fada scríofa aige leis, ina míníonn sé stair an téacs agus a mhodh eagarthóireachta féin.

Eagrán dioplamaíideach é seo, sa mhéid is nár dhein an t-eagarthóir ach litriú an lae inniu a chur i bhfeidhm, botúin bheaga de chuid an údair a chur ina gceart, agus codanna aírithe den lámhscríbhinn a thabhairt mar agusínín in ionad iad a bheithe i gcorp an leabhair. Níor cheart a mheas, féachadh, gurbh aon chúram a thabhairt go dtí an t-seachtain agus tá an t-eagarthóir, ach tá socruithe aírithe anso aige go mbeidh an d'éadair ina dtaobh. Mar shampla, ní d'fhéadfadh ina gcomhrath agus tá an t-éadair agus tá an t-reitheach go litriú ‘tagthaíthe’ an tsuíl, cé go bhfuil sé dílis don bhfuaimníú agus do stair na foirme; ba dheis an lámhscríbhinn a chur ina gceart agus do stair a dhéanamh. Níora réimse dílis aige, mar shampla, ní d'fhéadfadh ina gcomhrath agus tá an t-reitheach go litriú ‘tagthaíthe’ an tsuíl, cé go bhfuil sé dílis don bhfuaimníú agus do stair na foirme; ba dheis an lámhscríbhinn a chur ina gceart agus do stair a dhéanamh. Níor cheart a mheas, mar Shampla, ní d'fhéadfadh ina gcomhrath agus tá an t-reitheach go litriú ‘tagthaíthe’ an tsuíl, cé go bhfuil sé dílis don bhfuaimníú agus do stair na foirme; ba dheis an lámhscríbhinn a chur ina gceart agus do stair a dhéanamh.
a cheistíú. Ach táim in amhras i dtaoibh an tabharthaigh slait a heth curtha in ionad slat na lámhscribhínne in stráiméad don slait (7). Cé go raibh Tomás aná-dhílis don tabharthach uatha, ní theicim aon chuíis nach bhféadadh don slat a heth aige mar mhalaírth ar don slait, agus bheadh foirm na lámhscribhínne le n-ainiúnt mar shampla luath den mheath atá tagtha ar an tabharthach uatha ó shin. Ach tugann an t-eagarthóir leagan na lámhscribhínne i mbun an leathanaigh aon uair a dheineann sé a leithéid d’athrú, sa tsli gur féidir leis an léitheoir a dhéanamh suas. B’fhéarr liom féin na mínúcháin a thugann Tomás ar fhocail anseo is ansiúd (ar mhaithe le Brian Ó Ceallaigh) a heth curtha go bun an leathanaigh chomh maith, m.sh. gulaí (faoileann óg) ar lch 14 agus piardóg (craw fish) ar lch 227.

Tá chúig aguisín leis an eagrán so. An tríú caibideal a bhí sa cheadh eagrán (‘Na tighthe bhí againn’) is abhar breise é a d’iarr an Seabhac chun an cuntas ar shaol na ndaoine san Oileán a shaibhriú – mar ‘antraipeolaí seanduiné’ atá an t-údar ag caint anseo agus é ag féachaint siar ar a óige, fé mar a deirtear sa réamhrá (lch xx). Ní mhaireann an leagan lámhscríbhínne den chuid seo agus is ar eagrán an tSeabhaic ataímid ag brath don téacs. Díbroibh go deirdeadh an eagrán seo é (Aguisín 1) (331-37), an áit is oiriúnaí dó, mar bhí sé ina bhac ar rithim an scéil sa dá eagrán eile. Tá an cúigiú aguisín (‘Cuntas lae: an bhean mhoch’ (345-46)) níos cosúla leis na cuntas laethúla a bhíodh á mbreacadh ag Tomás sarar thosnaigh sé ar scéal a bheatha a scríobh agus a foilsíodh i bhfoirm an-ghiorraithe féin teideal Allagar na hInise sa bhliain 1928.

Is fadh a eagarthóireachte fé leith í gur scríobh an t-údar dhá chaibideal deiridi. Bhí an Seabhac míshásta leis an gcéad chlabhsú a chuir Tomás lena shaothar agus loiris sé leagan níos fearr; aon-taíonn Seán Ó Coileáin lena bhreithiúnachas agus deir gurb é an seancheann ‘an chaibideal is laige sa leabhar ar fad’ (lch xxi). Dob fhéidir a áiteamh gur cheart aguisín eile a dhéanamh, ag glacadh leis gur tharraing an t-údar siar é nuair a chuir sé leagan eile ar fáil. Mar sin féin, tá an dá cheann i gcló anso, mar Chaibidli 23 agus 24 fé seach, agus a envoy féin le gach ceann acu. Ag deirdeadh Caibidil 23 (323) cuireann Tomás críoch obann lena scéal agus iarrann beannacht Dé ar na léitheoirí agus air féin. Casaimid an leathanach agus tá an leagan nua romhainn mar Caibideal 24. Dá gcuirfí a bhfuil ar lch 323 go bun an leathanaigh i gcló beag, nó go deirdeadh an leabhair, ní bheadh an sárá céanna ar leanúnachas an téacs. Agus níor mhiste an rud céanna a dhéanamh leis an envoy atá le Caibideal
24: ‘B’fhéidir ná fuil eireball gearra anois air! Má tá abairt ann nach ansa leat féin, fág amuigh é’ (329). Is geall le cogar i leataoibh don Seabhac é sin, nó sonc más le an seanbhlas a dúradh é, agus maolaíonn sé draoicht na bhfocal sna leathanaithe roimis, mar a bhfuil cuid de na habairtí is cáiliúla sa leabhar. Ós eagrán deifnídeach é seo tá saol fada i ndán dó, agus beidh athcholó le cur air ó am go ham. B’fhiú athmhachnamh a dhéanamh ar ionad na sleachta san nuair a bheidh caoi chuige.

Léiríonn an dílseacht so do ipsissima verba Thomáis Dhónaill nach cúrsaí aesteitice is mó a bhí ag dó na geirbe ag an eagarthóir nua. Is léir ón réamhrá, agus óna bhfuil foilsithe cheana aige ar an abhar so, go n-aithnionn sé go maith an teannas idir dhá rogha: téacs ‘glanta’ a sholáthar a chuirfeadh le gradam an leabhair agus leis an moladh atá tuille ag an údar as feabhas a stile agus a fhríotail, nó an bunrud a chur os ár gcomhair amach, é amh, fírinneach, agus uair-eanta tútach. Téacs glanta ba rogha leis an Seabhac. Bhí Seán Ó Coileáin dian go maith ar chur chuige an tSeabhaic sna blianta tosaigh go raibh sé féin ag obair ar an téacs seo. Thagair sé (Ó Coileáin 1979, 183) don ‘laitiméireacht’ a dhein an bhfeirt eagarthóir eile, agus dúirt mar gheall ar eagrán an tSeabhaic gur ‘geall le héitheach buan é’ (184). Deich mbliana ina dhiaidh sin bhí sé níos fábhraí d’iarrachtá an tSeabhaic agus d’aithin nach é amháin go raibh cead ón údar aige, ach go raibh ‘teacht aige ar saoil, ar eolas agus ar dhaoine ná fuil againne. Thar éinne eile bhí teacht aige ar an Oileáin fén féin, fear ná fuaire oin locht ar an gcóiriú a dhein sé ar an saothar...’ (Ó Coileáin 1989, 201). Is é toradh an athmhachnaimh seo ná ‘muna mbeadh i gceist ach an saothar litertha, neamhspleách ar an té a cheap agus ar an údarás a bhí aige len é a cheapadh, ba dheacair a áiteamh gurbh fhéarr de leabhair é seo ná an chéad cheann úd 1929’ (lch xx). Tá Seán Ó Coileáin le moladh go mór as an ngéarchúis agus an t-ionracas atá atá dteannta a chéile sa bhreithiúnaachs atá tugtha aige ar na ceisteanna so sa réamhrá.

Is féidir a aithint go raibh cúiseanna liteartha ag an Seabhac le go leor de na hathruithe a dhein sé. Tógaimis an blúire seo ón leathanach deiridh: … agus go mbeidh ‘fhios i mhaith donn conas mar ‘bhí an saol lem linn, agus na comharsain do bhí suairis lem linn, agus an méid atá fós beo acu, gan focal searbh ideir me agus iad riamh (328). D’fhág an Seabhac ar lár agus an méid atá fós beo acu, gan focal searbh ideir me agus iad riamh, leasú a threisigh an parailéalachas deas idir an dá chlásal dar crioch lem linn. Tabhair fé ndeara go bhfuil agus an méid atá fós beo acu iomarcach ar shlí, ós
dócha go bhfuilid sin cuimsithe in *na comharsain do bhí suas len linn*, agus tá an píosa féinchosanta in ndeireadh na habairte fada san iomarcaigh ar shlí eile. Tá mórán den athscríobh san déanta ag an Seabhac tríd síos ina eagrán, agus is leir gur ghlac sé go fonnmhar leis an geacht a bhí aige ón údar giorrú a dhéanamh do réir mar ba mhaith leis. Ach is deacair aon bhun a fheiscint le cuid mhaith dár dhein sé. Mar shampla, ag tús an chaibidil dheiridh tá *Níl curtha síos anach an fhirinne* ag an Seabhac (263), cé go léirionn an t-eagrán nua so gurb é a scríobh Tomás ná *Níl ann anach an fhírinne* (325); cúpla clásal ina dhiaidh sin d’athraigh an Seabhac mar bhí an aimsir *fada* go dtí *mar bhí san aimsir fada agam*. Is ag deisíú rudai ná raibh briste a bhí an Seabhac san gásanna mar sin, agus rithfeadh an focal ‘laitiméireacht’ leat tapaidh go leor. Thug an Seabhac éachtaint ar an bple a bhí aige leis an údar i dtaoibh chóiriú a tacaíosa in aiste iarbháis a scríobh sé mar gheall ar Thómas Crithín (athchlo ag Ó Conaire 1992, 198-205). Deir sé go raibh ‘a lán bearnacha san obair, mion agus móir. B’eigean dom a iarraidh ar an údar iad a lionadh. Do lóin – cuid acu – le freagraí ar cheisteanna in dtaoibh iomad mionrudaí, agus le haistí ar leith de shaghas caibidil a III …’ (ibid. Ich 203). B’fhéidir gur mar sin a tháinig ann don chéad abairt a scríobh lámha in aiste iarbháis mar chuid air féin, dá bhrí sin, ní féidir a rá gur bhí an *lámha* den sórt san abhair sa lámhscribhinn (Ó Coileáin 1989, 195) agus atá ar ceal anso. Cé go raibh cumarsáid eatarthu a bhí aige leis an údar agus easgarthóir a bhí meán chomh maith go raibh an iomarca air féin sa lámhscribhinn. B’éigean dom a iarraidh ar na traidisiúntaí a scannaigh an eagarthóir, ach ní féidir a rá gur bhí an eagrán ‘tslat tomhais ‘final authorial intention’, ach oiread agus a d’fhéadfadh aon eagrán ó shin é a shásamh, agus níl feidhm anois leis an gcórais anois. Do féidir a fháil, mar a dhéanann an *lámha* a chuir féin ar aghaidh don téacs. An eagrán a fháil ina eagrán is mó a tháinig ann don chéad abairt a scríobh lámha in aiste iarbháis mar chuid air féin, dá bhrí sin, ní féidir a rá gur bhí an iomarca air féin sa lámhscribhinn. Ach ní féidir a rá gur bhí an eagrán a scríobh lámha in aiste iarbháis mar chuid air féin, dá bhrí sin, ní féidir a rá gur bhí an iomarca air féin sa lámhscribhinn. Ach ní féidir a rá gur bhí an eagrán a scríobh lámha in aiste iarbháis mar chuid air féin, dá bhrí sin, ní féidir a rá gur bhí an iomarca air féin sa lámhscribhinn. Ach ní féidir a rá gur bhí an eagrán a scríobh lámha in aiste iarbháis mar chuid air féin, dá bhrí sin, ní féidir a rá gur bhí an iomarca air féin sa lámhscribhinn. Ach ní féidir a rá gur bhí an eagrán a scríobh lámha in aiste iarbháis mar chuid air féin, dá bhrí sin, ní féidir a rá gur bhí an iomarca air féin sa lámhscribhinn. Ach ní féidir a rá gur bhí an eagrán a scríobh lámha in aiste iarbháis mar chuid air féin, dá bhrí sin, ní féidir a rá gur bhí an iomarca air féin sa lámhscribhinn. Ach ní féidir a rá gur bhí an eagrán a scríobh lámha in aiste iarbháis mar chuid air féin, dá bhrí sin, ní féidir a rá gur bhí an iomarca air féin sa lámhscribhinn. Ach ní féidir a rá gur bhí an eagrán a scríobh lámha in aiste iarbháis mar chuid air féin, dá bhrí sin, ní féidir a rá gur bhí an iomarca air féin sa lámhscribhinn. Ach ní féidir a rá gur bhí an eagrán a scríobh lámha in aiste iarbháis mar chuid air féin, dá bhrí sin, ní féidir a rá gur bhí an iomarca air féin sa lámhscribhinn. Ach ní féidir a rá gur bhí an eagrán a scríobh lámha in aiste iarbháis mar chuid air féin, dá bhrí sin, ní féidir a rá gur bhí an iomarca air féin sa lámhscribhinn. Ach ní féidir a rá gur bhí an eagrán a scríobh lámha in aiste iarbháis mar chuid air féin, dá bhrí sin, ní féidir a rá gur bhí an iomarca air féin sa lámhscribhinn.
mhuanna liteartha a admháíonn sé a bheith ag baint le leagan giorraíthe, leasaithe an tSeabhaic. Ní miste a rá go bhfuil an t-eagrán nua so ag freastal go cruinn ar mhianta an léitheora agus an scoláire sa lá atá inniu ann, ach gur fiú fós agus san am atá romhainn an chéad eagrán a bheith ar fáil mar cháipéis stairiúil. Ar deireadh thiar is mór an sásamh é an téacs breá so a léamh san eagrán nua so, fiú amháin má spreagann an t-athréimníu atá déanta ar fhocail an údair an smaoinemh ó am go ham ná fuil An tOileánnach chomh snasta mar shaothar agus a cheapamáir tríth.

Ní miste tagairt a dhéanamh anso do chomparáid eile a dheineann Seán Ó Coileáin idir a eagrán féin agus eagrán an tSeabhaic: ‘Agus, gan an éifeacht liteartha a bheadh leis an dá cheann a bhac, ní hí an bhrí chéanna atá leis an saothar go dtugaimid An tOileánnach air agus atá le scriobh Thomáis. Cuid mhór thabhachtach de stair na Gaeilge agus de stair an Stát, agus dá raibh de dhóchas as a chéile acu, is ea An tOileánnach. Is as a fáisceadh sinn; is ann a chuireann amhain an saothar go bhfuil an ré sin na húire i leith agus a cheapam tráth.

Ní hannamh a theoradh é, ní raibh de dhóchas as a chéile acu, tá smaoinemh eile a rith liomsa mar gheall ar sheachadh an téacs, is é sin go bhfuil an t-ádh orainn go bhfuil an mórshaothar so againn le léamh in aon chor. Faid a bhí an lámhscríbhinn i seilbh Bhriain Uí Cheallaigh bhí sí á cartadh timpeall na háite aige ar bháid agus ag thráenaí, go Páras, go Londain, that n-aíos go HÉirinn, féachaint an aimseodh sé aon dream a d’fhóilseodh i (Ó Coileáin 1979, 253). Ní hannamh a tháinig cáis taistil nó málaí amú i stáisiúin nó i gcalaoirt, agus imeacht gan teacht is ea é go minic. Pé fórsa a bhí ag tabhairt aird do scribhhinn Thomáis Dhónaill ar na camachuarda san agus a thug slán í, bímis baoch dó, agus bímis baoch leis do Sheán Ó Coileáin as eagrán chomh scrupallach, criochnúil, maisiúil, taitneamhach a sholáthar agus as a oiread san a bheith déanta aige chun stair an téacsa a shoiléiriú.

TAGAIRTÍ


DIARMUID Ó SÉ

An Coláiste Ollscoile, Baile Átha Cliath


This set of two volumes marks the first in a proposed series that aims to cover all the surviving New Testament apocrypha from medieval Ireland. The plan for this project was first laid out by Martin McNamara, the co-ordinator of the present series, in his book, The apocrypha in the Irish church (Dublin 1975). There he identified eight major topics among the surviving Irish apocrypha that deal with the principal events and figures of the New Testament: narratives about the infancy of Christ, his public life and his passion; texts relating to St John the Baptist, St Stephen, the Apostles, and the Virgin Mary; and eschatological texts about the otherworld.

Remarkably, most of this material has been preserved, not, as one might expect, in Hiberno-Latin but in Irish; not in Old or Middle Irish, but in Late Middle Irish and Early Modern Irish. No doubt, the fact that these apocryphal texts fall within a relatively neglected area of the Irish language helps to explain why they have remained unpublished for so long. Commendably, at least from the perspective of Irish literature, the editorial committee of the present series has adopted a flexible policy with regard to defining an apocryphon. This approach, while ensuring publication of a generous supply of Irish texts – by allowing for the inclusion of works that blend historical and apocryphal material – also does justice to the eclecticism of the original Irish authors, who did not labour under the strict modern dichotomy of apocryphal and canonical works.

Volume I contains the following three works in Irish: two prose
narratives of the infancy of Christ from the Liber Flavus Fergusorum and from the Leabhar Breac, respectively, both originally composed in late Middle Irish; and a verse narrative in Old Irish of the childhood deeds of Christ based on the *Infancy Gospel of Thomas*. Vol. II has the following works in Irish: a thirteenth-century poem containing elements from the infancy narratives; a medley of short texts in prose and verse relating to the nativity of Christ, notably a narrative of the Caesarian tax; an account (dated to the twelfth century) of the seventeen wonders of the night of Christ’s birth (dated to the twelfth century), and a homily on the marvels of the birth of Christ. Also included in Vol. II are excerpts from five Hiberno-Latin works, consisting of passages judged to contain apocryphal matter on the nativity of Christ. Finally, the remainder of Vol. II, an appendix of 340 pages, is given over to editions of two Latin works, a Latin Infancy Gospel which is a composite of two well-known apocrypha, the *Protoevangelium of James* and the *Gospel of Pseudo-Matthew*; and an independent Latin translation (from Greek) of the *Protoevangelium of James*. Both of these works are supplied because of their close relationship to the Irish infancy narratives. Following these texts is a formidable array of indices (manuscripts, themes, authors persons and places, sources), including an index of Irish words which claims to ‘contain all words appearing in the Irish texts … with the exception of the conjunction *ocus*’ (II 1006). However, as bad luck would have it, the first word that I searched for, *ceolmaine* (I 169, §21, line 8), was not to be found in the index; while variant forms such as *codlad/collad* and *coidiltech* were not expressly acknowledged in the index but silently incorporated under *cotlud* and *cotultech*, respectively. Presumably such minor lapses and difficulties will be rectified when the comprehensive concordance is published in the *CCSA Instrumenta* series (in microfiche).

Not surprisingly, such an ambitious project was conceived as a collaborative endeavour. The editorial team thus assembled is an impressive one, offering a collective expertise in the ancient ‘biblical’ languages and literatures of Hebrew, Coptic and Greek; in medieval Latin; and in all three linguistic stages of medieval Irish. This combination of scholars also ensures the broadest possible search for parallels to and sources for Irish apocryphal works among the huge corpus of early and medieval Christian literature. At the same time it promises that the editing of the Irish texts will be conducted according to the highest linguistic standards. However, this eclectic approach brings its own problems. For example, the reader
of an individual text may find that the introduction is written by those editors with expertise in the broad Christian apocryphal tradition, the actual edition by a scholar (or scholars) of the Irish language, the translation by several (not necessarily the same) scholars, and the notes by a blend of the two. At first glance such collaboration seems auspicious, but it produces a peculiar and unbalanced blend of commentary in which, for example, one note provides a lengthy excursus on the Palestinian placename Cornian (I 302-4), while the note following (by a different contributor) offers a brief comment on the manuscript reading *dun* as dative of *don* (p. 304). Reading through the notes (conveniently located at the bottom of the page) one sometimes wishes – perhaps unrealistically – for the guiding hand of a single editor weighing up and synthesizing the various issues (linguistic, stylistic, lexical, interpretative) in a unified commentary.

A more significant issue is that the Irish matter has been subordinated to the broader goal of apocryphal scholarship. To put it more concretely: were these Irish apocryphal texts to be published independently and individually, one would expect fuller treatments of such issues as language (including loanwords); date and place of composition; style (including similarities to contemporary secular Irish works such as the Book of Leinster *Táin*); and the accommodation of the original Latin sources to native Irish culture (for example, by means of such Irish terms as *cumal, disert, fingal, macgním*). In fairness, however, one must admit that the excellence of the present editions has ensured such studies that are now possible for the first time.

