

PB

1201

E6

vol. 7-8

ÉRIU

The Journal of the School of Irish
Learning, Dublin

VOL. VII

EDITED BY

KUNO MEYER & R. I. BEST

DUBLIN
SCHOOL OF IRISH LEARNING
HODGES, FIGGIS, & CO., LTD.

1914

PRINTED AT THE



BY PONSONBY & GIBBS.

CONTENTS

	Page
The Guesting of Athirne. KUNO MEYER, ...	1
On <i>Debide</i> Rhyme. KUNO MEYER, ...	10
St. Victrius of Rouen and St. Patrick. ALFRED ANSCOMBE,	13
Mid-Sixteenth-Century Numbers and Phrases. J. H. LLOYD,	18
<i>Bó Thúir</i> . ELEANOR KNOTT, ...	26
Modern Irish <i>téora</i> , 'limit, border.' OSBORN BERGIN, ...	27
The Authorship and Structure of the 'Annals of Tigernach,' EOIN MAC NEILL, ...	30
Palaeographical Notes. I. The Rawlinson B 502 Tigernach. R. I. BEST, ...	114
An Irish Penitential. E. J. GWYNN, ...	121
A Third Copy of the Guesting of Athirne. R. THURNEYSEN,	196
CúRóí and CúChulinn. JOSEF BAUDIŠ, ...	200
Poem by Cináed úa Hartacáin. LUCIUS GWYNN, ...	210
On a Line in Patrick's Hymn. ELEANOR KNOTT, ...	239
The Lament of the Nun of Beare. OSBORN BERGIN, ...	240
The Death of Conchobar's Sons. OSBORN BERGIN, ...	242
What brought the Saxons to Ireland. OSBORN BERGIN, ...	244
Report, Session 1913, ...	i
Subscribers to Ériu, ...	iii

THE GUESTING OF ATHIRNE

THE following tale, which is here printed and translated for the first time, has come down to us, so far as I know, in two manuscripts only, the Book of Leinster (L), p. 118a and Harleian 5280 (H), fol. 77a. It is a fortunate circumstance that these copies supply each other's defects; for the former has become illegible in many places, and in the latter the scribe has omitted two lines in the third poem. I print in the main the text of L, the gaps in which I have filled up by inserting the readings of H in square brackets.

The language both of the prose and poetry is early Middle Irish, probably of the eleventh century. The four poems on the seasons are composed in the common heptasyllabic metre with trisyllabic endings, a shorter line of five syllables with monosyllabic ending marking the end of a stanza. The other five poems are written in various metres: the first in five lines of six syllables with trisyllabic ending, followed by a line of eight or nine syllables. The remaining poems show varieties of the same structure.

The very doubtful state of the text of the last four poems makes it impossible for me to offer a full translation, as I only understand a line or a word here and there.

KUNO MEYER

*A third MS. - 23. N. 10, transcribed by
Thurneysen, *Eriu*, vii, 196.*

INCIPIT ĀIGIDECHT AITHIRNI¹

1. Dodechaid tra Athirne fecht and for turus isin fogomur do thaig a daltaí Amorgene, co mbái adaig and, *ocus* co rofóbbair imthecht arnabárách. Conid and atbert Amorgen ac fostud Athirni:²

R[aithe] fō foiss³ fogomur
 feidm and [for cech] ēenduine
 la⁴ tóeb na llā⁵ lāngarit.
 Lóig brecca [a broin]d osseilt
 dītnit⁶ rūadgaiss raithnigi.
 Ret[h]it⁸ daim a dumachaib
 [f]ri dorddān na damgaire.
 Derccain suba⁹ a ssithchaitib
 slatta etha imm ithgurtu¹⁰
 ōs īath domuin duind.
 Draigin drissi delgnacha¹¹
 fri tōeb¹² in lāir leithlessi,¹³
 lān do mess trom tairnith[].¹⁴
 Tuittit¹⁵ cnōi cuill cāinmessa¹⁶
 do robilib rāth.¹⁷ R.

2. Rotriall dano imthecht isin gemrud, conid and atber Amorgen:¹⁸

Dubaib rathib rogemrid¹⁹
 robarta tond tūargabar²⁰
 īar tóib betha²¹ blāi.
 Brōnaig eōin cach²² īathmaige
 acht fīaich fola forderge

¹ sic H, om. L ² D]odechaid Aithirni hisind ogomhor for terus di tig hi dalto *co* rotriaell dia tigh a frithise for culu *co* n-epirt Amirgin *oc* a astud H
³ rathi fo fois H foss L ⁴ rie H ⁵ laa H ⁶ oselltae H ⁷ dianit H
⁸ retid H ⁹ duba L ¹⁰ im ethgortu H amm ithgortaib L ¹¹ delcnechæ H
¹² toib H ¹³ lethlisse H ¹⁴ lan di meus trvom tindithir H ¹⁵ tuittid L
 tuitid H ¹⁶ cainmessæ H ¹⁷ rathi H ¹⁸ Anais cor ind fogomuir. Trialais dno imtecht hisan gaimrid. Inquid Amirgen H ¹⁹ sic H rogemred L
²⁰ roborto tond tuarcabann H ²¹ bethad L betha H ²² euoin cech H

HERE BEGINS THE GUESTING OF ATHIRNE

1. Once upon a time, on a journey in the autumn, Athirne¹ came to the house of his foster-son Amorgen,² and stayed a night there. And he was about to depart on the morrow, when Amorgen said, keeping him back :

‘A good stay-at-home season is autumn,
then there is work to be done for everyone
throughout the all too short days.
Speckled fawns from the midst of the deer-herd,—
the red stalks of the bracken afford a shelter (to them).
Stags run from mounds
at the chorus of the bellowing of hinds.
There are delicious acorns in long-leaved woods,
blades of corn around corn-fields
over the region of the brown world.
Spiked thorn-bushes (grow)
by the site of a half-ruined fort :³
the weight of a heavy harvest bows them down.⁴
Hazelnuts of the fairest crop
drop from the great trees of forts.’

2. Again he tried to depart in the winter, when Amorgen said :—

‘In the dark seasons of deep winter
heavy seas are lifted up
along the side of the world’s region.
Sorrowful are the birds of every meadow-field,
except the ravens of dark-red blood,

¹ Athirne Ailgessach or ‘the Importunate,’ an Ulster poet, is said to have lived in the time of Conchobar mac Nessa. See Wh. Stokes, *The Siege of Howth*, *Rev. Celt.* viii, p. 48 ff.

² As to him, see O’Curry, *Lectures* III, 374, and II, 171, where Aithirne is misprinted Dithirne.

³ I take *lis* as a by-form of *less*. Cp. *uingi d’ór cech lis*, LL 46a27.

⁴ *tairnith* . . ., the reading of L, seems to contain some form of the verb *do-airndim* ‘I let down.’

fri fūaim gemrid gaig,
 Garb dub dorcha dethaite.¹
 Dīumusaig² coin cnāmchomaig,
 curt[h]ir ar æd³ īarnlestar
 īar lō dorcha dub. D.

3. Ro triall dano⁴ imthecht isind erruch, conid and atbert Amorgen:⁵

Glass ūar errach aigide,
 []ūacht in gāeth⁶ gignither,
 glāidsit⁷ lachain⁸ lindusci,
 luin⁹ ic ēcnacht corr crūadēigmi.
 Cluinit cúana a dīthrebaib
 fri ēirge moch matanraid,
 dūscit eōno indferaid¹⁰
 mōr fiad resafirtheichet¹¹
 a fid,¹² a feōr¹³ glas. G.

4. Rotriall dano¹⁴ imthecht issint ūamrud, conid and atbert¹⁵ Amorgen ic a chetugud dó :

Fó sín samrad sithistar,¹⁶
 sādal fid forard forglide
 nāch fet gāithe glūaisēba,¹⁷
 glas clūm¹⁸ caille clithaige,
 sōit srotha¹⁹ sābusci,
 [tes hi fōtān fō]. F.

5. Ro cetaiged dó īarum imthecht²⁰ issint ūamrud. [Ó rosiacht oc] Athirne imthecht,²¹ is and rathothlaigsetar a daltaí .i. Amairgin²² co rothothlaiged saide²³ co Athirne ní dia eícsi do thadbsin dōib. [Is ed] tothlugud dorōne²⁴ Amairgin .i. tarb do thabairt istech²⁵ dia marbad.²⁶ [Is a]nd atbert²⁷ Athirne oc tairmesc²⁸ marbha in tairb :

¹ dethaīti (dethaigi?) H an leg. dethaigthe? ² sic H diumsaig L
³ æth H ⁴ Anais cin imdecht isan gemrid. Rotriall dno etc. H ⁵ co n-epirt
 Aimircen an tres fecht H ⁶ fuaght anagid H ⁷ sic H glaidsait L ⁸ locan H
⁹ Here the scribe of H has skipped everything between the *lu* of *luin* and the *gi* of
ēirgi, and writes: linnusci lugi moch matanraid, etc. ¹⁰ duscid eouna inſeraid H
¹¹ riasu firtechit H ¹² fir H ¹³ feur H ¹⁴ om. H ¹⁵ co n-epert H
¹⁶ samraid sithestar H ¹⁷ gluaisebai H ¹⁸ gluarfeda L ¹⁹ cluim H ²⁰ soait
 srebæ H ²¹ rocetaiged iersen imdicht H ²² comitecht H ²³ rototlaicestar

at the uproar of fierce winter-time,
rough, black, dark, smoky.

Hounds wax insolent from cracking bones,
the iron vessel is put upon the fire
throughout the dark black day.'

3. Again he tried to depart in the spring, when Amorgen said :—

'Raw and chilly is icy spring,
the cold will spring up in one's face.¹
The ducks of the pool-water have raised a cry,
harsh-shrieking cranes set up their blasphemous chorus,²
from wildernesses wolf-packs scent
the early rise of morning time.
Birds are scared
by many a wild beast before which they flee in terror
out of the wood, out of the green grass.'

4. Once more he tried to depart in the summer, when Amorgen said, allowing him to do so :

'A good season is summer . . . ,
peaceful is the tall choice forest,
which no whistling of the wind shall move.³
Green is the down of the sheltering wood,
rivers turn eddies,
good is the heat in the turf.'

5. So in the summer he was allowed to depart. When he was about to start, Amorgen's foster-sons desired of him⁴ that he would ask Athirne to let them hear something of his poet's craft. Then Amorgen ordered a bull to be brought into the house to be killed. Thereupon Athirne said, preventing the killing of the bull :

a daltae co hAmargin H ²³ anrototlaiged side H ²⁴ gonud e totlugad dorigni H ²⁵ asteg H ²⁶ de Aithirni add. H ²⁷ conid ann espert H ²⁸ toirmiusc H

¹ Here I translate the reading of H: *úacht i n-agid gignither*. L lacks one syllable: *úacht i ngáith gignither* 'cold will be born in the wind.'

² This line, which is omitted in H, is very corrupt in L, and my rendering is mere guess-work based upon taking *ecnacht* as standing for *écnach* 'blasphemy,' and *luin ic* for *luinniuc* 'chorus.' But the line has one syllable too many.

³ *glúaisēba*, an analogical future formation instead of *glúaisfe*. ⁴ viz. Amorgen.

[In tarbān] treballach
bailcerblach adircech¹
mer mothlach [munēlach],
oinmit na immirgi,²
athair na n-innile,³
tairrechtaid cecha⁴ [tāna] in tarb. T.

6. Doberar⁵ gamain⁶ istech⁷ dia marbad dar ēis⁸ in tairb.
Conid and atbert⁹ Athirne :

Berach ōach aircheltach¹⁰
and¹¹ elit im¹² bēim būridach,
samrad¹³ sir[fius hi cēin,
d]ersaid bec beodartaid,¹⁴
mani tuggedar d'ilbiadaib,
nocho¹⁵ dīdnad dam.
Niabron dián degduine
dliges [s]um dia [deg]berbud,
manip bīada ber.¹⁶ B.

7. Doberar¹⁷ īarsin¹⁸ cāire istech¹⁹ dia marbad.²⁰ Conid and
atbert²¹ Athirne :

Ce[tnat]²² cromm lomm lesc²³ liuntach lenamnach,
nī ecmainger²⁴ cen andre ét
esbadach aith īarna dīth ima tlacht.²⁵
Tōeb t[oll] tana tuidmide,²⁶
tadbanar²⁷ for slīastaib snīm,
sainemla [beu b]ās,
būaid dī a llacht a lloe,²⁸
ūar aigide i ngabras airrbe,²⁹
roilbe [rūad] rofes ūna³⁰ filedaib,
cobarthach cāich cet.³¹ C.

8. Doberar³² muc istech īar tain³³ co n-epirt Athirne īar tain
ic erāil a mmarbtha :³⁴

Mochen māta mōaigther
do nach mōaigther³⁵ mīad,
airrechtaid cecha debtha dūre,
nī ar dānaib dothīastar,³⁶
acht³⁷ dia letharthaib lāi.³⁸
lassamuin b[īad] doligthe,³⁹
rianalalile⁴⁰ bal don mātai is mochen. M.

The mighty-limbed bullock,
strong-tailed, horned,
wild shaggy, stout-necked,
the oaf of the drove,
the father of cattle,
the pursuer¹ of every herd is the bull.'

6 A year-old calf is brought into the house to be killed instead of the bull. Then Athirne said :

' Sharp-snouted, long-eared, . . .

* * *

Unless it be covered² with many foods
it is no comfort to me.'

* * *

7. Thereupon a sheep is brought in to be killed. Then Athirne said :

' Lambkin, with crooked horns, shorn bare. . . .'

* * *

8. A pig is brought into the house after that, when Athirne said, enjoining its killing :

' Welcome the pig. . . .'

1 balcerblach adaircech H 2 himirci H 3 athair n. n-i. om. H 4 airechtach
cech H 5 atnagar H 6 bec add. H 7 histeg H 8 hesi H 9 co n-epirt H
10 airceltrac H 11 ind H 12 in L 13 samraid H 14 beomartaid H 15 ni
ba H 16 mani bia ber H 17 diarberar L atnagar H 18 om. H
19 coeru isteg H 20 iarsin add. H 21 co n-eperti H 22 cnetait (sic) H
23 losc H 24 hecmongur H 25 esba dna iarna ditniud tlacht H 26 taidmidi H
27 tadþnarur H 28 buad din illacht illoe H 29 airbe H 30 acna H
31 foiritnech cach cnet. Cnet. c. H 32 atnagor H 33 histeg asa haitli H
34 ðiar-marbtha om. H 35 moigter do na mainigther H 36 ni dia dainib
detnestar 37 om. H 38 dialeth ardæ loe H 39 lasamna biad boligti H
40 riana baili H

¹ *tairrechtaid*, a derivative of *tairrecht* 'pursuit.' Cf. *icon tairrecht*, AU 1021. *α tarriucht creiche*, ib. 1018.

² Instead of the deponential *tugedar* the passive *tuigther* is required both by the sense and metre.

9. Ataigther tene trom trichemrūad¹ dó īar sin. Conid and atbert² Aithirne:

Tene trom trichemrúad
 taírges ūacht n-ōim[fir³]
 ēr]ge lond lassair loinderda
 īar lī grēne g[lán⁴]
 fri]⁵ silliuð súla
 suillse in cach taig⁶
 taírges [tene].⁷ T.

[Docōid Aithirne dia t[h]ig īar sin īar forbo a c[h]ēlidi 7 a imacoldmo frie hAmirgin foan innus sen. Finis.]

9. Thereupon a large red-flaming fire is kindled for it. Then Athirne said :

‘ A large red-flaming fire
which. . . .’

* * *

10. Thereafter Athirne went home, having finished his visit and his conversation with Amorgen in that manner. Finis.

¹ trom t. om. H ² co n-erbuit H ³ tairnus uaghtd n-ainfir H ⁴ eirgi
laidir lasser laindiurdæ ier lighi *greine* glan H ⁵ fria H ⁶ cech tigh H
⁷ taircius ten teni. trom. H

ON *DEBIDE* RHYME

I

IT is well known that the chief difference between the *debide* rhyme of Irish poetry and that of the Welsh *cywydd deuair hirion* concerns the position of the rhyming words. While in the Irish metre only a stressed syllable can rhyme with an unstressed one (*linn* : *Érinn*), in Welsh the reverse may equally well be the case (*goror* : *mor*). In other words, in Irish the shorter (monosyllabic or disyllabic) rhyme-word must always stand in the first verse of the couplet, while in Welsh it may equally well stand in the second. But the stricter rules of metrical composition were not developed all at once ; and in the older poetry there are numerous instances to show that greater liberty and license prevailed. In compositions like the poems inserted in *Imram Brain*, or the *Reicne Fothaid Chanainne*, which may both be ascribed to the eighth century, we find abundant traces of such freer practices. Both are largely composed in *debide*, and, as I pointed out in 'Fianaigecht,' p. 3, in a ruder form of this metre. Such rhymes, e.g., as *aicille* : *menmae* (Fian., p. 10), where the unstressed *e* and *ae* alone rhyme, or *céle* : *ilmile* (Imr. Br., § 26), *forcenn* : *forban* (27), *esbad* : *órdath* (43), not to speak of *saint* : *sóerchlaind* (46), *úasal* : *doreariásat* (48), would not have been tolerated at a later period.

Now in these poems we also find what I will call the Welsh position of the rhyme. The following instances occur :—

<i>fil inis i n-eterchéin</i>	<i>imma taitnet gabra réin</i>	
		(Imr. Br. 1, § 4)
<i>cáine tire adamri</i>	<i>ata comgnísi cadli</i> (§ 11).	
<i>ce adcetha óinchairptech</i>	<i>i Maig Meld co n-imbud scoth</i>	(§ 39)
<i>silis lergga, lecht imchian,</i>	<i>dercfid róï, roth imm rian</i>	
		(§ 55)
<i>a hindech do margarét,</i>	<i>brecht la cerdda ci o rét.</i>	
		(Fian. p. 14, § 32)

Again, in a quatrain quoted under the year 619 in Tigernach's Annals we have :—

roptar lána a cuileda, roptar toirthig a treba.

That this quatrain must be dated pretty early is also evident from the rhyme *Mumu : Áedo*.

In Cormac's Glossary § 878, a quatrain is ascribed to Máedóc Ferna († 624), which begins with a faulty rhyme :

A chélén Dé chumachaig, a maicc Thulchán, a bachlaig!

The practice continued, however, into later times, though examples are not so numerous. It was evidently a licence which was but rarely used. I have collected the following examples :—

*Locht mór do Dún Cháiredo innách lúachair bongair dó
'a great fault for Dún Cáiredo that no rushes are reaped
for it,'¹*

from a poem in the story of Mór of Munster (LL 274^b 32 and 38).

A Diarmait, a mallchobair, úamun Gúari fon-fodair

in the 'Battle of Carn Conaill' (CZ iii, p. 204).

Cuirithir in t-athéces carsam, nímráinic a less,

'Liadain and Curithir,' p. 16. Hence in the same text, on p. 14, I ventured to arrange a quatrain, the verses of which have got mixed up in the manuscripts, as follows :—

nech dorísed ba mithig, a thopuir file fiad tig.

Thurneysen (CZ iv, 377) objected to this at the time ; and he has recently (CZ ix, 208) taken exception to the following line from the 'Brinna Ferchertne' (CZ iii, 44, § 18),

tar sain tucad écomlond for Echdaig, ní fo chumlond.

proposing to read *éc omlund* instead of *écomlond*. But the numerous examples quoted above will, I think, show that no such alteration is needed. I have no doubt that as more specimens of early poetry are published further instances of the practice will be found.

¹ Mistranslated by T. P. O'Nolan in his edition of the text (Proc. R.I.A., vol. xxx, sect. C, p. 270).

II

That in *debide* long stressed final vowels may rhyme with short unstressed ones, as *glé* with *aire*, is known to all students of Irish metrics. But it has not been recognized so far as I know that long monosyllables ending in a consonant may also rhyme with short unstressed syllables. It is true that this is rare and can only be regarded as a licence; but it is too frequent to be considered altogether exceptional or faulty. I have collected the following instances:—

<i>is foill ní dobeir gnúis mbáin</i>	<i>Ultáin mocu Conchobair,</i>
	Fél. ² 200, 33.
<i>dia frith gol is gréch is gáir</i>	<i>is munter discir dígair,</i>
	RC vii, 296, § 109.
<i>atbath Celchair cona dáil¹</i>	<i>fri Dún Lethglasse anair,</i>
	ib. xxiii, 308, 1.
<i>is aibind innister dáib</i>	<i>isin tsoiscél iar nEbraib,²</i> YBL 170a16.
<i>is mē rothōcaib, nī chēl,</i>	<i>Gaiar mac nārach Nōesen,</i> ib. 178a40.
<i>ocus cia bé dlug bías dūib,</i>	<i>is ūaithe in brug dar būadaib,</i>
	Metr. Dinds. iii, 42.
<i>is hē rothochail ar tūs</i>	<i>in carn sin, fa cāem-ārus,</i> ib. 422, 13.
<i>asbert fris in ben co mbail,</i>	<i>Mugain miadmas co mórchéil,</i>
	T. Ferbe, l. 823.
<i>drong na ndeochein, derb la cāch,</i>	<i>fri immarchor curtinad,</i>
	SR 4889.
<i>dia forcetal feib roddēt</i>	<i>co cenn nōi laa (leg. lathe) ndēēc,</i>
	ib. 1627.

Similarly, with rhyme-words of two and three syllables:

<i>ropsa altra dia athair,</i>	<i>am aite dia derbrāthair,</i> Anecd. ii, 71, 4.
<i>ni gébat frit gnúis ngrāddai</i>	<i>buidni borba barbardai,</i>

SR 5015.

KUNO MEYER

¹ Stokes reads *conad ail* 'so that it is a shame'; but see *Death-tales*, p. 44. The MS. has *dil*.

² Cp. CZ v, p. 24.

ST. VICTRICIUS OF ROUEN AND ST. PATRICK

THE late Professor Zimmer believed that there was a town in Roman Britain called Bannauenta, and that St. Patrick indicated that town as his own birthplace.¹ So far as St. Patrick's statement is concerned, this belief has no foundation in fact; and the word to which a certain group of syllables occurring in the 'Confessio Patricii' is accommodated is one out of several forms of the name of a station mentioned in three passages in the 'Itinerarium Antonini'.² No attempt has been made to determine the true form of this place-name, and the one selected can be proved to be unreliable.

The most ancient manuscript of the 'Itinerarium' is preserved in the Imperial Library at Vienna, and is styled 'L.' It is uncial in character, and dates from the eighth century. It yields the three following forms:—

Iter II. *Bannauenta.*

Iter VI. *Isna^{an}autia.*

Iter VIII. *Bannauanto.*

The confusion of the scribe at the second quotation is evident. Whether we are to read *Isnania* or *Isnauantia* is not clear. An unidentified copy of the 'Itinerary' used by Bertram of Copenhagen in his *Richard of Cirencester*,³ presented two variations, namely, *Isantauaria* and *Isannauaria*. These appear in *Pseudo-Richard* in Iter I and Iter XVIII respectively. They indicate that the scribe of the Vienna MS. had *Isannauantia* in his copy. Our immediate problem, then, is how to account for the collision of *B* and *Is*.

¹ *The Celtic Church in Britain and Ireland*, transl. A. Meyer, 1902, § 15, p. 43.

² *Itinerarium Antonini Augusti et Hierosolymitanum*, ed. G. Farthay and M. Pinder, 1848.

³ *Ricardi Monachi Westmonasteriensis Commentarioli Geographici de Situ Britanniae et Stationum*, ed. and transl. J. A. Giles, 1841.

For palæographical reasons an initial letter, the representations of which waver between *B* and *Is*, must be adjudged to have been that peculiar form of *D* which is just like *L* and *S* joined together at the base, the letter *L* being a little taller than the *S*.¹ The word, therefore, that Professor Zimmer and others have relied upon, represents *Dannouenta*; and as the station referred to was at Daventry (Da... vent[ry]), we need not hesitate to make the emendation required. For this reason the notion that St. Patrick was born at Daventry, in the centre of England, should be abandoned.