The editions and their facing translations are of the highest quality. Especially noticeable in the translations is the skilful blend of accuracy and idiom which will satisfy both readers knowledgeable in the Irish language and those lacking that expertise who have an interest in Irish apocrypha. With dates of composition for individual works ranging from the eighth to the thirteenth century, and with manuscript witnesses varying from a single copy to multiple copies, it is not surprising that the editors have adopted correspondingly different editorial policies. Broadly speaking, editors of works from the later end of this chronological spectrum have adopted the policy of presenting their texts according to the linguistic standards of Early Modern Irish. This policy has much to commend it, though one would like to see some discussion of the late Middle Irish forms that have been subsumed under this standard.
Of special interest to students of Old Irish is Máire Herbert’s edition of the poem *I mбу macán cóі̇c bliadnae*, which was first edited by James Carney in *The poems of Blathmac son of Cú Brettan* (Dublin 1964). Herbert’s edition is an improvement on Carney’s, not only because she is able to refer to a broader background of Latin apocryphal sources but also because she makes a number of plausible textual emendations while providing a smoother translation. Oddly, she does not question Carney’s provisional date of c. 700 for the poem, though the claim for such an early date (with its implications for Irish knowledge of the Infancy Gospel of Thomas) surely requires reappraisal.

This series has set high standards for the editing of medieval Irish apocrypha. More importantly, by providing accurate texts, idiomatic translations and explanatory background, it will make possible a comprehensive study of Irish apocrypha and their fundamental role in so many aspects of medieval Irish life.

PÁDRAIG P. Ó NÉILL

*University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill*


This is a welcome addition to the literature which discusses the prose works of Geoffrey Keating and the writing of Irish history in seventeenth- and eighteenth-century Ireland. The major part of the book, parts 1 and 2 (chapters 1-9), deals with the world of Geoffrey Keating, the Ireland in which he grew up and lived and the Europe in which he was educated, and his expression in his three major prose works of his understanding of that world. Part 3 of the book (chapters 10-11) moves beyond Keating’s world to discuss the reception of his History of Ireland, *Foras Feasa ar Éirinn*, by networks of scribes and translators in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

As the author points out, biographical information on Keating is very sparse indeed: the date and place of his birth are not known with certainty; neither is it known when he went as a student to study in France, how long he spent there, when he returned to Ireland or in what parish(es) he served as a priest after his return. The author makes a plausible case, based on new evidence, for her belief that
Geoffrey was the third son of James fitz Edmund Keating of Moorestown, and inherited a parcel of his father’s land (19-20), but provides no evidence that would establish his date of birth, traditionally taken to be c. 1580. The statement that in ‘Keating’s youth, the baron of Cahir was Theobald Butler’ (18) does little to clarify when it was that Geoffrey was young, since Theobald was ‘lord of Cahir from 1566 to 1596’ (20). It is known that he studied at Rheims, where it seems he was awarded the doctorate in theology, and at Bordeaux (27-8). The Irish College of Bordeaux was founded in 1603, so that his documented association (28-9) with it must be later than that date. There is evidence that, having returned to Ireland after his studies, he was involved in the ministry in Tipperary by 1613 and specifically in the diocese of Lismore by 1615 (41). A silver chalice which Keating had made (as expressed in the standard formula ‘me fieri fecit’) bears the date ‘1634’: the author offers no evidence in support of her statement that it ‘must have been paid for by a benefactor’ (44). Keating was dead by the year 1644, as evidenced by a plaque erected in his memory over the west doorway of ‘Cillín Chiaráin’ in Tubrid. The author is careful not to accept uncritically any of the account of Keating’s life given in 1722 by Thomas O’Sullevane in his dissertation prefixed to the *Memoirs of the Marquis of Clanricarde* and is also judicious in using the evidence of verse attributed to Keating, being aware that the attribution to him is in a number of cases ‘highly dubious’ (23, n. 38). The paucity of hard evidence relating to his life all too frequently drives the author to speculation throughout the book: e.g. ‘A long-standing association with the Mac Craith family may explain Geoffrey Keating’s access to an early education …’ (21); ‘Contact with either the Meic Craith [sic] or their patrons, the Butlers of Cahir, might have enabled Keating to socialise with other learned families such as Mac Bruaideadha, Ó Dálaigh, Mac Aodhagáin and Mac Eochagáin’ (23); ‘A link with the Butlers of Dunboyne could have brought Keating into contact with Michael Kearney of Ballylusky … The two men moved in similar social circles and were very probably personally acquainted’ (23-4); ‘These literary connections, if valid [sic], suggest that the Butlers of Dunboyne and also the Butlers of Cahir may have acted as patrons of the scholar priest. Keating may well have been a visitor at both houses on occasion’ (24); ‘It is possible that Keating originally wrote [*Eochairsgiath an Aifrinn*] in Latin as a university thesis and subsequently translated it into the vernacular for use in an Irish pastoral context’ (32); ‘It is probable … that some material
inserted by Keating may have been drawn from memory … Keating probably had access to the full text of the Suarez treatise …’ (33); ‘The Latin source Keating was evidently translating here might possibly have been his own work’ (34, n. 85); ‘… if he encountered [Francis Toletus’s *Summa Casuum* …] he probably used a Latin version’ (34); ‘In this instance Keating may have been working from lecture notes drawn from a full printed text’ (34); ‘A case can also be made for a probably [sic] collaboration between Keating and Conall Mac Eochagáin’ (60); ‘Geoffrey Keating’s awareness of [the] … special reputation [of Bodleian Library, Oxford, MS Laud Misc. 610] … is probably best explained by his links with the Meic Craith [sic] and the Butlers. Another possible link also existed … Keating might have had access to any such manuscript that was available to [David] Rothe [Catholic bishop of Ossory], though no direct evidence of contact between the two men survives’ (61); ‘… Keating’s likely use of another manuscript supports the idea of a scholarly association between him and Mac Eochagáin … BL Add. MS 30512, which was in the possession of Conall Mac Eochagáin from 1627 until after 1640 might possibly be the manuscript in question’ (77).

Suasory arguments are advanced in some instances in support of this speculation. In others no such arguments are forthcoming, and in any case the repeated use of this register engenders an uncomfortable feeling that what one is reading is too speculative to be history. Furthermore, there is a tendency for some of this speculation to be transformed into fact: for example, the opinion quoted above from p. 23 is re-stated as fact on p. 181: ‘These [viz. Clann Chraith, Meic Eochagáin and Clann Bhruaideadha] were the same families through whom Keating achieved and maintained links with the traditional world of Irish historical scholarship.’

The real witnesses to the mind of Geoffrey Keating and to his view of the world in which he lived are, of course, his writings, and in particular the three major prose works which he produced, *Eochairsgiath an Aifrinn* (ESA), *Trí Biorghaoithe an Bháis* (TBB) and *Foras Feasa ar Éirinn* (FFÉ). The author uses these to impose a tripartite structure on her account of Keating’s life. In order to place the writing of ESA in the context of his early education at home and later abroad in chapter 2, however, the author felt constrained to

---

1 This particular set of opinions is particularly illogical, for the author has offered no evidence that Keating was aware of the manuscript’s special reputation.

2 For correct usage in naming these families the author might have taken guidance from authoritative sources such as that printed in *Celtica* 1 (1946) 91-2.
argue that ESA was composed during his time in France: as mentioned already, she suggests that it was originally written in Latin as a university thesis, and she points out that ‘while a range of medieval continental preaching handbooks were used by Keating, the Flores of Thomas Hibernicus was not’, and argues that this ‘reinforces the view that the text was probably originally put together while he lived abroad’ (39). It must be said that these arguments are weak. The first may be an echo of the belief that ESA was Keating’s doctoral thesis, but Pádraig Ó Fiannachta pointed out several years ago ‘[nach] trí mhórthráchtas a ghnóthaidh diagaire an dochtúireacht an uair úd, ach trí dhíospóireacht agus defensio.’ The second, an argumentum ex silentio, is not a proof; indeed, if it were, it could equally well have been used to prove that Keating was still abroad when he wrote TBB (see p. 50).

In her introduction the author points out the importance of ‘the links between the central themes of Keating’s writings, whether historical or religious, and the reality of the workings of society in seventeenth-century Ireland’ and complains that ‘[c]onfining the study of Keating’s writings to a mere paper-chase in search of the sources used, or discussing these texts simply as linguistic models or examples of baroque literary art, ignores their real significance’ (3). It is ironic, then, that the author draws quite heavily on the unpublished MA thesis of Diarmaid Ó Laoghaire, Príomh-fhoinseacha ‘Eochair-Sgiath an Aifrinn’ (University College Dublin, 1939) in her own quite extensive discussion of the sources of ESA (32-9, 56-7). So too she lays the published and unpublished researches of Anne Cronin under heavy contribution in her analysis, in chapters 4 and 5 and elsewhere, of references to manuscript and printed material used in FFÉ. Would she prefer that those scholars had not provided such a firm foundation on which to construct her own arguments? It must be admitted, however, that the author stresses the fact that Keating’s use of his sources in ESA is a function on the one hand of his work being ‘a continuation of a medieval preaching tradition’ in its reliance on the handbooks of moral tales, and on the other hand of its being an example of the kind of work in which ‘the core values of Counter-Reformation Catholicism’ were presented (37, 40).

On the basis that it ‘is believed to have been in circulation by

---

TBB is placed by the author (chapter 3) in the context of Keating’s experience of the pastoral ministry which she discusses at some length (41-8). In addition to providing a synopsis of the content of TBB (48-9), the author also discusses the biblical, medieval and contemporary sources of the work (50-57). However, she does not advert to Keating’s citation of some thirty-four stanzas from Irish syllabic poems in support of various points of teaching in his text. By adding this further layer to the typical panoply of biblical, patristic and medieval reference of European catechetical literature, Keating heightened the Irish flavour of his text and, furthermore, demonstrated his respect for the authority of the native literary tradition and provided evidence of his having received some significant education in a bardic school.

Such an education would have provided the foundation for Keating’s interest in history, but by the time he set to work on FFÉ (perhaps in the late 1620s or early 1630s, see p. 59) he also had the advantage of having been in contact with the mind of contemporary Europe and of having experience of life in contemporary Ireland. In chapter 4 of this book the author discusses in detail the native sources on which Keating drew in writing his history of Ireland and the scholarly networks through which he would have gained access to those sources. In doing so she illustrates how Keating handled his sources, expressing the view that his method ‘involved a sophisticated approach to a range of primary sources’ (80). That, and her judgement on FFÉ that it is ‘a professionally constructed history, executed according to the normal standards of scholarship in his own day …’ (76), would seem to be exceptionally generous praise in terms of modern historiography. In chapter 5, where non-Irish sources of FFÉ are discussed, she offers a somewhat more nuanced opinion of the work of Hector Boetius, whose Scotorum Historiae (1526), she argues, was Keating’s model (84): ‘Boece, no less than Keating, was inclined to give a new lease of life to old fables, knitting them into the narrative in a manner that gave them respectability as quasi-history’ (85). On the other hand she notes that Bede’s Historia Ecclesiastica Gentis Anglorum ‘retained the respect of later generations because of its careful attention to primary sources and its conscious effort to distinguish historical fact from fiction’ (93); and

Though the author does not discuss the evidence on which this belief is based, it is presumable the assignment by Seán mac Torna Úí Mhaolchonaire (in his copy of TBB in TCD MS 1403 which he made in 1645) of 2 December, 1631, as the date of completion by Keating of TBB.
that John Mair, author of *Historia Majoris Britanniae* (1521), ‘was wary of the mythological stories of Scotland’s past’ (85). The notion that FFÉ was ‘a professionally constructed history’ does not sit easily with other comments by the author, e.g. that Keating ‘tended to be rather uncritical in his use of those source materials, being reluctant to doubt the written word’ (117); that his use of fictional material left him ‘open to accusations of credulity’ (125); and that his version of some of the material that he presented ‘was at least partly his own fabrication’ (135). Indeed, the analysis of FFÉ offered in Part 2 assumes that Keating was not writing history, but was constructing a myth or an ideology in terms of which his readers could understand their country and themselves.

The following sentence is a useful synopsis of the thrust of the commentary on FFÉ, and indeed on TBB, in Part 2:

The kind of history required by Catholics in Ireland, whatever their ethnic origin, in the reign of Charles I, was one which affirmed that theirs was the true faith, that Ireland was their homeland and they its rightful inhabitants, that Charles was their true king, and that God’s providence would favour them in the future, as it evidently had done in the distant past. (108)

The history of Ireland, then, as presented in FFÉ is constructed around the central notion of the abiding importance of the political institution of kingship, which is seen as ‘the element that gave a sense of continuity and coherence to Keating’s story of Ireland through the upheavals associated with successive waves of settlement in pre-Christian Ireland’ (147). Kingship, however, was not just a political institution: it was also the case that the moral order of the Irish past, an order based on Christian religious and moral values, ‘was rooted in kingship and in law’ (159). These values sustained the awareness of the Irish people of themselves as a Catholic people. But it was not just the *Gaeil* who were Irish (*Éireannaigh*): though ethnically separate from the *Gaeil*, the descendants of the Normans in Ireland were for Keating also Irish, and this was so because their ancestors had come to Ireland, not as conquerors but ‘to establish themselves in Ireland under the protection of Henry II’, who had been welcomed to Ireland ‘by clergy and nobility as a monarch whose obligation it was to protect those over whom he had been legitimately assigned sovereignty by the pope’ (151). The legitimate kingship over Ireland of Henry II and his successors provided the fundamental basis for
recognising those of Norman descent as Irish; furthermore, in Keating’s time they were, like the Gaeil, Catholic and Irish-speaking.

While the parallel treatments of Keating’s writings, particularly FFÉ and TBB, in Parts 1 and 2, have the merit of separating description of the texts from analysis of them, they also have the disadvantage that they entail a certain amount of repetition. So, for example, the author’s view that Boece’s *Scotorum Historiae* provided the model for Keating’s choice of the succession of the kings of Ireland ‘as the framework around which the *Foras Feasa* was constructed’ is expressed on pp. 84, 108 and is referred to again on p. 112; the extract quoted on p. 88, in which Keating explains the inadequacies of Spenser’s historical data as being due to poetic licence, is repeated on p. 115; Polydore Virgil’s advice on the correct approach to the writing of history is mentioned both on p. 98 and p. 117 n. 53; and the reason for Keating’s conscious decision to limit the size of FFÉ is discussed on pp. 101 and 119. Occasionally such repetitions result in the author contradicting herself. For instance, on p. 79 it is stated that the Seán mac Torna Úí Mhaolchonaire, to whom Keating attributed two quatrains which he quoted, ‘was probably the father of the principal scribe of Egerton MS 1782’, which was written c. 1516-18. This Seán Ó Maolchonaire became *ollamh* of Síl Mhuireadhaigh in 1495 and died in 1517 (Robin Flower, *Cat. of Irish manuscripts in the British Museum* (London 1926) II 262, 261). On p. 140, however, it is stated that this same man was a Munster poet of Keating’s own day. Since the two quatrains occur in Egerton 1782 (f. 56) they cannot have been composed by a contemporary of Keating.

Repetition occurs within Part 2 also, e.g. the references to the biblical division into Old and New Testaments as the basis for Keating’s structuring of Irish history (112, 144); but the most bizarre example here is in the five instances in which the legend of Cairbre Chinn

---

5 The listing of references to three persons named Seán Ó Maolchonaire in the index is unsatisfactory. No distinction is made between the two men called Seán mac Torna, viz. the man who died in 1517, and the seventeenth-century scribe; and the latter is confused with another Seán Ó Maolchonaire, *alias* John Conry of Rathmore, who according to *Cat. of Irish manuscripts in the Royal Irish Academy* (p. 1672) was ‘possibly’ the scribe of MS C iv 1. Of the three, the first is referred to on pp. 78, 79, 140; the second on pp. 10, 174, 176, 199; the third on p. 176. Furthermore under Conry, John, references are listed which suggest that John Conry of Rathmore (176) and John Conry, author of a history of Ireland (222-3), are the same person, though no evidence for this is provided in the text.
Chait is referred to and/or discussed: on pp. 134, 141-2, 143, 153 and 159. None of the references does complete justice to Keating’s version of the legend, which consists of two narratives differing from one another in some details. The account on p. 143 is the most seriously flawed in that Cairbre is represented as being the king of Ireland who was apparently killed in a revolt against him and whose three sons were subsequently requested to assume ‘their father’s inheritance as kings’. In Keating’s first narrative (FFÉ II 236-40) Cairbre was the leader of the vassal tribes who revolted against Fiachaidh Fionnoladh, king of Ireland, and the kings of Munster and Ulster. The three sons, one of whom is Tuathal Teachtmar, son of Fiachaidh, are the unborn sons of the three kings killed in the revolt, and they became kings, accepting ‘oighreacht a n-athrach’. Cairbre died of the plague. In Keating’s second narrative (FFÉ II 242-4) it is the assumption by Tuathal of the kingship of Ireland which is the focus of attention.

It is not clear how the version of the story given on p. 143 was generated. However, a further problem which arises in all five references seems attributable to over-reliance on the English translation of Keating’s text by the editor of FFÉ II (P. S. Dinneen). Keating, having described those who revolted and killed Fiachaidh as athachthuatha Éireann (FFÉ II 236), soon, with a typical stylistic flourish, referred to them as daorchlanna nó athachthuatha Éireann uile (ibid. 238) and later made it perfectly clear that he intended the two terms to be synonyms, writing about moghsaine na ndaorchlann i.e. na nAthachthuath (ibid. 244). These three references were translated rather loosely by Dinneen, as ‘the rustic tribes of Ireland’, ‘The serfs or rustic tribes of all Ireland’ and ‘the slavery of the serfs and the Athachthuath’. Having twice used the plural form athachthuatha (ibid. 236-8), Keating began to use athachthuath (ibid. 238, 242-4), singular in form but in the context clearly plural in sense, and then later reverted to the plural form (ibid. 244). Dinneen clearly understood the reference to be plural throughout, translating an athachthuath twice as ‘the rustic tribes’ (ibid. 239); later, however, he used the Irish word Athachthuath in his translation, and continued to do so even when (ibid. 244) the plural form reappeared in the Irish text. Given that it faced the Irish text, the vagaries of Dinneen’s

---

6 The passage in question reads in part as follows: ‘Thus when the story was told of the serfs and rustic tribes who plotted against Cairbre … the usual prosperity of Ireland did not return …’ The phrase ‘the story was told of’ and the relative pronoun ‘who’ are redundant.
translation presumably had no particular significance. However, a modern commentator might have been expected to interpret Keating more precisely, using a plural form and a historically more accurate term, such as ‘subject/unfree/vassal peoples/tribes’ throughout, rather than giving references to the singular form only in Irish (134, 141, 159) and in English using singular forms such as ‘a lower order of people with an ignoble pedigree’ (134); ‘a legendary unfree tribe’ (141); ‘the unfree tribe’ (159); and inaccurate terms such as ‘rustic tribes’ (143) and ‘a peasant revolt’ (153). Another example of uncritical reliance on the translation of the editor is the author’s use on p. 136 of ‘song or story’ to translate Keating’s *laoi nó leitir* in referring to the reliable sources for statements made in his history. Dinneen may have been seeking to echo the alliteration of the original, but he surely failed to convey the sense of this stock phrase which means ‘oral and written evidence’, and he later turned to a literal translation ‘lay or letter’ (*FFÉ* III, 293), no doubt seeking to avoid the inappropriate resonances of the words ‘song’ and ‘story’.8

Further evidence of undue reliance on the translation of *FFÉ* is provided by occasional use without demur of unsatisfactory translations taken from the version provided by the editor of *FFÉ* vol. I (David Comyn) such as, ‘If only indeed they had given their proper estimate to the Irish, I know not why they should not put them in comparison with any nation in Europe in three things …’ (5), ‘And I think that [it] is why Scot[s] is more especially called to the posterity of Gaedheal …’ (137). One would have thought that the author might herself have improved on Comyn’s English; that she did not do so would suggest that she lacked confidence in her ability to deal independently with the Irish text. Unfortunately there is ample evidence in this book that her lack of confidence was justified, for virtually every attempt on her part independently to provide a translation is flawed to a greater or lesser degree. A salient example is the passage from TBB on p. 56, the translation of which should read:

---

7 Though the leader of the revolt, Cairbre Chinn Chait, was a mythological figure, the existence of the unfree tribes is a fact of history.

8 There is a reference to another version of the same phrase, viz. ‘laoidh nó leabhar’ at p. 63, where again the translation provided by the editor, Lambert McKenna, ‘song or book’ is given. Like Dinneen, McKenna recognised that this translation was unsatisfactory and later proffered ‘gach saghas fiadhnaise’ (Láimhbheartach Mac Cionnaith, *Dioghlúim Dána* (Baile Átha Cliath 1936) 472, 597), ‘any evidence’ (Lambert McKenna, *Aithdioghlúim Dána*, 2 vols (ITS 37, 40) (Dublin 1937-40) II 238), as an interpretation.
‘[Aquinas says] that [the state of original justice] was a virtue which was bestowed on Adam as a result of which reason would be made subject to God, will to reason [and] the feeling of the senses to will, and [from which would flow] the submission of the brute animals to man, and that the union of body and soul would be indissoluble.’ The third line of the second stanza on p. 128 should read in translation: ‘We did not find taken from them …’; and the first line of the passage from Aodh Mac Aingil on p. 129 should read: ‘If it were said that it was brazen of me to write something in Irish when I have not studied it …’9 So too on p. 197 the translation of the second stanza should read: ‘You are like an innkeeper / who cherishes a traveller; / as [the traveller] leaves, he says, seizing him: / “Pay for what you have consumed,”’ while the second line of the stanza on p. 198 means ‘he is an example for ignorant experts.’

It is hardly surprising then that the author has misread some passages in texts for which a translation was not available. So, for example, on p. 162 the second half of the sentence to which n. 25 refers is a misinterpretation of what Keating wrote in TBB on prayers for the souls in purgatory, and should read: ‘… there was also the promise that when the soul of the person for whom others prayed finally reached heaven, the favour could be returned’ (cf. TBB ll. 4952-60); and the phrase ‘having unconfessed sins’ on p. 163 should read ‘having sins which they forget to confess’ (na peacaidh do-bheirid i ndearmad san bhfaoisidin, ibid. ll. 4864-5). Also, taking the word cliar to mean ‘a clergyman’ rather than ‘clergy, clerics’, the author misinterprets the lines Caidhe an chliar gan chiach gan chlaoine, /

9 In writing that Mac Aingil and others like him ‘were less than comfortable with the way they themselves were using the Irish language as a mere functional tool … as though writing the living language for pedagogical purposes was a betrayal of the scholarly values of a bardic training’ (p. 129), the author has probably misinterpreted Mac Aingil’s apologia in two ways. It was not for his use of Irish as a functional tool that he wished to apologize, but for the fact that he did not have a command of the literary standard of the bardic schools (‘ceart na Gaoidhilgi’); he was seeking to deflect the criticism of a trained poet (the ‘saoi ré h-ealadhain’ to whom the Scot Seón Carsuel referred in a parallel statement in his Foirn na n-Urrnuidheadh (1567; edited by R. L. Thomson (Edinburgh 1970) 12, ll. 370-1). Secondly, such a statement is found, not only in Mac Aingil’s book, but also before him in Carsuel’s, as mentioned, and in Fáithri Ó Maolchonaire’s Desiderius: Scáthán an Chrábhaidh (1616, ed. T. F. O’Rahilly (Dublin 1955) 1-2, ll. 25-48), and after him in Froinsias Ó Maolmhuaidh’s Lucerna Fidelium (1676, ed. Pádraig Ó Súilleabháin (Dublin 1962) 11-12, ll. 186-205), where Ó Maolchonaire’s statement is plagiarised: the authors were making the expected gesture and in all likelihood did not expect to be taken too seriously.
Do-chínn ’san dúin ag scrúdadh an Bhíobla? from the lament for Thomas Butler, baron of Cahir, who died in 1627, as follows: ‘Among those mentioned as having suffered from this loss are [sic] a clergyman who used to spend time in the castle studying the Bible’; she goes on to speculate that ‘this presumably refers to a chaplain to the Butlers; there is a distinct possibility that it may even refer to Keating himself’ (23). And just as that misunderstanding of the word cliar forms the basis for a piece of misinformation, so too the misinterpretation placed on a line in another poem attributed to Keating causes the referential context of the poem to be unduly narrowed. In the verse from Óm sceol ar ardmhagh Fáil ní chodlaim oíche quoted on p. 156 na hóig ón mBáintsrath (‘the youths from Strabane’), are not O’Briens (who are included in Tálfhuil of the previous line), but O’Neills, so that the poem refers not just to ‘the major Munster families’, as suggested on p. 156, but to a great Ulster family also (and indeed in the following verse of the poem to the Fitzgeralds of Leinster).

Part 3 (‘Scribes, translators and other readers’) on the one hand extends the perspective of the book by taking us forward from the ‘world of Geoffrey Keating’ of its title, and indeed past the seventeenth century of its sub-title, and on the other restricts its focus to FFÉ, with not much more than passing references to ESA and TBB. The overview provided of the reception of FFÉ by later generations down to the middle of the eighteenth century is valuable. In chapter 10 the author concentrates on manuscript copies of the various versions of the text and on manuscript copies of translations into English and Latin, all of which were made before the end of the seventeenth century, together with other later seventeenth-century and early eighteenth-century texts which provide evidence for interest in, and/or influence by, FFÉ. In chapter 11 she discusses works published in print in the first half of the eighteenth century which owe a debt to FFÉ: Anthony Raymond’s schemes for the publication of a translation and Dermod Ó’Connor’s translation published in 1723.

10 A text not mentioned here but which seems to have been strongly influenced by FFÉ is Tadhg Ó Neachtain’s poem of 2112 ll., Chum glóire Dé gan bhréag im’ fhuighe, which was composed in 1726 and a holograph copy of which occurs in TCD MS H. 4. 20 (1361) pp. 127-211. The cataloguers of the TCD Irish manuscripts, T. K. Abbott and E. J. Gwynn, did not attribute the poem to Ó Neachtain, having failed perhaps to understand verse 527 where Tadhg gives his own name and those of his father and mother in cryptic form: ‘Gidh file m’ainm is fada ón ngaois mé / más teann is neach i n-easbaidh críonnacht’; / m’athair ba aisce, aicme an chiocrais; / mo mháthair ó Bhranach, ba dalta caorach.’ Tadhg had transcribed a copy of FFÉ in 1704: see FFÉ I p. xiv.
All the texts considered in chapter 10 offer a ‘Catholic’ (or perhaps a native) perspective on FFÉ; some of those reviewed in chapter 11 also offer a ‘Catholic’ perspective, while others constitute a ‘Protestant’ (or perhaps a ‘New English’) response to FFÉ.

Some of the account given in chapter 11 is rather too general: for instance, one would wish that some evidence had been supplied to support the undoubtedly true statement that ‘O’Connor’s printed translation consciously tailored the text [of FFÉ] to non-Catholic audiences’ (225). On the other hand, some of the detail provided in these last two chapters is not entirely satisfactory.

- The statement that ‘one mid-eighteenth-century Tipperary manuscript does claim to be based on a copy derived in direct line from [Keating’s autograph text]’ (173) is inaccurate: as is clear from a footnote on the same page, the claim was made in 1865, more than one hundred years after the manuscript in question, BL Add. MS 31872, was written.
- The suggestion (176) that RIA MS C iv 1 [(a)] was ‘probably the work of Seán Ó M Dolchonaire’ seems to be undermined by the statement in n. 17 that ‘it was probably the work of a scribe associated with the Ó Maolchonaire school.’
- The statement on p. 176 that TCD MS 1403 contains a copy of ESA is false, and the references given in footnotes 18 and 19 are incorrect: n. 18 should read ‘Manuscript “H” in Bergin’s analysis, TBB p. ix’, while n. 19 should read ‘FFÉ, ii, pp. xxvii-xxix. Manuscript “M2”’.
- The discussion on p. 177 of Michéal Ó Cléirigh’s transcription of FFÉ is confusing: whereas in her main text the author states that ‘[s]ince Foras feasa was not used by the Four Masters in their annals, completed in August 1636, it may be that the transcription of Foras feasa was undertaken after their own magnum opus was completed’, in n. 25 she suggests that ‘it is possible that Sept 1635 saw Ó Cléirigh commencing the work on copying Foras feasa’.
- It would have been helpful to point out that Fr Th. Sirinus, referred to at p. 187, n. 77, was Thomas O’Sheerin O.F.M. who saw Hugh Ward’s Sancti Rumoldi Acta through the press in 1662 and did further editorial work on the lives of the Irish saints.
- It is not made clear (on p. 189) why John Lynch, author of a Latin translation of FFÉ, thought that British writers who ‘being ignorant of Irish … could only read Latin writings on Ireland’ could not read
'the fragments of the Latin history of Cormac mac Cuileannáin' in the Psalter of Cashel – if indeed such a Latin history existed.

• The discussion of which English translation of FFÉ was available to the Earl of Anglesey seems to involve a circular argument. In nn. 105, p. 191, and 5, p. 202, the author states that ‘the translation of Foras Feasa available to the Earl of Anglesea [sic] in the 1670s was probably the “A defence” version’. No evidence is given in support of this probability in either note, but reference is made in both to n. 12, p. 204. In the latter note passages from Peter Walsh’s A Prospect of the State of Ireland … (1682), which are quoted in the text at pp. 202-3, 203-4, are taken to provide evidence that Walsh had had access in the 1670s to an English translation of FFÉ, and that that translation was the ‘A defence’ version. Walsh’s further statement that it was the Earl of Anglesey who had shown him that translation naturally provides evidence for the belief that the translation available to the Earl of Anglesey was the ‘A defence’ version and that he had it in the 1670s; no other evidence in support of this belief is supplied by the author, and therefore her deduction from Walsh’s evidence is not at all ‘reinforced by the fact that the Earl of Anglesea also had access to a translation of Foras feasa (probably the “A defence” text) in the 1670s’.

• The lines composed by Seán Ó Murchadha [na Ráithíneach] to celebrate having transcribed FFÉ were not ‘a poem’, as stated at p. 224, but a single verse. It might have been pointed out that, according to the editor of Ó Murchadha’s work, he composed that verse in or about 1750 and that he composed another similar verse in 1753 when he had made a further copy of FFÉ (see ‘Torna’, Seán na Ráithíneach (1954) pp. xxiv-xxv).
theology and philosophy in a non-Irish environment should not be underestimated’ (31); ‘Keating reaffirmed that only a priest had authority to say Mass’ (33); ‘Keating distinguished between three different types of sacrifice: the figurative sacrifice of the death of Abel in the Old Testament, the sacrifice of Christ on the cross, and the sacramental sacrifice of the Mass. He asserted that the Mass was a sacrifice under this last sacramental form and not, as he claimed the heretic stated, under the second form’ (33-34); ‘it was the work of the Franciscans … who led the way’ (39); ‘Each was a substantive point rather than simply quotations selected at random’ (56); ‘he specifically rejected his fellow Old English-man, Richard Stanihurst, who sought to disregard the significance of the Gaelic heritage in early modern Ireland’ (109); ‘the only other mention of an assembly at Uisneach is in an entry that confuses the event with Tara’ (135); ‘The emphasis was on physical pain … rather than mental torture suffered by the absence of the love of God’ (165); ‘the later seventeenth-century English translation of Foras feasa … retained the distinction between “the Old English and Irish gentry”, and “as well the Old English as the inhabitants of Ireland” “as for the Old Irish before the English conquest”’ (188). Furthermore, there are frequent misprints throughout the book, not only in Latin and Irish but in English too, and this is true not only of the text, but of the titles of works referred to and of quotations. Page 38 illustrates some of the kinds of errors that occur in the English text: ‘prophecied’ for ‘prophe-sied’, ‘an major issue’ for ‘a major issue’, ‘appear to derived’ for ‘appear to be derived’, ‘attitude’ for ‘attitude’. While it would be unfair to suggest that such errors occur on every page of the book, misspellings and misprints occur all too regularly throughout the book and detract from its quality as a work of scholarship. The publisher has done a serious disservice to the author.
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11 Since some misspellings occur more than once (e.g. ‘sparce’, ‘sparcer’ (35, 67), ‘tranquility’ (143, 165), it is clear that they are not misprints.


Deich n-uaire an chloig go leith a taifeadadh i Ros Muc agus is é an t-ábhar sin atá in eagar sa dá imleabhar seo. Réamhrá agus an téacs trascríofa go gnáthlitriú na Gaeilge atá atá le chéile in iarthar na Gaillimhe sa bhliain 1963. Réamhrá agus an téacs trascríofa go gnáthlitriú na Gaeilge atá atá le chéile in iarthar na Gaillimhe sa bhliain 1963.

Deich n-uaire an chloig go leith a taifeadadh i Ros Muc agus is é an t-ábhar sin atá in eagar sa dá imleabhair seo. Réamhrá agus an téacs trascríofa go gnáthlitriú na Gaeilge atá atá le chéile in iarthar na Gaillimhe sa bhliain 1963.

Is eard a frythear sa dara himleabhar liosta de na focail uile atá sa téacs; liosta de na daoine agus de na logainmneacha a luaitear agus liosta d’ainmneacha eile; liostaí de na focail Bhéarla a fháitear sa téacs; agus liosta de mhíniciocht na bhfocal Gaeilge.

Is faoina saol féin a bhfuil na cainteoirí a thrascríofadh agus faoi a fhágadh faoi béaloidis, scéalta faoin bhfharraige, faoi iascach, faoi cheirdeanna, faoi dheanamh an bhréidín, faoin osnádúr, faoin stair áitiúil. Ina iomláine is ina iomláine is ina chlann, bhí spéis ag lucht béaloidis san ábhar agus ag na daoine sin ar suim leis an bhfocal shóisialta agus cultúrtha. Tomás Ó Conaire, múinteoir, a stiúraigh an comhrá agus ba iad Micheál Ó Conaire, básóir (68 bliain d’aois), Seán Ó Meá, feirmteoir (54 bliain), Mícheál Breathnach, oibrí (50 bliain), Máirtín Ó Nia, feirmteoir (52 bliain), Seán Ó Mainnín, feirmteoir (52 bliain) agus Tomás Ó Mainnín, leictreoir (27 bliain), na faisnéiseoirí.

Cé gur sa ghnáthscríobh atá na téacsanna, tá iarracht déanta ag an eagarthóir an chomhrá a tharlúchtaí a chuid litrithe: báthann, báithheadh in áit báin, bádh; achuile, ’chuile in áit gach uile; d’úirt, níor úirt etc. in áit dúirt, ní dúirt etc.; dhá in áit dá; dhom, duirt etc. in áit dom, duirt. Dealaíonn sé modh coinmliollach spleách an bhriathair faigh ón aimsir ghnáthchaite trí éagsúlacht an ghuta: m.sh. go bhfaigheadh ach go bhfaigheadh.
Is de réir an leathanaigh in *Caint Ros Muc* (CRM feasta) a chuirim síos mo chuid nótaí anseo ach luaim córas tagartha an eagarthóra (Wigger = W. feasta) idir lúibíní.

**Éiginteacht i gcóras litrithe CRM**

Tá níthe i gcóras litrithe W., áfach, a bhfuil aistíl ag baint leo. Óh a scríobhann sé *passim* mar intriacht, ach is é ó an leagan Gaeilge (féach FGB ó, lch 918a). Ar an gcaoi chéanna *á* a scríobhann sé *passim* mar intriacht, leagan nach bhfuil le fáil sa Ghaeilge; is mar á is ceart é a scríobh (féach á², FGB 1b). Is mar thrí fhocal a scríobhann sé *pé ar bith* (*passim*) cé gur dócha gur mar pébí nó pébri a deirtear an leagan ina fhoirse. Túgann FGB aitheantas do pébí agus pébri ar aon (féach FGB 945b). Ar an taobh eile *cés moite* a scríobhann sé, nuair is *cé is moite* an leagan caighdeánach (féach FGB 199a). Scríobhann sé *ar éigean*, an leagan caighdeánach, in áiteanna agus *ar égin*, an leagan canúinach, in áiteanna eile, cé gur léir óna fhoclóir (II, 208) gur mar *ar égin* a deirtear an dá rud ina fhoirse. Ní léir an bhfuil fáth aige leis an éiginteacht sa litriú.


Is cás faoi leith an iolra *caoirigh*. San fhoclóir in iml. II deirtear linn gur mar *caoirigh* a litrítear an uimhir iolra. Faightear *caoirigh* mar shampla ag 58 (1-09-09 M), 229 (4-09-03 To), 304 (6-04-02...
Ma), ach ansin faighimid *caoirí* 304 x 2 (6-04-01 T, 6-04-04 T) freisin. Ní léir go bhfuil bunús ar bith leis an éagsúlacht litríthe.

Tá aistíl i litriú roinnnt de na foirmeacha briathartha freisin. Tá an leagan *mar a déarfá* coitianta sna téacsanna. Ach is mar chuid den bhriathar féin a litrítear an mhír a sa láithreach den bhriathar céanna, mar shampla, *adeirimse* 12 x 4 (1-02-05 M), *adeir sé* 24 (1-02-31 M). Bheadh sé ní ba leanúnaí *a deirimse*, a *deir sé a liríù i bhfianaise mar a déarfá*, etc. Is mar *dhul* a litrítear áinm briathartha *téigh* tríd síos ach tugtar le fios in iml. II 470 gur mar [goil] a deirtear an leagan. I bhfianaise *bhoil* [wel'] agus *scoil* [skel'] atá in CRM, bheadh sé níos ciailmhaire *dhul* a liríù *goil*.

Nós eile atá ag W., a bhrathairse aisteach, an chaoi a scróibhann sé an aimsir chaite den bhriathar *fágaim .i. d’fhágaigh*, m.sh., *d’fhágaigh muid* 31 (1-02-50 M), 35 (1-03-04 M), 34 (1-03-04 M), *d’fhágaigh siad* (x 2) 40 (1-05-07 M), *gur fhágaigh* (x 2) 46 (1-05-21). Is mar *d’fhága* a deirtear an leagan sa chaint, agus tá an chuma ar an scéal ach gceapann an t-eagarthóir gur leis an dara réimníú a bhaineann sé. Is ó *d’fhágaibh* a thagann *d’fhága* (< *fo-ad-gab*) agus ba nós, mar sin, é a liríù *d’fhágaibh* (féach, mar shampla, GCFD 75 fonóta, 104, 152, etc.). B’fhéarr liom féin é a liríù *d’fhága* anseo.

Úsáid an *fheiscín*

Tá an fleiscíniú aisteach in áiteanna. Tá sé le tuiscint ón fhoclóir gur *mí-ádh* a scríobhtrí tríd síos, agus tá samplaí den liríù sin sna téacsanna, m.sh. 212 (4-03-11 S), 268 (5-12-01 T), 282 (5-16-07 Mi) agus 303 (6-03-01 T). Ach tá an liríù gan fleiscín (mhiadh) chomh coitianta céanna: 14 (1-02-10 M), 23 (1-02-29 M), etc. Is nós le W. freisin fleiscín a chur idir an dá eilimint deirdh d’arda an chompáis: *aniar-aduaidh* 18 x 2 (1-02-20 M), *aniar-aneas* 4 x 2 (1-01-10 M), *aneas anoir-aneas* 23 (1-02-23 M), *anoir-aneas* 21 (1-02-25 M) etc. Níl bunús ar bith leis an liríú sin sa Ghaeilge chomhainseartha;

*aniar aduaidh, aniar aneas, aneas anoir aneas* agus *anoir aneas* na gnáthleaganachá inniu (féach, m.sh. GGC 221-22).

Is mar *dó-dhéag* a litrítear an uimhir go minic anseo, m.sh. 36 x 2 (1-04-01 M, 1-04-01 T), 166 (3-10-19 M). Ach tá *dó-dhéag* scríofa gan fleiscín freisin, m.sh. 222 (4-06-07 S), 223 (4-06-09 S); cf. freisin *dó-dhéag is trí dheag is ceathair déag is cúig dheag* 272 (5-14-03 Mi). Ós rud é gurb é *dó-dhéag* gan fleiscín an leagan caighdeánach (FGB 423b), ba chóir an leagan a liríú mar sin tríd síos.
Focail Bhéarla
Deirtear linn ar lch xxvi den chéad iml. gur coinníodh litriú an Bhéarla iniasachtaí Béarla 'go minic, cé gur léir nach nglacann cuid mhór de na cainteoirí leo mar iasachtaí níos mó.' Is léir ina dhiaisí sín féin nach rabhthas leanúnach le hiasachtaí Béarla, mar is i ríocht Gaeilge a litrítear cuid acu, m. sh. blac ‘bloc’, citil, druig ‘dredge’, druigáil, robar, sáirjint, smeartáilte. Ar an taobh eile is mar fhocail Bhéarla a litrítear cuid eile díobh, cé go bhfuil litriú Gaeilge in úsáid leana n-aghaidh le fada an lá, m. sh. melodeon (mileoidean) 178 (3-12-09 M), doubt (dabht) 376 (7-02-05 Se), sulphur (sulfar) 292-93 (5-17-15 Mi x 2) agus swede (svaeid) 275 (5-13-13 Mi).