Muirchu macu Machthéni² fixed the seat of Patrick's family "haut procul a mari nostro"; and Probus,³ with equal truth but greater particularity, says "haud procul a mari occidentali." The pedigree in the Franciscan *Liber Hymnorum*⁴ derives Patrick's ancestry primarily from Ferinus, the son of Brittus, i.e., from the Morini Brython.⁵ This pedigree is in agreement, in this particular, with the statements of Muirchu and Probus.

In the 'Table of Dignitaries' (c. 405)⁶ we are informed that the Tribune of the First Cohort of Morini was stationed at Glannibanta. This is the nineteenth station in the list headed "Item per lineam valli." It immediately follows "Tunnocelo," and similarly precedes Aliona, Bremetennacum [MS. -nr- with r::n], Olenacum and Uirosidum. Consequently, if the phrase *per lineam valli* means anything, the station of Glannibanta must have been in Cumberland. *Tunno-(celum)* is a mistake

¹ Another interesting instance of the misreading of *D* as *IS* is "ISamnium," the name given by Ptolemy to the Promontory of the Irish Dumnii.

Other instances of the confusion of *D* and *B* in the text of the "Itinerarium" are "Eduraco" and "Burnovaria," for *Eburaco* and *Durnovaria*. These occur in the tenth-century Florence manuscript designated "R," and in the viiiith and xiiith Journeys therein, respectively. Yet another instance is "Baroavernus" for *Durovnum*, in the "Tabula Peutingeriana."

² "Extracts from the Brussels Codex of Muirchu's Life of St. Patrick": ed. Hogan, *Analecta Bollandiana*, 1882, i, 549-552, 575-577; ed. Wh. Stokes, *The Tripartite Life of Patrick*, "R.B.S.S.," No. 89, 1887, ii, 494.

³ "Beati Patricii . . . Vita et Actus, auctore Probo." This is the *Quinta Vita* of Colgan, *Trias Thaumaturga*, 1647, ii, 47 (51).

⁴ *Vide* Stokes, *u.s.*, p. 412.

⁵ *Vide* Skene, "IV Ancient Books," ii, 108, 301, 303. But the reference in the pedigree may have regard to Palladius exclusively: *v. ÉRIU*, vi, 120.

⁶ *Notitia Dignitatum*, ed. Otto Seeck, 1876.

for Turno-, and I would place it at Cardurnock, which is five miles from the western end of the Picts' Wall. In the two authorities, namely, the 'Table of Dignitaries' and the 'Itinerary of Antonine,' we get the following order :—

I.	II.	<i>m. p.</i>
Glannibanta	Clanoventa	
.....	Galavam . . . XVIII.	
Alionæ	Alonem . . . XII.	
.....	Galacum . . . XVIII.	
Bremetennaco	Bremetonacim.	XXVII.

In I the forms are locative; in II they are accusative, the first name in each column being excepted. The order and distances in the Tenth Journey (col. II), and the name Cardurn-ock, show that the instruction *per lineam ualli* should have been supplemented at "Tunnocelo" by the information that the end of the Wall had been reached. There is no need to suppose that the instruction meant that all the stations enumerated were on or even near the Wall. But Bremetennacum (Lancaster?), at a distance of seventy-six miles from Glannibanta, could not be described as *per lineam ualli*. The Tenth Journey proceeds southward to Mamucunium and Mediolanum. In view of the vocal confusion between *b* and *v*,¹ and the frequent collisions between *G* and *C*,² in the manuscripts, I believe we may regard *Glanni-banta* and *Clano-uentia* as really identical.³ Similarly *Alion-* and *Alon-* would appear to be due to scribal variation only. If we take *Glänobanta as the true form, the Welsh *glan* would require us to place the *bant* on the [sea]shore or on the

¹ Cf. 'Itinerarium,' Journey xv, wherein we get *Belgarum* : *Uelgarum*; also *Sorbiодони* for *Sorviодони* of Journey xii; *Vetasii* of the "Table of Dignitaries" for *Baetasii* of early diplomas; and *Mauri Beneti* in Armorica for *M. Veneti*, &c., &c.

² Cf. *Calleua* : *Galleua*; *Galava* : *Calava*; *Calacum* : *Galacum*; *Goccio* : *Coccio*, &c.

³ The vocable "banta" is interesting. We meet with it on the middle Rhine in the Alemannic folk-name "Bucinobantes"; we get it in "Brabant," in the country of the Nervii, and in "Tubantes"; and the true form of "Trinobantes" is still disputed. As the Trinobantes were Belgæ, and the First Morini were stationed at Glannibanta, the connexion might, perhaps, incline us to reject the form in -uentia altogether.

strand of a river. I know of no other indication of the position of the quarters of the First Morini.

The Morini were Belgæ. They served in the Britannias at least as early as A.D. 103. Their neighbours the Nervii were also Belgæ; and four Nervian regiments served here in 105 and 124. In the 'Table of Dignitaries' we are apprised that there was a company of the Dictensian Nervians at Dictis (locative, *Dicti*); that the Third Nervian Cohort lay at Aliona, about thirty miles from "Glannibanta," and the Sixth at Virosidum. All these stations were situated in either Cumberland or Westmorland. Consequently there must have been a large number of colonists of Belgic origin in Cumbria, in the closing years of the fourth century, whether we classify them severally as Morini and Nervians, or collectively as "Morini Brython."

The bearing of these facts upon our inquiry must now be made clear. Patrick tells us¹ that, after he returned to his native land in the Britannias (in about 395), he was powerfully influenced by a dream:—

"in sinu noctis uirum uenientem quasi de Hiberione cui nomen Victoricus [-icius, MS. C] cum aepistolis innumerabilibus uidi; et dedit mihi unam ex his et legi principium aepistolae continentem: 'Vox Hyperionacum'"

I identify this Victoricus, or Victoricius, with St. Victricius, the bishop of Rouen from 383 to 415. He had laboured ardently and successfully among the Morini and the Nervii, whose respective countries were not very far distant from his see. At about the year given above, *sc.* 395, he visited the Britannias. His mission was undertaken at the request of the bishops of Northern Italy.² Its object may have been the refutation of Arianism and the cleansing of the insular Churches therefrom.

¹ *Vide* "Confessio Patricii," ed. Wh. Stokes, *Tripartite Life*, p. 364, from the Book of Armagh, fo. 23b(2).

² Haddan and Stubbs fixed this mission at about, or rather before, 396. The "Liber de Laude Sanctorum" of St. Victricius (apud Migne, *Patrologia*, xx, 1845, col. 443) was written in 396, or later. In it Victricius says: "Nam quod ad Britannias profectus sum, quod ibi moratus sum vestrorum feci executio praeceptorum Hoc ego Domini Iesu et vestrum salutare praeceptum intra Britannias exercui, si non ut debui tamen ut potui."

Victricius's good works "in terra Morinorum situ orbis extrema," and "in remotissimo Neruici littoris tractu," are eulogized by Bishop Paulinus of Nola in *Epistola XVIII*; apud Migne, *Patrologia*, lxi, 1847, col. 239.

The profound interest that Victricius took in the spiritual well-being of the Belgæ is a matter of common knowledge; and I submit that the propositions—(1) that Victricius when in the Britannias penetrated as far as Cumbria, (2) that he ministered there among the Britannic Morini and Nervii, and (3) that St. Patrick saw and heard him, was profoundly influenced by his example, and named him correctly, are reasonable propositions to make.

ALFRED ANSCOMBE

MID-SIXTEENTH-CENTURY NUMBERS AND PHRASES

THE words and phrases that follow here are an excerpt from an English book of the Tudor period, to wit, *The Fyrst Boke of the Introduction of Knowledge made by Andrew Borde of Physycke Doctor*, published in 1547,¹ but of which the materials must have been gathered together more than five years earlier, for the Dedication is dated 1542. Dr. Borde's book was clearly intended to illustrate his travels, which extended as far as the north of Africa. Fortunately, unlike most travellers, Borde, in almost every case, gives specimens of the languages of countries visited by him, his record being of all the more interest because some of the languages, as, for instance, Cornish, are no longer living tongues. The Welsh and Cornish portions have already been edited.

Borde's record of colloquial Irish is rather scanty, consisting, as it does, of only twenty-eight numbers and twenty-six phrases, and that being so, one cannot be expected to infer very much from it in the way of dialect. Nevertheless, it seems possible to infer something, despite the scantiness of material. As there are clear traces of many of the peculiarities of the south-eastern (Meath-Oriel) variety of the northern main dialect, and also some well-marked divergences from it, it seems fairly safe to infer that Borde probably recorded the speech of some part of the north of the ancient Laighin (Leinster)² bordering on Meath. As almost all English travellers of the time were bound to have arrived first in Dublin before reaching any other part of Ireland, there is some likelihood of these numbers and phrases having been drawn from the Irish then spoken in the city and county of Dublin. Indeed, one of his spellings *-ewe-*, *-ew-* = Ir. *ao* may represent a sound that is at present in vogue in the

¹ Edited by F. J. Furnivall. Early English Text Soc., 1870.

² The Liffey and Rye Water were the ancient boundary between Leinster and Meath.

speech of the common folk of Dublin, viz. *īw*, which is substituted for that of *oo* in such words as *boots* (" *bīwts* "), &c. I shall, however, give a list, as impartial as possible, showing agreements, not only with Meath-Oriel, but also with other dialects, so as to enable anyone who so desires to arrive at his own conclusion from all the data.

Against the above conclusion must be set a piece of internal evidence—though it be a single instance. This is the mention of Waterford being twenty-one miles away, presumably from the place in which phrase 44 is supposed to have been uttered—a fact that should point to some district much nearer Waterford than Dublin is, at least as regards that one phrase. There is, also, however, the possibility that this particular phrase may really be in an artificial setting, no specific place being intended by the description " It is one an twenty myle." Everyone knows how little permissible it is to argue from a single instance. Hence all that one can do is, as mentioned in the previous paragraph, viz., to proceed from the known of to-day to the unknown of Borde's period.

The record, scanty though it be, is valuable as showing that the colloquial Irish was characterized 370 years ago by the same peculiarities we find in it nowadays. We notice the clippings and elisions of to-day just as strongly marked four centuries ago. These are: (1) the loss of a pretonic vowel, *e.g.*, *nish*, 52 = 'nois, *tato*, 31 = 'tá tú; (2) initial consonantal elision, *e.g.*, -n (-n *wely*), 30 = 'na = *chuin an* (*chum an*), as found in Ulster, Louth, and Meath, to which may perhaps be added *auer*, probably a mistake for **aner*, 48 = *chuin ar* (*chum ár*); (3) loss of the -n of the article and interrogative particle, *e.g.*, *ano[1]ha*, 29 = a' n-ólfá, -n' (-n *wely*), 30, for 'na', *benyte*, 38, 41, 49 = *bean a' tighe*, *farate*, 39 = *fear a' tighe*; (4) the reduction of *do* to *a* and consequent omission of it altogether, *e.g.*, *glog*, 46, 47 (for [a] *ghlog*) = 'chlog = a chlog = do chlog; (5) the elision of the interrog. part. *an* in *woll*, 33 = 'bhfuil, as commonly in Leath Chuinn to-day; (6) loss of a very lightly pronounced obscure vowel, *e.g.*, *gramahagood*, 32 = g' ra' math agud, just as one hears the opening words in many parts of Munster to-day; (7) the -f of the future was either silent or pronounced as *h*, *e.g.*, *yeke ke*, 50 = *tocfa*, -o[1]ha, 29 = ólfá; (8) the elision of a final vowel in *ih*, 53 = *oidhch'*, *feh*, 20 = *fich'*, &c., as existent to-day

in some districts ; (9) one even finds an elision not traceable nowadays, e.g., sor, 54 = *soraidh*, which is of much the same class as the preceding ; (10) perhaps already the evolution of the barbarous 1st pers. plur. pron. *muid*, for *rah moyd* (= *racha muia*) is twice (48, 51) so written as two words, this, however, being very doubtful, for we find *yeke ke*, 50 = *iocta* also written as two words, and *tato*, 31 = *tá tú* as one, &c.

AGREEMENT WITH MEATH-ORIEL

feh, 20 = *fich'*, 'twenty.'

feet, 21, &c. = *fichead* (pron. *fíot*, i.e. *fich'd*).

feet, 27 = *fichid* (pron. *fít*, i.e. *fich'd*).

eges, 26 = *agus*.

dayth, 26 = *dá fhichead* (pron. *dá íot*, i.e. *dá fhich'd*).

-in chow, 35 = *innseo*, 'here.'

toor, 38, &c. = *tabhair* (pron. *tóir*).

haran, 38 = *arán* (pron. *ar'-án*).

teena, 43 = *téana*, 'do,' imptv. 2 S.

o showh, 44 = *ó seo*, 'from this.'

gath haad, 44 = *gá h'fad* (*gá h-a fhad*).

rah moyd, 48, 51 = *racha muid*.

doyen, 49 = *duinn*, 'to us'; cf. moyd = *muid*; doyt (doit), 54 ; and for addition of -e- hewen.

soper, 48 = *soipeár*, *suipeár*.

may, 53 = *maith*.

kaar, 4 = *ceathair* (pron. *ceáir*, Meath ; *céir*, Oriel).

ga, 44, 46, 48, 51 = *gá* (Mon.). [Written *gath*, 44.]

-ee, 34 = *dhí*.

gaued, 46 = *gá mhéad*.

Ih, 53 = *oidhch*.

Tam a, 32 = *tá mě* (*mě* pron. *mea*).

kaardeek, 14 = *ceathairdéag*; cf. *Damh Liac* (Meath, pron. *dúlliac*) = *Daimhliag*, 'Duleek.'

AGREEMENT WITH OTHER DIALECTS

showght, 7 = *seacht*: like Con. *shóχθ*.

howght, 8 = *hocht*: like Con. *húχθ*.

howghtdeek, 18 = *hochtdéag*.

goomawh, 32 = *go math* (Muns., Ossory).
 gramahagood, 32 = *g' ra' math agud*.
 oket, 33 = *acat* (*agat*): like Sc. *aküθ*.
 Kanys tato, 31 = *ca'nnus tá tú* (Wat., Ossory).
 De wa-, 30 = *Dé bheatha* (Muns.).
 mah, 32 = *math* (Muns., Ossory).
 sowgh, 43 = *subhach* (Muns., Con.).
 countes, 49 = *cúntas* (Muns., Oss.).
 pyn Iny, 50 = *pingine, -í* (Muns.).
 yeke ke to, 50 = *tocfa tú* (Con.).

[In Oriel only used in the sense of being requited : *tocfa tú sin*, 'you'll pay for that' = you'll be requited, &c. Otherwise *díolfa tú* is the usage = 'you'll pay' (a sum of money).]

keede, 28 = *ciad* (Sc.)? for *céad*, but it is possible that Borde used *ee* in two values, (1) *i*, e.g. feet, &c., (2) *é*, e.g. deek = *déag*, teena = *téana*, 43, feene, 52 = *féin*?
 -n wely, 30 = *'na bhaile* (Don.).
 syn, 34 = *soin* (Ossory).
 feene, 52 = *féin*, pron. *fin* (Glenfinn, Don., and Sc.)?

IDIOSYNCRASY

hewen, 1 = *haon*, 'one.'
 -k, 5, &c. = -*g*, in quiek (*cúig*), hewnek (*haonáig*), -deek (*déag*), &c.; cf. *thainic* (Con., Uls.), *thuc* (E. Con.) = *thug*, &c., *Damh Liac*, 'Duleek' (Meath).
 myle hewriht, 45 = *mile hao' r fhichid* (*mile a haon ar fhichid*).
 Gah hon rah moyd holowh, 51 = *gá chuin racha muid a chodlaadh*, which contrasts in some respects with its Oriel form: *gá huair a racha muid a luighe*, and in others with that of Munster: *Cá chuin a raghamíd a chodla?* Borde's phrase may be set down as transitional.
 port laarg, 44 = *Port Láirg*. [Neither Northern nor Southern, as we find *Port Láirce* (Omeath), *Port Láirge* (Muns.).]
 galow, 33 = *Gaedhleagh* (?) for *Gaedhealg*? Final -*g* aspirated as in *thánagh* (Muns.) = *thánag*. [Sharply distinct from any of the numerous present dialectic forms.]

GLIDE, BROAD AND SLENDER, MARKED, CHIEFLY BEFORE
 -n, BY -e-

hewen, 1 = *haon*, but hewnek = *haondéag*.

doyen, 49 = *duinn*, but doyt = *duit*.

teena (?), 43 = *téana*.

feene (?), 52 = *féin*.

yeke ke, 50 = *iocta*.

LOSS OF FINAL -e AND -aidh

port laarg, 44 = *Port Láirg'*.

Ih, 53 = *oidhch'*.

feh, 20 = *fich'*.

sor, 54 = *sor'* (*soraidh*, 'farewell').

The dialect represented appears to have had the Northern sound of -adh, e.g. holowh, 51 = *chodladh*, but the Southern and Western pronunciation of -ach, e.g. sowgh, 43, = *subhach*. It had not the Meath-Oriel-Down weakening of -ch- before -t, for showght, 7 = seacht, howght, 8 = *hocht*, with which cf. Ballybought (Inq. Jac. I), now Ballybough (part of the city of Dublin) = *Baile Bocht*, a single instance sufficient to prove that the Meath loss of -ch did not extend to Dublin. The Southern *Ca'nnus tá tú* (Kanys tato, 31) appears in accord with *Cones tá tú* of Baron Delvin's Primer (Nat. MSS. of Ireland).

The conclusion from the above data is naturally that we have here a form of speech intermediate between Meath-Oriel and that of the South and West, hence probably that of Leinster as situate between Meath and Ossory. With this the few idiosyncrasies traceable are in agreement; especially *Gah hon rah moyd holowh*, which, as I have shown, is transitional between those of Oriel and Munster.

In these phrases there is only one clear case of Anglicism (v. 43), and that of a kind firmly rooted in the colloquial Irish of the present, cf. *ag déanamh go tioghbhusach* (Con.), &c. Another peculiarity which looks like Anglicism and is certainly impossible Irish has really a different explanation. I allude to what is found in phrases 29, 33, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 49, and 53, in which we have the words *sor* (?), *cailín*, *bean*, and *fear* not used in the indispensable vocative form. I believe that Borde simply tacked on these words to the phrases he had originally heard without them in order to titivate or "trick them

out a bit" to please himself. As to *sor*, no one ever hears to-day anything but *a dhuine uasail* everywhere. Borde may have found this too difficult to note down, and through indolence have used the English word which has always had a certain currency in usages like *Sir Balbhuaidh*, &c., i.e. in knightly names.

The numbers and phrases that follow are numbered consecutively to the end. The ciphers, therefore, have no connexion with the numbers, although they mostly happen to coincide with them. The italics represent my own solution in Irish orthography of each example.

1. one	Hewen	<i>haon</i>
2. two	dow	<i>dó</i>
3. thre	tre	<i>trí</i>
4. foure	kaar	<i>ceathair</i>
5. fyue	quiek	<i>cúig</i>
6. syx	seth	<i>sé</i>
7. seuen	showght	<i>seacht</i>
8. eyght	howght	<i>hocht</i>
9. nyne	nygh	<i>naoi</i>
10. ten	deh	<i>deich</i>
11. aleuyn	hewnek	<i>haondéag</i>
12. twelue	dowek	<i>dódhéag</i>
13. thirtene	tredeek	<i>trídéag</i>
14. fourtene	kaardeek	<i>ceathairdéag</i>
15. fyuetene	quiekdeek	<i>cúigdéag</i>
	[qulekdeek B] ¹	
16. syxtene	sehdeek	<i>sédéag</i>
17. seuentene	showghtdeek	<i>seachtdéag</i>
18. eyghtene	howghtdeek	<i>hochtdéag</i>
19. nynetene	nythdeek	<i>naoidéag</i>
20. twenty	feh	<i>fich'</i>
21. one & twenty	hewn feet	<i>haon fíchead</i>
22. .ii. & twenty	dowhfeet	<i>dó fíchead</i>
23. thre & twenty	trefeet	<i>trí fíchead</i>
24. Thirty	Dehfeet	<i>deich fíchead</i>
25. forty	eayfeet	<i>dhd fíchead</i>
	[recte <i>dhd fíchead</i>]	
26. fyfty	dewhegesdayth	<i>deich agus dá fíchead</i>
	[dewhegesnayth B] ¹	
27. syxt	trefeet	<i>trí fíchid</i>
28. a hondred	keede	<i>céad</i>

¹ Quotations from another ms.

29. God sped you, syr ! Anoha dewh, sor ! *A' n-o[l]fá deoch, [sor]?*

30. You be welcome to the towne. De wan wely. *Dé bheatha 'na bhaile.*

31. How do you fare ? Kanys tato ? *Ca'nnus tá tú ?*

32. I do fare well, I thanke you. Tam a goomawh gramah-agood. *Tá mě go math, g' rai' math agud.*

33. Syr, can you speke Iryshe ? Sor, woll galow oket ? [Sor], 'bhfuil *Gaedhleagh acat ?*

34. I can speke a lytle. Tasyn agomee. *Tá soin agam dhi.*

35. Mayden, come hether, and gyue me som meate ! Kalyn, tarin chow, toor dewh ! [Cailín], tar innseo, tabhair deoch.

36. Wyfe, haue you any good meate ? Benitee, wyl beemah hagoot ? [Bean] a' tighe, 'bhfuil biadh math agut ?

37. Syr, I haue enoughe. Sor, tha gwyler. [Sor], tá go leór.

38. Wyfe, gyue me bread ! Benytee, toor haran ! [Bean] a' tighe, tabhair arán.

39. Man, gyue me wine ! Farate, toor fyen ! [Fear] a' tighe, tabhair fion.

40. Mayden, gyue me chese ! Kalyn, toor case ! [Cailín], tabhair cáis.

41. Wyfe, gyue me fleshe ! Benytee, toor foeule ! [Bean] a' tighe, tabhair feoil.

42. Gyue me some fyshe ! Toor yeske ! *Tabhair iasg.*

43. Much good do it you ! Teena go sowgh ! *Téana go subhach.*

44. How far is it to Waterford ? Gath haad o showh go port laarg ? *Gá h'fhad o seo go Port Láirg'?*

45. It is one an twenty myle. Myle hewryht. *Mile hao' r fhichid* (Mile a haon ar fhichid).

46. What is it a clocke ? Gaued bowleh glog ? *Gá mhéad buille a chlog ?*

47. It is .vi. a clocke. She wylly a glog. *Sé bhuiille a chlog.*

48. Whan shal we go to supper ? Gahad (leg. Gah hon, 51) rah moyd auer (leg. aner?) soper ? *Gá h'fhad* (leg. *Gá chuin ?*) *rachamuid 'un ar suipeir ?* [Perhaps for *Gá h'fhad go*, &c.]

49. Giue me a rekenyng, wyfe. Toor countes doyen, benitee. *Tabhair cíntas duinn, [bean] a' tighe.*

50. Ye shall pay .iii. pens. Yeke ke to tre pyn Iny. *Iocfa tú trí pinginni.*

51. Whan shal I go to slepe, wyfe? Gah hon rah moyd holow? *Ga chuin rachamuid a chodladh?*

52. By an by. Nish feene. *'Nois féin.*

53. Good night, sir! Ih may sor! *Oidhch' maith* (recte *mhaith*), [sor]!

54. Fare wel. fare wel! Sor doyt, sor doit! *Sor' duit, sor' duit!* [Soraidh duit.]

Thus endeth the maner and speche of Irland.

NOTES

29. It is evident that Borde made a mistake here, either by setting down his informant's personal question: "A' n-ólfa deoch ?" = "Would you take a drink ?" as the equivalent of the phrase he wanted translated, or by passing over a line in transcribing and so bringing two phrases, one English and the other Irish, together that did not belong to one another.

34. Leg. Tasym? Hence *Tá suim agam dhi* = I have something of it. Otherwise *Tá soin agam dhi* = I have that [much] of it, but such a phrase is unknown to me in present usage which is *Sin a bhfuil agam di* or *Tá an méid sin agam di*.

35. The Irish represents "... bring a drink." Borde may have here confused two similar phrases, one containing "meate" and the other "drink." No. 36 shows that he should have had "bee" = "meate."

40. "case" may represent either *cáis* or *caise*.