Córas litrithe LFRM
Ní thuigim go díreach cén fáth nár bhain W. feidhm as córas litrithe ab fhearr a thaispeánfadh tréithe na canúna, arae bhí eiseamláir aige i litriú LFRM. Tugann Ó Máille cuntas ar na difríochtaí idir a litriú féin agus an Caighdeán Oifigiúil ar lgh x-xii dá réamhrá. Seo roinnt de na difríochtaí céanna:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LFRM</th>
<th>Caighdeán/CRM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>hugam, hugad</td>
<td>chugam, chugat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>go, g’</td>
<td>do, de, d’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tiúra</td>
<td>tabharfaidh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tiuca</td>
<td>tiocfaidh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>molha</td>
<td>molfaidh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fánn</td>
<td>faigheann</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coinneo</td>
<td>coinneoidh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diona</td>
<td>déanamh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cluife</td>
<td>cluíche</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beithiach</td>
<td>beithíoch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rúm, rút</td>
<td>romham, romhat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acab</td>
<td>acu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leothab</td>
<td>leo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scatha</td>
<td>scaitheamh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaille</td>
<td>Gaillimh</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Is mar bacaí agus Sasanaí a litríonn Ó Máille bacaigh agus Sasanaigh faoi seach. Mar a tharlaíonn is nós le W. iolraí den chineál sin a litriú ar an gcaoi chéanna le -aí, bíodh nach bhfuil sé leanúnach. Tá fathaí aige, m.sh. 195 (2-02-14 To) ach fathaigh freisin, m.sh. 193 (4-02-09 To).
Tréith shuntasach de chuid CRM na nótaí ag bun na leathanach a mhínionn céard go díreach a chuala sé ar an téip, nuair nach mar a chéile é sin agus an rud a thugtar sa téacs. Dá mbainifí feidhm as córas litrithe LFRM, ní bheadh gá go minic lena leithéidí d’fhonótaí.

**Nótaí ar an téacs**

Ní obair éasca í trascríobh beacht a dhéanamh ar chaint bheo agus admhaíonn W. nár éirigh leis an bhrí a thabhairt leis go cruinn i ngach cáis. Ba mhaith liom anois aird a dhíriú ar roinnt áiteanna a raibh mé amhrasach faoina bhfuil liom agus CRM á léamh agam. Ní raibh teacht agam ar an taifeadadh bunaidh; nílim mar sin ach ag nochtadh buille faoi thuairim i roinnt mhaith cáisanna. Nó móir a chur in úil freisin nach bhfuil sna nótaí seo a leanas chun blaiseadh beag de na pointí a bhual liom agus CRM á léamh agam.

13 (1-02-06 M) Bhoil dheamhan *fág* dhá raibh ag tíocht fúinn, saoir faoi Cheann Gainimh, *nach shílfeá* go bhfágfadh sí thoir i mullach na Gaillimhe mid. Is faoin mbriathar *fág*, *fágaim* a liostaithear an leagan *fág* anseo san fhocloir (II, 213) ach is léir nach cuid den bhríathar *fág* atá anseo ach ainmfhocal. Cf. *fág* ... Gleann idir dhá dhroim toinne (idir barr dhá mhaim)’ LFRM 83b. Ba chóir ion-tráil dá chuid fén a bheith ag an bhfocal san fhocloir. Táim amhrasach faoi *nach shílfeá* freisin. Is léir go ndeachaigh *ch* ag deireadh *nach* i bhfeidhm ar thúshcón-san *shílfeá*, ach tá cárta mhícheart ar nach *shílfeá*.

14 (1-02-10 M) cheannaigh sé an lucht an bhfuil a fhios agat, ar fhéaráilte. Ní léir dom céard is brí le ar fhéaráilte. D’fhéadfadh sé go bhfuil rud éigin ar lár anseo.

16 (1-02-15 M) Gura ndeachaigh sí amach an bhfuil a fhios agat, cheangail sí trí cinn de chúrsaí inti. Tá cuma neamhghramadúil ar gura ndeachaigh Nó foláir nó bhí na cúrsáil á gceangal sula ndeachaigh an bás amach, agus is dócha, mar sin gur mithuiscint é *gura* ar leagan éigin de *sula*, le [h] nó [x] mar thúshchónsan aige (féach II, 452).

20 (1-02-22 T) *cúpla* ceann. Anseo agus sa téacs tríd síos is mar *cúpla* a litrítear an focal seo. Ach is léir ón bhfocloir (II, 161) gur leis gairid a deirtear é. I gConnachta go hiondúil is mar *cupla* a deirtear an focal nuair is ‘roinnt, beaga’ is brí leis agus mar *cúpla* leis an fhuta nuair is peire rataf nó beirt a bhítear len a chéile (‘twins’) atá i gceist. Ní léir, mar sin, cén fáth nár lítrigh W. le gairid anseo é agus in an fáil a bhí in éile ar bhrí ionann an bhí agus ‘roinnt’. Tugann Ó Dónaill airtheantas don litriú *cupla* ar ‘two, a few’ (FGB 357b).

34 (1-02-56 M) Bhí sé, *ndéana* Dia trócaire air. Bhí sé, *ndéana* Dia trócaire a léamh anseo. Tá an leagan cánaí ar 53 (1-08-03 M) agus 90 (2-10-05 M); cf. freisin *ansin bhfhóire* Dia orainn in áit *ansin bhfhóire* Dia orainn (1-09-06 M).

39 (1-05-06 M) fear de chloinne Conaola. Is ó *de chaillín Uí Conaola* (an leg. Chonaola?) a thagann sé sin, is dóchá. Cf. freisin *de Chaillín Con Ri* é 65 (2-02-07 M) agus ba Chloinne Con Ri é 66 (2-02-08 M). Ag caint dó faoi chloinne in abairtí den chineál seo deir Brian Ó Curnáin: ‘This old dative singular of *clann*, occurring in phrases such as *de chaillín ’ic an Iomaire* has in fact been re-analysed as c*thlaimne* (with facultatively lexicalised lenition)” (Éigse 31 (1999) 142). Is trua nach mhintear an leagan anseo. Ní mhínionn W. cén fáth a bhfuil
chlainne aige chomh maith le chloinne, ná cad chuige a litríonn sé an leagan le litir mhór uaireanta agus le litir bheag uaireanta eile.

42 (1-05-13 M) *is téalthaigh se* right away. Léitear is théalthaigh sé.

44 (10-05-18 T) *léitear* is téalthaigh sé.

47 (1-06-02 M) *faitíos go mbéaradh ceann eile air.* Léitear *Faitíos go mbéaradh.*

51 (1-07-05) *gur é féin a chuir a láimh suas agus d’fhialfraigh air.* Ó tharla gur le *air* a théann an braithar, is dócha gurb é *iarrat* sa cheannach fialfraí atá i gceist. Is é a raibh sé a chomh maith le litir mhór uaireanta agus litir bheag uaireanta eile.

52 (2-01-06 M) *Taobh istigh den aon alt amháin léimid a bhí sa gcurach agus an curach ar trá*. Sa chéad sampla tá an focal *curach* sa chéad sampla. Sa dara *curach* sa chéad sampla. B’fhéar liomsa acheapadh *curach* a bhí i gceist leis an curach sa cheannach.

56 (2-02-10 M & T) *Is spéisiúil go luaitear ‘Orán* 'Oranmore’ trí huaire anseo. *Órán* a thugadh Gaeilgeoirí na Gaillimhe ar an mbaile; cf. an rann traidisiúnta Col ceathair don chriathar an bodhrán / Shiúil mé a lán agus chonaic mé mórán/ Is ní fhaic léimheas a phós sa bhóthar níos salait/ Ná atá ó Ghaillimh go hUarán (N. Williams, Cniogaide Cnagaide 111).

57 (2-02-11 T) *dtéadh sí an bealach go deo.* Léitear *dtéadh sí an bealach go deo?*

61 (2-04-07 M) *agus nach dtosaigh sé ag fiafraí an diabhal*. Is deacair glacadh leis go ndúradh *fiafraí* an diabhal. Is deacair *mbeifí* leis an gceart. Is deacair *mbeifí* leis an gceart.

66 (2-02-10 M) *is spéisiúil go luaitear Órán* 'Oranmore’ trí huaire anseo. *Órán* a thugadh Gaeilgeoirí na Gaillimhe ar an mbaile; cf. an rann traidisiúnta Col ceathair don chriathar an bodhrán / Shiúil mé a lán agus chonaic mé mórán/ Is ní fhaic léimheas a phós sa bhóthar níos salait/ Ná atá ó Ghaillimh go hUarán (N. Williams, Cniogaide Cnagaide 111).

67 (2-02-11 T) *Mhaith liomsa a cheapadh gur sa gcurach a bhí i gceist leis an curach sin.*

72 (2-04-4 M; 2-04-5 M) *Is aisteach liom an dá leagan ag abairt agus ag abairt faoisteann anseo.* Léitear *ag abairt?*

74 (2-04-10 T) *Bhí brigeantín a thugaidís ar chuid acu ag square rig ar chuid eile.* Tugtar faoi deara go bhfuil leathghaelú déanta ag W. ar an bhfocal Béarla *brigantine*, cé go bhfáithigh sé *square rig* i litriú an Bhéarla. Is aisteach liom ag *mbeifí* leis an gceart. *Bhí* brí stairiúil leis an gceart.

80 (2-06-01 T) *Luaitear an breitheamh Muiris i gcomhthéacs an Spidéil anseo. Is trua nach bhfuil aon chur síos ag W. ar an duine céanna. Déanaimse amach gurb é atá i gceist Michael Morris, an chéad bharún ‘Chill Ainthinne’ a raibh cónaí ar Spidéal. Is breitheamh móir le rá a bhí ann agus tiarna achوشaire; rinneadh barúin de sa bhliain 1889 agus cailleadh sa bhliain 1901 é. Garnia leis ab ea Michael Morris, an triú Tiarna ‘Chill Ainthinne’, a bhí seal ina chathaoirleach ar an gCoiste Idirnáisiúnta Oílimpeach.

81 (2-06-04 M) *M’anam go bhfiafraigh Pádraig Shéimín de Mháirtín. Nach dóichí gur go bhfiafraíonn le brí stairiúil a bhí ann dáiríre?*
82 (2-07-03 M) Chora na Ronna. Cé gur mar Ronna a deirtear an dara heilmint anseo, is dócha gur leis an mbunaimh Rinn a bhaineann sé; cf. an Rinn ach Bóthar na Ronna ar an gCeathrú Rua. Más é gínideach an fhocail Rinn atá anseo, b’fhearr é a litriú Rinne.

83 (2-07-04 M) Bhi sí tairnithe suas condemnáil mar a déarfá. Léigh *condemnáilte?

87 (2-09-07 M) tháinig rosámh agus ceo. Ós rud é gur ar an dara siolla atá an bhéim san fhocal rosámh ’summer haze’, is fearr é a litriú ro sámh .i. mar dhá fhocal. Ró sámh an litriú a mholtar in FGB; féach s.v. ró (FGB 1005a).

88 (2-10-01 M) bhíodh sé ag cur a chapall soir i ngarraí an tsagairt, san oícheanta gealaí go maidin. Léigh *

92 (2-10-11 M) maidneachán atá san alt seo faoi dhó; cf. maidneachán 21 x 2 (1-02-25 M), 107 (2-13-19 M). Maidneachán an litriú is coitianta sa téacs; maidneachan a scríobhtar in áiteanna (12 (1-02-06 M), 202 (4-02-28 To) etc.). Is dócha gurbh fhearr mar litriú maidneachan tríd síos, ós rud é nach dtugtar an litriú *maidneachán in áit ar bith in FGB.

98 (2-12-07) bhí sé go dona nuair a dtiocfadh [sic] an t-uisce. Ar chualathas é seo i gceart?

98 (2-12-07) Níor mhór dhuit clúd a bheith agat ar an ngaineamh agus clúd a bheith agat ar an salann chomh maith céanna. Is focal é *clúd nach n-aithním agus nach bhfuil in FGB ach an oiread. An bhfheidfadh sé gur seachleagan de clúda atá ann .i. clúdadh (féach FCG s.v. clúdach)? Is mar clúda a déarfaí sin sa chanúint agus, ar ndóigh, chaillfí an siolla neamhaiceanta roimh ghuta ina dhiaidh.

98 (2-12-09 M) Níor dóadh aon mhaide uirthi. Níor dóadh tada… Cf. a dóadh an teach 224 (4-07-02 T), ó dóadh 293 (5-17-16 T). Nó a fhios agam cén fáth a scriobhann W. dóadh anseo .i. an saorbrithairt aimris chirte de dóigh ‘burn’. Má tá sé ag iarraidh dëshiolla a thaispeáint, nárth bhfhear dóigh heading a scriobh .i. an fhoirm stairiúil? Cf. báitheadh a luann sé sa Réamhrá (xxvi). Má tá sé ag iarraidh cloí leis an gCAighdeán Oifigiúil atá sé, ba chóir dó dóadh a scriobh. Is litriú gan bhunús dóadh sa Nua-Ghaeilge; is mar seo a litrítear saorbhriathra na mbriathra aonsiollacha san aimsir chaite:

99 (2-12-09) Dul chun dona, dul chun dona leis an uisce. Ar chualathas é seo i gceart?

100 (2-13-03 T) tá mé a cheapadh. Tá an leagan céanna le fáil arís ar lch 101 (2-13-03 T) agus in áiteanna eile. Tá tá mé cheapadh coitianta sa chumhacht agus is dócha gurbh ionann sin go stairiúil agus tá mé 'ceapadh (.i. tá mé ag ceapadh) le séimhiúi calcatha ar thúschonsan ceapadh, a fuarthas ó leaganacha ar nós tá mé á ceapadh. Bfhear mar sin an leagan a litriú tá mé ag ceapadh nó tá mé a ceapadh. Bhí mise ag ceapadh a fhaightear níos faide anonn (lch 105, 2-12-14 M). Tá cuma neamhghramadúil ar tá mé a cheapadh.

106 (2-13-5 T) M'anam nach bhfuilis Sa 2 p. u. láith. atá an briathar anseo. Chéapfainnse féin grú nach bhfuilis a dúradh.

106 (2-13-17 M) Tá sé dúnta suas anois. Dúinte an ghnáthfhhoirm in iarthar na Gaillimhe.
110. (2-14-05 M) go **Crachmhaoil** ... **Muintir Chrachmhaoil**. ‘Craughwell’ in oirthear na Gaillimhe atá i gceist, is dócha. Is mar **Crachmhaoil** a litrítear é sin go hoifigiúil. Aisteach go leor is mar **Crach Mhaoil** a litrítear an logainm in innéacs na logainmneacha in inml. II, 521.

140. (3-05-19 M) ... nach **labharfá** aon fhocal arís go brách air, agus ná raibh tú suppose aithiúil a labhairt air go **labhrófrá** in áiteacha eile air. Dá mbeadh W. ag iarraidh na foirmeacha éagsúla den mhodh coinníollach a thaispeáint, b’fhéidir gurbh fhearr dó an tseacht a dho an téacs a fhoilsiú i scriobh foghruil. Anseo tá idir **labharfá** agus **labhrófrá** aige ach ní léir cén luachigth bhí agat air ag ceachtar den dá litriú. Is é is dóichí gur **labhrófrá** nó **labharhá** atá i gceist atá i gceist leis an gcéad leagan thuas. Ní féidir a rá cad dó a seasann **labhrófrá**, áfach: **labhróthá**, **labhráthá**, **labhrathá**, nó **labharhá** féin? Feictear domsa gurbh fhearr **labhrófá** a scríobh.

142. (3-05-19 M) le haghaidh iadsan [sic]. Tá a leithéid le fáil i gcanúintí eile i gCo. na Gaillimhe; cf. **Ní raibh focal foghlaim i bpluic iadsan** (de Bhaldraithe, **Seanchas Thomáis Laighléis** (1977) 173).

161. (3-10-33 M) Ach cé bheadh istigh uisce ann le go mbeadh a fhios aige ... Ní thugim é sin. B’fhéidir gur chualathas go mícheart é?

184. (3-14-05 T & M) An raibh tú féin in ann na seoltaí a dhéanamh di? Ní dhéanadh. Níl a mh'anam agus inniu. Is éard atá i gceist sa dara habairt: ‘I am not able to repair her sails until this very day’. Ba chóir mar sin é a litriú:

*Níl a mh'anam gus inniu.*
250 (5-05-01 Mi) *ar oifigi* is *leathoifigi* is quartermaster is ’chuile shórt. Feictear anseo an fhadh bhaingeanne le hiolra ainmhfhoctail ar -each a liríú ar -í. Is é an bhrí a bhainfeadh an gnáthléitheoir os *oifigi* ’offices’ níos túisce ná ’officers’.

253 (5-06-02 Mi) a *gcuid capaille*. Is tréanóra le an leagan *capaille* anseo. Ní féidir a bheith cinnte go bhfuil *capaille* anseo le dealú ón bhfoirm a litrídear *cauple* in áiteanna eile, m. sh. lch 318 x 6. San fhoclóir in iml. II (lch 95) deirtear gur mar [*kaːpˈL̩ə*] a fhuaimhneadar *cauple*; deirtear freisin, áfach, mar [*kaːpˈL̩ə*] a deirtear *capaille*, rud a bhfuilim amhrasach faoi.

279 Locht ar chlóchur an leabhair é *XLVIa Obair feamainne* a bhheit ag bun leathanaimh anseo gan aon scríobh eile faoi.

286 (5-16-21 T & Mi) Tá an féidir anseo chun fógraí leis an dá shampla á rá gur mar [*bəvˈɪn*] agus [*bəjin*] a deirtear iad faoi seach. Más mar sin atá an scéal, ba chóir iad a liríú *babh in* agus *badh in*.

290 (15-17-06 Mi) *Dhá ndóadh* sí. Más sa mhodh coinníollach atá an briathar sin, ba chóir é a liríú *ndóadh*. Más foshuiteach caite atá ann is mar *ndóadh* a litriútaí é. Níl aon bhunús le *ndóadh*. Is docha gur modh coinníollach atá i gceist, aracht mhodh *ndófa* a fuaimhneáras níos faide síos (5-17-08 T).

295 (6-01-02 T & Ma) Tá idir iomú píosa agus is *iomáid* muis. *Is iomáid* anseo. An difríocht cainteora amháin atá i gceist anseo, nó difríocht timpeallachta?

307 (6-05-07 Ma) *an fearsaid* ... *leis an fearsaid* [sic]. In áiteanna eile, áfach, is mar *fearsad* a lirítear an focal, m. sh. 173 (3-11-09 S). San fhoclóir (II 229) tugtar le fios gur mar *fearsaid* a deirtear an focal gach uile áit. Cén bunús mar sin atá leis an difríocht sa litriú?

368 (6-21-12 T & Ma) faightear *romthu* (= *rompu*) x 2 anseo. Táim amhrasach faoi a liríú, arae san fhoclóir (II 392) deirtear gur *ráthab* a deirtear an fhoirm. B’fhéarr liom é a liríú *ráthab* anseo mar sin.

Is docha go bhfuil go leor scríofa lena thaispeáint a ancarraí is atá obair an traslitrithe i gcás téacsanna a taifeadh adh ó bhéal na ndaoine. Ní mór don eagarthóir cinneadadh a dhéanamh faoi mbrí fín, faoi gcórais litrithe agus faoi mhéad na héagsúlachta atá sé sásta a cheadú ina eagartr. Ní i gcónaí a aontaíms leis an gcáoi ar réitigh an t-eagarthóir na fadhbhanna sin sa saothar seo. Caithfear a adhmenth, ina dhaídh sin fín, gur luachmar an baillúchán atá curtha ar fáil ag Wigger agus go bhfuilimid dá bharr sin go mór faoi chomaoín aige.

NODA


This is one of the most significant publications of the Irish Texts Society for many a year. Being the first fascicle of the much-awaited historical dictionary of Gaelic placenames, comparisons with Fr Hogan’s pioneering and inspirational work of nearly a hundred years ago are invited and expected; and due credit is given, and homage paid, to Hogan’s Onomasticon in the editors’ ‘seoladh’ (pp. x-xi). Hogan’s approach differed from that of the editors of the Historical dictionary in that he did not confine himself to historical and literary sources, nor to sources terminating at 1800. His work will, therefore, retain its value to some degree into the future. In his list of river names, for instance, he included many items – such as ‘a[bha] na sead’ and ‘a[bha] na gcaerach’, in Counties Waterford and Cork respectively – where no sources are cited, and where one assumes that he was working from maps and local information.

The decision (p. x) to employ, where possible, Early Modern Irish as the standard for the lemmata, is a laudable one, and a marked improvement on Hogan (the post-classical form ‘Athfhóidhla’ – not reflected in any of the entries – seems to have slipped in unnoticed). Insofar as the Grammatical Tracts form a useful touchstone in this regard, their authority may have been enforced somewhat too strictly in rendering the form Áth Caille as Áth Coille, when only examples with ai are cited (cf. also Ard Coille), with no cross-reference to assist the reader. Cross-referencing to other entries within this fascicle is generally successful, but I have sought in vain for Áth Fuinnseann, under which headword the reader is referred to Áth Uinnseann (recte Áth Uinseann), where the F- form is not cited. In the case of Ard Fionáin, that lemma should probably contain cross-references to Aill na Méaróg and Áth Arda Fhionáin. The level of cross-referencing to future fascicles is necessarily high, and whets the reader’s appetite for the publication of those volumes.
Other departures from Hogan’s presentation are the brave and welcome decision to attempt English translations of the placenames; and the multiplicity of instances of those names which, at least since Knott’s time, have been categorised as ‘bardic names for Ireland’. In the present volume, these encompass such harmless combinations as Achadh Iúghoine, Achadh na bhFear, Adhbha Chuinn, Adhbha Éimhir, and Adhbha Ír. It is presumably the principle of inclusiveness or exhaustiveness that lies behind the presence of these names in the book, but whether they should be considered as bona fide placenames, or whether, indeed, they add anything to our knowledge of Gaelic placenames, is debatable. Similar combinations involving clár, fonn, iath, etc. must now be included in later volumes. Matters such as this point up the absence here of an explanatory introduction, more comprehensive than that provided (pp. x-xi), wherein might be given the arguments for the inclusion of such a category.

This absence is perhaps most keenly felt in the area of Scottish placenames. Quite a number of such names are given here, the majority of them deriving from Irish sources; those from Scottish sources are mainly from the Book of Deer, with occasional entries coming from the Book of the Dean (Ard an Eascair) and from the Fernaig Manuscript (Apuinn). If Scottish names are to be included – and Hogan considered them worth including also – there is no shortage of Scottish sources that may be drawn on. A reasonably significant amount of Scottish placenames in A- is to be found, for example, in collections of poetry in Gàidhlig of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, but these collections do not seem to have been consulted. Again, this must be deliberate editorial policy, and one that awaits exposition in some future fascicle of the dictionary. For the present, however, one cannot but feel that a Gaelic name such as Ard Chatan (Donnchadh Bàn, c. 1752) should be as welcome in this work as Adhbha Ír.

As in all works of this nature, the amount of labour is huge, and is largely concealed behind a format that necessarily precludes any kind of discussion or lengthy annotation, and allows of only the most abbreviated of references. In some cases, therefore, we are obliged to accept at face value corrections of previous readings and identifications. In the case of Ard Petun, for instance, Carrigan’s reading of the Mac Murchadha charter was Ardpetrann (History IV, 281), and that of Bernard (PRIA 35 (1918-20) 5) was Ardpetraim. While, again in Co. Kilkenny, O’Donovan’s identification of Achadh Mic Earclaighe with Agha in Gowran is silently, if tentatively, abandoned in favour
of Killahy in Knocktopher. The ground-breaking work of one of the editors, Diarmuid Ó Murchadha, is to be seen in the entry for Áth Coirthíne, which reflects his proposition in *Laois history and society* 40, that this is the correct origin for the name Aharney, as opposed to Áth Charna of *Liostaí logainmneacha*, and ‘aith Charrna’ in a manuscript of 1606 (*RIA Cat.* p. 1194). Some names still resist identification, however, or present choices that are at best frustrating: e.g. Áth Doire Dhuibh, which may be located either in Laois or in Leitrim. Possible ghost-names are *Aileann Uí Theachtais* (cf. O’Brien, *Corp. Gen. Hib.* I (1976) 124b24), and *Ana* (2), which, in the source cited, should be spelt in the lower case and should be taken as the word meaning ‘wealth, abundance’. Typographical errors are few: for *The place-names of the Decies* (p. xxvi) read *The place-names of Decies*; for *orrdhuire* (s.v. Áth Meadhóin (1)) read *orrdhuire*; C[atholic] B[ulletin] 8 (s.v. *Abha(nn)* Life) wants a page reference; for *SHDR* (s.v. *Alba* (1)) read SHD.

The final judgement on this important work will not be given until the last fascicle has been published. In the meantime this project should carry with it the good wishes of all scholars interested in onomastic studies, many of whom will, it is hoped, accept the editors’ invitation (p. xii) to supply them with information, identifications, corrections, etc. There is enough in this first volume to indicate that when the final volume is issued, it should mark the completion of a monument of Irish scholarship of the twenty-first century.

PÁDRAIG Ó MACHÁIN


This volume of nine essays is a co-operative undertaking between the universities of Strathclyde, Aberdeen and Trinity College Dublin – the Irish-Scottish Academic Initiative – and the fruit of seminars held in these universities in 1997-98 (p. 7). The stated purpose of the collection is to illuminate the ‘underlying thread of unity’ (2) of the cultural and religious diversity of the sea-divided Gael.

One of the obvious points of connection between the cultures of Gaelic Scotland and Ireland is the shared tradition of *fianáíocht*. It is
fitting, then, that the volume begins with an essay by one of the editors, Donald E. Meek, that examines a prominent aspect of this shared tradition, the *laoithe fianaíochta* preserved in the Book of the Dean of Lismore (BDL) and in Duanaire Finn (DF) (‘The Scottish tradition of Fian ballads in the Middle Ages’ (9-23). One distinction of interest observed by Professor Meek between BDL and DF is that the selection of *laoithe* in BDL is predominantly elegiac in emphasis, in contrast to what he sees as a martial emphasis in DF. Meek correlates these emphases with a hankering after the Lordship of the Isles in BDL, and the military proclivities of Somhairle Mac Domhnaill determining content in DF.

Professor Meek shows that ‘only some four ballads or so’ (14) are shared between these two manuscripts. His research indicates that DF generally preserves an earlier stratum of *laoithe* than BDL, the ‘ballad sample’ in which is ‘more recent’ (15). This is evidenced by the fact that BDL shares fourteen *laoithe* with the later Irish collections. In-depth analysis would be out of place in a survey-essay such as Meek’s, but we can look forward to further elaboration by him of this interesting distinction. Apart from the obvious matter of availability of sources, the question of scribal intention might be worth considering in this regard. The evidence of the Book of the O’Conor Don suggests that Aodh Ó Dochartaigh went about his work for Somhairle Mac Domhnaill in a very deliberate way, selecting material thematically and organising the bardic poems according to family. Such deliberation may well be in evidence in the case of DF, and Ó Dochartaigh’s intention or instructions the same: to present his patron with the choicest and most representative examples of a specialised variety of composition by the learned Gaelic poets.

Damian McManus, in a worthwhile and finely annotated essay (‘The bardic poet as teacher, student and critic: a context for the Grammatical Tracts’) (97-123) takes us through material from classical verse that provides evidence for the education and learning of the bardic poet, and for the dissemination of his work. In a paper so densely annotated, it is disappointing to note that of the aspects of the poet’s qualifications emphasised here – ‘reading, writing and a strong memory’ (102) – that of writing receives no annotation. In the author’s stirring theory concerning the three lives of a poem (110) it is argued that the chief mechanism for guaranteeing the perpetuation of a patron’s – not a poet’s – fame was that the poem should be studied in the bardic schools; the otherwise exhaustive annotation is again silent at this point.
This serves to emphasise that without the dissertation prefixed to the *Memoirs of the Right Honourable the Marquis of Clanricarde* (first published in 1722 not 1772 as is stated here (97)) – our knowledge of the modalities of the bardic schools would be very thin. It is a point worth making that while the ‘golden era’ of bardic poetry may well have been the thirteenth to fifteenth centuries, as Professor McManus claims, our only detailed account of a bardic school is an eighteenth-century source. We have to hope or assume that the information given there is accurate, and, with Bergin, that it ‘will probably hold good for several centuries earlier’. McManus’s study gives us hope that this may be the case.

This tenacious element in Irish tradition is highlighted sharply in Katharine Simms’s contribution (‘Gaelic military history and the later Brehon Law commentaries’) (51-67), where it is shown that the treatment of *meath slóighidh* in eleventh-century commentaries on the legal tracts is startlingly paralleled by the evidence of Irish and English sources of the sixteenth century. As one might expect, there is much in this essay on the subject of mercenary soldiers, from their earliest appearance in the sources in the tenth century, to the three tribes of Clann Suibhne in Tír Conaill in the later Middle Ages.

Among the terms dealt with by Dr Simms are *fuba ocus ruba* (62-63), the latter referring to duties concerning the guarding of passes and frontiers, and therefore intersecting with Liam Breatnach’s contribution. Dr Simms also connects with Meek’s essay on BDL in that she points out poems in that manuscript that are of great interest to Irish scholars but still remain imperfectly transcribed and transliterated. Surely a body styling itself the ‘Irish-Scottish Academic Initiative’ should see to it without delay – while the talents and skills to do so still exist – that such texts are made available as a matter of priority.

Another area of comparison and interaction within Gaelic Scotland and Ireland is the phenomenon of the visiting poet, for which there is much evidence from the Early Modern period. Liam Breatnach (‘On satire and the poet’s circuit’) (25-35) provides a valuable analysis of the position in early Irish law regarding the technical aspects of such visits, in particular the arrangements to be made and the formalities to be observed in the reception of a visiting poet, regardless of whether his visit was for the purposes of praise or of satire.

Legal texts stress the universal feature of the ‘regulation of honour’ enforceable by satire (26-7), and Breatnach shows that when a
subject proved unamenable to such enforcement, the satire could be directed at his kin or his lord. Parallels with procedures outside the specific area of visiting poets are pointed up: the legal steps inherent in the composition of *trefhocal* compare with procedure in cases of distraint (26), and the maintenance of poets while on a visit of satire compares to the obligations of a defendant in the maintenance of a plaintiff (30). The essay concludes with the presentation of a hitherto unpublished text from the Book of Ballymote, laying down the conventions to be observed on a poet’s visit to a territory other than his own, highlighting the function of the *drisiuc* in receiving him (30-32) and in so doing adjusting Breatnach’s own translation of a gloss in §19 of *Uraicecht na Ríar*. Again a parallel is adduced, not from the laws, but from the *Táin*, where the function of the border sentinel is seen to be similar to that of the *drisiuc*, all of which demonstrates the regulation to which the freedom of movement of the poet in early Irish society was subject.

Cathal G. Ó Háinle (‘The novel frustrated: seventeenth- to nineteenth-century fiction in Irish’) (125-51) revisits his well-known ‘*an t-úrscéal nár tháinig*’ study. The question of why the novel, as opposed, one supposes, to the romance, never developed in Irish literature in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, when such development was taking place in English and European literature, comes down to the absence in the Irish situation of the interrelated factors of ‘printing, literacy and a reading public’ (140). Narrative literature is, of course, a valuable and long-established part of Irish tradition, and one wonders whether the criteria of verisimilitude and character development, on which, apparently, the development of the novel is to be gauged, are any more valid in the context of Irish prose than those of bombast and allegory. Professor Ó Háinle may well be right in commending *Stair Éamuinn Uí Chléire* for its realism, though for this reviewer the early section at least of that work (lines 1-583) remains the funniest pre-Mylesian piece of prose in Modern Irish, particularly the account of the protagonist’s encounter with alcohol in Thomas Street (a parody of Bunyan?). Among other thought-provoking observations in this essay is that regarding Amhlaoibh Ó Súilleabháin’s ‘tendency in all his writing … to treat the common people with near contempt …’ (148), a judgement that may not be shared by all.

Two papers on linguistic matters are included. Richard A. V. Cox (‘The Norse element in Scottish place names: syntax as a chronological marker’) (37-49) approaches the question of the solution of
Scottish placenames with the structure \( x \text{ (of)} y \), where \( x \) is the generic element, and \( y \) the specific. James Grant (‘The Gaelic of Islay, a North Channel dialect?’) (69-95) analyses eleven distinctive features of the phonology and vocabulary of the Gaelic of Islay, and shows how these features are shared, not so much with other Scottish dialects, but with dialects of Irish, Ulster Irish particularly. He concludes that the traditional Scottish/Irish dichotomy must be set aside in discussing such dialects, and advances the case for ‘a North Channel group of dialects’ (94).

Two essays in this collection did not originate with the Irish-Scottish Academic Initiative, but are nevertheless judiciously included by the editors. Terence P. McCaughey’s revised O’Donnell Lecture of 1995 (‘Andrew Sall (1624-82) textual editor and facilitator of the Irish translation of the Old Testament’) (153-71) provides an interesting biographical essay on Andrew Sall, who was involved, in the last year of his life, in Robert Boyle’s project to get Bedell’s Old Testament into print. McCaughey treats of Sall’s origins in Cashel, his years in Salamanca, his apostasy, his time at Oxford, and his return to Ireland. Neglected topics, such as Fr Peter Walsh’s remonstrance (160-61), are touched upon, and the author sketches the controversy – with its attendant bibliography – occasioned by the conversion of so prominent a Jesuit as Sall to the Established Church. Donald E. Meek, in his second contribution (‘Religion, riot and romance: Scottish Gaelic perceptions of Ireland in the nineteenth century’) (173-93) advances his contention that the nineteenth century was ‘perhaps the last century in which there was any strong natural awareness of Ireland on the part of Scottish Gaels’ (173). The evidence of the poetry provided by Professor Meek shows how much that awareness had become attenuated and, in the case of religion, skewed, since the apparently heady days of the Book of the Dean.

This unassuming collection of essays is a valuable one. While there is no talk here of subsequent volumes, the volume and serial numbers encourage one to believe that such will be forthcoming. This would be very welcome, and perhaps the editors, in addition to resolving minor stylistic peculiarities in the reference system, might consider including matter in Gaeilge and Gàidhlig on the next occasion.

PÁDRAIG Ó MACHÁIN

*Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies*

These are the proceedings of an Irish Texts Society seminar held at University College Cork in November 2001, and consist of a timely study of the text that has come to be known as Beatha Aodha Ruaidh Uí Dhomhnaill, which is preserved in a manuscript in the hand of Cú Choigríche Ó Cléirigh (RIA 23 P 24). There are six contributions, all in English: Hiram Morgan, ‘The real Red Hugh’ (1-35); Mícheál Mac Íтраith, ‘The Beatha in the context of the literature of the Renaissance’ (36-53); Damian McManus, ‘The language of the Beatha’ (54-73); Marc Caball, ‘Politics and religion in the poetry of Fearghal Óg Mac an Bhaird and Eoghan Ruadh Mac an Bhaird’ (74-97); Nollaig Ó Muraíle, ‘Paul Walsh as editor and explicator of Beatha Aodha Ruaidh’ (98-123); and Pádraig A. Breatnach, ‘Irish records of the Nine Years’ War: a brief survey, with particular notice of the relationship between Beatha Aodha Ruaidh Uí Dhomhnaill and the Annals of the Four Masters’ (124-47). A bibliography and general index complete the book.

A measure of the productivity of this seminar is the dialectic that is generated, whereby points advanced by certain speakers are clarified or refuted by other contributors. Morgan’s thesis, for instance, that one aspect of Lughaidh Ó Cléirigh’s presentation of the ‘unreal’ Aodh Ruadh is his accentuation of Ó Domhnaill’s part in the events of his day to the exclusion of Ó Neill’s part, is answered by both McManus (72) and Breatnach (142–3), who point out that Lughaidh himself anticipated this criticism by explaining his function as historian to Ó Domhnaill. Morgan’s paper, indeed, though contributing much to our knowledge of Aodh Ruadh, is affected by what appears to be a strange imbalance. His starting-point, as emphasised by the title of his paper, is that the Beatha ‘at many points is a gross misrepresentation of the historical record’ (2). By the end of his lecture, however, this starting-point has fizzled to the mere conclusion that the complementary sources (English and Spanish state papers) provide ‘a more rounded picture of Red Hugh’s life’ (35). Could it really be otherwise? And how impartial is any historical source of this period?

Solutions to the vexed question of the use of language in Beatha Aodha Ruaidh are also proposed by various speakers. Mac Craith – on his way to reading the Beatha as a propaganda exercise dating to
1627 – does not help his case by stating that ‘the artificially inflated language of the Beatha, allied to the fact that it survives in only one authoritative manuscript, suggests that it was the intention of Ó Domhnaill’s supporters to have the text translated into Latin and published on the Continent as part of their propaganda’ (46). It is not clear how Dr Mac Craith could have put such a construction on the combination of language and textual history, yet it would seem that his is the only contribution to concentrate in any way on the important question of for whom the Beatha might have been written.

Breatnach appears on surer ground when he suggests that the ‘concentrated archaism’ of Beatha Aodha Ruaidh was cultivated by Lughaidh Ó Cléirigh ‘probably out of deference to the remembered tastes of its noble subject’ (146). McManus, summing up an able analysis of the language of the Beatha, comes closer still to the heart of the matter when he identifies the model used by Lughaidh, in which to celebrate his hero and patron, as that closest to hand ‘in which he found the heroes of early Irish literature celebrated, viz. Old and Middle Irish saga’ (73). We still, however, have to deal with the assumption that Lughaidh had some choice in the matter of language: it may well be that he had no more choice in the matter than a fully-fledged bardic poet would have had, and that he wrote in the only style appropriate to his subject.

Several contributors refer to the contrast between passages from Beatha Aodha Ruaidh and the form in which they occur in the Annals of the Four Masters. Ó Muraíle (112) goes so far as to propose the publication of ‘a parallel edition of Beatha Aodha Ruaidh and the corresponding portions of the Annals of the Four Masters’ and provides a useful (albeit ‘very general’) concordance of these passages (120). Breatnach’s paper presents the reader with a sample selection of six corresponding passages from both sources and these are analysed and contrasted from the point of view of language and style and of content (129-46). With so much common ground in the subject matter addressed by the speakers, one wonders why no one thought of speaking on Lughaidh Ó Cléirigh’s poetry in the Iomarbhágh. McManus, in a footnote (56), points to evidence in one of his poems for Lughaidh’s acquaintance with Irish texts and manuscripts of some antiquity. This reinforces Carney’s virtually throw-away remark (The Irish bardic poet, 10–11) concerning Eochaidh Ó hEódhusa, that ‘he must have read a considerable amount of Old Irish.’
A study of Lughaidh’s poetry is, then, an omission from the seminar, all the more so given that one of the speakers, Marc Caball, opted instead to discuss the poetry of Eóghan Ruadh and Fearghal Óg Mac an Bhaird. An encouraging aspect of this paper is the benefit that Dr Caball has derived from a dissertation on Fearghal Óg, to which I gave him access some years ago; that this has gone unacknowledged is a mere oversight. It is disappointing, however, that this contribution fails to connect with the subject of the seminar, thereby eschewing participation in the dialectic that is such a feature of this publication. Much of Caball’s attention is directed to what he describes (83) as an interrogation of the work of these poets as he tries to discern in them any hint of Ó Néill’s faith and fatherland ideology. When they come up short in this regard, the author is puzzled (95), and he proceeds to offer a lame explanation to a puzzle of his own creation.

Behind these papers (that of Caball excepted) lies the figure of the editor of Beatha Aodha Ruaidh, an tAthair Pól Breathnach, whose work was published posthumously, assembled by Colm Ó Lochlainn. An tAthair Breathnach was blessed in having so clean a manuscript as 23 P 24 from which to edit his text. Ó Muraíle’s welcome article points out the important detail that, for the most part, the translation in that publication is not Breathnach’s but rather Fr Denis Murphy’s, from his flawed edition of 1895 (108).

Finally, one may make the small point that the question of the spelling of personal names in a publication such as this must present a huge headache for any editor. Where authors such as Morgan and Caball, uncomfortable with Early Modern Irish, may prefer to use hybrid or anglicised forms, or forms sanctioned by the usage of English state papers, such versions sit uneasily beside the correct forms used by scholars of Irish. Perhaps the solution might be to use the Irish form in all cases, thus avoiding the likes of ‘Conn McCalvach’ (4), and ‘Tibbot ne Long Burke’ (24). This is not altogether the same as Caball’s ‘Ruaidhrí O’Donnell’, for here the author fails to recognise the correct forename, even when presented with it in a line of poetry (88).