43. The Irish = "be merry" (mirthful, cheery), *lit.* do mirthfully.

45. The form of this in Irish is very strange, although its equivalence with the English is quite plain. The common way is *mile is fishe*.

46. I do not recollect having heard the exact Irish of this, though I believe it possible for Meath-Oriel. I know the following, however: *Cé bhuelle a chlog é?* (Roscommon), *an 'mó buille a chlog é?* (Mid-Cork), with *buille*, whilst without it there are *cad a chlog é?* (Muns.), *goidé a chlog é?* (Uls.)

47. She wylly = *sé bhuelle*: In this we find the common colloquial rule of to-day, viz., the aspiration of the initial consonant when the singular of the noun is used after a plural numeral.

48. Borde evidently confused *gá h'fhad*, 'how far,' with *gá chuin*, when? in this phrase.

49. The Irish = give us, &c.

50. The Irish = thou shalt pay, &c.

51. The Irish = when shall we go to bed?

52. 'By and by' = 'immediately, at once,' in the contemporary English. The Irish = "even now, just now, this moment."

BÓ THÚIR

IN *Fled Bricrend* § 9 the following passage occurs:—Atá bó thúir and dianat slána a sechtí mbliadna: o robo loeg bec ní dechaid fraech nó foigdech inna beólu acht firlemnacht ocus luigfér glasfeoir ocus arbar. Here Windisch's rendering of *bó thúir* as 'Kuh-herr = Stier' is unconvincing. Cf. *bó-aire*, 'stock-owner, cowherd.' The common word *túir*, 'chief,' has a short vowel, as is attested in plenty of metrical examples; so if the mark of length is correct, it cannot be the word here. It is very likely that in this passage we have the gen. sg. of the comparatively rare, and rather obscure, word *túir*, which seems to mean 'cornland,' or 'crops': *bó thúir* might then be equivalent to 'stall-fed cow.' I subjoin several examples of *túir*, the quantity of the vowel being fixed in the metrical instances by the rime:—

(1) bliadhain don cuaille co cert: a tri don gurt na glasbert [i.e.] na thúir 7 na athtur 7 an tres na trestur. Book of Fermoy, [156]a.

(2)ioth an túir tairthi na srebh: gach dúil ag aithni th'airghedh. R.I.A. A iv 3, p. 648.

(3) feedha lúbtha limnte tiorma: tobuir mhillse os mhoighibh túir: mil fan gcongal re headh nuaire: ag donna sreabh nuaine a húir. R.I.A. 3 B 14, p. 36.

(4) gach cnú chorr ag cur a blaoisce: fa bhun slaite ar slios túir (: úir). Kuno Meyer Miscellany, p. 172.

(5) learga túir braonchláir bhanbha: fan laochdáimh ndúir ndanardha. R.I.A. 3 C 13, p. 635.

(6) brat do chlúimh tríthe do theilg: ódchíthe leirg túir a T[h]aidhg. *Ibid.* p. 604.

(7) mar budh clach aoil gach tegh túir (: múir). *Ibid.* p. 680.

(8) gabhla ní cabhair do chraoibh: na habhla do shaluigh céir: ní thug tuar a ttacha clúimh: clacha an túir na ngual ón ngréin. *Ibid.* p. 602.

(9) gráinne ghuirt dergthúir (: súil). R.I.A. A iv 3, p. 862.

MODERN IRISH *TEÓRA* 'LIMIT, BORDER.'

PEDERSEN, Aspirationen i Irsk, p. 190, and Vergleichende Grammatik I, p. 241, brings this word from W *terfyn* with metathesis. It would then be a younger doublet of *tearmann*. The Aran form *tōrəN'* with broad *t* he explains as due to the fact that *t* and *t'* fall together when lenited. While there is no phonetic impossibility in the change postulated, one would like to see other instances in support of the metathesis *-eru-* > *-eur-* in loan-words. But the real objection to Pedersen's etymology is a historic one. The forms with broad *t* are the older.

The word is common in bardic poetry. I give some examples in which the rime is decisive.

tóraann : *drólann*

coinde cladh na cōic tōraann
ag drólann ban foid Éreann.—R.I.A. C II 3², 6b.

táraind : *álainn*

do lingsean tīr tar a tāraind
sinnser an trīr álainn óig.—ib. 5a.

co tōrainn¹ Rodhba re rādh
as forba álainn iomlān.—Top. Poems, O'Dubhagáin,
p. 60.

tóraann : *cnódhonn*

rannfa meisí ós mé do fidir
aithne a tōraann
i ndíbh leithibh críoch fúar Éirionn
na ccúan ccnódhonn.—Bk. of O'Conor Don,
f. 29a.

tóronna : *cnódhonna*

muighe cnódhonna chrú cCais
is tóronna brú Bernais.—R.I.A. 23 L 17, p. 74a.

¹ leg. *tárainn*. Many words containing *ó* have doublets with *á*, which are very common in verse; a poet writes *ród* or *rád*, *fód* or *fád*, *tionól* or *tionál*, as the metre requires.

tórranna : *mónanna*

led ghruaidh móanna ón mall sriobh
tórranna Ghall is Ghaoidhiol.—ib. p. 58a.

tórranna (sic leg.) : *mórurra*

mórurra gach rī do rad
 trī tórranna do thacmacc.—C II 3² 4b.

tóra : *cródha*

iath cródha soighionrod seang
tóra oirerbhog Éireann.—23 L 17, 38b.

Similar forms are found in prose: *crioch* 7 *torann Ereann*. FM. I 116z: *nach faicci fein . . . torainn in morlongephui?* CCath. 2996–8 (Stokes in his glossary analyses *torainn* ‘outline’ as *to-rinn*, which would have given **tuirinn*; it is obviously *tórainn*). The denominative *tórrannaighim* ‘I march on, I border,’ occurs twice in Maund. § 7, *rígdacht na hUngaire thórannaighes re rígdacht na Poidle*, and *rígdacht Rois thórannaighes ré ríghdhacht téire an tsnechta*.

Its earlier sense is ‘the act of marking out, marking off,’ of ground for buildings, etc.: *ag torainn chille i nDál Araíadhe, Buile Suibhne*, p. 2. This is simply O.Ir. *tórand* (commonly analysed **to-fo-rind-*, perhaps rather **to-od-* or **to-oss-rind-*, ÉRIU iii. 66) used as in *contísed Patric do thoorund a luic lais* ‘until Patrick should have come to mark out his place,’ Thes. II, 242, to which the corresponding verb preterite is *durind*, ib. As Thurneysen has pointed out, *tórand* serves as vn. both to *do-fóirndeá* and *du-rinda*.¹ The development of the more general sense of ‘limit, border’ is the same as in the word *mark* in the Teutonic languages.

In O’Mulc. Gloss. 823, the gen. sg. is *tóraind*, but in Atkinson’s PH. the dat. is always *tóraind* ‘denotation.’ That an O.Ir. neut. should become fem., or that a fem. noun ending in *-nd*, *-nn*, should become attached to the *n*-stems, is of course nothing exceptional. The change of *tóra* to *teóra* is accounted for by the very confusion of lenited *t* and *t'* to which Pedersen appeals in postulating the opposite change. *tórranna* is still the

¹ In Archiv iii. 303, § 9, the pf. is *dosrórann* (sic leg.); the quantity of the *ó* is established by the consonance with *scribenn* and *irenn*.

form in the NT. of 1602, *Acts xvii. 26* (retained in the edition of 1681). On the other hand, in the OT. of 1685 the forms with slender *t* appear to be the only ones: nom. sg. *teóra*, Num. xxxiv. 3, 4, 5, *tebra*, ib. 11, 12, etc., and the slender forms are common in Late Modern Irish. But I have not noted *teóra* in classical verse. Whether the Aran form is a survival of Early Mod. Ir. *tóra*, dat. and acc., or an accidental reversion to this through the later *teóra*, cannot now be decided.

OSBORN BERGIN

THE AUTHORSHIP AND STRUCTURE OF THE "ANNALS OF TIGERNACH"

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I. Extent of our knowledge regarding Tigernach. II. The writings ascribed to Tigernach. III. False guise of annals imposed on Fragments I and II. IV. Notes on the edition by Stokes. V. The existing structure of Fragments I and II. VI. The original structure of Fragments I and II. VII. Growth and transformation of the text. VIII. The "Chronicon Eusebii" continued in Ireland to A.D. 607. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> IX. The "Old Irish Chronicle" compiled c. A.D. 712. X. Chronography of the Old Irish Chronicle. XI. Structure and authorship of the "Dublin Fragment." XII. Chronographic formulæ of the "Annals of Tigernach." XIII. Summary of the development of the "Annals of Tigernach." XIV. The oldest known history of pre-Christian Ireland. XV. An Irish "Synchronism" related to Fragments I and II.
---	--

I.—THE EXTENT OF OUR KNOWLEDGE REGARDING TIGERNACH

THE authentic record of Tigernach is contained in obituary notices in the Irish annals.

Annals of Tigernach, A.D. 1088: "Huc usque Tigernach scripsit *ocht ar ochtmogait* quieuit."

Annals of Ulster, A.D. 1088: "Tighernach Hua Broein, airc[h]innech Cluana-mac-Nóis ['monastic chief of Clonmacnois'], in Christo quieuit."

The foregoing are the only contemporary notices of Tigernach that have been discovered. He is not mentioned in the Annals of Inisfallen.

The next known mention of Tigernach is in the *Chronicum Scottorum*, compiled by Dubhaltach Mac Fir-Bhisigh in the middle of the seventeenth century (c. 1650): "1088. Tigernach Ua Brain, do Shil Muiredhaigh, comharba Chiaráin Chluana-mac-Nois ocus Chomáin, d'ég ['of Síl Muiredaig, successor of Ciarán of Clonmacnois and (successor) of Comán, died']. Síl

Muirendaig, "seed of Muiredach,"¹ was the name of the principal sept of the Ui Briúin of Connacht. To this sept the kings of Connacht and many noble families belonged. Among these was the family surnamed Ua Broín (Ua Broein, Ua Braín, Ua Braoin). Thus "do Shil Muiredhaigh" is merely an obvious amplification by the chronicler, who was likewise a genealogist. We do not know on what authority, so long after the death of Tigernach, he is stated to be "successor of Comán," i.e. monastic chief of Roscommon, or whether he held authority first in Roscommon and later in Clonmacnois, or concurrently in both establishments.

So far, except for the words "huc usque scripsit" in the Annals of Tigernach, there is no mention of Tigernach as an historian. The Four Masters do not name him in the list of authorities used by them. They name, however, in that list "the Book of Clonmacnois," and further on they state that "the Book of Cluain [Mac Nois] and the Book of the Island," already called by them "the Book of Oilean na Naemh in Loch Ribh," "come down only to the year of our Lord's age 1227." Both books were unknown to O'Curry. The words used by the Four Masters imply clearly that both contained a record of events for some time not specified. It is unlikely that the record in both ended in the same year, 1227—unless one was copied from the other, or both were transcripts of one original, and in either case the Four Masters would probably have noted the fact. At all events, the description is applicable neither to the chronicle known as the Annals of Clonmacnois nor to the other known book preserved by that monastery, *Lebor na hUidre*. It therefore seems pretty certain that the Book of Clonmacnois contained a consecutive historical record older than the extant Annals of Clonmacnois, which reach down to 1408. Now the Annals of Tigernach were compiled in Clonmacnois, and were continued there as far as the year 1178. It is not probable that another chronicle, ending in 1227 or perhaps somewhat earlier—for the date 1227 may have reference only to the Book of the Island, which may have covered nearly the same period as the Book of Clonmacnois—was also kept in

¹ Muiredach † 702, son of Fergus † 654, son of Rogallnech, king of Connacht, † 649.

the same monastery, or that the chronicle now associated with the name of Tigernach, chief of the monastery, was unknown to the Four Masters. Hence we may reasonably infer that the Book of Clonmacnois known to them contained a version of the Annals of Tigernach. If so, we may note that the Four Masters did not ascribe the compilation of this record to Tigernach, and did not know it by the name of the Annals of Tigernach.

That name, Annals of Tigernach, is first cited by O'Conor from Ware's list of contents of the MS. Rawlinson 488: "Annales Tigernachi (Erenachi, ut opinor, Clonmacnoisensis) usque ad annum Salutis 1088, quo obiit, a folio 1.—Continuatio Tigernachi usque ad annum 1178, a folio 20." So far as I have traced, then, it would appear that the title Annals of Tigernach was not attached to this chronicle until the time of Ware, the middle of the seventeenth century; perhaps for the first time by Ware himself, or by his collaborator, Dubhaltach Mac Fir-Bhisigh, compiler of *Chronicum Scottorum*, in which the Annals of Tigernach are freely used as a source. All that Ware says of Tigernach, beyond naming the chronicle from him, is found in Tigernach's obit in the Annals of Ulster. But the words "Continuatio Tigernachi" imply that Ware regarded Tigernach as author or compiler of the chronicle contained in Rawlinson 488 (i.e. of the Second, Third, and Fourth Fragments) as far as 1088.¹

With the naming of Tigernach by Ware, what we may call the legend of Tigernach sets out on its course; and successive writers find satisfaction in building up a personality and a reputation, where six preceding centuries show nothing but a name.

Within the years 1765-1775, Sean Ua Maolchonaire (or Ua Conaire) compiled in Paris a chronicle which has been allowed to usurp and duplicate the title of an older chronicle, the Annals of Innisfallen. The older Annals of Innisfallen contain no mention of Tigernach. The later compilation has more to say of him than is found in all the known earlier

¹ O'Conor, *Rerum Hibernicarum Scriptores*, vol. ii, p. ii. From the preceding page, it appears that Ware failed to connect Fragment I, contained in Rawlinson, B 502, with the Annals of Tigernach.

notices combined: "1088. Tiagarnach Hua Brain, of Siol Muireadhaigh, successor of Ciarán of Cluain-mac-Nois and of Comán, *illustrious sage in wisdom and in learning, and professor of eloquence, and the man who wrote the Annals of Ireland as far as this year, died, and was buried in Cluain-mac-Nois.*"

O'Conor (vol. ii, p. 83), though he had already treated at length of Tigernach, is stirred by this eulogy to rival its praises, not the less, as he makes clear, because he is able to claim kindred, though in a very remote degree, with the illustrious sage. He thus annotates the notice: "Glorior inter meos Majores extitisse antiquissimum omnium Historicorum Septentrionalium qui *Annales Patrios lingua vernacula descripsere*. Glorior etiam virum fuisse *Sanctum*, et doctum, qui *bibliothecam instructissimam habuisse videtur, et Sacras literas impense coluit* Saeculo ferreo. Obiit enim *grandaevus anno 1088.*" Already, by 1775, Tigernach, unknown as a historian to the Four Masters, and known to his contemporaries as a monastic chief, has become a sage, a professor, and the author of a complete chronicle of Ireland. The place of his burial is at length made known. In 1825, he has become holy; we see him surrounded by a well-furnished library, and diligently pursuing the study of sacred literature, and the curtness of the older obituary notices is relieved by the newly ascertained fact that he died at a great age. And all this is but a postscript to the voluminous tribute that O'Conor has already paid to the personality of Tigernach. Every ancient writer, from Eusebius to Bede, that is named in the chronicle, we are asked to believe, was quoted direct by Tigernach from the MSS. of his well-equipped library. Beyond all things, one sentence, which, we must not doubt, was originally penned by Tigernach, is held remarkable: "Omnia monumenta Scottorum usque Cimbaeth incerta erant." Here is the proof that Tigernach was not alone the one great chronicler of Irish antiquity, but was also an historical critic—rarest of birds in that age.

The definite assurance of O'Conor produced a mesmeric effect on later writers. O'Curry takes up the legend with perfect confidence. "As to Tighernach's personal history," he says candidly, "but little unfortunately is known." In quoting that little, he refrains from reproducing O'Conor's epithets

“sanctus” and “grandaevus.” But his own word, “unfortunately,” shows that he is under the same temptation to look for more ample detail than could be found, and he uses a rather expansive paraphrase of the notice in *Chronicum Scottorum*: “He appears to have risen to high consideration and ecclesiastical rank, for we find that he was Abbot of the Monasteries of Clonmacnois and Roscommon.”¹ Now the known contemporary evidence goes no farther than to say that Tigernach was *airchinnech* of Clonmacnois; and O’Curry translates *airchinnech* in the same work by “lay impropriator,”² and again explains that, “after the Danish wars, . . . the *Airchinnechs* . . . were seldom, if ever, ecclesiastics.”³ O’Curry, too, says unaccountably that the statements regarding Tigernach in the *Chronicum Scottorum* (seventeenth century) and in Ua Maolchonaire’s so-called “Annals of Inisfallen” (eighteenth century) “are confirmed in the Annals of Ulster.” I have already given in full the notices to which O’Curry refers. O’Curry demurs to the claim set up for Tigernach by O’Conor that he was the earliest of northern historians; but in other respects he echoes O’Conor’s tribute to the great learning, industry, etc., of Tigernach, “whose name,” he says, “stands among the first of Irish annalists.” “Tighernach himself was undoubtedly one of the most remarkable of all the scholars of Clonmacnois. His learning appears to have been very varied and extensive. He quotes Eusebius, Orosius, Africanus, Bede, Josephus, Saint Jerome, and many other historic writers, and sometimes compares their statements on points in which they exhibit discrepancies, and afterwards endeavours to reconcile their conflicting testimony, and to correct the chronological errors of one writer by comparison with the dates given by others. He also collates the Hebrew text with the Septuagint version of the Scriptures. These statements, which you will find amply verified when you come to examine the Annals of Tigernach in detail, will be sufficient to show the extent of his general scholarship.” It will be seen that the Tigernach legend, mainly developed by O’Conor, has carried O’Curry far beyond the bounds of attested fact, and that an examination in detail will by no means verify a single clause of the statement. The

¹ *MS. Materials*, p. 57.

² *Ib.* p. 290.

³ *Ib.* p. 344.

legend, indeed, has grown in O'Curry's hands. One might imagine that Tigernach showed evidence of having collated the Scriptures in Hebrew with the Greek version; the supposed Tigernach got no farther in that direction than to set side by side dates based on the old Irish chronology derived from the Septuagint and dates based on Bede's chronology derived from the "Hebrew verity"—an arithmetical process of the most elementary kind, requiring no acquaintance with the Scriptures in Hebrew, Greek, or any other language. As for reconciling discrepancies and correcting chronological errors, an examination of the Annals of Tigernach in detail will lead to results beside which O'Curry's words read like sarcasm.

When we come down to the minutely critical scholarship of the generation just past, we find the Tigernach legend still triumphant. Its prepossession of the mind of Stokes is manifest in the brief introduction to a new and complete edition of the chronicle in the *Revue Celtique*, 1895-1897, and is but too strongly operative in the treatment of the text in this edition. Dr. MacCarthy, in his Todd Lectures (1894), and again in his introduction to the Annals of Ulster (1901), shakes off some of the glamour of the myth, and shows that the work ascribed to Tigernach is in some respects less erudite and less accurate than had been supposed; but he is not less convinced than others of the substantial authenticity of the legend, and directs his criticisms, with an asperity which will be found amusing, against the personal attributes with which the exiguous record of Tigernach has been so generously amplified. Stokes had gone so far as to add the virtues of exceptional trustworthiness and honesty (among Irish chroniclers!) to the list of Tigernach's gifts and graces, and to complain that Tigernach had been "ill-used." MacCarthy disallows these virtues, on the strength of an imagined discovery of plagiarism—plagiarism in a text which, as every reader sees at once, consists mainly of excerpts from other writers!¹

Except the name of Tigernach Ua Broín, the office held by him, and the date of his death, this grand epos which has Tigernach for sole hero, and of which only the least samples

¹ *Annals of Ulster*, vol. iv, p. xciii. MacCarthy's imagined discovery of a source used by Tigernach is a "mare's nest," itself due to the overpowering influence of the Tigernach legend.

have been quoted—for the whole saga is voluminous—has been evolved out of the words “huc usque scripsit.” The growth of the Tigernach-saga within a single century, the century of self-conscious incredulity and criticism, surpasses anything that has gathered, in the legends of uncritical ages, round the memory of saint or hero. “Huc usque Tigernach scripsit” is clearly susceptible of two interpretations. It can mean that Tigernach wrote, compiled, and reduced under chronological arrangement the entire chronicle down to this year 1088 in which he died. That is the extreme, the maximum of meaning, that can be attached to the statement, but even with that maximum the makers of the Tigernach-saga have not been content. They will have it, not alone that Tigernach brought all the materials of the chronicle together, and supplied the cement that seems to unite them, but that he in person was acquainted with every source that is quoted in the chronicle, and with his own hand transcribed the quotations from every author. Thus Stokes credits Tigernach with direct access to the chronicle of Julius Africanus, a work, written early in the third century, of which only a few quotations have been known in modern times. Stokes, as editor, had to examine every word and letter of the Annals of Tigernach. His annotations show that he compared, to some extent, the material with one of the chief sources quoted therein, Bede's chronicle. Had he not been prepossessed by the notion of that “bibliothecca instructissima,” which is one of O'Conor's most picturesque contributions to the legend, he might easily and quickly have discovered that all quotations referred in the text to Julius Africanus are embodied in passages taken over at large and word for word from Bede. I venture to suggest, what is beyond the scope of this inquiry to test, that Bede's quotations of Africanus may themselves be traced to intermediate sources, for it was the habit of writers of that age—a praiseworthy habit on the whole—to take over, without change or with slight verbal changes, and with or without acknowledgment, whole passages from earlier writers covering the ground of statement. By this means was avoided the trouble of expressing anew, through the medium of a dead language or in an artificial style that late Latin had inherited and outgrown, things that had already been sufficiently well said; and what might nowadays

be foolishly called plagiarism was in truth the most honest course—it saved the reader, contemporary or later, from imagining that there were or might be two authorities for a statement when in fact there was but one.

The other possible meaning of "huc usque Tigernach scripsit" is that "at this point Tigernach's part of the chronicle ends." It will be seen that, before as well as after Tigernach, there is much clearer evidence of a succession of annalists in these annals than most chronicles afford. When there is a succession of annalists in this way, it is a rare accident to find any one of them named. Had any other annalist of the series, before or after Tigernach, chanced to be named in the same way, the question of authorship would not have been decided without inquiry, and even a moderate degree of inquiry would have placed the question in a new light. Behind any notable work, human curiosity looks naturally for a personal agent. Here, Ware or some one of his time appears to have discovered the words "Tigernach scripsit," and the adoption of the title "Annals of Tigernach" became powerful in suggestion, so that later writers became more interested in Tigernach, or in the chronicle as the supposed work of Tigernach, than in the chronicle *per se*, its structure, and the valuable and unique testimony it affords to the history of Irish chronicling. Into the void of that yearning for knowledge of the person, the tiny and nebulous item, Tigernach, having escaped from the bottle, swelled into gigantic dimensions, *airdithir neolla nime*, and the bottle, which still contained far greater wonders, becoming a thing of minor interest, was henceforth thought of chiefly as belonging to the giant.

MacCarthy found it strange that the contemporary obit of Tigernach in the Annals of Ulster is so curt in its terms, ignoring altogether the historian's learning and achievement. Surely the notice of Tigernach in his own chronicle, written by one who must have known him intimately, is much more remarkable. This notice is not an obit in the ordinary form. It is merely a scribal memorandum. It occurs at a break in the middle of an annal. It is quite sufficiently explained if we understand that the annalist who succeeded Tigernach, before continuing the entries for the year 1088, desired to mark the place where Tigernach left off, and where he himself began. Very different

is the obituary notice of Mac Maghnusa in his own chronicle (*Annals of Ulster*, 1485). Apart from the rather glowing eulogy and the recitation of dignities, there is a clear statement to the effect that Mac Maghnusa had compiled the chronicle from many sources. And yet no one has ventured to ascribe to Mac Maghnusa the degree of authorship that has been so commonly ascribed, on such evidence as we have seen, to Tigernach. Now, in a case of this kind, it is not permissible to draw any larger conclusion than the barest meaning of the statement. If we had corroborative evidence of Tigernach's learning and aptitude, or any evidence whatsoever of his contemporary reputation as an historian or as a man of learning, then we might argue some probability for the assumption that Tigernach had compiled the chronicle, that at least, like Mac Maghnusa, he had collected and transcribed the materials. But, on the strength of the known evidence, to claim for Tigernach that he went direct to ancient sources, that he supplied the chronography, such as it is, of the chronicle, that he was author of a single phrase outside of the record of events that happened in his own time of chronicling, is altogether gratuitous. There is nothing in the annals of the years that nearly precede the death of Tigernach to indicate any high degree of learning or of the critical faculty or of an aptitude or taste for history in the annalist. The annal of 1084 bespeaks a mind in the rudest state of primitive culture, and is, I think, in that respect without parallel in the whole annalistic literature of Ireland. Shall we believe that the annalist who records, as events of his own time, an apparition of Oengus son of the Dagda, and a revelation by Oengus, and the invasion of Ireland by three legions of gigantic demons from the Northern Islands of the world, was, as Stokes, who edited and translated the passage, has declared, "the only Irish chronicler honest enough to confess that some of his materials were uncertain"¹?