PÁDRAIG Ó MACHÁIN

Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies
The latest volume in the series *Ireland and Europe in the early Middle Ages*, devoted to ‘texts and transmission’, approaches this broad theme appropriately from a variety of angles and with recourse to a number of disciplines, including art history, linguistics, legal history and (in one instance) archaeology. The articles in this volume cover texts written in Irish, Latin and Welsh, a choice of languages that reflects the bilingual background of intellectual life in early medieval Ireland, and the sometimes multilingual environments in which Insular scholars operated. The present review will restrict itself to a selection of articles concerned primarily with Irish texts and Irish language.

Alexander Falileyev, ‘Beyond historical linguistics: a case for multilingualism in early Wales’ (6-15), considers the ‘multilingual character of the medieval Celtic or Insular scriptoria’, where texts in Old Welsh were written. Multilingualism is proposed as the explanation for peculiarities of orthography found in early vernacular texts which would otherwise be accounted for by ‘postulating new rules and exceptions’. The limitations of linguistic analysis are illustrated by an examination of two entries in Welsh texts – the tenth-century *De raris fabulis* and the late eighth- or ninth-century *Surexit Memorandum* – that are explicable only when their non-Welsh character is considered. A hapax legomenon in the second text, *nouidligi*, normally rendered as a Welsh adjective meaning ‘newly calved’, is postulated by Falileyev to have been a borrowing from Irish *nuidlech* ‘milch-cow’, inserted into the Old Welsh text by a bilingual scribe. Postulating multilingual scriptoria may have far-reaching implications for studying the transmission of texts in the early medieval period, since it challenges the prevalent notion that vernacular glosses testify to a manuscript’s origin or provenance.

Staying on the topic of multilingualism, Kevin Murray’s article, ‘Some observations upon the treatment of non-Irish placenames in medieval Irish manuscripts’ (37-44), lists various occurrences of such names that begin with the letter A alone, which he discusses under five categories (e.g. placenames with Irish adjectival suffixes, placenames in metrical works). The author justifies the inclusion of this article in the present volume by drawing attention to the potential that linguistic forms preserved in these placenames may have for
dating texts. But no systematic attempt is made to illustrate how this potential can be tapped. Hence, in spite of some interesting observations, one is left uninformed as to the full significance of the accumulative evidence. A follow-up study of placenames beginning with the remaining letters of the alphabet could yield a useful catalogue.

The opening article of a section entitled ‘Texts’ is by Francis John Byrne, ‘Ut Beda boat: Cuanu’s signature?’ (45-67). Byrne attempts to show that Cuanu, a chronicler to whom thirteen entries in the Annals of Ulster are attributed, was the source for several entries in the Annals of Tigernach and Inisfallen. He proposes to identify citations from Cuanu’s work by means of a distinct mark: an alliterated clause of attribution combining the name of an authority with a verb (usually of speaking). The best example for such a clause is ut Beda boat, where the choice of the rare Latin verb boare ‘to cry out’ indicates deliberate alliteration with the name Beda. Some of the other examples adduced, such as Eusebius ait or ut Orosius, are less clear-cut since the pairing of ait and ut with the names of authorities is quite common, especially in canonical texts. The reason for crediting Cuanu with penning these passages is that ‘none of the references to him contain the alliterative device … in it we have as it were his signature’. The question mark in the article’s title suggests that its author did not find this argument compelling.

The article by Martin McNamara, ‘Apocryphal infancy narratives: European and Irish transmission’ (123-47), is ideal for inclusion in this volume since it encompasses all the main themes and sub-themes addressed in its title. The author examines in great detail the transmission of non-canonical accounts of the birth and upbringing of the Virgin Mary and of Christ. An equal amount of attention is devoted to the Irish and continental transmission of these texts, but the author’s ultimate goal is to establish which traditions were known in Ireland and when. He concludes that some infancy narratives reached Ireland as early as the seventh century, but others were not known there before the twelfth. This article could be said also to serve as a concise introduction to the Irish and Latin infancy narratives which McNamara and Jean-Daniel Kaestli and others have edited for volumes 13-14 of the Corpus Christianorum Series Apocryphorum (Turnhout 2001).

Damian Bracken, in a very well-researched and original article, ‘The Fall and the law in early Ireland’ (147-69), examines repeated references to the Fall in early Irish law. It emerges from this study that theological interpretations of the Fall (both Irish and Patristic)
contributed to the manner in which certain legal principles were perceived, and to the shaping of fundamental legal concepts such as free will, malevolent intent, and alertness to the consequences of one’s actions. Bracken shows that despite the fact that Irish legal prescriptions developed independently of Christian reasoning, later clerical comments are important in their own right, since they can reveal a great deal about their writers and their use of Patristic literature.

Fergus Kelly, ‘Texts and transmissions: the law-texts’ (230-42), characterises his contribution as a ‘brief account of the transmission of the Irish law texts’. Brevity notwithstanding, however, the topic is approached through a broad prism which anchors aspects of transmission alongside distinct historical issues such as the authorship of legal tracts, Christian influences, and the role of the legal families. Some important points are made concerning the complexities that arise from variant readings that law texts accumulated through the course of their transmission. Kelly argues that ‘in general, it seems that there was a single fixed version of each Old Irish law-text,’ and that in the case of the different versions of the Heptads, for example, the core text can be retrieved: ‘… copyists were thus at liberty to update spelling and to omit material, but custom evidently did not permit alteration of the text itself’. It is interesting to note that in this respect vernacular law may have differed from Irish canon law. The compilers of the Hibernensis (c. 700) openly declared that they added, omitted and altered material that was available to them, some of which was indigenous.

The legal-historical angle is pursued further by Robin Chapman Stacey, ‘‘Speaking in riddles’’ (243-48), an article which focuses on a specific legal tract, Gúbretha Caratniad ‘False judgements of Caratnia’. This text is written in the form of a dialogue between Conn Cétchathach and Caratnia the judge who appears to make false judgements but is in fact making concessions to exceptional circumstances. Based on theories on Shamanism in early Ireland, Chapman Stacey argues that the tale with which the tract opens casts Caratnia in the role of the Shaman who is thrust across the boundaries between worlds by means of a violent removal from society. According to the author, his wisdom is portrayed as being of an otherworldly nature, manifested in his ability to embrace a judgement that can be simultaneously true and false. In support of this she notes a few cases in which Caratnia appears to be speaking in what are termed ‘riddles’ of the ‘paradox riddles’ variety. Chapman Stacey suggests that the tract may pertain to a genre centred around the
conceit of a false-judging judge, and that it might have represented a statement on behalf of the Irish judicial class concerned to uphold its traditional power in the wake of attempts by kings to consolidate judicial power under their own authority.

It remains to consider a further article touching on the topic of legal history which is that by Patricia Kelly, ‘The Rule of Patrick: textual affinities’ (284-95). This appears to be the only modern study (not an edition) to be devoted entirely to the eighth- or ninth-century *Ríagail Pátraic* ‘Rule of Patrick’. As such it is a pioneering work. Using mainly stylistic evidence, Kelly proposes to classify the text as a *cáin*, and proceeds to reinforce the theory put forward by J. G. O’Keeffe and later upheld by D. A. Binchy, which identified the ‘Rule of Patrick’ with the *Cáin Phátraic*, promulgated for the first time in 738. The article also discusses the relationship between two short fragments in the Book of Lismore and in the Leabhar Breac which appear to have formed a part of the Rule. On the basis of linguistic evidence Kelly concludes that the Leabhar Breac fragment is later than that in the Book of Lismore and that it can be dated to the Middle Irish period. She argues against P. J. Corish in maintaining that the Leabhar Breac fragment ‘may represent a Middle Irish reworking of an earlier version of the text, possibly its Latin original’. The notion that a Latin original underlies the Irish is based on a Latin penitential prescription found in the Leabhar Breac.

In the final article for mention in this review Peter Smith, ‘Early Irish historical verse: the evolution of a genre’ (326-41), traces the evolution of early Irish historical verse from the seventh to the twelfth century. Smith proposes that historical verse transformed gradually from versified pedigrees and similar accounts to a synthetically merged type that combined the Irish tradition of *scéala* with a Christian historiographical tradition. His approach to the classification of historical verse is noteworthy for the manner in which it minimises the risk of anachronism: the five categories of verse that he postulated to serve as the basis for his investigation are based on terminology derived from Middle Irish poetry.

ROY FLECHNER

Wadham College, Oxford

The corpus of Irish gnomic literature, a considerable one, has been edited piecemeal by different scholars over the past century, but never systematically or thoroughly. The present work attempts to impose some order on this chaos by identifying and editing as a single collection a group of some two hundred and ninety maxims that share certain features of style, syntax and content. Prominent among these features are the compressing of the maxims into three words (e.g. Ad-cota léigind libru ‘Latin learning gives rise to books’), the arranging into groups of maxims that begin with the same word (e.g. Ad-cota, Dligid etc.), and the frequent use of alliteration and even rhyme. While identifying such maxims as a single collection, the editor admits that it cannot be reconstructed in its original order and sequence. The problem, he argues, stems from the survival of at least three recensions, each of which derives independently from the hypothetical archetype. His solution to these difficulties is to choose one manuscript (Dublin, RIA MS 23 N 10) as a template for the order of sections and the sequence of maxims, while adopting an eclectic approach to culling the best readings from among thirty-three manuscript witnesses and normalising their spelling to accord with the usage of classical Old Irish. With such editorial burdens to carry, it hardly comes as a surprise that the edition’s smallest section is the actual text (and facing translation), which is outweighed by a substantial introduction and an even lengthier set of notes, as well as five appendices giving editions of related texts.

A novel feature is the editor’s declaration (in the foreword) that he has in mind an audience not only of Celticists but also general medievalist, notably Anglo-Saxonists. The reason for wishing to involve the latter group stems from the attribution – found in certain manuscripts – of these maxims to Flann Fína maic Ossu, whom Irish literary tradition venerated as a prolific scholar in both Irish and Latin and whom most modern scholars identify as King Aldfrith of Northumbria (685-715). To have an actual work composed in Irish by King Aldfrith would certainly vindicate the former and excite the latter. The editor, while clearly enthusiastic about this possibility, is too good a scholar to deny his own linguistic evidence which points
to a date well after Aldfrith’s time, in the second half of the eighth century or even later. With one exception, the selection of linguistic features adduced to show ‘age’ (34) is consonant with classical Old Irish. Indeed, one such form, dīdin (‘protection’) is dubiously interpreted as the acc. sg. of dīden and the latter erroneously identified as a form which ‘became obsolete early and was often replaced by dītiu, n.f.’; in reality dītiu is the older form, and so it is unclear to which of the two paradigms dīdin belongs.

The editor also addresses the questions of authorial intent and intended audience. His verdict on the first is that these maxims ‘are not the immediate product of the Church, for they do not convey a theological or religious message’ (13). However, that argument is hard to accept given the abundance of evidence that early Irish ecclesiastics did not confine their activities to theology or religion. Indeed, one whole section (§7) comprises in its first half an encomium on the temporal and spiritual benefits of learning, to which is juxtaposed in the second half a listing of the corresponding disadvantages of the military life (láechdacht). Such obvious characterisations likely reflect the prejudices of a committed ecclesiastic rather than simply ‘an ecclesiastically educated redactor’ (48). On the question of intended audience, the editor plausibly suggests one that was ‘literate’ and ‘secular’.

Within the edition the main text, translation and notes are of high quality and readily accessible even to those unfamiliar with Irish. One might question a few translations, notably §5.9 Tosach crábuíd cosmailius (‘Imitation is the basis of devotion’), where crábuíd properly means ‘Christian piety’; §1.48 where léigind is not merely ‘learning’ but ‘Latin learning’; and §6.84 Ferr fróech forbbu (‘Better the heather than fighting’), where the intended meaning may be that it is better to have poor land because one is less likely to incur disputes over it. At the same time the editor has addressed the needs of Celticists by providing a clear apparatus of manuscript variants at the bottom of each page, a glossarial index, and diplomatic editions (and collations) of manuscript witnesses representative of the three recensions. Overall the present work is a major improvement on earlier editions and a valuable contribution to the study of wisdom literature in medieval Ireland.

PÁDRAIG P. Ó NÉILL

University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill

THIS attractive publication, in which is expanded somewhat the content of the Dublin Institute’s 1996 statutory lecture, is in itself a fine illustration of interdisciplinary research. In the case in question, happily, both branches of learning, Celtic and Divinity, reside within a single author. As the latter makes clear, his study is concerned not primarily with the process or principles behind the translation of Bedell’s Bible, or even with the text itself, ‘but rather with the confluence of persons and events which led to its being undertaken, with particular resources which were to hand and even more with the ideological perspectives and presuppositions which informed the minds both of the promoter of the translation and of those who obstructed him in the overall project of which this translation was a major component’ (5-6). Nevertheless, the translation process is, in effect, discussed in the context of the Bishop’s early training in that early seventeenth-century hothouse of biblical textual examination that was Emmanuel College, Cambridge, whose contribution as a newly-fledged Puritan, yet Conformist, institution to the completion of the Authorised Version McCaughey duly notes. According to the author, this was one of the things which ideally fitted Bedell to be Provost of Trinity College, an institution whose role in Ireland, like the progress of the Protestant cause there, is reported to have been a source of disappointment to the first Stuart monarch.

Bedell’s Hebraic and biblical scholarship was born and nurtured at Emmanuel and he appears to have cultivated it thereafter during his years as an East Anglian clergyman. Another factor in favour of his appointment as Provost was the experience gained from having been chaplain to King James’s ambassador in Venice during the turbulent years when that state embarked on a brief flirtation with Protestantism. The Venetian years, as the work demonstrates, had not only schooled Bedell in the ‘wiles of Rome’, but had offered him other rare opportunities through contacts he would never have made at home. He was able, for example, to hone his Hebraic skills through contacts with the charismatic Rabbi Leone da Modena, Talmudic scholar, ‘musician, translator, poet, alchemist, and compulsive gambler’, as well as bringing with him from that city a copy of Giovanni Diodati’s annotated Italian translation of the Bible,
published in Geneva in 1603. This was to play a central role in the translation process at Kilmore and, McCaughey reminds us, as shown by N. J. A. Williams, had a demonstrable effect on the text finally approved by Bedell for translation into Irish. Another companion of the Italian period was the excommunicated Padre Paolo Sarpi. Together they undertook a number of linguistic projects: Bedell learned Italian from Sarpi, made him an English grammar and with his help published a translation of the Book of Common Prayer into Italian. Herein lay an excellent apprenticeship for the Irish translation projects which Bedell was later to pursue. It may also have been the case that the possibilities of wholesale conversion which seemed to lie open to Protestant interests in Venice during those years helped shape Bedell’s pastoral approach – radically different from that of Archbishop Ussher, as we are shown here – to the Catholic natives of Ireland.

The contrasting approach of these two eminent churchmen is portrayed in the study as an outcome of their origins and family backgrounds, the Archbishop, like many of his class, being unwilling to see the native Irish gain acceptance and advancement in ecclesiastical and national governance. Both men, as well as others of the English and Anglo-Irish, made use of Gaelic men of letters for their own purposes, but it was this basic difference in the backgrounds of the two clerics which led, as McCaughey demonstrates, to a signal difference in the way in which they employed their Gaelic helpers. While Ussher’s collaborators gleaned and translated materials deemed suitable for propagandist works such as the Archbishop’s *Antiquitates*, it was with the sole intention of bringing the native Irish within the fold of Ussher’s church that Bedell, in turn, set his Gaelic scholars to work producing Irish versions of scriptural and other religious material. In this way the Archbishop’s work had much in common with that of the learned Franciscans of Ireland, for both groups, though working in opposition, were creating lasting monuments in the Irish language. Contrasts between the products of the two schools are instructively made in the course of the study: while the Franciscans produced a version of the Rule of St Clare for the Sisters at the Bethlehem Convent in a ‘high register’, Bedell’s aim was, if working in the same register, towards a ‘plain style’. The area of stylistics in relation to the various religious texts produced during the period, though beyond the scope of a brief treatment such as this, is one which will bear much further examination and, since Dr McCaughey has promised us a further paper exclusively on
the text (57), such an account could most conveniently find a place there.

What is attempted in the treatment under review has been the presentation of a ‘picture of a complex of persons’ engaged for various ideological reasons in the use of the Irish language, and, especially, of that beleaguered band of lettered men now bereft of their traditional patronage. McCaughey refers to the altered allegiance of various members of the learned families, Ó Cionga and others, in the Midlands and traces connections between these and Franciscans working in the area who, for their part, dedicated their learning and skills to the service of the Gaelic cause and the Catholic Church. Two branches of the Dillon family in this region (for whom a genealogical table is provided at the front of the booklet) constitute the main link between the two groups, with family members prominent on both sides of the religious divide, among them Mother Cisly together with her Poor Clares Convent, who figure prominently. (The only three photographs featured relate to the site of this convent and include the commemorative plaque – a rather forlorn-looking block inscribed in English only.) It is no doubt as a result of the cursory nature of the account provided in such a brief study that the picture fails to strike one as a coherent whole, but rather as the story of a Bible and its translators on the one hand, and various other supernumeraries engaged in separate tasks, similar or dissimilar, on the other. There is thankfully more to come, however. McCaughey is undertaking a study of the Irish text not only in its printed form but also of the neglected manuscript, and he has likewise signalled his intention of publishing results of further study of the significance of Diodati’s work for Bedell’s text, although perhaps the latter study merely constitutes an aspect of the former. However that may be, the Dr McCaughey is, of all scholars, eminently qualified to produce a definitive study on virtually every aspect both of Bedell’s Bible and of its translation, and it is greatly to be hoped that he will give himself free rein in his research.

SEOSAMH WATSON

University College Dublin

This volume records proceedings of an international conference on hagiography held in April 1997 which was organised by the Department of Early and Medieval Irish, University College Cork, as part of the commemoration of the 1400th anniversary of the death of Colum Cille. The volume is divided into six sections: I. The Columban tradition (1-62); II. Traditions of other Irish saints (63-92); III. Irish saints and Brittany (93-171); IV. Irish saints’ lives in continental Europe (172-236); V. Approaches to the study of Irish hagiography (237-88); VI. Hagiographical scholarship: from seventeenth-century beginnings to contemporary projects (289-355). The volume includes a bibliography of both primary and secondary sources (357-92) and an Index (393-418). The editors are to be congratulated for making these proceedings available to the wider scholarly community. The volume consists of some twenty-four contributions and the following are comments on a small selection of these.

Máire Herbert’s contribution, ‘The Vita Columbae and Irish hagiography: a study of Vita Cainnechi’ (31-40), discusses the contents of the Codex Salmanticensis version of Vita Cainnechi. This version belongs to a group of Lives which, as Herbert points out (31-2), are assigned by Richard Sharpe, Medieval Irish saints’ Lives (Oxford 1991) (see in particular pp. 297-339), to an exemplar written in the period 750-850. (It may be mentioned in passing that the orthographical evidence on which Sharpe’s dating is based has been brought into question by the present writer in ‘The significance of the orthography of Irish proper names in the Codex Salmanticensis’ Ériu 55 (2005) 85-101.) Evidence for a terminus a quo of c. 700 and a terminus ante quem of the early ninth century for Vita Cainnechi is discussed on pp. 32-3 and 36. The saintly portrayal of Cainnech, it is argued, can be compared with the portrayal of Colum Cille in Adomnán’s Vita Columbae, from which it emerges that Cainnech appears ‘not as a second Columba, but rather as a superior alternative’ (34). Herbert’s study of this Life establishes that, as with many medieval texts, contemporary circumstances played an important role in its composition. Cainnech’s hagiographical association with the Southern Uí Néill king Colmán Bec, it is suggested (37), may have had contemporary resonance for an author writing in the second
half of the eighth century. Herbert discusses the critical attitude of the Life toward the Columban community with regard to political events in Southern Uí Néill lands in this period, and other counter-Columban episodes (38-9). On the basis of the historical context outlined, a date of compilation between 766 and 780 is proposed (39). One reason why the Life is also of literary significance is that it ‘not only testifies to the presence of V[ita] C[olumbae] in Ireland in the second half of the eighth century, it also testifies to the development of the genre of hagiography in Ireland about a century after the earliest works were compiled. It shows Irish hagiography drawing on exemplars from within its own tradition, and developing its own rhetorical strategies, while also retaining generic conventions adopted from external models during the seventh century’ (40).

John Carey, ‘Varieties of supernatural contact in the Life of Adamnán’ (49-62), argues that the episodes in the Life of Adamnán pertaining to its hero’s encounters with unearthly beings are closely interrelated, and that they convey a specific message. The episodes in question are discussed in detail, as are relevant comparanda from other texts. It is argued that Adamnán is explicitly or implicitly compared with his predecessor, Colum Cille, and that ‘these stories about Adamnán bear witness to an intriguing body of lore regarding Colum Cille: the latter appears as a visionary open to contact with the angelic and diabolical realms, and with the more equivocal representatives of the native supernatural’ (61). In contrast to Colum Cille, however, comparable exploits are denied to Adamnán in the latter’s Life. Carey argues that traditions regarding Colum Cille’s relations with several supernatural beings, who were neither angels nor devils, and to whom the saint’s attitude is one of interest rather than antagonism, may have become something of an embarrassment to the Columban familia (61-2). In contrast, Adamnán’s encounters with supernatural beings ‘serve to distance him – and, by implication, the other heads of the Columban familia – from this risqué side of the patron saint ... Adamnán, when not dealing with God Himself, faces the beyond with the uncomplicated hostility of an exorcist’ (62). A regrettable feature of this contribution is that the many items of text quoted are in translation only.

Edel Bhreathnach’s contribution is entitled ‘The genealogies of Leinster as a source for local cults’ (250-67). The author states (251): ‘A high concentration of information about the dynasties of a particular area, or the inclusion of information additional to the genealogical lists, reflect the interests of these dynasties and probably of the
churches or learned schools in which the material was collated and committed to writing. Allusions in the genealogies to particular saints’ cults and to the dynastic and ecclesiastical interests of certain churches undoubtedly reflect claims which influenced the content of the secular genealogies.’ The reader is presented in this paper with a thorough discussion and analysis of sources relevant to Leinster. Unfortunately the recording and translation of material from primary sources are not always accurate. In the translation of a section of text cited from M. A. O’Brien, *Corpus genealogiarum Hiberniae* 43, we find (253) ‘to Áth mBithlann’ (cf. ‘as far as Áth mBithlann’, p. 254) and ‘to Féith nEchaille’. Áth and féith are not neuter nouns and should not be followed by nasalisation. (The translations are based on co Ath mBithlann and co Feith nEchaille where nasalisation is present because the forms are in the accusative after co.) There are problems with other placenames also. For instance we find reference to *Sceith Chruaich* (253), purportedly taken from Rawlinson B. 502, f. 121a (= *CGH* 43). The reading *Sceith*, however, as indicated in the variants in *CGH*, is from the Book of Lecan (confusion between Rawlinson B. 502 and variant readings with regard to other matter can be found on p. 258, n. 36). Rawlinson B. 502 reads *Scoith*, which also happens to be in the dative (preceded by the preposition ó). The correct nominative form of this placename as found in the Rawlinson manuscript is given in the Index of Placenames to *CGH* (763) (*Scoth Cruaich*). The correct nominative form of the other names mentioned above can also be found in this Index. In the Index to the volume under review, however, erroneous nominative forms of the same placenames are given as headwords.

In ‘The reproductions of Irish saints’ (278-88), Joseph Falaky Nagy begins by discussing the relationship between St Brigid and various female and male devotees as depicted in stories from early Brigidine legend and the means by which the devotees are drawn closer to their saintly mentor. These stories are to be related, according to Nagy, to a fascination with the prospect of nonbiological reproduction which emerged in Christian thought ‘in conjunction with the rise of the cult of the saint, a teacher and model by whose power the identity of both the community and the individual could be profoundly transformed and revalidated’ (280-81). Examples of the relationship between saint and devotee and their significance in the case of Adomnán’s *Vita Columbae* and Patrician material are also discussed.

The title of D. J. Thornton’s article is ‘*Vita Sancti Carthagi* in the seventeenth century’ (317-36). Among the matters discussed in this
paper is the relationship of the copy of the Latin Life of St Carthage, or Mochuta, patron of Lismore, Co. Waterford, in the NUI Maynooth MS RB201 (17th cent.) with other Latin copies of the saint’s Life. Arising from a detailed examination (324-29), Thornton points out that this relationship requires important revision. According to the author, the Lives of the saint can be divided into four groups, namely (1) a longer Latin Life (LLatin), (2) a shorter Latin or Office Life, (3) a late Middle Irish Life (LMI) and (4) an Early Modern Irish Life (EMI) (318). She states that all copies known to her of the Lives in groups 2-4 have been collated and that comparison of the four existing versions ‘suggests that all descend from a LLatin original’ (329). It is then stated that there is evidence which would suggest that the original LLatin was probably composed shortly before 1215 (329), but the reader is simply informed that ‘detailed argument for this date will be presented elsewhere’ (330, n. 46). It is a pity that this argument is only presented in brief summary form here, especially since one immediately wonders how a late Middle Irish Life could possibly descend from such a text. Questions as to what exactly is intended by Middle Irish in this contribution are also raised by the statement that ‘LMI now survives only in two seventeenth-century copies, but is likely to reflect the fifteenth-century fashion for writing in Irish that produced the saints’ Lives in the Book of Lismore, Laud 610, and the Book of Fermoy’ (330). Does this reflect a long-outdated view of what constitutes Middle Irish (cf. Liam Breathnach, ‘An Mheán-Ghaeilge’ in K. McConne et al., Stair na Gaeilge (Maigh Nuad 1994) 221-333 (at p. 221))? One would also like to know how the author defines Early Modern Irish. Needless to say, these matters have serious implications for the author’s analysis of the relationship between the different Latin and Irish versions of the saint’s Life. We are advised that there are seven copies of EMI dating from the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries and a fragment dating from the seventeenth century (318). It may be added here that in his edition of the earlier Irish Life of Mochuta, Charles Plummer (Bethada náem nÉrenn I (Oxford 1922) 291-9) included a passage of text found in only one of the two extant manuscript versions, viz. Brussels, Bibliothèque Royale MS 2324-2340, ff. 151a-157b, written in the seventeenth century. This passage comprises §6 and (with the exception of the final sentence) §7 of his edition and, according to Plummer (p. 291, n. 18), ‘is added in Br. on an inserted slip (f. 150 bis) in a smaller but probably identical hand, with a mark of reference to this place’. It may be pointed out that this passage belongs,
in fact, to the later Irish Life (cf. Patrick Power (ed.), *Life of St. Declan of Ardmore and Life of St Mochuda of Lismore* (London 1914) 76-8).

CAOIMHÍN BREATNACH

*University College Dublin*


This volume, containing papers read at the *Scottish Gaelic Studies 2000* conference which was held at the University of Aberdeen 2-4 August 2000, is divided into three sections: 1. *An Cànan* (1-99); 2. *An Litreachas* (101-81); and 3. *An Eachdraidh* (183-284). It ends with a bibliography (285-308), a list of abbreviations (308-9), and a list of the other papers read at the conference but not published here (311-12). Among articles in Section 1 is that by Roibeard Ó Maolalaigh, “*Siubhadaibh a bhalachaibh! Tha an suirbhidh a-nis ullamh agaibh*: mar a dh’èirich do -bh, -mh gun chudrom ann an Gàidhlig Alba’ (61-74). The author discusses -bh and -mh preceded by a and i in unstressed syllables in Scottish Gaelic, focusing on the realisation of these features as /u/ and /i/ in such an environment. In the course of a detailed study it is pointed out *inter alia* that the situation is much more complex than one has been led to believe by previous scholars, most notably T. F. O’Rahilly. Included in Section 2 is a contribution by Maolcholaim Scott, ‘Politics and poetry in mid-eighteenth century Argyll: *Tuirseach andiugh criocha Gaoidhiol*’ (149-62), in which the elegy of the title, addressed to the second Duke of Argyll, is discussed. The author considers both the earlier and contemporary influences on the poem and argues, for instance, that the elegy reflects familiarity with metropolitan writers in English such as James Thomson. The poem is edited and translated (154-61).

Sharon J. Arbuthnot’s contribution to the volume is ‘A context for Mac Mhaighstir Alasdair’s *Moladh air deagh bhod*’ (163-70). The subject matter of the short poem in question here has offended the sensibilities of some, a fact which is also observable with matter of a similar nature in Irish. Arbuthnot discusses the poem’s affinities with the praise tradition. She discusses six other poems from Scotland, Ireland and Wales which deal in main or in part with the
sexual organs and which make some use of the conventions of established verse traditions. As to the general relevance of these poems, she observes that the composers’ excursions into earthy matters served an entertainment purpose, but that this does not address their use of praise formulae (166). She suggests that ‘by introducing the conventions of praise-poetry to high-impact “low” subject matter, the men responsible for these poems were rather deflating the tradition’ (167). It is also observed that discussion of material of this kind can only be partial until all such material is properly edited (168).

The present reviewer (‘The transmission of Ceasacht Inghine Guile: some observations’ Éigse 32 (2000) 138-45) has pointed to certain obstacles, both editorial and scribal, placed in the path of those seeking similar material in Irish tradition, and several others could be cited. A parallel between the subject matter discussed in the latter article and some poems discussed by Arbuthnot (165) is the use of euphemistic terminology in reference to sexual organs (on which see also Brian Ó Cuív, ‘The romance of Mis and Dubh Ruis’ Celtica 2 (1954) 325-33 (at p. 327, n. 5)).

Among the contributions in Section 3 is that by David Dumville entitled ‘Ireland and North Britain in the earlier Middle Ages: contexts for Míniugud Senchasa Fher nAlban’ (185-211), in which the reader is presented with a new edition and detailed analysis of this text. Míniugud Senchasa Fer nAlban was previously edited by John Bannerman in Studies in the history of Dalriada (Edinburgh 1974) 27-68. The principal manuscript witness used by Bannerman was TCD H. 2. 7 (1298). He also cited variants from the Book of Lecan and the Book of Ballymote and provided an edition of the text written by An Dubhaltach Mac Fhirbhisiigh. Dumville states that his reason for providing the reader with a new text proceeds from his view that Bannerman’s text ‘serves nobody’s interest’ (200). The text presented here, however, ‘is not yet a critical text’ and ‘is essentially derivative of Bannerman’s edition in that it retains the form of an edited transcript of his principal witness, the copy in Dublin, Trinity College, MS. 1298’ (200). Surprisingly, Dumville then states that although he has collated other copies, he has not re-collated the principal witness (200). It is even more surprising to find in the light of this that there are instances in which Bannerman’s text is altered without any indication whatsoever. For example, at §13 of the present edition (201) we find immorra instead of Bannerman’s autem (p. 41, l. 19). According to Bannerman’s edition (p. 43), autem is simply omitted in the other two manuscript witnesses, thus indicating that there
is no manuscript authority for immorra. Consultation with the principal witness confirms Bannerman’s reading. The manuscript contains the abbreviation for autem and not immorra. It may be pointed out here that although autem and immorra are synonymous, they are of course abbreviated in different ways (as indeed are autem and vero). It would appear, although acknowledgement is lacking, that immorra here and the readings mater (instead of máthair) and Ceniuil (instead of ceniul), at p. 202 (§§ 29, 33), derive from the review of Bannerman’s work by Donnchadh Ó Corráin in Celtica 13 (1980) 168-82 (at pp. 169-70). On the other hand, Dumville follows Bannerman in a number of unnecessary editorial additions, e.g. lenition of the initial of fer in miniugud senchasa f\textless h\textgreater er nAlban, p. 201, §1, repeated in the title and throughout the contribution. The decision by Dumville to use angle-brackets instead of square brackets to denote editorial additions has also resulted in a number of cumbersome readings such as dá s\textless h\textgreater ec\textless h\textgreater ts\textless h\textgreater ess (at pp. 202, §44, 203, §§50, 52). Furthermore, comparison of Dumville’s text with that of Bannerman indicates that Dumville also uses angle-brackets in instances where, without any indication as to why or on what manuscript authority (if any), he has altered Bannerman’s text. For example, at p. 201 §19, Dumville’s text has the reading E\textless chd\textgreater ach (cf. eochach, Bannerman, p. 42, l. 29). Elsewhere also this contribution might have been improved by the provision of more precise information about the nature of editorial intervention in the case of sources cited. For example, Dumville cites text from commentary on Amra Coluim Chille based on Whitley Stokes’s ‘The Bodleian Amra Choluimb Chille’ Revue Celtique 20 (1899) 423-6, ‘into whose text I have drawn some readings from An Leabhar Breac’ (188). There is no indication as to what the readings from the Leabhar Breac are, or where exactly in this manuscript the relevant text is to be found.

Among other interesting articles in this section is that by David Findlay, ‘Divine right and early modern Gaelic society’ (243-55), who examines the origins of the divine right of kings and the development of political and religious theory based upon it and then explores the ideas of kingship within a selection of Gaelic poetry of the seventeenth and first half of the eighteenth centuries. The exploitation of the ideology of divine-right kingship by Gaelic Jacobite poets is also discussed.

CAOIMHÍN BREATNACH

University College Dublin


D’fhán an Cumann Buan-Choimeádta féin i mbun gnótha go dtí an bhliain 1891, nuair a ghabh cor na tire lastuas dóibh, ach tháinig porradh faoi ar feadh tamaill arís timpeall na bliana 1927, agus níor scoireadh go dtí 1941 é. Cumann lárnaithe gan craobhacha aitiúla ab ea é a dhírigh ar dhul i bhfeidhm ar na húdaráis chun nithe a bhaint amach ar son na teanga, go háirithe san oideachas, agus ar an
bhfoilsitheoireacht. Ní mór dúinn a chuímhneamh nach raibh aon áit ag an nGaeilge sa chóras oideachais go dtí sin agus gur beag leabhar a bhí i gcló inti. Bhí folúis mhóra le lónadh agus b’iad seo an chéad dream a thug faoi sin a dheánamh. Tá cur síos mion ag Máirtín Ó Murchú sa leabhar seo ar an éacht a dheineadar ar son na teanga. Maidir leis an oideachas de, chuireadar aighneacht faoi bhráid Choimisinéirí an Oideachais Náisiúnta sa bhliain 1878 ag lorg aitheantais don Ghaeilge mar ábhar breise ar chlár na bunscolaíochta, rud a géilleadh go luath. Is suimiúil an t-eolas é go raibh ‘Gaeilge óna n-óige ag móran de na múinteoirí bunscoile; ag dhá mhile nó breis díobh a d’áirigh an Cumann’ (160). Sa bhliain chéanna sin cuireadh an meánoideachas in Éirinn ar bhonn reachtúil don chéad uair leis an Intermediate Education (Ireland) Act, a bhunaigh bord stáit chun bhreith i bhfeighil an chúraim. D’ullmhaigh an Cumann aighneacht eile agus fuair aighneacht síniúcháin óbhreis is daichind eisire de chuid na héireann i bParlaimint Westminster. Ghlac an rialtas leis an nGaeilge mar ábhar meánscoile, faoin ainm ‘Celtic’. Bhí an Cumann gníomhach chomh maith maidir le teastais ábalta do mhúinteoirí, íocaíochtaí do mhúinteoirí, etc. Dar ndóigh, ní raibh aon ábhar teagaisc ná léitheoireachta ar fáil go dtí sin, agus thosnaigh an Cumann ar phríomhachtí agus teáascáil a thaoilisiú, cúram a bhí orthu ar teacht in bhfad Gníomh tábhachtach eile ab ea an chomhdháil a d’eagraíodh san bhliain 1882 chun caomhnú agus cur chun cinn na teanga a phlé. (Tugann Ó Murchú sliocht leis an socheolaí teanga Joshua Fishman (134 n. 2) ina n-aithnítear comhdháil mar chéim thábhachtach i mbunú gluaiseachtaí teanga.)

D’ainneoin na hoibre sin go léir tá an tuairim forleathan gur eagras ar bheagán éifeachta atá an Cumann agus nár cuireadh tús ceart le hathraimní na Gaeilge go dtí gur bunaíodh Conradh na Gaeilge sa bhliain 1893. Dheimhnigh teideal leabhair le Máirín Ní Mhuiríosa (Réamhchonraitheoirí (1968)) gur mar ‘Réamh-Chonraitheoirí’ a d’fhéadfadh siar ar an gCumann lenár linn féin, cé gur dhein sí féin a dóibh is dícheall chun a bheith cothrom leo (2). In alt leis mar gheall ar Dhiathí Cóimín agus Aontacht na Gaeilge duitr Breandán Ó Conaire: ‘Cé go raibh beagán iomlán de dhúthachtaí ina measc, ba chineál club chultúrtha/shóisialta d’aicmintí deisiúla ar aiththe – agus do dhaonóir mhian leo ar aicme sin a thaitheá – a bhí sa Chumann’ (4). Deir Breatnach agus Ní Mhurchú (Beathaisnéis a dó (1992) 59) an méid seo a leanas mar gheall ar Dhiarmuid Mac Suibhne in alt a bhaineann lena mhac Pádraig Mac Suibhne: ‘Bhí daoine eile a chuirfeadh an locht air faoina mhí-éifeachtaí a bhí an Cumann.’ Ní tógtha ar na
húdair sin é, ós léir ó chuntas Mháirtín Uí Mhurchú gur thosaigh lucht na hAontachta an cháinseoireacht agus an bholscaireacht i gcoinne an Chumainn in aimsir na scoilte. I measc na modhanna oibre a bhí acu siúd bhí litreachta cáinte gan ainne a sheoladh go dtí na nuachtáin (75). Is cuspóir bunúsach é de chuid an leabhair seo deireadh a chur leis na móthuiscintí mar gheall ar thábhacht an Chumainn, agus an bonn a bhaint de mhothaíseágsula a tugadh creidiúint dóibh. Tá slánú déanta anseo ar chlú Dhiarmuda Mhic Shuibhne go háirithe.

Seans gurbh é an miotas ba mhó a ghreamaigh do lucht an Chumainn ná go rabhadar ar bheagán Gaeilge trí chéile. Tá scéal ag Canice Mooney in alt leis mar gheall ar anAthair Peadar Ó Laoire ag scríobh ‘to the Society for the Preservation of the Irish Language for some Irish books – but the letter could not be understood, because it was written in Irish’ (4). B’é Muiris Ó Droighneáin (Taighde i gcomhair stair na litridheachta na Nua-Ghaedhilge ó 1882 anuas (1936) 22) a chuir cosa faoi bharr an n-ábhar a bhí ag Ó Murchú a bhí laistiar de ná tagairt (chruinn) ag Dáithí Coimín ina chomhfhreagra agus do litir i ngAeilge a sheol an tAthair Peadar go dtí na foilsitheoirí, muintir Gill, le hairgead as leabhair a bhí faighte aige uathu, agus aitheasc fada inti, dírithe ar an gCumann, mar gheall ar mhúineadh na teanga. Ní haon iomáint étGearháilthar a bheith ar mhuintir Gill, agus ní gá gur de bharr easpa Gaeilge é. Dearbháitear anseo go bhfuil ‘ardchumas Gaeilge ag príomhchinní Chumainn Buan-Choimeádta na Gaeilge’ (5). Dar ndóigh, is trí Bhéarla a dheintí gnó na hAontachta chomh maith, an fhaid ab ann don eagaras sin, toisc gan cumas oibre trí Ghaeilge a bheith ag an mbeirt bhunaithetheoirí.

Is mótais eile é a mbaintear an bonn de anseo gurbh éigean bob a bhualadh ar Pharlamint Westminster chun an Ghaeilge a chur ar chlár na meánsoileanna nuair a bhí Acht an Oideachais Ídirmeánaigh a phlé sa bhliain 1878. De réir an chuntas atá tugtha ag údar éagsúla is amhaidh a mhol Ó Conchúir Donn, feisire de chuid na hÉireann, ‘Celtic’ a chur le liosta na n-ábhar a bhí le ceadú agus ghlac Príomh-Rúnaí leis sin de bharr aineolais ar a raibh i gceist leis an téarma sin. Dúirt Dubhghlas de hÍde (201): ‘Focal deas séimh é ‘Ceiltis’, focal nach sgannróchadh duine ar bith. Dá n-abradh sé Gaedhilg, ní dóigh go n-éireóchadh leis.’ Ach is léir ó Hansard gurbh é a mhalairt a thara. Bhí áit á lorg go hoscailte ag feisirí na hÉireann don Ghaoilge ach is é an t-ainm ‘Celtic’ ba rogha leis an bPríomh-Rúnaí, James Lowther, agus chuir sé a chos i bhfeic. Luann Ó Murchú (207 n. 2) as taifid an Chumainn gur mholadar sin
‘that whenever reference was to be made to the Irish language or literature the word “Irish” and not Celtic should be used.’ Deir sé go rabhadar ‘ag teacht leis an aigne choitenn sa mhéid sin’. Toradh amháin a bhí ar an eachtra sin guir fágadh míshuaimhneas áirithe ar lucht na Gaeilge mar gheall ar úsáid an fhocail ‘Ceilteach’.