¹ A most unworthy reflection on the character of Irish chroniclers, whose reputation need fear no comparison in this respect.

II.—THE WRITINGS ASCRIBED TO TIGERNACH

Before going further into the question of authorship, it is well to state the extent of the annals ascribed to Tigernach. They consist of five separate fragments.

Fragment I is contained in the twelfth-century codex, "Rawlinson, B 502," now fortunately published in facsimile. This fragment begins with a broken sentence containing nothing that can be dated. Its next item, "Osse, Amos, Essaias, Ionas, et Michias in Iudea profetant," is based on an entry in the Eusebian chronicle, dated in the Abrahamic year 1208 = 807 B.C. The last event in the fragment, "Polycarpus Romam veniens multos ab heretica labe castigauit," is dated A.D. 160 in the Eusebian chronicle and reckoning.¹

Fragments II, III, and IV are contained in Rawlinson, B 488, written in the fourteenth century.

Fragment II covers a period from about B.C. 322 to A.D. 360. It thus supplies a later transcript or rather version of about half the material contained in Fragment I, and adds two centuries more.

Fragment III covers the period A.D. 489 to A.D. 766.

Fragment IV² covers the period A.D. 975 to A.D. 1178.

The fifth fragment is contained in the Trinity College MS. H. 1. 18, and is called by Stokes the "Dublin Fragment." It covers the period from about A.D. 34 to A.D. 378. Its character will be discussed later. For the present, suffice it to say that though the contents deal with a period almost all covered by Fragments I and II, they are presented in quite a distinct guise. The Dublin Fragment appears to have been first ascribed to Tigernach by Todd. Stokes expresses no view as to its authorship. Mac Carthy assumes Tigernach to be the author of this fragment as well as of Fragments I and II.

Three portions of the chronicle are thus missing: (1) the beginning, about as far as B.C. 807; (2) between A.D. 360 or 378 and A.D. 489; (3) between A.D. 766 and A.D. 975. There is also

¹ A.D. dating was not used in the Eusebian chronicle, but the dates are reduced to anni Domini by the editors.

² Stokes applies the term "Fourth Fragment" to the section from 975 to the death of Tigernach in 1088, calling the rest of Frag. IV "the Continuation."

a folio missing, causing a lacuna between the years 1002 and 1017, and a portion of unknown extent is lost at the end of Fragment IV.

The first important fact to be noted in regard to this collection of annals is that the contents of Fragment III (A.D. 489-766) are in the main identical, even as to phrasing, with the chronicle of the same period embodied in the Annals of Ulster. There is a common body of annals, which in each chronicle is independently supplemented to some extent by additional entries. This common body was not derived by the compilers of the Annals of Ulster from Tigernach or from any of the annalists whose work is found in Fragment IV; for, in respect of the period A.D. 975-1178, the Annals of Ulster and the Annals of Tigernach are quite independent chronicles. There was therefore in existence before 975 a chronicle written up to some date later than 765, which forms the basis from 432 to 765 of the Annals of Ulster, and also of the Annals of Tigernach. Since this chronicle was written in the Old-Irish period, I propose to call it for convenience "the Old-Irish Chronicle."

Tigernach, then, was not the compiler of Fragment III. He, or some chronicler whom he succeeded, or who succeeded him in the Clonmacnois compilation, *may* have added the supplementary items which are not found in the Annals of Ulster. Most of this supplementary matter comes under two heads: (1) quotations *in extenso* from Bede's chronicle, which was completed in 726; (2) the obits and successions of the kings of some provincial dynasties, especially of Leinster, Munster, and Connacht, taken apparently from regnal lists, such as are extant in prose and verse.¹ The provincial regnal entries are usually inserted at the end of the annal. The supplementary matter is thus mainly such as almost any scribe could have introduced.

If, then, we cannot properly speak of any named author or compiler of Fragment III, it is clear that, unless and until better evidence is discovered, we cannot pronounce Tigernach to be the author or compiler of the text represented in Fragments I and II or in the Dublin Fragment, which deal with the period before St. Patrick's mission.

¹ Hence caution is necessary in quoting these annals in confirmation of such regnal data from other sources, or vice versa.

When we examine Fragments I and II somewhat closely and in detail, the first prominent characteristic that is perceived is the absence of any such unity of design or treatment in the text, as it stands, as would suggest individual authorship or even the work of an intelligent individual compiler. The text appears to be an unmethodical and random aggregation of disproportionate materials thrown together in the form of annals. Dates are for the most part absent. Some are found in the margins, a few in the text, but rarely as headings. The division of the material into years is indicated by the headings "K" or "Kl" (= Kalendae). This method of dating, so far as it can be called dating, is found also in Fragments III and IV, down to A.D. 1002.¹ Further inspection reveals the true character of this division of the material into years.

III.—FALSE GUISE OF ANNALS IMPOSED ON FRAGMENTS I AND II

The introduction of annal-headings, dividing the matter of Fragments I and II in appearance into separate years by means of the letters "K" or "Kl," is foisted on an earlier text by a late reviser. It is the work of a redactor, who found the text ready to hand and wished to pass it off as a collection of annals,

In order to see clearly that the guise of annals imposed on this text is fictitious and full of errors, the framework of the text must first be understood; for there is a definite and systematic framework to which long passages of continuous prose and other accretions, unsystematic and utterly disproportionate, have been from time to time attached.

The framework, except with regard to its Irish items, which form only a minor fraction, is taken direct from St. Jerome's version of the Chronicle of Eusebius.² Moreover, within the

¹ In some sections the ferial notation of the year is also given.

² The original Chronicle of Eusebius was written in Greek, covering the time from the beginning of the world to A.D. 329. It was translated into Latin by St. Jerome, and continued by him down to A.D. 381. It was further continued by Prosper of Aquitaine down to 445. Some MSS., it is said, contain a further continuation for about ten years. I follow the text printed in Migne's *Patrologia*, vol. xxvii, and take therefrom the A.D. dating which does not belong to the original chronicle or its continuations. Of the original Greek only fragments survive. The

period covered by Fragments I and II the whole framework—that is to say, all the regnal entries—of the Eusebian Chronicle are taken over and embodied in the Irish compilation; but various entries of events other than the regnal items, and not belonging to the framework of the Eusebian Chronicle, are not taken over.¹ The material thus taken from the Eusebian Chronicle was supplemented by the addition of precisely analogous material, dealing with the history of Ireland. The use of the Eusebian Chronicle as basis for the Irish compilation may be proved by collation. I can here give only a proof by sample, which will be found in the tabulated abstract in Section VI of this paper.

Let us now see how the annalistic form of the existing text compares with the chronological data of the chief authority upon which the text is founded, the Eusebian Chronicle. It may perhaps be well to explain that where a single "K" or "Kl"² is found at the head of a paragraph in the text, all that intervenes between this heading and the next following "K" or "Kl" constitutes a separate annal, purporting to contain the events of a single year. When two or more "Ks" are found together at the head of a paragraph, the last "K" of the group indicates the commencement of a fresh annal, and the other "Ks" of the group indicate so many vacant years, under which no event is placed. Thus in Fragment I, p. 386,³ we find :

- "K. Darius Persicus . . . regnauit annis xxui."
- "K. Secundo anno Darii," etc.
- "K. K. K. K. Sexto anno Darii," etc.

Latin version was a standard work of history in ancient Ireland. For convenience, it is cited by me as "the Eusebian Chronicle." Its contents, down to the time of the Caesars, are mainly the accession-dates and the number of years reigned by those who were deemed to be the rulers of the greater kingdoms of antiquity. To each kingdom a *vertical column* in the chronicle was assigned. For every year there was a horizontal alignment, so that all the accessions of the kings were given in chronological order. Besides this tabular record of reigns, various entries of important events were inserted in chronological order.

¹ Some of the entries originally omitted in this way can be shown to have been interpolated in later revision.

² An abbreviation for "Kalendae (Ianuarii)," denoting the beginning of the year.

³ I quote the pages of the *Revue Celtique* in which the edition of Stokes is published; Fragment I in vol. xvi, Fragment II in vol. xvii, and the Dublin Fragment in vol. xviii. I follow this edition, except where the facsimile Rawl. B 502 supplies corrections.

No event is assigned to the third, fourth, and fifth years of Darius, and the three vacant years are indicated by entering K three times before the K which indicates the sixth year. Thus the text purports to indicate *a complete series of years*, the vacant years as well as those to which events are assigned.

When the interpolator of the annal-headings found data in the text to guide him, as in the entries just quoted, he introduced his headings accordingly. When he found no such guidance in the text, he inserted the annal-headings at random. Thus (p. 387) he dates the expulsion of the kings from Rome in the twenty-eighth year of Darius. This entry, "Pulsis urbe regibus," etc., is taken verbatim from the Eusebian Chronicle; but the Eusebian Chronicle assigns the event to the tenth year of Darius.

I shall further illustrate this artificial scheme of dating by taking, as they chance to occur, a series of dated events from Fragment I, and another series from Fragment II. Almost any page of the text would serve equally well, for the fictitious dating occurs throughout.

In Fragment I, p. 415, let us take the reign of Domitianus Cæsar. The initial entry is taken verbatim from the Eusebian Chronicle: "Domitianus frater Titi iunior regnauit [annis] xu. mensibus u." The death of Domitianus should thus be recorded in the sixteenth year of his reign, but the redactor overlooks "mensibus u.," and assigns fifteen Ks to the reign.¹ Let us compare the "annals" year by year with the consecutive series of years in the original authority.

EVENT.	YEAR OF DOMITIAN. TIGERNACH. EUSEBIUS.
Second persecution of the Christians, and exile of St. John to Patmos, . . .	1 14
Senators exiled and put to death, . . .	3 3, 8, 13
Descendants of David put to death, . . .	4 16
Abilius becomes bishop of Alexandria, . . .	5 4
Clemens becomes bishop of Rome, . . .	12 12
Ignatius becomes bishop of Antioch, . . .	13 (Nero 14)
Domitian's death,	15 16

¹ Doubtless on the principle that fractions of a year less than half a year are to be ignored at the end of a reign, or rather carried forward to the succeeding reign.

In Fragment II, let us take the reign of Constantius, p. 30:—

	YEAR OF CONSTANTIUS.	
	TIGERNACH.	EUSEBIUS.
Accession of Constantius and his brothers,	1	1
“ Iacobus Nisibenus episcopus agnoscitur,”	2	1
“ Impietas Ariana Constantii fulta presidio,”		
etc.,	3	2
“ Constantinus occisus est,”	4	3
“ Constans interfectus est,”	8	13
Vetranio chosen Emperor,	9	13
“ Maximus Treuirorum episcopus clarus		
habetur,”	10	6
“ Nepotianus interfectus est,”	11	13
Magnentius defeated at Mursa,	12	14
“ Hilarius . . . ad Gallias redit,”	13	23
“ Reliquiae apostoli Timothei Constan-		
tinopolim invectae,”	16	19
“ Constantio Romam ingresso,” etc.,	21	20
“ Constantius . . . moritur,” ¹	22	24
“ Antonius monachus . . . quieuit,”	24	19

The question arises, since the events in the foregoing lists are found in the Eusebian Chronicle, which is the foundation of our text, how does it happen that their order has been so transposed as to increase the “annalist’s” opportunities of error? The answer is that only a few of these events were embodied in our text as originally drawn up. The others were added by later revisers, at first in the marginal or internal spaces, and were incorporated in the text by still later scribes who were heedless of the chronological sequence. The “annalist,” in inserting his year-headings, took no trouble to ascertain the true sequence, being quite satisfied to mark twenty-four separate years between the accession of Constantius and that of his successor.

Many other absurd results follow from the false imposition of the form of annals on the text. I shall give two examples. In Fragment I, p. 403, the etymological gloss “Caesar a caeso

¹ Here we have a specimen of the heedlessness of the “annalist,” who makes the death of Constantius two years earlier than the end of his reign, though the text gives the length of the reign as twenty-four years, five months, thirteen days.

"utero matris dictus est" appears as the sole event of a year, and that year the second before Caesar's death. The last "annal" in Fragment I consists of an explanation of the epithet "Pius" added to the name of Antoninus. In many instances, the whole account of a reign—quoted from Bede's Chronicle—is dated as a single annal, for no better reason than that the quotation forms a single paragraph of the text.

It is now evident that the first step towards recovering the original textual form of Fragments I and II must be the elimination of all the annal-headings. The text was not compiled in the form of annals. It was a synchronic history of the kingdoms of the world, formed by adding an Irish section to the material taken over from the Eusebian Chronicle. It was forced into a false annalistic form, no doubt in order that it might be prefixed to a collection of Irish annals.

IV.—THE EDITION BY STOKES IS UNSATISFACTORY.

We have now to examine further the structure of the text. And here I must say that Stokes, who justly charges "gross inaccuracy" against the edition produced by O'Conor in 1825, has himself produced an edition which, if not grossly inaccurate, is certainly inadequate, to judge by a comparison of his printed text of Fragment I with the facsimile later published, of the MS., Rawl. B 502. The facsimile shows, what one would never have surmised from the printed version, that *the text in this twelfth-century MS. is still in a condition of active growth*, thickly stuck over with interlinear and marginal accretions. Some of these accretions are placed by Stokes in brackets. A few are distinguished by him in foot-notes, but a large number are integrated in the printed text without special mark or comment of any kind.

To show how the printed text of Fragment I compares with the MS.—especially with regard to scribal treatment—I refer again to the pages of *Revue Celtique*, xvi :—

375. "ut alii aiunt," an interlineation, is integrated in the printed text. Second last line: there are Roman numerals, hardly, if at all, legible, in the margin—probably an A.M. dating not noted by Stokes.

376. The interlineations are printed in round brackets; a marginal addition, in a foot-note.

377. The interlineations are printed in brackets. Opposite "Salmanasar rege Caldeorum" there is a marginal entry ([? et] Assiriorum) not noticed in the printed edition.

378. One interlineation is printed in brackets. Another, "Iudam," in the fifth last line, is incorporated without mark.

379. "Acneus." MS. has "Ameus," with "*vel* Acneus" interlined. The true reading is "Arg[a]eus," = ΑΡΓΑΙΟΣ.

380. "Teo rexit Aegiptios annis .ii.," interlined, is incorporated without mark. "Ancus Martius . . . regnauit annis, xxxiii"—MS. has "xxui" and over it "*vel* xxxiii." Two other interlineations are given in brackets.

381. "Alii ferunt Iochim . . . ductum," an interlineation, is printed without mark. "Tarquinius Priscus annis xxvii"—MS. has ".xxxvii." and over it "*vel* xxvii." "K. Sedecias," etc.—there are Roman numerals in the margin. "ex quo fundari cepit ccccxxxiiii" MS. has "ccccxxx" and over it "*vel* ccccxxxiiii." The interlined gloss on "cloacas" i. inna fannacon, is here given in a foot-note. This gloss is much earlier than Tigernach.

382. Last line, "Esquilinum"—MS. has "Esquinalem" and over it "*vel* linum."

383. The interlineation "Beda ait," etc., is given in brackets. The correction of "Egessar" to "Negasar" is recorded in a foot-note. Another foot-note gives the insertion "Hieronymus ait."

384. First line, "Baldazar"—MS. has "Baldastar" with "*vel* z" over "st." A marginal addition is given in a foot-note.

385. Two MS. readings, corrected in the text, are given in foot-notes; but this practice is not general in the printing of the text.

386. "Hiessus sacerdos magnus" . . . "Pithagoras fissicus clarus filosophus habetur" . . . "Darius Persicus, filius Istai[s]pis"—"magnus," "filosophus," and "filius Istaispis" are interlineations, not so noted. Two glosses and one correction are given in foot-notes.

387. First line, "ad quem"—MS. has "apud" with "*vel* ad" above it. After "mensis Adar" the interlinear gloss ".i. Martius" is printed in brackets. "dictatores, qui quinque annis regnauerunt populum"—the words "qui," etc., added in the

lower margin, are here integrated. Third last line, "Leonida . . . pugnante" is an interlineation.

The same variety or absence of method is found throughout the printed text of Fragment I, and need not be further exemplified, unless particular instances call for special remark. For the remaining pages, I shall note chiefly the interlineations which are incorporated in the printed text without any indication that they were not so found in the MS. The interlined words are here placed in square brackets.

389. l. 7 [qui fuerunt]. l. 22 [Perdica . . . annis .xxix.].

390. The curious gloss on "Galli Zenones," l. 11, ".i. Liberpaterda. Liber Pater enim Steno dicitur. Galli autem Stenonés uocantur quia Liberum Patrem hospitio recipiunt," may be compared with S. Isidori Etymologiarum lib. ix, cap. 2, No. 106: "Galli autem Senones antiquitus Xenones dicebantur, quod Liberum in hospitium recepissent, postea *x* in *s* litteram commutata est."

392. l. 7 [contra Antipatris copias]. l. 8 [contra Bruttios . . . suis]. l. 9 [contra Scithas . . . interficti sunt].

393. l. 4 [.i. qui et soter].

394. l. 5 [.i. in Ancipolitana]. l. 7 [cui nomen Poliercites]. l. 18 [filius Casandri bellum parans fratri]. l. 21 [filius Antigoni].

396. "Húamchend mac Co . . . aind regnauit in Emain annis .1." is added in the upper margin of fo. 7^b.

397. l. 1 [.i. quia in adulterio deprehensa est]. l. 9 [belli]. l. 12 [Antigonus regnauit in Macidonia annis .xii.]. l. 21 [Pilipus regnauit in Macedonia annis .xlii.].

398. l. 14 [uel Seleuco Philopatore magiis]. l. 22 [frater Seleuci .i. filius Antiochi Magni]. l. 24 [Eusebius. Hoc anno . . . annis .xii.].¹ l. 29 [Epiphanes]. The correction cited in note 1 and the gloss in note 2 are also interlineations.

399. l. 9 [.i. pater Machabeorum]. l. 12 [a quo . . . dicti sunt]. l. 13 [.i. centisimo quadragisimo septimo]. l. 15 [.i. centissima quinquagesima quinta].

¹ Showing that the Eusebian Chronicle, besides having supplied the foundation of the original tract, was used at a later time to furnish additional matter.

400. l. 20, "Euergitis—MS. has "Euergitas" with "vel tis" above. l. 26, "Sebastiam"—MS. has "Sebastem" with "vel tiām" above.

401. l. 19, "ex regio"—MS. has "egregio" with "vel ex regio" above.

402. l. 3 [Janeus].

403. l. 3 [fratri eius tradedit]. l. 26 [qui Cleopatram uiolauit]. l. 31 [.i. dux Romanus].

404. [Natiuitas Conculainn maic Soaltaim].

405. l. 27 [Isin tsechtmad bliadain iar ndith Conairi rogab Lugaid Reoderg rigi]. For *rogab*, "took, obtained," Stokes has "seized." This interlineation is important, since it does not agree with the date assigned to Luguid in the earlier text. See p. 411 and p. 414.

406. [Slógad Tána Bo Cúalngi].

407. On this page the ferial notation of the years begins to be used.

408. l. 2, here for once an interlineation is introduced by the word "[Interlined]". l. 11 [hoc est coniuge] is not marked in any way. l. 29, ".iii. m. uel iiiii m. ut Eusebius ait" is placed in round brackets. Three interlineations in one page, treated in three different ways.

409. l. 6 [ut Eusebio placet]. l. 7 [traditus luna].

410. l. 3 [Cath Artig regnauit]. All this paragraph is interlined. Another interlineation is given in note 2—this being the fourth way of treatment within three pages.

411. l. 7, "iiiiim uiuii menses uii dies" is added in the margin.

412. l. 1, "Thirty-six"—read "Thirty." l. 9, this paragraph is written in the upper margin.

413. l. 10 [poeta moritur]. l. 11, "Nero feruentis" is not written in the hand of the text. l. 14 [Tomaídum Locha Rib maic Maireda dar Mag n-Airbthen].

414. l. 3 [episcopus post Petrum xxiiii annis]. l. 24, for "Kuu" read "Kuui." l. 27, "conn-abbad"—the second *n* is interlined. l. 28 [nodechsad]. l. 34 [.i. Achaiae]. In the next line a precisely similar interlineation is given in round brackets.

415. In last paragraph [.i. mac Conaill Cernaig] and [uel a Gallis ut alii dicunt]. The gloss in note 4 is also interlined.

416. l. 16, "Kxii." There is no twelfth feria. Read "Kii." l. 20, note 1, "This entry seems inserted *man. rec.*" Add that it is inserted in the margin.

417. l. 11, "anchora collo *configata*" is added in the margin, but for "*con*" read "*eius*." l. 15 [apostulus ut alii aiunt]. l. 16 [a Traiano . . . annorum]. Note 3, "nuathescthid"—the letters "esc" seem doubtful in the facsimile.

418. l. 9, for "Kiiii" read "Kuii." l. 28, for "Kiiiii" read "Kiiii." l. 29, "in Teomoria uel him-Maig bolg ut alii aiunt" is added in the margin. Last line, for "Connra" read "Conri" (genitive Conrach).

419. l. 8, read "Kiii. Kiiii. Ku. (not Kii) Kui. Kuii. Kii." l. 17, for "Kuiii" read "Kuii." l. 23, "Sulpicio"—MS. has "Suppio" and, above the line, same hand, "uel Sulpicio."¹ l. 23, for "Kii" read "Ku."

It is fairly certain that a large proportion of the additions and alterations, which Stokes has adopted as integral parts of his text, represent mere corrections made by a reviser who compared the MS. with the exemplar, or with another version, or with the sources; but it is equally certain that many of them are not of this kind, but arise from an effort to develop the text. Stokes remained throughout under the impression that he was dealing with a text composed or compiled by Tigernach, who died in 1088.²

Accordingly the various apparent flaws in the integrity of the text are treated by him as mainly due either to scribal handling or to unimportant meddlings after the author's time. Nevertheless, the inconsistency of his ways of noting these things is, for him, extraordinary; especially since his aim was to produce a correct edition of an important body of annals never before printed, except, as he says, by O'Conor "with gross inaccuracy" in 1825. Had it occurred to Stokes that he was engaged on a text much older than Tigernach and bearing evidence of successive stages of development, his treatment would no doubt have been different.

¹ "Sub Pio" is the correct reading. The whole passage is taken over from Bede's Chronicle (reign of Antoninus Pius).

² See his Introduction, *R.C.* xvi, 375, and his foot-note to the concluding article, *R.C.* xviii, 388.

V.—THE PRESENT STRUCTURE OF FRAGMENTS I AND II.

If it is thus manifest that the text represented by Fragments I and II—i.e. the text of the pre-Patrician section of the “Annals of Tigernach”—was still growing and undergoing revision in the twelfth century, it will, I think, be evident to one who examines the body of the tract in Fragment I, apart from the visible accretions, that an irregular process of growth must have been suffered by the text even before that time. A large proportion of the material has almost obviously come from the earlier integration of copious marginal or interspacial notes, chiefly quotations from the Eusebian Chronicle, Orosius, St. Isidore, and Bede. The whole framework was originally taken verbatim from the Eusebian Chronicle ; therefore when we find Eusebius further quoted by name, we have good evidence of a revision in which recourse was had to the Eusebian Chronicle for additional matter ; and one has only to look into the character of the quotations to find that they are precisely of such a kind as would be added in this way.

Stokes gives a list of the sources of the non-Irish material, chief among them the Eusebian Chronicle, the *Historiae* of Orosius, and Bede's Chronicle. “Besides these, Tigernach used the Vulgate, Isidorus Hispalensis' *Etymologiarum Libri xx*, a Latin translation of Josephus' *Antiquities of the Jews*, and possibly, also the lost *Chronicon* of Julius Africanus.” We see in this phrasing how Stokes was prepossessed by the notion of one chronicler compiling the whole matter from the beginning to A.D. 1088.

The *Historiae* of Orosius deal in a discursive way with the history of the world from the beginning down to the writer's time, about A.D. 417 ; the keynote of the work being to “assert eternal Providence, and justify the ways of God to men.” This work had great influence in the ancient Irish schools. Its geographical description of the world supplied most of the details in the legendary migrations of the Scotti up to the point of their arrival in Ireland ; a revised version of the legend, in which a different course of migration is followed, is also based

in detail on Orosius. All the quotations from Orosius in our tract are plainly accretions.

Bede's Chronicle contains a summary of world-history from the beginning to the date of its completion, A.D. 726, grouped in paragraphs. Bede follows the theory, familiar in ancient Ireland, that among the kingdoms of the world there was always one chief kingdom, though the supremacy changed at times from one chief kingdom to another. This theory, indeed, underlies the Eusebian Chronicle, but finds its most definite expression in Orosius, who writes (book ii, chap. i): "Quod si potestates a Deo sunt, quanto magis regna, a quibus reliquae potestates progrediuntur! si autem regna diversa, quanto aequius regnum aliquod maximum, cui reliquorum regnorum potestas universa subjicitur! quale a principio Babylonium, et deinde Macedonicum fuit; post etiam Africanum, atque in fine Romanum, quod usque ad nunc manet." But Bede's Chronicle is a section of his great work on chronology, *De temporum ratione*, and its chief subdivisions are consequently the "Six Ages of the world." The division of the world's history into six ages arose from the effort to calculate according to the Bible the number of years from the Creation to the Incarnation. It was found convenient to take certain definite points in the Scriptural narrative, up to which and from which the intervening years were numbered. This procedure is already introduced by Eusebius, and followed by St. Jerome in the summary of chronology with which his continuation of the Eusebian Chronicle ends. But the Six Ages obtain, as it were, a sort of consecration from St. Isidore, whose chronicle ends about A.D. 626, and is subdivided according to the Six Ages. In his *Etymologiae* also (book v, ch. xxix), St. Isidore gives a dated framework of history divided into the Six Ages, and prefixes to this an account of the six days of the Creation, thus suggesting an analogy which was certain to take strong hold of the medieval imagination. In the preceding chapter, he ascribes in general terms the treatment of history under the same division to Julius Africanus, Eusebius, and Jerome. The chronicle of Julius Africanus is lost, but the Eusebian Chronicle does not treat the Six Ages as epochs in history; and this division probably owes its medieval celebrity to St. Isidore himself. That the Irish schools adopted the Six Ages from

him, and not, as some have thought, from Bede, is indicated by the fact that the tract on the Six Ages in Rawl. B 502 is preceded by a quotation from the *Etymologiae*. In the extant text of Fragments I and II, the greater part of Bede's Chronicle for the corresponding space of time is taken over verbatim. But all this material from Bede is manifestly an accretion. It is inserted in blocks, without regard to the chronological sequence of the rest of the text; that is to say, when the accession of any ruler whose reign forms a chapter in Bede's Chronicle is found in the text, the whole chapter from Bede, or a large part of it, is, as a rule, inserted at that point, although much of the contents of the chapter may properly be later in sequence than items that come afterwards in the text. The Bedan material was first added in the margins or vacant spaces. We have an interesting proof of this on page 377, Fragment I. The paragraph "Sexto Ezechiae anno," etc., is taken from Bede's Chronicle. It was inserted in a space which already contained the gloss "tunc Tobias captus est"; and the quotation extended both above and below this gloss; with the result that, when the accretions were incorporated in the text by a later scribe, the gloss became incorporated in the quotation. The same passage further illustrates the gradual growth of the extant text. In it, the words "ad Ninuen scilicet ciuitatem" and "ante" do not belong to the quotation, but are glosses added thereto. They are now incorporated. We trace here five stages of growth: (1) the original text; (2) the stage of marginal supplementing represented by "tunc Tobias," etc.; (3) the addition, as an external entry, of the passage from Bede; (4) the glossing of the passage from Bede; (5) the incorporation of all these accretions in the text. Apart from Irish items, the latest source that has been traced of the materials in the extant text is Bede's Chronicle; but *Bede's work is not in any degree the basis or model of the Irish compilation*, for which it cannot thus be held to fix an anterior date.

In addition to the *Etymologiae* of St. Isidore, mentioned by Stokes, but not extensively quoted in the text so far as I have traced, the *Chronicon* of St. Isidore is the source of many passages. Stokes has traced some quotations from Bede. Had he investigated a little further, he would have found that every quotation of Julius Africanus comes through the medium of

Bede. Josephus likewise seems not to be quoted except through Bede or the Eusebian Chronicle.

I have argued that, from the composition of the text, nearly all these quotations should be judged to have crept in by way of marginal or interspatial entry. It might be urged to the contrary that a great degree of incongruity in detail is compatible with unity of authorship and composition; especially when the sources vary from concise tabular form, as in the Eusebian Chronicle, to the most discursive treatment, as in Orosius. It happens, however, that the text has undergone one particular change which reveals in the clearest manner its original form and scope.

VI.—THE ORIGINAL STRUCTURE OF FRAGMENTS I AND II

The text of Fragments I and II, as originally drawn up, was arranged, not in the form of paragraphs or in lines written continuously across the page, but in narrow vertical columns, according to synchronized reigns, on the model of the Eusebian Chronicle. The text in fact, apart from the Irish items, was merely a somewhat abbreviated version of the Eusebian Chronicle, retaining the form of that chronicle and its whole framework of regnal entries, but omitting most of the other material. By regnal entries, I mean those given in the form "Carpus regnauit Athenenses annis x." (I, p. 375). This is the form employed in the Eusebian Chronicle; and the entries in this form contained in our text, except the entries of Irish reigns, are all found in the Eusebian Chronicle, and only a small fraction of them are found in all the other known sources of the text taken together. They form the groundwork of the existing text, both as to matter and chronological arrangement. The tract was therefore founded, in the first instance, on the Eusebian Chronicle. Let us then compare a section of the text in detail with this source.

In the Eusebian Chronicle, the first or left-hand column is assigned to one kingdom or dynasty regarded as chief, and forming a norm for the chronology of the others. A horizontal line is assigned to each year, whether any event is recorded in

the year or not. This line is headed with a number, indicating the year of the reign recorded in the first column. Thus a regnal chronography provides the Eusebian system of dating in detail. The beginning of the extant portion of Fragment I is during the rule of the Medes in Babylon. The first king of the Medes recorded in the Fragment is Medidus,¹ p. 377. The previous section, from the beginning of what is now extant, should fall accordingly within the reign of the predecessor of Medidus, who was Sosarmus, the second king of the Median dynasty (p. 346, Migne). I shall now give an abstract of the Eusebian Chronicle for the purpose of comparison, abbreviating each regnal entry to the personal name only. I also omit the vacant years of the Eusebian Chronicle. The number given in the column to the left indicates the year of the Median king in which the Chronicle records the event in that horizontal line.

¹ Stokes has "M . . oidus." What appeared to be "o" is, of course, part of the letter "d."

EUSEBIAN CHRONICLE.

Year.	Medes.	Macedonia.	Judea.	Israel.	Egypt.	Rome.	Athens.	Lydia.
1.	Sosarmus.	—	—	—	Psammus.	—	—	—
2.	—	Coenus.	—	—	Bocchorus.	—	—	—
7.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
12.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
14.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
17.	—	Tyrimas.	Joathan.	—	—	—	—	—
19.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
20.	—	Medidus.	—	—	—	—	—	—
1.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
5.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
7.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
9.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
10.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
19.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
20.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
21.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
26.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
27.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
29.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
34.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
38.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
39.	—	Cardiceas.	—	—	—	—	—	—
1.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
6.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
8.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
9.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
10.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
—	—	Diocles.	—	—	—	—	—	—
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
1.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
6.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
10.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
16.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
22.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
24.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
29.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
36.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
42.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
46.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
50.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
52.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
					Hammon.			

I wish now to direct attention to those reigns which, in the Eusebian Chronicle as abstracted in this table, and, on the other hand, in the text of Fragment I, commence in the reign of Medidus. To facilitate the comparison, I have given in italics the names of the kings whose accession is placed by our text in that reign, i.e. between the accession of Medidus, p. 377, and of Cardiceas, p. 379.

First, under Macedonia, our text is here in agreement with its source—the Eusebian Chronicle. It gives only one accession in the time of Medidus, that of Perdica.¹

Under Judea, there is disagreement. The Eusebian Chronicle places the accession of Achaz in the fifth year of Medidus; Fragment I places it considerably earlier than Medidus (p. 375). The Eusebian Chronicle places the accession of Manasses in the tenth year of Cardiceas; Fragment I (p. 378) places it within the reign of Medidus. There is here a displacement of at least ten years.

Under Israel, there is also disagreement. The accession of Ossee, in the seventh year of Medidus according to the Eusebian Chronicle, is placed by our text (p. 376) in the preceding reign: a displacement of at least seven years.

Under Egypt, none of the names here found in the Eusebian Chronicle are in our text. Instead, we find under the reign of Medidus, “Amoyses rexit Ægyptios annis xlii” (p. 377), and again (p. 379), still under the reign of Medidus, “Dinastia Ægyptiorum intermittitur annis cxii.” The accession of Amasis, king of Egypt, is recorded in the Eusebian Chronicle in the thirty-second year of the reign of Astyages, king of the Medes, year 1450 of the Abrahamic era. The intermission in the kingdom of Egypt is recorded at the end of the reign of Amasis, year 1493 of the Abrahamic era. The last year of Medidus in the Eusebian Chronicle is 1295 of the Abrahamic era. We have here, in our text, a displacement amounting to two centuries! How is so great an error to be explained? The Egyptian succession in the Eusebian Chronicle is thus continued from the last three names in my abstract.

¹ It is needless to compare the year of Medidus in which the reign of Perdiccas begins in the Eusebian Chronicle with the year indicated in the Irish Chronicle, for, as we have seen, the extant dating year by year in the Irish Chronicle is of very late introduction.

1. Nichepsos, 6 years.
2. Necho, 8 years.
3. Psammitichus, 44 years.
4. Necho qui et Nechepsos, 6 years.
5. Psammites, 12 years.
6. Vaphres, 30 years.
7. Amasis, 42 years.

It is possible that some transcriber or reviser of our text, not having the source to consult, imagined that the fourth and fifth names in this list were a repetition, by mistake, of the first, second, and third ; and one of these two sets of reigns may thus have been eliminated, and the sixth and seventh names moved up accordingly. Even if we suppose this to have happened, the displacement is reduced by only forty years.

Under Rome, the accession of Romulus in the Eusebian Chronicle is in the tenth year of Medidus ; in our text (p. 376) it comes before the accession of Medidus. The accession of Numa is in the eighth year of Cardiceas ; in our text (p. 379) it is within the reign of Medidus. Here is a displacement of at least ten years.

Under Athens, the accessions of Alcmæon, Carops, and Æsimedes and Clidicus, are, in the Eusebian Chronicle, within the reign of Medidus ; the accession of Clidicus being in the twenty-ninth year of Medidus. In our text (pp. 375, 376) these four accessions precede that of Medidus. In the Eusebian Chronicle, the accession of Leocrates is in the reign of Cardiceas, and the accessions of Alexander and Eryxias are in the reign of Diocles (= Diceces). In our text (pp. 377-379), these three reigns begin within the reign of Medidus. There is here a displacement of at least twenty-nine years.

Under Lydia, in the Eusebian Chronicle, the accession of Alyattes is in the twentieth year of Medidus ; in our text (p. 376), it precedes the reign of Medidus. In the Eusebian Chronicle, the accession of Gyges is in the tenth year of Diocles (Diceces) ; in our text (p. 377) it is in the reign of Medidus. Between Medidus and Diocles there are thirteen years of Cardiceas, so that the displacement here amounts to at least twenty-three years.

Thus we see that, of the seven dynasties synchronized during

this period with the dynasty of the Medes, only one, that of Macedonia, retains the same relative position in our text that it has in the original source. All the others have been displaced. Five of them are placed too late by spaces of years varying from at least seven to at least twenty-nine. The Egyptian reigns, on the contrary, are placed too early by about 160 or 200 years. The one dynasty which has not suffered displacement happens to occupy in the Eusebian Chronicle the second column, the next to the Median dynasty, which has the first and chief place.

All these regnal data which I have discussed are found in the Eusebian Chronicle, only a few of them in any other known source of our text. Moreover, all the regnal data in the Eusebian Chronicle are taken over into our text, so far as its extent allows us to make comparison, and so far as such displacement as has been traced does not exclude the data from the extant scope of the text. Hence there can be no doubt that the text, in those particulars which form its framework, was derived from the Eusebian Chronicle. The quotations from the Eusebian Chronicle show that it was still in use at the later time when the text was under revision; so that we need not doubt that the chronicle was the immediate source of the text in its original form. How, then, shall we account for the curious variations in synchronizing?

It is clear that, if the material had been transferred from the Eusebian Chronicle in such a way that the regnal data were given in continuous paragraphs or in successive lines written across the page, the displacements that we find could never have come about. No number of transcriptions, however careless, could have changed the regnal entries from their original order to the existing disorder. Therefore it is evident that our text, in its original form, was drawn up, not in paragraphs or in successive lines across the page, but in vertical columns on the Eusebian plan. Such columns were easily deranged in transcription.

The columnar arrangement of the original text precludes the possibility of the embodiment therein of the mass of quotations *in extenso* which form the bulk of the extant text. On the other hand, the internal spaces provided by the columnar arrangement left room for the introduction of a large quantity of collateral material from other sources, and the presence of this added

material must have served further to obscure and confuse the original synchronic order, and to increase greatly the liability to displacement in transcription.

VII.—GROWTH AND TRANSFORMATION OF THE TEXT.

A further stage in the history of the text was marked by a transcript in which the columnar arrangement, thus obscured by interspatial additions, was found too difficult to reproduce, and an effort was made to convert the whole material, original and added, into continuous paragraphs. All errors that had arisen in earlier transcription were thus made permanent.

At some stage in the history of the text, another revision took place. The reviser discovered some of the errors that had arisen in the process of rearrangement, that is to say, errors in the relative position of entries bringing the events into a false order of time; and he undertook to correct these errors. Hence the frequent occurrence, at the beginning of an entry, of corrections in the formula "Tertio anno priore," etc. In Frag. I there are many such corrections in the first twenty-seven pages of the printed text ending with p. 401. From this point on they are not found; and their absence confirms my explanation of their origin. On p. 403 begins "Regnum Romanorum"; and from the corresponding point in the Eusebian Chronicle, the columnar arrangement is not employed,¹ the notion being that the Roman Empire displaced the other dynasties.

Even after this revision and correction, fresh matter continued to be added, or to be integrated from the margins and interlinear spaces in the process of transcription.

P. 376. "[Tertio anno priore] Teglad Fallazar . . . sub Faccea . . . rege Israel transtulit . . . Ruben et Gad etc. in Assirios." The reviser assigns this event to the last year of Phaceas, the third year, according to Eusebius, before the foundation of Rome, which is related in the preceding entry.

P. 377. "[Secundo anno priore] Hippomenes rexit Athenenses annis x." The preceding entry deals with the sixth year of Ezechias; but Hippomenes, according to Eusebius, began to

¹ Except for the succession of pontiffs and kings in Judea, which occupies a separate column as far as the reign of Titus.

reign in the nineteenth year of Ezechias, and the text has no preceding entry which is placed by Eusebius after the accession of Hippomenes. The correction is thus misplaced in the present state of the text.

P. 379. “[Sexto anno priore] cœpit regnare Medos Cardeceas.” The earlier event to which the correction refers should be, according to Eusebius, the disappearance of Romulus and the accession of Numa Pompilius. But the actually preceding entry is “Dinastia Ægyptiorum intermittitur,” which is, as I have shown, here introduced very far before its time.

P. 379. “[Quinto anno priore] cœpit regnare Macidonios Acreus.” Acreus represents Argeus of the Eusebian Chronicle, which, however, has no event in the fifth year of that reign.

P. 379. “[Secundo anno priore] regnare cœpit . . . Tullus Hostilius.” This entry immediately follows the last quoted, but Eusebius places the event in the twelfth year of Argeus, and no event in our text is recorded in the second year of Tullus.

P. 380. “[Secundo anno priore] cœpit regnare Medos Fraortes.” The preceding entry has “Elchias sacerdos claruit,” which in Eusebius corresponds to the eleventh year of Phraortes. No event in our text corresponds to the second year of Phraortes.

P. 381. “[Quarto anno priore] cœpit regnare Lidios Aliates.” Nothing in our text corresponds to the fourth year of Alyattes in the Eusebian Chronicle.

P. 381. “[Quarto anno priore] (cœpit) regnare Medos Ciraxires.” Nothing in our text corresponds to the fourth year of Cyaxares in the Eusebian chronicle (p. 401), but his fifth year is the first year of Sadyattes, king of Lydia, = “Caditates” in our text, p. 380.

P. 383. “[Nono anno priore] coepit regnare Medos Astiages.” The ninth year of Astyages in the Eusebian Chronicle (p. 417) is “primus annus captivitatis Jerusalem.” This event is related considerably earlier in our text, p. 382. As the text stands, the correction purports to relate either to the accession of Servius Tullius, placed by Eusebius in the eighteenth year of Astyages, or to the death of Servius Tullius, thirty-four years later.

P. 393. “[Undecimo anno priore] Arideus . . . rex Macidonum . . . occisus est.” No event in our text seems to correspond to the eleventh year from the death of Aridæus in the Eusebian Chronicle (p. 475).

P. 394. "[Quarto anno priore] Ptolomeus Soter perit et Ptolomeus Philadelphus regnare coepit." P. 395. "[Quarto anno priore] Ptolomeus Philadelphus regnare coepit." The previous entry contains the accession of [Ptolomæus] Ceraunus, king of Macedonia, which Eusebius has in the third year of Ptolomæus Philadelphus. We must suppose "iii" to have been transcribed as "iiii." The correction made by the reviser stands then in its proper place, the transcript from the columnar text having placed Ceraunus wrongly before Philadelphus. But what, then, of the earlier correction of the same event? We must, I think, suppose that a later reviser endeavoured to restore the accession of Philadelphus to its proper sequence in accordance with the correction, but allowed the earlier amended entry to stand at the same time.

P. 401. "Iohannes tenuit pontificatum [quarto anno priore]." The pontificate of Iohannes began, according to Eusebius (p. 545), in the seventh year before the accession of Antiochus Grypus, which is in the preceding entry in our text. The Roman numeral "uii" has become "iiii" in transcription. The correction here holds good for the actual text.

All these corrections have been made in entries which belong to the columnar arrangement in the Eusebian Chronicle. They all have reference to the beginning or end of reigns. No other entry is corrected in this way. Here we have further indication that the original text consisted mainly of regnal entries taken from the Eusebian Chronicle. The corrections must have been inserted in a transcript which retained the columnar arrangement, but with incorrect alignment. Further displacement took place in later transcription, so that the majority of the corrections became themselves displaced.

One would have expected that the final reviser, who endeavoured to impose on the text the guise of annals, would have made an effort to place the corrected entries in the order indicated by the corrections, and would have then omitted the correcting clauses. But he seems to have been too lazy or too careless to take the trouble. One more instance of his method is worth noting. In Fragment I (p. 378) the accession of Leocrates is followed by a long passage, apparently quoted from some commentary on Kings iv or Isaias, "Hos annos xu. qui sequuntur," etc., in allusion to the fifteen years by which the

life of Ezechias was prolonged. The passage was added in the margin or in an internal space opposite the first year of Leocrates, which was the *last* year of Ezechias. The changes in the form of the text caused the death of Ezechias and the accession of Manasses to be wrongly placed further down (p. 378). The "annalist," however, had noted "Hos annos xu. qui sequuntur," and accordingly took fourteen "Ks" and distributed them between that entry and the displaced obit of Ezechias! A false date is thus assigned to every one of the intervening events.

VIII.—"CHRONICON EUSEBII" CONTINUED IN IRELAND TO
A.D. 607

Our text, then, was originally drawn up in columns on the Eusebian model. To the Eusebian material is added a list of Irish kings, giving the regnal data according to the Eusebian formula. Have we any independent evidence of the existence of such a compilation in ancient Ireland? The answer may take this form:—

The original text, of which a portion, with many late accretions, is found in Fragments I and II, may be identified with that version of the Chronicle of Eusebius which is thus recorded in the Annals of Ulster, under date of A.D. 609: "Finis cronici Iusebii" (Annals of Tigernach: "Finis cronice Euséui").

The editor of vol. i of the *Annals of Ulster* has on this entry the following note:—"This cannot refer to the genuine Chronicle of Eusebius, who died A.D. 340,¹ but may possibly allude to some copy thereof, with additions, known to old Irish annalists." I have shown that there was a version made in Ireland, with additions and omissions. It would be gratuitous to assume that there were two separate versions. We may therefore reasonably date the compilation or completion of our text, in its original form, about the year 607.²

This Irish continuation of the Chronicle of Eusebius, having been known to the compiler of the Old-Irish Chronicle, must have

¹ But the Chronicle was known in Ireland through the Latin version with continuation down to A.D. 445.

² There is much uncertainty as to exact dates in the Irish annals at this period.

been used by him. We may therefore expect to find some traces of the earlier compilation underlying the contents of the Annals of Ulster and of the Annals of Tigernach in the section preceding A.D. 609—some feature or features distinguishing this section from the section that follows it. There is one such feature—a very prominent one—and exactly typical of the kind of material of which the original of our text has been shown to have chiefly consisted. The reigns of the Popes, nearly in the typical form of Eusebian regnal entries, are given continuously in the Annals of Ulster from 432 to 607. This feature, and the formula followed, are already found in Prosper's continuation of the Eusebian Chronicle. For the pontificate of Sixtus, 432–440, the authority of Bede is quoted both under the first and the last year. If the citation were accurate, it might go to invalidate the argument; but, as the editor says (A.D. 440, foot-note), Bede "makes no mention, in either his Chronicle or History, of the pontificate of this Sixtus." The last Pope named in the Old-Irish Chronicle is named in the annal of 607 in the Annals of Ulster:—"Sabunianus natione Tuscus sedem Petri tenuit anno i. mensibus u. diebus x., et sepultus est in basilica Petri." A complete annal intervenes between this entry and "finis chronicī Eusebii." The true date of the death of Sabinianus is 606. He was succeeded in 606 or 607 by Bonifacius III, who reigned 8 months, 28 days, and died within the year 607. Hence it seems most likely that the document containing the succession of Popes ended in that year, before the death of Bonifacius III became known to the chronicler. The compiler of the Irish continuation of Eusebius may well have been Sinlán, or Mo-Sinu, moccu Min, scribe and abbot of Bangor, whose death is recorded in the same annal with "finis chronicī Eusebii"; he is called "famosus mundi magister" in the Antiphonary of Bangor, and obtained some celebrity in the history of Irish chronography.¹ Mo-Chuaróc "Sapiens" was his pupil.