Maidir le saothar an Chumainn i ngort an oideachais, tá scagadh déanta ag Ó Murchú ar stataisticí na linne agus tá móran nithe inspéisé tugtha chun solais aige. Thuigeamar riamh go raibh páirt mhór ag na Bráithre Críostáí i gcur chun cinn na Gaeilge sa scoláíocht (216-21), ach cuirtear an fhianaise os ár gcomhair go beacht anseo. Sa bhliain 1883 is ar scoileanna de chuid na mBráthar a bhí 50% de na daltaí a roghnaigh an Ghaeilge sna scrúduithe idirnáraithe agus mhéadaigh sin le himeacht ama (218). Bhain 473 pas amach sa bhliain 1900 agus ba leis na Bráithre 319 dóibh. Nó naomh intíosa é gur moladh an fhocail ‘Teacht’ sna bhall déanta in bhall na Gaeilge. Bhí 80 cailín istigh ar an t-ainm don bháthar bhliain sin, agus bhain 54 dóibh sin le Clochair San Lughaidh, Muineachán. Tugtar liosta anseo (219) de na clochair eile ar éirigh le hiarrthóirí uathu sa bhliain sin. Cúig bhliana ina dhiaidh sin, i 1905, bhain 2,465 pas amach sa Ghaeilge. Bhí an fás céanna tagtha ar na figiúirí sna bunscoileanna idir an dá linn agus is dhá ghné iad sin den bhroradh obann a tháinig faoi chur chun cinn na Gaeilge i dtús an fhichiú céad, finéimean a dtáblaíonn Ó Murchú dó in áiteanna eile sa leabhar seo. Maidir leis an ollscolaíocht, is ábhar spéisí e an t-ontas a bhí ar lucht an Chumainn, de réir thuarsácaí na bhliain 1909, mar gheall ar an méid ollnachtaí le Léann na Gaeilge agus an Léann Ceilteach a cuireadh ar bun in Ollscoil na hÉireann, a bunaíodh i 1908. Ní féidir gurb é a mbraistint ar thábhacht na n-ábhar sin mar chuid d’oideachta ar tíre a thug ar údaráis na linne na poist sin a chur ar bun. Faoi Choróin Shasana a bhí na húdaráis sin ag obair, dar ndóigh, agus is íoróch an chéad é gur faoi rialtais dúchas atá poist den chineál sin á scór lenár linn féin.

Thosnaigh meath ag teacht ar an gCumann i dtús an fhichiú céad agus tháinig Conradh na Gaeilge chun cinn go tréan an uair sin. Clár oibre an chumainn a leanadar sin cuíd mhaith, ach chuirtear gréasán craobhacha ar bun ar fud na tíre, a bhúthchas sin don £2000 a fuairtar in bhliain 1898 ó uacht Ghael-Mheiriceánaigh ag cailleadh cúpla bhliain roimhe sin (131 n. 1). Is é an fórtiún sin a chuir ar a gcumas na timirí go léir a chur timpeall na tíre chun gnáthdhaoinse a spreagadh ar son na cúise, agus eagrás náisiúnta don phobal a thógaint. Tá sé ráite ag daoine éagsúla gurbh é an fhíchú céad ‘ré an
ghnáthdhuine’ agus bhí Conradh na Gaeilge ag freastal go cruinn ar riachtanais agus ar mhianta na ré nua sin. Tháinig ceardchumainn, cineálacha nua spóirt don choitiantachta agus siamsaíochta do ghnáthdhaoine Chun cinn i dtreo dheireadh an naou céad déag agus ní móir fás an Chonartha, agus an rath a bhí orthu, a fhéiscint sa chomhthéacs sin. Bhí an bhéim a chuir an Conradh ar an modh díreach i múineadh na teanga tráthnúil chomh maith agus fágsadh téacsatáin an Chumainn as dáta agus as úsáid cúisacht tapaidh. Níor éirigh leis an gCumann seifteanna nua a cheapadh a dheimhneodh buan-mharthain dóibh i gcomhthéacs a bhí an-dhfriúil leis na cúisí inar thosnaíodh. Theip orthu athrú mar ba gha a mheasadh. Mar sin féin thug an Cumann oscailtí do ghlúin nua Gaeilgeoirí i mblianta sin an mheatha, daoine ar nós Phádraig Uí Dhruinnín, a bhí ag obair as a stuaím féin mar scoláire Gaeilge ó d’fhág sé Cumann Íosa sa bhliain 1900; Tomás Ó Rathaille, a bhí gníomhach go maith sa Chumann an feadh tréimhse go dtí gur éirigh sé as de bharr easaontaí i dtaobh fhoilsiú írisleabhair (agus sheol Gadelica as a stuaím féin) (297); agus Seán Ó Ceallaigh (‘Sceilg’) a tháinig i gcomhbaracht ar Dhiarmaid Mac Suibhne sa bhliain 1914 agus a scríobh sráith leabhar don Chumann a raibh an-éileamh orthu. Is ag a chlann sin a d’fhás na leabhair miontuaiscisciúntar é a scór an Chumainn agus is tróithiú sin a tugadh an bhunfhianaise ar imeachtaí an Chumainn slán. Tá cur síos an-spéisiúil ar na claochluithe deiridh sin ag Máirtín Ó Murchú anseo (303 et seq.).

Is leabhar den chéad scoth é seo a dheineann atá refersént riachtanach ar an slí inar tháinig gluaiseacht na Gaeilge ar an saol. Tá curtha go mór ag an údar lenár n-eolas ar thús na hathbhreochana, ar thús na foilsitheoireachta i nGaeilge, ar phréamhú na Gaeilge sa chóras oideachais, agus ar pearsana tábhachtacha i saol na Gaeilge. Ba dhóigh leat gur dheacair é a shárú mar phíosa taighde ó fhoinsí príomha, a bhí uathú ar an fhéin a mhillíonn le feadhadh. Tá doiciméid bhunadh agus nós imeachta an Chumainn san áireamh, mar aon le haighneachtaí agus comhfhreagra-ras a bhaineann le feachtas an Chumainn agus lena gcuid foilseachán. I measc na mioncháipéisí i gcúl leabhair tá léirmheas Osborn Bergin ar Filidheacht Ghaedhealach le Dubhghlas de hÍde, as Banba, Méitheamh 1903 (399-401). Is léir óna líne thosaigh, ‘Níl puinn maitheasa san leabhrán so,’ go bhfuil a áit féin tuilleadh eige i dtraidisiún na léirmheasanna feannáideacha i Léann na Gaeilge.
Mar fhocal scóir, is é an an leabhar seo an túsphointe feasta don té a chuirfidh roimhe léitheoireacht a dhéanamh mar gheall ar stair shóisialta na Gaeilge le céad go leith bliain anuas.

DIARMUID Ó SÉ

An Coláiste Ollscoilte, Baile Átha Cliath


ELEVEN contributions and five reviews comprise the contents of this volume. Anna Bosch, ‘The syllable in Scottish Gaelic dialect studies’ (1-22), outlines methods used to determine syllabification in Scottish Gaelic. Beginning with Borgstrøm’s study of the dialect of Barra (1937) – the first reference to a vowel-consonant structure in Scottish Gaelic ‘and perhaps the first mention of such a structure for any language’ (3) – Bosch compares definitions of syllable structure in twentieth-century descriptive work on the language. While syllables and syllable structure are generally addressed, it is argued that ‘a clear definition is rarely if ever forthcoming’ (18). Close descriptive work must incorporate ‘a more principled approach to the reporting of data on syllables, syllable boundaries, and syllable structure’ (19).

Linda Gowans, ‘Sir Uallabh O Còrn: a Hebridean tale of Sir Gawain’ (23-55), presents an edition of the Gaelic romantic tale, complete with textual notes and discussion. It will be of interest to Gaelic scholars and Arthurians alike. Both an oral recitation by Donald Cameron from Tiree (= B) and a translation thereof were first published in the Transactions of the Gaelic Society of Inverness (vol. 13 (1886-87) 69-83) by Rev. John Gregorson Campbell. Gowans’s edition derives from item 425 of the Carmichael-Watson Collection in Edinburgh University Library, ‘an unattributed manuscript [= A] of the story’ (23), written in an unidentified hand. The author suggests that ‘if not the original, our manuscript A is a copy made very soon after collection, before the text had received detailed editorial attention’ (24). Many variant readings and the ‘unpolished nature of A’, which inserts ‘etc.’ (24), however, indicate that it is not identical with B. Further, a number of passages in the published English translation of B were omitted in the Gaelic original. These omissions,
which may have occurred while the text was being written out for the Gaelic Society of Inverness or during subsequent publication, may now be supplied from A.

Benjamin T. Hudson, ‘The language of the Scottish Chronicle and its European contexts’ (57-73), examines Gaelic words and phrases of this contemporary record of Scottish affairs from c. 840 to c. 973.

Anne Loughran considers Irish and Scottish versions of Ceann dubh dileas / Cuir a chinn dileas (75-88). According to Loughran, these renderings originated in the seventeenth century (79). While independent of the other, each has ‘virtually the same metre’ which, it is suggested, ‘may have been the influence of an original tune, [but] which we now cannot identify for sure’ (81). The ‘tune and the performance’ (81) fixed a pattern of rhyming words and ensured that both Irish and Scottish groups remained metrically together.

Colm Ó Baoill, ‘Caismeachd Ailean nan Sop: towards a definitive text’ (89-110), examines a poem beginning ’S mithich dhùinne, mar bhun ùmhlachd in praise of Ailean nan Sop, second son of Lachlann Catanach (d. 1523), tenth Maclean of Duart. Its only primary source is MG15G/2/2, formerly part of the eighteenth-century manuscript collection of Dr Hector Maclean, now in the Public Archives of Nova Scotia, Halifax. According to its heading it was composed in 1537 by Eachann mac Iain Abraich (fl. 1536-79). Ó Baoill’s metrical analysis accords with this dating. The poet is ‘exceptional among vernacular poets (whose work is extant) in sharing the Classical fondness of alliteration’, while writing in the Scottish vernacular language with ‘a less than strict application of syllable-count and rhyme’ (91). Interesting linguistic features include: (i) the occurrence of bùrduin (l. 2) which, if one accepts the date of the poem, may be the earliest attested example in Scottish Gaelic; (ii) ’s nitear sin a rèir a chèile (l. 15), which may show the earliest attested use of the expression de réir a chèile in Irish or in Scottish Gaelic (98); (iii) a liuthad sodar mhuir anfaidh (l. 27), where Ó Baoill ‘must take mhuir anfaidh as a fixed phrase for ‘stormy sea’ (so that the genitive mhara is not required)’ (100). Two examples from bardic poetry are cited in support of the latter translation (DIL A, 344.34 and LBrananach (ed. Mac Airt), l. 6786). To these may be added muir anfaidh ag tochta i dtráigh (TDall (ed. Knott) no. 8 l. 31).

Dorothee Tratnik, ‘Three poems from County Cork in praise of Bobbing John’ (167-74), edits and translates three contemporary poetic accounts of the Jacobite rising of 1715, led by John Erskine (alias Bobbing John) eleventh Earl of Mar. These poems are unusual
for praising a hero other than the Pretender. Moreover, their contemporary nature implies not only a close observation of political events in Scotland, but indicates the access, on the part of Irish poets, to information concerning the Jacobite rising of 1715.

Other articles in this volume include Robert A. Rankin, ‘Place-names in the Comhachag and other similar poems’ (111-30); Laura S. Sugg, ‘Summary list of items 488 to 576 in the Carmichael-Watson Collection’ (131-65), which incorporates legal land documents in Old English, Gaelic proverbs, English and Gaelic omens, placenames, and ‘Laoidh Chlann Uisne’, all hitherto uncatalogued; John Lorne Campbell, ‘Notes on poems by Mac Mhaighstir Alasdair’ (175-185); Andrew Breeze, ‘Common Gaelic Básaire “Executioner”: Middle Scots Basare “Executioner”’ (186-187); Eric P. Hamp, ‘Easter Ross iad-sa’ (188).

MEIDHBHÍN NÍ ÚRDAIL

University College Dublin


This volume of ZCP contains contributions on a variety of aspects of Celtic languages and literature. In ZCP 49/50 (1997) 287-309, the late Hans Hartmann contributed an article entitled ‘Was ist Wahrheit?’ That essay consisted of an analysis of the similarities and of the differences between the concept of truth as it is manifested in Irish and Indian society, both from a linguistic and from a cultural perspective. The current volume contains a further instalment on this topic and related ones from Professor Hartmann entitled ‘Was ist Wahrheit (2)?’ (1-101). The aim of this lengthy second contribution is stated by the author as being: ‘um die Möglichkeiten zur Vergleichung von Fakten zu erweitern und den Grad der Sicherheit von Schlußfolgerungen zu erhöhen’ (2). For scholars of Irish those portions of this article which deal with the relationship between truth and kingship in Ireland are of interest (19-38). Hartmann draws on a range of sources including Old Irish texts such as Críth Gablach and Audacht Morainn, and also Modern Irish material such as that gathered by himself in Airnéán: Eine Sammlung von texten aus Co.
Gaillimhe, a work edited with assistance from Ruairí Ó hUiginn and the late Tomáš de Bhaldraithe (Tübingen 1996). Further material on this subject is promised for a future number of the Zeitschrift (100).

Kingship also is the main focus of the contribution by Miranda Aldhouse-Green, ‘Pagan Celtic iconography and the concept of sacral kingship’ (102-117). Here linkages are attempted ‘between the presentation of certain Gallo-British imagery and specific aspects of the Irish tradition’ (102). Irish texts are cited sometimes in Irish, sometimes in English. Specific references (paragraphs and/or line numbers) are not supplied at all, so we read, for example: ‘the Morrígan is clearly a divinity and there is good evidence – particularly that of place-names in the mythic History of Places – to link her securely with the land etc.’ (104). History of Places, we deduce, is a reference to The metrical Dindshenchas, edited by E. J. Gwynn (Dublin 1903-35), which is a work of five volumes, running to over fifteen hundred pages, and it is left to the reader of the article to locate the relevant references therein! Incidentally, these will be found in MD V 173 s.v. Mórrígan.

The editor of the Zeitschrift, K. H. Schmidt, in ‘Die altirischen Glossen als sprachgeschichtliches Dokument’ (137-153), analyses the importance of the Old Irish glosses as a historical linguistic source. The article is in four main sections: (i) definition of the OIr glosses (140); (ii) discussion of two OIr typological features (141-46); (iii) discussion of the place of the glosses in the history of the Irish language (146-50); (iv) discussion of the relationship between the Irish and Latin languages (150-51). Schmidt’s contribution offers a concise and accurate introduction to this most important corpus of texts, which in short (as the author notes) amount to ‘die Quellen für Thurneysens Handbuch bzw. Grammar’ (138). The article consists (see p. 137, n. 1) of the text of a lecture delivered on the occasion of Gearóid S. Mac Eoin’s seventieth birthday. Apart from the addition of footnotes, the text has not otherwise been altered for printing and ends with the courteous if unusual formula ‘Ich danke Ihnen für Ihre Geduld’ (153).

A number of articles deal with etymological and Indo-European topics. These topics by their nature can be complex and contain citations from a variety of Indo-European languages as well as special phonological notation to illustrate underlying forms or stages in the derivation of particular words. If the general reader (i.e. one who is not a specialist in Indo-European linguistics) is to gain an understanding of the material it is essential, that the line of argument
should be clear, logical and formulated in language which is grammatically correct. Regrettably, some of the linguistic contributions to the current volume of the Zeitschrift do not consistently fulfil these criteria. Nikolai N. Kazansky, ‘PIE *megʰ-’ (118-20), argues that the Indo-European adverbial root *megʰ- ‘up to, near’ underlies words such as Latin mox ‘soon’, Sanskrit maksi-, ‘soon’, Avestan mošũ ‘as soon as, when’, and also the Old Irish adverbial prefix mos-. (For ‘Kymr. moch’ (119) read ‘Welsh moch’.) The English in which the argument is presented in this instance contains a number of odd renderings, as for example the following: ‘resulted into the division of *megʰhr- into the beginning particle me- and the root *ɡʰer- “hand”’ (119); ‘it seems to be ancient heritage going back to PIE’ (119); ‘The temporal semantics of the root mox does not prevent from the comparison with the Greek and Armenian adverbs’ (119).

Alexander Falileyev, ‘Celto-Slavica II’ (121-4), suggests possible Slavonic parallels to the word for ‘beard, bristles’ in a number of Celtic languages, viz. Old Irish grend, Welsh grann. There are several examples of erroneous terminology and misformulations in this article, e.g. ‘continuation’ (121, 123, leg. ‘derivation’?), ‘which go according to’ (122, leg. ‘which develop according to’?), ‘which is altogether not unparalleled’ (123, leg. ‘which is not without parallel’?). More seriously, however, some of the argument is presented in so confused a manner as to be almost impossible to appreciate. Thus, for example, the following: ‘Could it not be the case, therefore, that these Slavic words (as well as the Celtic words for ‘beard, bristles’) go back to this particular *ɡʰer-, provided that we face a wide range of difficulties in dealing with the forms given in the entry for *ɡ(u)rendh- on the one side, and that there is already a precedent of considering (though a homonymous) IE *ɡʰer- for the discussion of the pre-history of these Slavic words on the other’ (123).

There are two contributions from Václav Blažek. The first is entitled ‘Celtic-Anatolian isoglosses’ (125-8), in which the author argues that the rare Irish word airne ‘stone’ (hitherto without etymology) may be cognate with Anatolian *parn(o) ‘house’ (125-6). He goes on to suggest a parallel between Irish láth, láith ‘warrior’ and Anatolian *latti- ‘tribal troop(s)’ (126-7). Blažek’s second contribution, ‘Balor – “the blind-eyed”’ (129-33), attempts to provide an etymology for the name of the infamous Fomorian king. The reference at the start of this article to Balor and his evil eye (biruderc suil milldach, 129) should read [Bolur] Birugderc, súil milldtagach (cf. Cath Maige Tuired: the Second Battle of Mag Tuired, ed. Eliza-
beth A. Gray, Dublin 1982, §133, ll. 619-620). The starting-point for the author’s proposed solution is a hypothetical compound \textit{bhol-H(o)kwlo} – ‘blind-eyed’ (129). This reviewer’s efforts to follow the logic of the argument were severely hampered in places by the author’s apparent refusal to utilise footnotes under any circumstances for the purpose of referencing other scholars’ work. The following sentence may serve by way of an example:

If we accept the derivation of the divine name \textit{Vellaunos} from IE \textit{*wel-} ‘to see, sight’ etc. (Pokorny 1959: 1136) following Jakobsen & Watkins (see Olmsted 1994: 329 with discussion and de Bernardo Stempel 1994: 289f. concerning the identification of the \textit{*mH1no-} participle; it is not important that she prefers the derivation of this theonym from \textit{*welH-} ‘to rule’), it is quite natural to agree with Olmsted’s interpretation of \textit{Vellaunos/Mars’} epithet \textit{ocelos} = ‘the seer’ or ‘of the eye’ (130).

Joseph F. Eska’s short note, ‘Further to Vercelli \textit{šo=}’ (134-5), argues that the particle \textit{šo-} which occurs in the verbal form \textit{Tošokote} in the bilingual Latin-Gaulish inscription at Vercelli may be derived from the demonstrative stem \textit{isto-} (134). Two contributions deal with Welsh material. Peter Busse, ‘Die 3 Sg. Prät. im Mittelkymrischen – ein Wechsel im Paradigma’ (154-99), traces the spread of the 3 sg. preterital ending \textit{-awd} at the expense of the earlier \textit{-wys} in Middle Welsh. The background to this paradigm-shift is described and the diachronic development illustrated with copious examples from the literature. This article concludes with a discussion on the consequences of this change for Modern Welsh. Gwyn Thomas, ‘\textit{Gweledigaethu y Bardd Cwsg: The Visions of the Sleeping Bard (1703)}’ (200-10), analyses aspects of this Welsh text compiled by one Ellis Wynne and published in 1703. The work contains descriptions of a number of visions of death and hell. Thomas compares the Welsh text with a variety of similar burlesque and satirical compositions from seventeenth-century England and continental Europe. He concludes that ‘many seventeenth-century writers were much taken by descriptions of visits to the land of the dead and to hell, and that they used these excursions for their own purposes, mainly to castigate and satirize their enemies’ (210).

Manfred Hainzmann, ‘The F.E.R.C.A.N. Project: Fontes epigraphici religionis Celticae antiquae’ (211-18), outlines the back-
ground to an ambitious project initiated in 1998 by the Iron Age Section of the Austrian Academy of Sciences. The goal is to produce ‘a fundamental work of compilation of and commentary on all the epigraphic evidence of ancient Celtic religion’ (211). The project cycle described here consists of four stages: (1) the compilation of epigraphic records; (2) the evaluation and interpretation of these records; (3) the storing and processing of these records; and (4) the publication of editions of these records with appropriate commentaries (214-17).

The volume concludes with a lengthy section of reviews and notices of publications (219-356).
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