An abstract of the papal succession from the Annals of Ulster (431–608) is here given. In the case of each Pope the length of his pontificate is stated in years, generally, as in the earliest catalogues, with the additional months and days; but

¹ See *Annals of Ulster*, Introduction, cxxxiii.

this statement is sometimes given with the record of his accession, sometimes with his obit, and in a few instances it is doubtful whether the year indicated is that of obit or of accession. I here compare the dates supplied by the Annals of Ulster with those commonly accepted¹ :—

		A.U.
Sixtus, . . .	8 years, 27 days, . . .	432-440 .. 432-440
Leo, . . .	21 (or 24) years, 1 month, 13 days,	441-460 .. 440-461
Hilarius, . . .	6 years, 3 months, 10 days, .	461-465 .. 461-468
Simplicius, . . .	12 ² years, 1 month .. days,	465- .. 468-483
Felix, . . .	12 or 13 years, . . .	481- .. 483-492
Gelasius, . . .	3 years,	492- .. 492-496
Anastasius, . . .	2 years,	496- .. 496-498
Symmachus, . . .	15 years,	498- .. 498-514
Hormisdas, . . .	9 years,	514- .. 514-523
Johannes, . . .	2 years, 9 months, 17 days,	524- .. 523-526
Felix, . . .	4 years, 9 months, 14 days,	527-532 .. 526-530
Bonifacius, . . .	2 years, 26 days, . . .	533- .. 530-532
Johannes, ³ . . .	2 years, 4 months, 6 days,	535- .. 533-535
Agapetus, . . .	11 months, 8 days, . . .	537- .. 535-536
Silverius, . . .	1 year, 5 months, 11 days,	538- .. 536-540 (537)
Vigilius, . . .	17 years, 6 months, 22 days,	539- (537) 540-555
Pelagius, . . .	11 years, 18 days, ⁴ . . .	555- .. 556-561
Johannes, . . .	12 years, 11 months, 26 days,	566- .. 561-574
Benedictus, . . .	4 years, 1 month, 29 days,	578- .. 575-579
Pelagius, . . .	10 years, 2 months, 10 days,	582- .. 579-590
Gregorius, . . .	13 years, 6 months, 10 days,	592-606 .. 590-604
Sabinianus, . . .	1 year, 5 months, 10 days,	607- .. 604-606

It is to be noted that, beginning with A.D. 487, one year must be added to the A.D. quoted from the Annals of Ulster in order to obtain the true A.D. Consequently we note that, starting from a correct dating of the accession and obit of Sixtus, nearly every following date in the papal succession is wrongly given, the errors varying from one to seven years. Similar data are found in the version of the Old-Irish Chronicle represented in Fragment III, but the absence of numerical dates and the omission of a number of annal-headings render minute comparison unprofitable. In both versions, the record of the papal succession ceases altogether with Sabinianus, and

¹ As in Denzinger's *Enchiridion Symbolorum*, ed. Bannwart, 1911.

² Read xu instead of xii.

³ Also named Mercurius.

⁴ Pelagius reigned less than 5 years.

the second following annal in both has the entry "Finis Chronici Eusebii."

The papal succession, as given in the Old-Irish Chronicle, is a typical example of a class of catalogues of the Popes. Duchesne (*Liber Pontificalis*, p. xii) has shown that similar catalogues were drawn up at various times in the fifth, sixth, and seventh centuries. The earliest instance and the model of such catalogues is found in the entries regarding the papal succession in Prosper's continuation (down to A.D. 445) of the Eusebian Chronicle, where, in the record of each Pope's accession, the years, months, and days of his pontificate are given. Duchesne describes nine extant Latin catalogues of the Popes drawn up after Prosper's time. The earliest of these originally ended with Felix III († 492), but was afterwards continued to 640. The second, third, and fourth contained originally a catalogue ending with Hormisdas (514-523). The fifth ended with Pelagius († 561). The sixth, in the first hand, included Agapetus († 536), but was later extended to include St. Gregory († 604). The seventh reaches to St. Gregory († 604), the eighth to Theodorus († 649), the ninth to Conon († 687).

The Irish catalogue is distinct from any of these. It was unknown to Duchesne, and comes between the seventh and the eighth of his list. To judge from the omission of the months and days in the five successive pontificates of Felix, Gelasius, Anastasius, Symmachus, and Hormisdas, the Irish catalogue in its earlier portion was founded on a catalogue drawn up in the time of Felix III, perhaps the first of the nine catalogues found by Duchesne. The resumption of the detailed account in months and days after Hormisdas seems to indicate that the compiler of the Irish list used a catalogue which was a continuation of one of the catalogues ending with Hormisdas, but which did not include the catalogue down to Hormisdas. The Irish catalogue resembles Prosper's in being embodied in a chronicle; and the entry, "Finis Chronici Eusebii," indicates that this chronicle, though dealing also with the affairs of Ireland, was drawn up as a continuation of the Chronicle of Eusebius, Jerome, and Prosper. It thus becomes fairly evident that in Fragments I, II, and III of the Annals of Tigernach and in the Annals of Ulster, as far as A.D. 609, we have what remains of the Irish Chronicon Eusebii. We

have here also the oldest known history of Ireland; and we have proof that Irish contemporary chronicling begins as far back as the close of the sixth and the beginning of the seventh century.

The errors in dating the Popes are to be explained, like the errors in synchronizing of Fragments I and II, by displacement of material arranged in columns. The Irish *Chronicon Eusebii* cannot have contained the full text of the chronicle whose name it borrowed, and appears to have contained very little, if anything, more than the regnal items. The original *Chronicle of Eusebius* seems to have abandoned the columnar arrangement when it ceased to record any dynasty except that of the Roman Empire, that is to say, after the destruction of Jerusalem. But the Irish abbreviated version had already, before this point, introduced in columnar arrangement the Irish dynasties of Emain and Temair; and, since the record of these dynasties continued after the cessation of the Judean dynasty, the Irish chronicle maintained the columnar arrangement for its record of Roman emperors and Irish kings. This record furnished its chronographic system —a fact which is sufficiently established by two chronographic notes found in both versions of the Old-Irish Chronicle.

Annals of Ulster, A.D. 490: "Zeno Augustus uita decessit anno septimo mense sexto. *Hi sex menses et sex menses Marcianni addunt annum quem non numerant chronicā.*"

A.D. 537. "(Agapitus, natione Romanus, Romane ecclesie episcopus, sedit mensibus xi. diebus uiii., et in basilica beati Petri apostoli sepultus est): xxui. dies Bonifacii, et iiii. menses et ui. dies Mercurii, et xi. menses et dies uiii. Agapiti efficiunt annum et iiii. menses et x. dies."

The former of these two notes explains the latter, which might otherwise seem to be a purposeless exercise in arithmetic. In a regnal system of chronography, such as is found in the *Chronicle of Eusebius* and its continuations, every event is assigned to a numbered year in a reign, and each reign appears to contain an exact number of years without any additional fraction of a year. Since nearly every reign contained an additional fraction, it became necessary, when such fractions were in view, to deal with them in such a way as to maintain throughout the whole series of reigns as correct a chronography as possible. Thus, if a given reign exceeded an exact number

of years by a fraction, the broken year must be reckoned as a year either of that reign or of the following reign. The method adopted seems to have been to assign the whole of the broken year to whichever of the two reigns contained the greater part of the year. The note under A.D. 490 deals with two reigns, in each of which there was a surplus fraction of six months. The two reigns were not consecutive; and the writer of the note indicates that, in the "chronica" known to him, this surplus fraction was in each case left out of the reckoning, so that in any series of years containing both reigns, the chronography, reduced from regnal years to years in an era, Mundane or Christian, would be made erroneous by the omission of a whole year. The note was written with a view to such reduction; and it proves that such a change as has been shown to have been made in the form of Fragments I and II was also contemplated and was afterwards carried out in the form of the early section of the Old-Irish Chronicle, the section beginning with A.D. 431 as in the Annals of Ulster.

The note under A.D. 537 has a similar significance and purpose. The writer of the note found the papal data in a chronicle—doubtless the Irish continuation of the Eusebian Chronicle—in which the chronographic norm was supplied, as in the last part of the Eusebian Chronicle, by the regnal years of the Roman emperors, not by numbered years in an era; that is to say, the chronicle was a tabular synchronism, not a book of annals in the ordinary form. The note contemplates the reduction of this chronicle to the form of annals, and the problem with which it deals is, under what years the accessions of certain Popes are to be recorded. We may observe that the note deals only with the fractional parts of years, making no mention of the two complete years of Bonifacius or of the two complete years of Mercurius (Iohannes). It points out that the fractions, taken together, amount to more than a year, so that, in addition to the two years of Bonifacius and two years of Mercurius, the fractional parts make up a total of more than five years.¹ The accession of the next Pope, Silverius,

¹ The writer of the note, with all his precision, overlooked the fact that the intervals between the pontificates were not included in his reckoning. The maxim "Le roi est mort, vive le roi!" does not hold good for the papal succession, and perhaps part of the erroneous dating of the Popes in the Old-Irish Chronicle was due to this oversight.

would thus have to be recorded in the sixth, not in the fifth, annal from the accession of Bonifacius. It is so recorded in the Annals of Ulster, but the Annals of Tigernach have it in the eighth annal. Here we have further indication of an early regnal chronography which has been independently converted into common annalistic form in the two versions of the Old-Irish Chronicle.

A note of similar import, but not correctly transcribed, is found in the annal of 527: "Felix, Romane ecclesie episcopus, sedit annis *iiii.*, mensibus *ix.*, diebus *xiiii.*¹ *Iohannis et dies xiiii.*, et mensibus *ii.* et diebus *xiii.* *Felix efficiunt quartum annum* et sepultus est in basilica beati Petri apostoli." The words in brackets, as their place in the context shows, are an incorporated gloss. The annal of 524 gives the pontificate of Iohannes 2 years, 9 months, 17 days. The two years and 9 months are taken by the glossator as bringing the reckoning to the end of a year, leaving 17 days to be carried forward. For "annum quartum" in the gloss, we should read "annum quintum." The import of the gloss may be stated thus in arithmetical form:

	Years	Months	Days
From the pontificate of Iohannes,	0	0	17
The pontificate of Felix,	. .	4	9
These with the addition of	. .	0	2
Make a total of	. .	5	0

In other words, if a calendar year ended with the nine months of Iohannes, the fifth succeeding calendar year is completed by two months after the pontificate of Felix. The gloss, then, should have read, "Hi *iiii* anni, menses *ix.*, dies *xiiii.* [Felicitis], et dies *xiiii* Iohannis, et *ii.* menses post Felicem efficiunt quintum annum."² Whence it would be inferred that the next Pope, Bonifacius, began his pontificate within the fifth year of the series in view, and that the entry of his accession was to be made in the fifth annal after the pontificate of

¹ "xiiii," Fragment III.

² The present condition of the note may be ascribed to the ineffectual effort of some reviser to reconstruct a statement which had no precise meaning for him; perhaps after the original had suffered mistranscription. Compare the next footnote here.

Johannes. This note, like the two others, was a memorandum intended to secure the accurate conversion of the tabular chronicle into a series of annals. It did not secure this purpose in either of the extant versions. The Annals of Ulster have the accession of Bonifacius in the seventh annal, Fragment III in the sixth annal, from the accession of Felix.¹ But these notes prove that the papal accessions were originally given in a vertical column. If they had been given as items in a para-graphic text, the notes would have served no purpose; in that case, too, the items would have been found in the same context in the two extant versions.

The effect of the conversion of columns into paragraphs, already illustrated in regard to Fragment I, is further plainly seen in Fragment III and the Annals of Ulster, when the established data of the imperial and papal accessions are compared with the relative position of the accessions in these chronicles. It will be further evident that the variations here shown could not have arisen if the original text, from which these data in the two chronicles were derived, had been written in consecutive dated paragraphs.

	EMPEROR.	POPE.	FRAG. III.	AU.
A.D. 526.	—	1. Felix.		
527.	1. Justinianus.	2.	1. Felix.	
528.	2.	3.	2.	1. Felix.
529.	3.	4.	3.	2.
530.	4.	5.	4.	3.
531.	5.	1. Bonifacius.	5.	4.
532.	6.	2.	6.	5.
533.	7.	1. Iohannes.	1. Bonifacius.	6.
534.	8.	2.	2.	1. Bonifacius.
535.	9.	1. Agapetus.	1. Iohannes.	2.
536.	10.	1. Silverius.	2.	1. Iohannes.
537.	11.	2.	3.	2.
538.	12.	1. Vigilius.	1. Agapetus.	1. Agapetus.
539.	13.	2.	2.	1. Silverius.
540.	14.	3.	1. Silverius.	1. Vigilius.
541.	15.	4.	1. Vigilius.	2.

The Irish continuation of the Eusebian Chronicle appears to have had its regnal framework drawn up in three columns, one

¹ For the meaningless "et possito ergense ecc leccam lias" of AU. 532, read "episcopus Romanae ecclesiae lius."

for the emperors, one for the kings of Ireland, and one for the Popes. The imperial succession, being the normal basis of the chronography, suffers the least displacement. It is given thus in the Annals of Ulster:

Marcianus,	449 [accepted date 450]	[Bede, 452]
Leo I,	456 [, , 457]	[, 459]
Leo II,	473 [, , 474]	[, 476]
Zeno,	473 [, , 474]	[, 476]
Anastasius,	490 [, , 491]	[, 493]
Anastasius,	ob. 517 [, , 518]	[, 521]
Justinus,	ob. 526 [, , 527]	[, 529]
Justinianus,	526 [, , 527]	[, 529]
Justinus, ¹	565 [, , 565]	[, 567]
Tiberius,	576 [, , 578]	[, 578]
Mauricius, ²	583 [, , 586]	[, 585]
Phocas,	604 [, , 602]	[, 606]

Since, after 486, the dates in the Annals of Ulster are to be corrected by adding one year, it will be seen that the maximum of error in this list is three years.

In the list of kings of Ireland, we are on more difficult ground, as there is no other known document of nearly so early date available for comparison. For the first eight reigns, beginning with Loeguire, the Annals of Ulster supply alternative final dates. These dates may be derived either from the different versions of the Irish "Chronicon Eusebii" or from quite distinct sources. Fragment III does not give alternative dates, so that, unless selection was made between the alternatives, this redaction relies on a single older version. It may be remarked that, of the various entries quoted by the Annals of Ulster from the lost Book of Cuanu, I can find only one in Fragment III, the curious entry (p. 169=AU 610) "Aed Róin et Aed Laigen," perhaps to be supplemented by "moriuntur." The following is the list of the Irish kings within the period 431-609:—

1. Loeguire, ob. 461 and 462.
2. Ailill Molt. "Initium regni Ailella Muilt maic Nath-í."
463. Ob. 482 and "secundum alios," 483.

¹ Inserted from Bede, having probably been omitted in an early transcript through confusion with the preceding names. Fragment III (p. 146) preserves the original entry.

² "Mauricius annis xxi. regnauit, ut Beda et Isidorus dicunt," indicating an amendment of the original dating by a reviser in accordance with Isidore and Bede.

3. *Luguid.* "Initium regni Lugdech maic Laeghaire, 484." Ob. 506, 507, and "secundum Librum Monachorum," 511. Perhaps the other wide variations in date, amounting to five, six, and seven years, may be ascribed to the chronography of this lost "Liber Monachorum." Fragment III joins in one entry the death of *Luguid* and the battle of *Ard Chorann*, as in AU 506 and 507.

4. "Muirchertach mac Earca regnare incipit," 512. Ob. 533 and 535. The obit in Fragment III corresponds to the earlier entry in AU.

5. "Tuathal Maelgarbh regnauit annis xi," 536. This entry follows the Eusebian formula in both versions. Possibly the uncertain length of the reigns caused this formula to be laid aside in other instances. Ob. 543 and 548. Fragment III follows the latter entry in detail.

6. "Cui successit Diarmait mac Cerbaill," 543. "Diarmait mac Fergusa Cerrbeoil . . . regnare incipit, secundum Librum Cuanach," 544. Fragment III has this accession in the same annal as *Tuathal*'s death. Ob. 564 and 571; Fragment III accords with the earlier entry.

7. "Cui successerunt duo filii Maic Erce, Forgus et Domnall," 564—so in both versions. "Mors Domnaill filii Muirchertaig Maic Earca," 565—so in both versions. Neither records the death of *Forgus*, who may have continued to reign jointly with *Domnall*'s successor. An alternative obit of *Domnall* and accession of *Ainmíri* is given by AU in 572.

8. "Cui successit Ainmíri mac Setni," 565—so in both versions. Ob. 568 and 575. Fragment III accords with the earlier date. Neither version records the accession of a successor.

9. "Occisio of the two descendants of Muiredach, i.e. Baetán son of Muirchertach and Echaid son of Domnall, tertio anno regni sui," 571—so in both versions. In the following annal, Fragment III has "Baedan mac Ninedadha regnauit."

10. "Occisio of Baetán son of Ninnid . . . king of Temair," 585. AU adds "qui uno anno regnauit," but names no other king of Ireland during the foregoing thirteen years. If *Aed* son of *Ainmíri* was king of Ireland at the time of the Convention of *Druim Ceata*, and if this event took place in 575, it would appear that *Aed* and *Baetán* reigned jointly. Fragment III does

not record the Convention of Druim Ceata, given in AU under the year 574.

11. "Initium regni Aeda maic Ainmireach," 591. Fragment III records the accession of Aed in the same annal as the death of Baetán son of Ninnid. From AU we may also infer that Aed succeeded Baetán. Baetán was slain at the instance of Colman Bec, son of King Diarmait (sixth in this list), and the next annal in both versions records the defeat and death of Colman by Aed son of Ainmíri. Hence the entry in AU under 591 is probably to be taken as a duplicate record of Aed's accession, implied in his victory over Colmán. Aed's death is recorded by AU in 597, and the entry in Fragment III accords with this.

12. Colmán Rímid and Aed Sláne. "Initium regni Colmain Rigmedo et Aeda Slaine simul," 597. The obits of both are given under 603.

13. "Aed Uairidnach . . . regnauit," 604.

Though the Eusebian formula of regnal entries is not commonly used by the Annals of Ulster in recording the accessions of kings of Ireland, and a special Irish formula (e.g. "Muirchertach do gabail rigi nErend") is used in Fragment III, nevertheless that these entries occupied a place apart, that is a separate column, in the original chronicle is to be inferred from the different context in which the accessions are recorded in the two versions. Hence it would appear that, in converting the tabular entries into paragraphic form, one redaction, from which the Annals of Ulster are derived, abandoned the Eusebian formula. The other redaction, which was the source of Fragment III, omitted for the most part the number of years assigned to the reigns.¹ The change in each case may have been caused by the difficulty in reconciling the number of years in each reign with the apparent number indicated by the displaced entries. One reign only, that of Tuathal Maelgarbh, retains the Eusebian formula in both versions.

¹ The formula "cui successit," etc., found in both versions, indicates that the Eusebian formula had already been discarded in the Old-Irish Chronicle.

IX.—THE OLD-IRISH CHRONICLE COMPILED c. A.D. 712.

As between the two extant versions of the Old-Irish Chronicle, there is much variation in the sequence of events extending as far as A.D. 584.¹ Omitting entries not common to the two versions, we find that alternative dates are frequent in the Annals of Ulster until the year 602 (= 603) is reached. Between 602 and 639 (= 640), they are not found. For "bellum (Cathrach) Cinn Chon," two dates, 639 and 642, are given. This is a south-western event, and the chronicle at this period is mainly occupied with the affairs of "Conn's Half" and of the Irish colony in Scotland. But in the series of years 647–667, alternative dates again become frequent in the Annals of Ulster, and in the same series of years there is considerable variation in the sequence of events as between these annals and the Annals of Tigernach. After 667, the two versions are in close agreement, and alternative datings are very rare. The confusion in dating and sequence within the period 647–667 can be explained as due to the "Great Plague" ("mortalitas magna") which broke out in Ireland in the autumn of 664, and was still raging in 668. In the second year of the pestilence, the chronicle records the death of the two kings of Ireland, the king of Munster, St. Feichéne of Fobair, Ailerán Sapiens, St. Manchán of Liath Mancháin, and "innumerable bishops, abbots (kings, according to the 'Tigernach' version), and others"; and in 667 (according to the same version) "four abbots of Bennchor perished." It is therefore no wonder that the record of the foregoing twenty years is lacking in precision.

Alternative datings are of rare occurrence in Fragment III—I mean, instances of an event recorded in more than one annal. It does not necessarily follow that Fragment III is to be derived from a version of the Old-Irish Chronicle in which such alternative entries had not yet been introduced, and that they were of later introduction in a version belonging to the pedigree of the Annals of Ulster. Of alternative entries quoted in the Annals of Ulster,

¹ In a minor degree, as far as 592. Though the entries are found in different sequence, their wording is either identical, or so nearly identical as to prove a common source.

from the "Book of Cuanu," I have noted only one¹ in Fragment III, where this book is never quoted by name; but this one entry cannot be held to prove that the version of the Old-Irish Chronicle from which Fragment III is derived had already been amplified by the entries from Cuanu. It may have been introduced later and indirectly. I would ascribe the absence of alternative datings in Fragment III, in part to a process of selection, in which the redactor, unlike the faithful copyists of the Annals of Ulster, thought it proper to determine for himself the question of the correct placing of each event. We have evidence that a redactor of the version represented in Fragment III used his own judgment in the retention and rejection of entries found in his exemplar. The entry in the Annals of Ulster, under A.D. 732, "Congressio iterum inter Aed mac Fergaile et Genus Conaill etc.," is found in Fragment III, in the corresponding annal; but the entry of the previous year, "Bellum inter Genus Conaill et Eugain," which explains "iterum," is not found in Fragment III. In general, comparison of Fragment III with the Annals of Ulster leads me to think that Fragment III represents a version of the Old-Irish Chronicle abridged, not by mere verbal shortening, but by the omission of entries regarded as of minor importance. Most of the omissions are records of events in Scotland and obits of persons of minor celebrity.

The Old-Irish Chronicle, in both versions, continues one Eusebian feature, the succession of the Roman Emperors. Here is the Imperial succession, as recorded in the Annals of Ulster from A.D. 600 onward.

A.D. 604. Phocas, 7 years.² [602-610.]

A.D. 612. Heraclius, 26 years.³ [610-642.]

A.D. 638. Heracleonas cum matre sua Martina, 2 years.
[641.]

A.D. 641. Constantinus filius Heraclii, 6 months. [641.]

¹ Viz. the curiously brief entry, "Aed Roin 7 Aed Laigen." In AU. 628, I take the words "Sic in libro Cuanach inueni, vel sic in libro Duib Da Lethe narratur" to refer to the entry which follows; the event being entered also under 629 and 635.

² In Fragment III, 8 years.

³ In Fragment III, 22 years. The number 26, taken from Bede, is obtained artificially (638-612), for Heraclius was still reigning when his sons became emperors.

A.D. 642. *Constans¹ filius Constantini, 28 years.* [641.]

A.D. 672. *Constantinus filius superioris Constantini, 17 years.*

[668]. Fragment III, in the corresponding annal, no doubt through the notion that this entry was a duplicate of the preceding one, substitutes "Justinianus minor, filius Constantini, annis x. regnauit." The entry is preceded by the Bedan A. M. 4658 = A.D. 707—a further confusion, the date of the second reign of Justinianus being taken instead of the date of the first. This shows that the entries of Fragment III were revised by collation with Bede's chronicle. The error thus initiated in the relative placing of the reigns is continued to the end of the series in Fragment III.

A.D. 689. *Iustinianus minor filius Constantini, 10 years.* [685]. Fragment III, having already given this entry in the wrong place, gives it also in the annal corresponding to 689 of the Annals of Ulster, but without the Bedan date.

A.D. 701. *Tiberius Caesar, 7 years.* In Fragment III the corresponding annal does not contain this entry, but the annal corresponding to 684 of the Annals of Ulster has "Tiberi[u]s annis . . . regnauit," and in the margin the Bedan date A.M. 4668 = A.D. 717. This version of the chronicle has therefore endeavoured to correct what was thought to be an erroneous entry, and has made a much greater error, dating the reign of Tiberius after the second reign of Justinianus, mistaking no doubt Tiberius Absimarus for Tiberius son of Justinianus. The omission of the number after "annis" was probably intentional, owing to the difficulty of reconciling the erroneous dates.

A.D. 709. *Justinianus secundus² cum Tiberio filio, 7 years.* [705.]

A.D. 719. *Theodosius³, one year.* [716.]

The imperial succession supplies a valuable criterion for dating the compilation of the Old-Irish Chronicle. The series is consecutive as far as the end of the second reign of Justinianus the younger, A.D. 711. The usurper Leontius (695-698) is not recognized, but Tiberius Absimarus, who overthrew Leontius and

¹ "Constantinus," Fragment III, which gives this entry under the same annal as the preceding entry. AU. also reads "Constantinus."

² Read "secundo," as in Bede and Fragment III, = for a second time.

³ Both AU. and Fragment III have "Teodorus."

reigned until the restoration of Justinianus, is admitted to the list.

Bede's Chronicle, in which each Imperial reign forms a chapter, and which ends in the ninth year of Leo III, A.D. 726, was not the source of these data in the Annals of Ulster. Bede records the reign of Leontius, which the Irish chronicle does not recognize.¹ After Justinianus, Bede records the reigns of Philippicus (711-713), Anastasius (713-716), Theodosius (716-717), and Leo (718). Of these reigns, that of Theodosius alone is found in the Annals of Ulster. It is evident from the contents of the Annals of Ulster that they embody a contemporary chronicle commenced at latest within the first half of the eighth century. Such a chronicle would not be likely, if it drew on Bede's Chronicle for the Imperial succession from 600 to 695, to omit the latest Imperial reigns recorded by Bede, and fresh in memory when the chronicler was at work.

We shall, however, if I mistake not, find the source of the Imperial regnal data of the seventh century in an earlier work by Bede, the tract *De Temporibus*, forming a section of the book *De Natura Rerum*, and completed in the fifth year of Tiberius Absimarus, A.D. 703.² This work must have attracted much attention in Ireland, especially in northern Ireland, where the Columban monasteries still held out against the Roman observance of the date of Easter. It lays down rules for ascertaining the date of Easter in accordance with the Roman usage. It uses the A.D. reckoning, as yet unfamiliar, though not wholly unknown to the Irish schools; and it gives a rule for ascertaining the year of the Lord. But its strongest claim to notoriety was perhaps the introduction of a quite new reckoning of the age of the world, differing by more than a thousand years from any older reckoning known in Ireland. Bede's wording, where it is distinctive, is found in some of the entries in the Irish chronicle: "Heracleonas cum matre sua Martina," the name Constantinus substituted for Constans, "Constantinus filius superioris Constantini." In the annal of 712 (AU 711), both versions of the Old-Irish Chronicle have the entry "Beda fecit

¹ For Leontius, Bede, in Migne's edition, has Leo. This change of name may have had a scribal origin (e.g. Leōtius misread as Leo tertius), but it is copied in Fragment III.

² In the Annals of Ulster the fifth year of Tiberius is 705.

librum magnum." This date is not applicable to those other works of Bede which an Irish chronicler was likely to have singled out for special notice, his *De Temporum Ratione*, containing the Chronicle, and his Ecclesiastical History; both being of much later publication. I therefore suggest that a manuscript of *De Natura Rerum* and *De Temporibus*, written in 703, reached Ireland in 712. Such a manuscript could have continued the list of Emperors found in *De Temporibus* by completing the entry of the reign of Tiberius and adding the second reign of Justinianus, which ended in 711.¹

Two alternatives may be considered. The Irish chronicler may have drawn on Bede's *De Temporibus* as far as it went, and may have added the second reign of Justinianus from separate information; or he may have had a separate source for the whole succession of emperors. In the latter alternative, the wording of the entries may have been changed by the later redactor to accord with Bede's wording. It is to be observed that the second reign of Justinianus is recorded in the words of Bede's chronicle:—"Justinianus secundo² cum Tiberio filio annis ui." Whatever may have been their source, the termination of the series of imperial regnal entries with this reign of Justinianus is the most definite indication that I can find of the date of compilation of the Old-Irish Chronicle.

¹ Fragment III contains a specific record of Bede's book *De Temporibus*, and this confirms my suggestion that the book obtained special celebrity in Ireland: "In hoc anno Beda fecit librum [de Natura Rerum] et Temporibus et in pagin et [in figell]." The source—Chronicon Scottorum?—from which Stokes supplies the missing words is not stated by him, nor does he say anything of the nature of the lacunae, whether they arise from scribal omissions, spaces left blank, erasures, or defacements. He does not suggest any interpretation of "in figell"; "in pagin" he connects with "paginare breuiter scribere" of Ducange; cp. Bede's own words with which his later work *De Temporum Ratione* begins: "De natura rerum et ratione temporum, duos quondam stricto sermone libellos, dissentibus ut rebar necessarios, composui." The entry in Fragment III is wrongly placed in the annal of 690 (= AU. 689), this being taken for the fifth year of Tiberius, whose accession is wrongly entered in the annal of 686. The entry is thus of late insertion, and probably taken from a gloss on Bede's Chronicle, which has been freely used in supplementing the Old-Irish Chronicle in Fragment III. In the annal of 712 (AU. 711), the entry "In hoc anno fecit Béda librum magnum" is followed in Fragment III by the gloss ".i. Berba Béid." For "Berba" read "Uerba"; the glossator doubtless meant Bede's tract *De Orthographia*, which, however, in comparison with his other writings, would hardly have been called "liber magnus."

² "secundus" AU., "serdō" (l. *secundo*, *q* mistaken for *ar* by the scribe) in Fragment III, where Stokes, following AU., incorrectly substitutes "secundus."

The isolated entry of the reign of Theodosius remains to be considered. This entry, in both versions of the Old-Irish Chronicle, is found in a very brief annal, of which the entire contents are as follows:—[A.D. 719=720] Aestas pluvialis. Sínach Insolo Crothraṇṇ dormiuit. Murbrucht mar in mense Octobris. Theodorus anno uno (regnauit).¹ Bede likewise has “Theodosius anno uno,” but, if the entry is taken from Bede, it is not easy to understand why the reigns of Leontius, Philippicus, Anastasius, and Leo have not also been inserted from Bede. The date indicated by Bede for this reign is 719-720. The Annals of Ulster indicate 720-721, since they record the Imperial reigns in the commencing years.² I can only suggest that the reign of Theodosius was inserted by a contemporary chronicler when the news of his deposition reached Ireland, or was a late and casual insertion from some document other than Bede's Chronicle.

The version of the Old-Irish Chronicle in Fragment III, unlike the version in the Annals of Ulster, has been freely supplemented by a late redactor, with quotations *in extenso* from Bede's Chronicle. Precisely similar quotations from the same source are found in Fragments I and II, especially, as in Fragment III, when an Imperial reign is recorded, so that all this supplementation from Bede's Chronicle may be ascribed to one hand. In Fragment III Bede's Chronicle is the source of the long quotations beginning with the following words:—“Simacus papa,” p. 124; “Anastassius imperator,” p. 128; “Iohannes Rome,” p. 129; “Heldericus,” p. 130; “Benedictus,” p. 130; “Iustinianus,” p. 131; “In isto anno,” p. 131; “Vigilius,” p. 136; “Narsis,” p. 146; “Gregorius,” p. 152; “Rex Gothorum” (with the rest rendered in Irish), pp. 154, 155; “Secundo anno” (as far as “abstulerunt”), p. 167; “Anastasius” (as far as “scribsit”), p. 170; “Senodus,” p. 197;

¹ “Indsi Clothrand,” Fragment III. “Insolo” must arise from a late scribal confusion with the genitive *inseo*.

² Leo, having deposed Theodosius, was crowned in 717. In the Annals of Ulster, the Imperial accessions from the beginning of the seventh century are post-dated usually by four or five years. So far I have found no explanation of this dating, unless it be that the Imperial reigns were set out in a separate column, forming the chronographic norm of the annals and suffered displacement, like the regnal data in Fragments I and II. Bede post-dates the reigns by three years as compared with the accepted dating.

"Papa Sergius," p. 207; "Gisulphus," p. 208; "Hereberctus," p. 209; "Hic auxilio," p. 212; "Anastasius," p. 217; "Luidbrandus," p. 217; "Ecberctus," p. 217; "Theodosius," p. 218; "Saraceni," p. 219; "Luidbrandus," p. 219. The last quotation from Bede is found on p. 219, and is taken from the beginning of the chapter which follows the chronicle in *De Temporum Ratione*:—"Haec de cursu praeteriti saeculi ex Hebraeica veritate, prout potuimus, ostendere curauimus." It seems to indicate that the interpolation from Bede was one continuous operation.

The interpolator worked on a version of the chronicle which either had no dates to guide him or was dated by a chronography that was obsolete in his time. Before Justinianus Minor, Bede records the reigns of three Emperors named Constantinus. The second of the three should be Constans. The interpolator here became confused and omitted the last Constantinus; and, being guided, not by dates, but by the number of years in each reign, he recorded here the beginning of the reign of Justinianus. He was consequently thrown out of his reckoning to the extent of seventeen years, the length of the reign of the last Constantinus. Each succeeding imperial reign is accordingly entered about seventeen years before its time. This version of the Irish Chronicle contains all the reigns, beginning with Justinianus Minor, that are found in Bede's Chronicle, all wrongly placed. Four of these reigns, as we have seen, are not recorded in the Annals of Ulster.

The chronicle which was thus interpolated already contained a record of the two reigns of Justinianus; and of the reigns of Tiberius Absimarus and Theodosius. The interpolator expunged—or, if he was a transcriber, omitted—the record of the reign of Tiberius from its original place.¹ He made no such adjustment in the other cases, and thus Fragment III contains both the interpolated and the original entries of the first reign of Justinianus (pp. 232 and 211), and the second reign of Justinianus (pp. 212 and 222), and the reign of Theodosius

¹ Unless the original chronicle omitted Tiberius as well as Leontius, regarding both as usurpers during the exile of Justinianus. In that case, Tiberius must have been inserted from Bede in the version followed by AU. But, as already said, we cannot well understand why, if certain reigns were inserted from Bede, four of the reigns in Bede were omitted.

(pp. 218 and 227). Further, the interpolator, not having read his Bede with much care, and finding Bede's Chronicle concluded in the ninth year of Leo, records (p. 219): "Leo annis ix. regnauit." Leo reigned twenty-four years.

Of the four imperial reigns found in Bede's Chronicle and in the Annals of Ulster, only the interpolated and misplaced entries are found in Fragment III. Hence we may conclude that the omissions in the Annals of Ulster are not merely scribal, but original; and so, that the compiler of the Old Irish Chronicle did not use Bede's Chronicle as a source. Thus we arrive at a posterior limit for the compilation; Bede's great *De Temporum Ratione*, containing the chronicle, must have been eagerly sought after in Ireland as soon as it was known to exist.¹ A chronicle which ceases to be retrospective about A.D. 712 may be regarded as a contemporary record for a generation before that date, or from about A.D. 680. The general character of the annals accords with this view. Towards the end of the seventh century, they increase in extent and become more detailed. The contrast with the earlier portions is much greater than would appear at first sight, for the earlier annals are extended by duplicate entries and by the inclusion of many entries relative to the Irish in Scotland, the Britons, and the Anglo-Saxons. The compiler seems to have drawn on a written record kept in Iona for his account of events in Britain. Thus we find, in the annal of 669, "UENIT genus Garnait DE HIBERNIA"; in the annal of 675, "Faelbe [abbas Iae] de Hibernia reuertitur"; 690, "uentus magnus xui. kl. Octimbris quosdam ui. ex familia Iae mersit"; 691, "Adomnanus xiiii^o. anno post pausam Failbei ad Hiberniam pergit"; 696, "Adomnanus ad Hiberniam pergit." The entry

¹ The Karlsruhe copy contains many Irish glosses. I think, however, that the compiler of the Old-Irish Chronicle must have ceased to work on it very soon after the death of Justinianus in 711. The succeeding Emperor, Philippicus, was blinded and deposed in 713. Throughout all Christendom, at that time, in Ireland as elsewhere, the Emperors were regarded as the chief rulers in the world; and we cannot well suppose that a chronicler who had recorded every Imperial reign down to 711 would have omitted to record the reign of Philippicus as soon as its end became known to him. Hence we may conclude that in or about the years 711-713, perhaps just after the record of Bede's "great book" in 712, the Old-Irish Chronicle ceases to be a retrospective compilation, and becomes thenceforward a contemporary record of local events.

of 684, "Terrae motus in insola," developed in Fragment III to "in Ibernia insola," may well have had reference to Iona.

Another source from which quotations are found in both versions of the chronicle is a poem or poems, apparently on the subject of the wars of Cenél nEogain or of the northern Ui Néill, by Cenn Faelad "Sapiens," whose death is recorded in the annal of 678.¹

In endeavouring to date the compilation of the Old-Irish Chronicle, we must have regard to the record of unusual phenomena outside of personal and political events. The force of this evidence will best be appreciated from a complete abstract. The dates are given as found in the Annals of Ulster.

495. Solis defectus apparuit.

[511. Defectus solis contigit.]²

[535. Perditio panis. (A.U. only, probably in duplication of the next entry quoted).]

538. Perditio panis.

544. Mortalitas prima, quæ dicitur bléfed, in qua Mo-Bi clarainech obiit. ("Prima" indicates a retrospective record. Fragment III has "Magna" instead).

548. Mortalitas magna, in qua isti pausant, &c.

553. Pestis quæ uocatur [in] samthrosc.

[555. Mortalitas magna hoc anno .i. in chron chonaill .i. in buide chonaill. (The gloss ".i. in crom conaill nó in buidhe chonnaill" in Fragment III accompanies the entry of AU 548.)]

[563. Uentus magnus factus est.]

575. Scintilla lepræ et habundantia nucum inaudita.

587. Conuersio Constantini ad Dominum, et nix magna.

588. Eodemque tempore aestas torrida et sicca contigit.

For "tempore," Fragment III has "anno."

590. Defectio solis .i. mane tenebrosum.

[591. Matutina tenebrosa.] (Probably a duplicate of the foregoing entry. I would translate, not "a dark morning," but

¹ Cenn Faelad, son of Ailill † 620, s. o. Baetán † 572 (king of Ireland), s. o. Muirchertach mac Erca † 534 or 536 (king of Ireland), BB. 69a27.

² Entries bracketed thus [] are found in the Annals of Ulster, not in Fragment III. All entries of the kind quoted that are found in Fragment III are also in the Annals of Ulster.

"the dark morning"—the current description, to wit, of the morning of the eclipse.)¹

[600. *Terrae motus i mBairchiu.*]

610. *Fulminatus est exercitus Uloth immBairchiu fulmine terribili.*

613. *Stella uisa est hora octaua diei.* (For "octaua," Fragment III has "septima.")

617. *Indraedh Macha* (Inredh Machae, Fragment III) et *terrae motus in Gallia.*

624. *Annus tenebrosus.*

[634. *Nix magna occidit multos in campo Breg.*]

[656. *Orta est uacca i lLathrug Briuin quae quatuor vitulos peperit.*]

[657. *Uentus magnus.*]

663. *Tenebrae in Kalendis Maii in nona hora, et in eadem aestate coelum ardere uisum est. Mortalitas in Hiberniam peruenit in kalendis Augusti.* (Fragment III adds ".i. i Muigh Itha i lLaignib.") *Mors Cernaig . . . et terrae motus in Britannia.* (Three obits follow.) *In campo Itho Fothart* ("In campo Fochairt," Fragment III) *exarsit mortalitas primo in Hibernia.* A morte Patricii cc.iii., prima mortalitas cxii ("c.xii." in Fragment III).

The correct reading is perhaps "prima mortalitas xcii," $461 + 95 = 556$, corresponding to the second entry of the "mortalitas magna" above. The reckoning cannot well be reconciled with the date of the "prima mortalitas" of 544 above.²

664. *Mortalitas magna.*

666. *Mortalitas in Hibernia.* (Fragment III has "Mortalitas in qua quatuor abbates Bennchair perierunt, Berach, Cumine, Colum, Mac Aedha.")

[665. *Mortalitas magna .i. an buidhe chonaill.*]

669. *Nix magna facta est. Oscolt mor.* ("Nigis facta est occid magna esolt" Fragment III.)

673. *Nubes tenuis et tremula, ad speciem coelestis arcus,*

¹ The entries at 511, 535, 555, and 591 may indicate that two distinct versions of the Irish Chronicon Eusebii, or of the Old-Irish Chronicle which embodied it, were used in the compilation of these annals.

² But the entry may have been based on an older reckoning from St. Patrick's arrival, 432 + 112.

quarta uigilia noctis, sexta feria ante Pascha, ab oriente in occidentem per serenum coelum apparuit. Luna in sanguinem uersa est. (Fragment III has "quinta feria ante Pasca.")

676. Stella cometes uisa luminosa in mense Septimbris et Octimbris. ("Stella mirae magnitudinis uisa est per totum mundum lucens," *Annales Cambriae*).¹

679. Lepra grauissima in Hibernia, quae uocatur bolgcach.

682. Initium mortalitatis puerorum in mense Octimbris.

683. Mortalitas paruulorum . . . Loch Eachach do šoudh hi ful [hoc anno].

684. Uentus magnus. Terra motus in insola ("in Ibernia insola" Fragment III).

685. Obscurata est pars solis.

691. Luna in sanguineum colorem in natali sancti Martini uersa est.

698. Bouina strages in Saxonia.

699. Accensa est bouina mortalitas in Hibernia i(n) kalendis Februi in Campo Trego i Tethbai. . . . Fames et pestilentia tribus annis in Hibernia facta est, ut homo hominem comedaret. (The last entry was evidently made some years later.)

700. Bouina mortalitas.

702. Bellum Corainn . . . iii. Id. Iulii, sexta hora diei sabbati, hoc bellum confectum est (Fragment III has "tertia hora," "iii" for "ui").

[706. Duo terrae motus, septimana in eadem, in mense Decimbroi, in aquilonali parte Hiberniae.]

[707. Bouina strages iterum incendit.]

708. Pestis quae dicitur baccach cum uentris profluvio in Hibernia.

713. Siccitas magna . . . Nox lucida in Autumno.

[717. Eclipsis lunae in plenilunio suo.]

[718. Aestas sicca.]

719. Aestas pluialis . . . Murbrucht mar ("a great sea-burst") in mense Octobris.

[720. Terrimotus in Octimbre.]

¹ This comet was also observed on the continent of Europe and in China, in the year 676, in the months of September and October. See Catalogue No. II of comets in *Chambers's Astronomy*, ch. vii. Apparently, then, we cannot be sure of arriving at a correct date in every instance at this period by adding one year to the date given in AU.

[724. *Luna tenebrosa et sanguinea xiiii. kl. Ianuarii.*]

[729. *Terrae motus ui. id. Februarii. iiiii. feria.*]

732. (Fragment III), Uacca uisa est in Delginis Chualand quae ter [in die] mulsa est ("docmlacht fo tri olnais caich mbleguin,"¹ A.U.), et butirum eius et galmarium multi comedere ; cuius forma haec est : unum caput et unum collum ("oenchenn sair," A.U.), et post scapulam duo corpora ("da chorp iar n-farthur" A.U.), cum ii. caudis et sex pedibus ("se cossa leae" A.U.), habebat.

733. *Eclipsis lunae in xi. kl. Februarii.*

734. *Draco ingens in fine Autumni cum tonitruo magno post se uisus est.*

[739. *Terrimotus in Ili ii. id. Aprilis.*]

[741. *Lepra in Hibernia.*]

742. *Commutatio martirum Trenero Cille Deilgge, 7 in bolgach.*

744. *In nocte signum horibile et mirabile uisum est in stellis.²*

745. *Dracones in coelo uisi sunt.*

747. *Nix insolitae magnitudinis, ita ut pene pecora deleta sunt totius Hiberniae ; ut postea insolita siccitate mundus exarsit.*

748. *Naues in aere uisae sunt cum suis uiris [os cinn Cluana mc. Nois].³*

752. *Sol tenebrosus.* (The story of the whale with three golden teeth, told at the end of this annal, is told at the end of the ninth preceding annal in Fragment III.)

758. [Aestas pluialis.] *Benn Muilt effudit amnem cum piscibus.*

759. [Nix magna hi iiiii. nonas Februarii.] . . . *Fames 7 mess mar.* (Fragment III, adds "sa bliadain sin.")

¹ Ó Máille (*Language of the Annals of Ulster*, p. 163, note) translates : "She was milked three times, a drink of milk at every milking." In which case very few, we may think, would have eaten the butter. The text seems defective. Hennessy's interpretation, though the actual text does not admit it, gains support from the following : *Fecht ann tancatar VII n-epscoip co Brigit, ocus ni bói aicce-si ni doberad doib. Iar mblegan na mbó fa tri, ro bliged tra doridise na ba in tres fecht, ocus ba huilli inas cech blegan* (Windisch, *Ir. Texte*, i, p. 42.) May we read *ollnass*?

² "744.—A great comet was seen in Syria (Theophanes, p. 353)." Chambers.

³ For the story in detail see Meyer, *Anecdota from Irish MSS.*, vol. iii, p. 8.

761. Nix magna et luna tenebrosa. . . . Nox lucida [in Autumno].¹

762. Sol tenebrosus in hora tertia diei.

763. Nix magna tribus fere mensibus. . . . [In t-ascalt mór 7 fames.] . . . Siccitas magna ultra modum. . . . Riuth ("Sruth," Fragment III) folia in tota Hibernia.

764. In nocte signum horribile et mirabile in stellis uisum est.

The dating of events by the day of the month is specially worthy of notice. We may omit the case of the great plague of 664 (A.U. 663), where the days are two great traditional festivals, Beltaine and Lugnasad. After this we find the exact day of the event recorded in 702 (= 703), 724, 729, 733, 739, and 759. The compiler of the Chronicle was probably at work on it in 703. The entry of 724 (= 725) is earlier than the completion of Bede's Chronicle.

That the annals common to these two Chronicles are a contemporary record for some period before 765, is not questioned. That down to some point in the seventh century, if not in the eighth, they are a retrospective compilation is also apparent. We can see the compiler at work in the annal of 643 (A.U. 642): "Hic dubitatur quis regnauit post Domnall. Dicunt alii historiographi regnasse quatuor reges per commixta regna." (Fragment III: "Quest annso cia dogab rige tar eis Domnaill. Quidam dicunt historiographi .i. ceathrar da gabail i. flaithemnus cuma[i]sc ann sin.")

Looking at the entries of phenomena omitted from Fragment III, we shall see that they consist mainly of (1) duplicates or apparent duplicates; (2) records of earthquakes; (3) records of the less remarkable events. Hence it appears likely that all or nearly all of these entries belonged to the common source of the two Chronicles, and that the omissions in Fragment III were caused by deliberate selection or by the absence of duplicates in the exemplar. Accordingly, it seems proper to take account of the whole list from the Annals of Ulster.

We find, then, in the years 538-590 a moderately frequent record—nine events in sixty-three years, or one in every seven

¹ "762.—A comet was seen in the East like unto a beam (Theophanes, p. 363)." Chambers.

years. In the years 610-634, five events, again averaging one in every seven years.

Then comes a space of twenty-one years in which no event of the kind is recorded. Within this space is found the notice "Hic dubitatur," etc.¹

In the years 656-764, there are fifty-five events, or about one event in every two years. That is to say, the record is three or four times as frequent as in the century 538-634. Moreover, the entries are in many cases much more minute and precise than in the earlier period.

It is also to be noted that duplicate entries of an event (including many events other than those here cited) are frequent in the Annals of Ulster down to the middle of the seventh century, but are not found from that time forward.

The inference to be drawn from these particulars is that the compiler of the Old-Irish Chronicle obtained his record of phenomena from A.D. 656 onward largely from the testimony of living witnesses; also that from that time onwards, he was able, or thought himself able, to fix the date of every event. Before that time, he relied on documentary evidence both as to events and dates.

All this confirms the inference already suggested by the list of Imperial reigns. That list is consecutive down to the end of the second reign of Justinianus the younger, A.D. 711, but not thenceforward. We may therefore place the retrospective work of the compilation of the Old-Irish Chronicle within the quarter century or so preceding A.D. 712, and we may regard the chronicle as a purely contemporary record from that time or thereabouts. It was also largely a contemporary record during the period when the first compiler was at work, probably from 680 or thereabouts (cp. the entry of the *partial* eclipse of the sun in 689). Ó Máille (Language of the Annals of Ulster) has shown that, in the annals of the fifth, sixth, and seventh centuries, there is much larger mixture of late with early Irish spellings than in the eighth century. This fact seems to lead to the conclusion that in the eighth century and afterwards these annals are the

¹ It may be noted that the quotations from the Book of Cuanu cease in 629, and that "alius liber" begins to be quoted in 663 (A.U. 662), and is quoted in 664, 666, and 668 (the last year of the Great Plague).

work of contemporary writers, and that before the eighth century, they are a compilation *drawn up at a later time than the earliest contemporary section.*

But such a conclusion raises serious difficulties. We should expect to find a fairly well-indicated break or suture between the later compilation of the first section and the earlier writing of the second section. Nothing of the kind has been signalized. The stratum of mixed late and early orthography extends by unbroken gradation into the eighth and ninth century.

Again, it is clear that no linguistic test of the date of compilation is valid that fails to take account of the version of the chronicle contained in Fragment III. Here we have the same entries mainly word for word. The material not common to the two chronicles ought to be segregated in the application of such a test.

In general, the spelling of Fragment III, as compared with the Annals of Ulster, has been far more extensively modified in the direction of Middle-Irish usage; and this fact alone shows how dependent the linguistic evidence is on the accidents of scribal transmission. On the other hand, Fragment III has preserved a number of spellings which show in the converse way how unevenly the changes in transcription have operated in the two versions. Pausa sancti Albi = Ailbe, A.D. 526 (AU).¹ uas Boind = Boinn, 533. Ainmiri = Ainmire, 560, 565. Aennu = Oena, 569. Ite = Itae, 569. Femin = Feimin, 572. Ele = Eile, 572. Etchen = Eitchen, 577. Caiblene = Caibleine 581. Caibleni (genitive) = Caibleine, 581. Cill mBiain (accus.) = Cill Biein, 583. Domungort = Domangairt, 595. Brandub = Brannub, 596. Suibni (gen.) = Suibne, 599. mair = moer (gen. of már), 599. Oche = Ochae, 608. To Lua = Tolfa, 613. inred Machae = indraed Macha, 617. Quies Fursu in Paruna = Quies Fursi in Barruna, 648. már = mōr, 650 (poem). coimelt = chomaitl, *ib.* Fursu = Fursa, 655. Tuenóc = Tuenog, 662. cath Feirtse = bellum Fertsi, 667. eter Arado 7 H Figente = itir Arada 7 Hu Fidgenti, 666. Caulne = Chualne, 690. aue = auae, 700. Pluit fross mela for Otain mBicc = Oithin Bicc, 717. Bellum maritimum Ardde anesbi = Ardae nesbi, 718. On

¹ The undated quotations in this list are from Fragment III; the dated quotations are from the Annals of Ulster.

the other hand, very many words which retain the archaic spelling in the Annals of Ulster are changed to a later spelling in the same entries in Fragment III. We have thus clear evidence that the presence of late spellings in both versions is largely, if not wholly, due to changes in transcription.

Again, let us suppose that the Old-Irish Chronicle was commenced about the beginning of the eighth century as a record of contemporary happenings, and was continued as a contemporary record for a century or more; and that then the section dealing with the fifth, sixth, and seventh centuries was prefixed, having been compiled retrospectively. It is evident that this hypothesis does not afford a satisfactory explanation of the late spellings found so profusely in the first three centuries of the Chronicle. The documents used by the retrospective chronicler in the ninth century would be chiefly as old as the seventh century, and would contain older forms than the contemporary section. This should at least counterbalance the tendency to modernize in the first transcription, and the section compiled retrospectively should retain abundant orthographical evidence of the earlier origin of its sources, as compared with the later contemporary annals. In short, we should expect to find a profusion of such forms as we find in the *Vita Columbae*.¹

The true explanation of the late spellings found in the early portions of the Old-Irish Chronicle—an explanation applicable to both extant versions and to all the known circumstances—I take to be this. Each version has reached us through a series of successive transcripts. At each transcription, the scribe began his work with the influence of his own contemporary pronunciation, and of later texts on which he had previously been engaged, governing his notion of word-forms and his habit of spelling. As he went farther in the transcription of the chronicle, his eye became more and more habituated to the older spellings, and, as must always happen in any large piece of transcription, the workings of his older memory became less active, and he tended

¹ It is remarkable, as bearing on the date of compilation, that the *Vita Columbae* of Adamnán does not appear to have furnished material for the Chronicle, and is not quoted when it refers to events recorded therein; e.g. I, 12, the death of Baetán and Eochoid (AU. 571); 14, the death of Suibne (AU. 599) and of Aed Sláne (AU. 603); 36, the death of Aed Dub (AU. 587); 49, the battle of Dán Cethirnn (AU. 628).

more and more towards a mechanical reproduction of his exemplar. Hence, his modernizing tendency expended itself mainly on the earlier parts of his transcript, and the later parts were more faithfully copied.

From this it follows that we cannot rely on mere variations in spelling in seeking to determine the date, or dates, of compilation of a text like this Chronicle. Changes independent of spelling afford a better criterion; yet, even in respect of these, we must use reserve. For example, *ro edbair* (588 A.D.) is distinctively a Middle-Irish form, and we might infer too much from it if we had not in *adrobhairt*, used in the corresponding passage of Fragment III, proof that *ro edbair* has been substituted for an early form represented in the Book of Armagh by *adopart* or *adropert* in precisely the same sense, the granting of land for an ecclesiastical foundation.¹ The substitution of *mc. nepotis* for the Old-Irish *moccu*, in connexion with the archaic spelling *Uinniani* in the annal of 578, is susceptible of similar explanation.

In the century preceding 657, there is an average of almost exactly six lines in each annal of the Annals of Ulster. In the next forty annals, the average is nine lines—an increase of fifty per cent; but the real increase is much greater, for this section is free from the duplicate entries that abound in the section before it. From 697 onward, the average goes on steadily increasing, reaching sixteen lines in the decade beginning with 727. This tends to confirm the thesis that the chronicle began to be compiled about the end of the seventh century.

All the evidences, so far as I have been able to follow them, concur with the indication of A.D. 712 as the approximate date of compilation of the Old-Irish Chronicle,² of which a version is found in the Annals of Ulster, and another version, defective at the beginning and end, and probably somewhat abridged by omissions in the extant portion (A.D. 489–766), is found in Fragment III of the Annals of Tigernach. The compiler used,

¹ Ó Máille notes (*Lang. of A. U.*, p. 161) that *ro edbair* belongs to oss. But the passage is common to both versions, and the gloss may thus be as old as the first compilation of the O.-I. Chronicle.

² About this date, 712, the work of the first compiler of the Chronicle should have ceased. Had he continued in after years, we should expect to find a continuation of the record of Imperial reigns, which was a normal feature of the first compilation.

for the fifth and sixth centuries, the Irish continuation of the *Chronicon Eusebii*. The agreement of the two versions as to the order of events, the absence of duplicate entries, and the record of non-human phenomena, seem to point to a brief contemporary chronicle written during the years 584-634 or thereabouts. Then there is a break in the fullness and precision of the record until after the plague of 664-667. Thenceforward the record is clear and precise, with gradually increasing minuteness as far as 712. From this time it enters on a new phase. Events outside of Ireland cease to receive much attention; and the remainder of the chronicle appears to have been written by a succession of contemporary annalists.

X.—CHRONOGRAPHY OF THE OLD-IRISH CHRONICLE.

There is no evidence that the compiler of the Old-Irish Chronicle used any systematic chronography beyond dating by the years of the Emperors. The notes of computation found in the annals of 490, 527, and 537 give a clear indication that in the section covering the fifth and sixth centuries regnal data were used as a chronographic basis. These notes could not have been written by the compiler of the Irish *Chronicon Eusebii*. One of them was manifestly a gloss; and it is fairly evident that the others were also glosses. That they are not contemporary with the compilation of the section of the chronicle in which they appear is indicated by the failure to take any account of the periods of vacancy between the pontificates. Such an omission was not likely to have been made by one dealing, as a contemporary, with the papal catalogue. It vitiates the precision that was sought; for, as a matter of fact, in the note of 537, the three pontificates with the two intervals separating them covered a period, not of five years, four months, and ten days, as the annotator calculated, but of five years, six months, and seven days; or rather, since the vacancy following the third pontificate must also be reckoned, of five years, seven months, and twenty-four days—the time between the accession of Bonifacius II (15th October, 530) and of Silverius (8th June, 536). The notes were therefore added by a later chronicler, striving after accuracy,

but ignoring the insufficiency of the data before him ; and they indicate that this chronicler took his chronology, not from the numbered years of any era, but from the regnal data of his material. Now, since no trace of years numbered in any era is found in the Old-Irish Chronicle, except the A.D. dating in the Annals of Ulster, which is absent from Fragment III, the writer of the notes under the annals of 490 and 537 is most likely to have been the compiler of the Old-Irish Chronicle. If so, then that chronicle, as first drawn up, is likely to have had no chronographic basis except its regnal data—the years of the Popes (inaccurately reckoned) as far as the death of Sabinianus, and the years of the Emperors as far as the death of Justinianus Minor.

The absence of a system of consecutive numerical dating in an Irish chronicle compiled about A.D. 712 is indeed to be expected. Dating by the Christian era may have been a theoretical possibility ; but no one in Ireland seems to have used such dating systematically until Bede, in his Ecclesiastical History, which was of later production than the Old-Irish Chronicle, had set the fashion. Dating by the Mundane era does not appear ever to have been habitual in Ireland, if by dating we understand the ascription of numbered years to events in general, and not the employment of an era in occasional reckonings ; and if the materials of an Irish chronicle had contained occasional Mundane dates, the redactor of those materials in A.D. 712 or thereabouts, in view of Bede's recently published reform, would have been slow to make use of the older reckonings. We have seen that the compiler of the Old-Irish Chronicle was in touch with Iona, and Iona in his time of working was still unreconciled to the Roman calendar, of which Bede was a strong champion ; we cannot wonder, then, if he did not adopt a new system of dating from Bede. It remains to be considered whether the Old-Irish Chronicle, and its materials, may not have contained dates based on the Paschal cycle of eighty-four years, used in Iona until 716. I have seen no evidence of the use of Paschal cycles for systematic annual dating in Ireland ; but if any such dates ever appeared in this chronicle, they must have been expunged not long after its compilation. On each side of the Irish Paschal controversy, acute from about A.D. 600 to A.D. 716, the errors ascribed to

the other side were deemed sufficiently grave to merit excommunication; and after the controversy ended, the use of the impugned Irish reckoning must have been considered equivalent to an act of schism. The absence of dating by era in the Old-Irish Chronicle is thus explained by Anscombe (ÉRIU, vol. iii, p. 132): "The annals of this fascinating period have come down to us with great authority. But they are devoid of exact chronology, and the authority of Tigernach is not unquestioned. The annals themselves, it is well known, are not accompanied in the manuscripts by the year-numbers. So determined and so 'thorough' was the ecclesiastical policy of the seventh century after the resumption of communion, that no vestige of the method of numbering the years in the unidentified era employed by the annalists of schismatic times was received or transmitted by Tigernach. What Bede said of the results of the conversion to orthodoxy of the Picts (*H. E.*, v. xxi, p. 346) may be applied to Irish annals compiled before the death of Domhnall mac Aedha; 'Oblitteratis per omnia erroneis . . . annorum circulis.' " But why should the expunction or omission of dates have extended, in the Annals of Tigernach, to the year 1002? It still remains to be proved that any era was employed for the consecutive dating of Irish annals before the eleventh century.

XI.—STRUCTURE AND AUTHORSHIP OF THE DUBLIN FRAGMENT.

The Dublin Fragment represents an attempt made by the same reviser who imposed the fictitious form of annals on the text from which Fragments I and II are derived, to produce a fresh chronicle from the materials of that text, with further additions.

The older text, of which fragmentary transcripts remain in I and II, was the raw material on which this pseudo-annalist first set to work. Perhaps he found that it was too bulky, too full of world-history, or too difficult to manipulate freely, for his purpose, which was to produce a complete Irish chronicle from the earliest times, with a complete dating year by year.

Can we venture to say with assurance that the pseudo-annalist of Fragments I and II was identical with the redactor

of the Dublin Fragment? The alternative is, that two distinct men, each characterized by the same ineptitude and effrontery, set to work separately on the same material, with similar method, to effect the same purpose. But the redactor of the Dublin Fragment has left us a slight yet indubitable trace of his hand on the earlier compilation.

Groping after some knowledge of chronography that would facilitate his adaptation of the material, he acquired a vague notion of the "great cycles" ascribed to Dionysius. He knew that the great cycle of Dionysius was based on the *annus Incarnationis*. It seems doubtful whether he knew what *annus Incarnationis* meant in regard of chronography. He certainly did not know who Dionysius was, or when he lived. But in his own time, the old A.M. reckonings had gone out of use, and moreover they were conflicting and confusing. No other dating existed for the early material. The pseudo-annalist, therefore, determined to introduce the Dionysian dating, which he did not understand. This he achieved by identifying A.D. 252 with the year of the Incarnation. MacCarthy has discussed this extraordinary feature of the Dublin Fragment, and has not hesitated to denounce Tigernach as the author; but is unable to account for the blunder.¹ The explanation becomes apparent when we turn to the corresponding place in the Eusebian Chronicle. There we find: "Alexandrinam ecclesiam XXIII episcopus tenuit Dionysius an. 17." The pseudo-annalist identified the first year of the episcopate of Dionysius, Bishop of Alexandria, with the year of the Incarnation, on which the great cycle of Dionysius "Exiguus," who flourished about two centuries later, was based! The Dublin Fragment contains a series of entries of Christian ecclesiastical events before this point, so that one can only wonder what our annalist meant by writing here "Hic est annus Incarnationis." This, however, was not his only attempt to determine the beginning of the Dionysian great cycle. Fragment II, p. 7, contains the Eusebian entry (A.D. 175): "Dionysius episcopus Corinthiorum," and over against

¹ He suggests that 252 years were a cycle of 9×28 specially devised by this chronographer; but this explains nothing, and the reader of this paper will judge whether the "annalist" of our text was likely to take the trouble of devising a new cycle. The fact remains that he placed the *annus Incarnationis* at the end of two centuries and a half of Christian history.

it in the margin, the note "Initium cicli." This was merely tentative, for further on in Fragment II, p. 15, we find the Bedan Mundane date 4203 (= A.D. 252, the date of Dionysius of Alexandria) and against it the marginal note "Inicium cicli." It is thus clear that the compiler of the Dublin Fragment used the text from which Fragment II is derived in his preliminary operations; and the identification of the author of the Dublin Fragment with the interpolator of the annal-headings in Fragments I and II is hardly doubtful.

The construction of the Dublin Fragment is readily seen. It includes a threefold process. (1) Most of the world-history in Fragments I and II is excluded. (2) Much additional matter relating to Ireland is added. (3) The chronography is further elaborated.

The items of world-history that are retained are chiefly concerned with the history of the Church, and do not seem to be selected on any plan. They are all found in Fragments I and II, except those on the last page of the printed text (p. 389), which are outside of the extant range of Fragment II. The only non-Irish secular events taken over are:—(p. 375) the death of Domitian, (p. 385) the accession of Constantine, (p. 387) the end of his reign and the accession of his sons.

The added Irish material will be considered further in detail. The chronography is developed by prefixing to most of the years under which an event is related a Bedan Mundane date, and the ferial and lunar incidence of the kalends of January. Here and there paragraphs comparing the Bedan and Septuagint Mundane reckoning and the reckoning ab Incarnatione are inserted. Also in connexion with the false A.D. reckoning already alluded to, more or less lengthy discussions of chronography are introduced (pp. 380-384). These discussions, which are concerned with the dating of the Passion and Resurrection, are not likely to be the work of the compiler of the text, or even, considering their context, to have been intelligible to him. Indeed, the concluding passage (p. 384) seems to indicate that they are quotations from some treatise on the Paschal controversy written not long after Bede's time, and while the controversy was still fresh in memory:—"... ubi Resurrectio fuit secundum Bedam. Hoc universaliter sciendum est, *quia*

*ubicumque Passio et Resurrectio variantur.*¹ The Easter controversy came to an end in Iona in 716, and probably somewhat later in the Irish Columban monasteries.

The Dublin Fragment, as will be seen, is still in a tentative and unfinished stage. Its author must have intended to elaborate it still further. Its subsequent history is curious. The earlier text, represented in Fragments I and II, became attached to the Annals of Tigernach, and the similarity of their year-headings, K or Kl with or without the ferial notation, and without A.M. or A.D., to the year-headings found in Fragment III and also in Fragment IV, which is a contemporary record kept by a succession of annalists between 975 and 1178, strongly suggests that someone working on these annals introduced the false year-headings in the earlier portion. I have already identified the interpolator of these headings with the author of the Dublin Fragment. All this seems to indicate that the tentative chronicle represented in the Dublin Fragment was never completely worked out, but was abandoned, and that its raw material, represented in Fragments I and II, was adopted instead as the pre-Patrician section of the Clonmacnois chronicle. The Dublin Fragment afterwards became attached to a copy of the Annals of Ulster. The scribe of this copy appears to have been misled by the false Dionysian reckoning of the Dublin Fragment, for a new Mundane reckoning, based on that error, appears thirty times in the early part of the Annals of Ulster, A.D. 432-497, and once again in the year 1199.² This fictitious Mundane reckoning has not been found in the post-Patrician sections of the Annals of Tigernach. It would appear, then, that the scribe of H.1.8 came upon the Dublin Fragment, and, taking it for a genuine chronicle, prefixed it to the Annals of Ulster, and introduced its dating system inchoatively in his copy of those annals. Perhaps, however, some more certain explanation of the association of these documents may be revealed by a study of their handwriting.

The added Irish entries in the Dublin Fragment deserve special notice.

¹ The passages in Fragment I, pp. 406, 409, in which the Dionysian great cycle ("Óghthathchor") is mentioned, and in which the date of the Passion is discussed, seem to be quoted from the same or a similar source.

² The entry of the false Mundane date in this annal may be significant as to the authorship of the Dublin Fragment.

P. 374. A.M. 4040. "Crimthann Nia Nar moritur. Cairpri Cenn Cait reg. annis u." The second item is a visible interpolation in Fragment I. It has now reached the stage of incorporation; but the "annalist" has not yet readjusted his dates, and gives the accession of Feradach in the following year.

P. 375. A.M. 4056. "Fiatach Find r. in Emain annis xiii." [A.M. omitted, no doubt to leave room for adjustment] "Fearadach Finnfectnach in Temoria mortuus est, || et Fiatach Find regnauit annis .ii. coro marbh Fiacha Findfalaid mac Feradhaig, || et Fiacha Findfalaid r. a. xu." The words bracketed thus ||. . . || are interpolated in accordance with the later regnal lists, but the dates remain without adjustment.

P. 375. A.M. 4076. Death of Fiachu Findfolaid.

P. 376. A.M. 4079. Battle of Achall, death of Elim, and accession of Tuathal. In Fragment I these events are entered under the same year as the death of Fiachu. Here they are separated; and "Kl. Kl" (i.e. two blank years) are inserted between, doubtless to make room for the reign of Elim as king of Ireland in accordance with late histories, but this reign is not as yet specifically given.

A.M. 4104. "Tuathal Teachtmair occisus est la Mal mac Rochridi la rig nUlad || et Mal regnauit annis iiiii secundum¹ quosdam||."

A.M. 4109. "Feidhlimidh Rechtaidh mac Tuathail Techtmair r. an. ix." The preceding reign of Mál, as king of Ireland, is interpolated. In Fragment II, p. 6, Feidlimid succeeds Tuathal without a break.

A.M. 41 [i]8 "..... [Catháir] Mór cecidit la Lua[igniu Temrach] annorum ut alii aiunt." The editor does not describe the nature of the lacunae, or the extent of space left vacant. We may suspect that, in accordance with the later histories, the annalist proposed to find room for Catháir Mór among the kings of Ireland, but did not complete his purpose. The reign of Catháir as high-king is not found in Fragment II.

P. 377. A.M. 4118. "Cond Cétcathach in Temoria annis xx."

A.M. 4137. "Conn Cétcathach occisus est . . . || Conaire cliamain Cuind regnauit annis uii. secundum quosdam."||

¹ "per," Stokes.

A.M. 4138. "Art Oenfer regnauit annis xxxii." The preceding reign of Conaire is interpolated, but as yet only tentatively without adjustment of dates. A further addition here is "Eochaid Finn Fuad nAirt do . . ." It is apparent that these incomplete entries were made by way of rough draft in preparation for a finally revised chronicle.

P. 378. A.M. 4167. Battle of Mag Mucruma and death of Art. "¶ Alii aiunt Luguid MacCon post hoc bellum in Temoria regnasse annis iii, vel xxx. ut alii. ¶ Cormac Ulfata hua Cuinn regnauit annis xlii." The interpolated reign, found in all the late histories, is here adopted; but the adjustment of dates thereby necessitated has not yet been carried out.

P. 382. A.M. 4205. "Hic est annus Incarnationis Christi secundum Dionysium." This is the error pointed out by MacCarthy. Our "annalist," who has already recorded various events in Christian history, imagines that he has now only reached the beginning of the Christian era! The error creates a fictitious surplus of two and a half centuries. We shall see by what means this difficulty is surmounted.

A.M. 4209. Death of Cormac, related at length.

A.M. 4211. "Hoc anno secundum quosdam adbath Cormac hua Cuinn, et Echu Gundat regnauit annis iiiii." In II, Echu is king of Emain and does not succeed Cormac as king of Ireland. His reign of four years goes to diminish the surplus of 252 years.

P. 383. A.M. 4215. "Eochu Gunnat do tuitim la Lugaid Mend mac Oengusa."

A.M. 4217. "Coirpri Lifechair r. xxviii. annis vel xluiii." The increase from twenty-eight to forty-eight was dictated by the necessity of gradually using up the superfluous two and a half centuries. In Fragment II Coirpre is the immediate successor of Cormac.

P. 384. A.M. 42[]. Death of Coirpre Lifechair. The account of his death by the hand of Oscar, absent from II, is first given. Then the account given in II, with amplification. Then, under the same year, "Na Fothaidh [fothaigh, MS] regnauerunt anno," a reign not found in II. The A.M. date was left incomplete, no doubt with a view to adjustment. To accord with the next entry, the date should be 4264. See under 4217.

A.M. 4265. "Fingal na Fothad inter se. Fothad Cairpthech cecidit." Not in II.

P. 385. A.M. 4266. "Cath Ollobra du hi torchair Fothad Aircthech. Fiacho Robtene uictor erat." Not in II.

A.M. 4267 (read "uui" for "iiji"). "Fiacho Robtine r. in Temoria an. 26 *vel* . . ." Again, a suspended alteration, which the next date cited here explains.

A.M. 4317. Two lines are here left vacant. Then under a fresh year-heading, "Kl" : "Fiachra (*sic*) Roibtine cecidit i cath Dubcomair." The number, which had not been decided, to follow *vel* under 4267 should be 51. The surplus is thus reduced by a quarter of a century. Next we have "Kl. Kl. Kl. Kl. Kl. Kl." six vacant years, in further reduction of the surplus.

A.M. 4325. "Colla Uais r. in Temoria annis iiiii." This reign is found in Fragment II; but it has been interpolated at some stage in the growth of the history. See the various texts of the genealogical legend of the Airgialla, descendants of Colla Uais and his brothers. In this legend, Colla Uais, after the battle of Dubchomar, is forthwith driven from Ireland by Muiredach, who becomes king of Ireland in immediate succession to his father Fiachu.

P. 387. A.M. 4330. Muiredach Tirech banishes the three Collas, "et ipse post eos regnauit annis xxx || *vel* lui ||." In II, "*vel* 56" is not found. Another quarter of a century is thus absorbed.

A.M. 4356 [4357]. "Patricius ||secundum quosdam|| nunc natus est ||sed falsum est||." The difficulty was that, in our chronicler's improved Dionysian reckoning, St. Patrick began his mission in Ireland in A.M. 4636,¹ when he should have been 280 years of age; which naturally *falsum est*!

P. 388. A.M. 4386. Muiredach Tirech slain by Coelbad. Here the surplus is further reduced by noting six vacant years.

A.M. 4393. "Coelbad mac Cruinn regnauit anno uno." This reign is not found in Fragment II.

A.M. 4394. "Eochu Mughmhedhoin mac Muiredhaigh Tirigh regnauit [here three lines vacant] ut alii aiunt." The

¹ Annals of Ulster: "A.D. 432 (4636 secundum Dionisium). Patricius peruenit ad Hiberniam," etc. A.M. 4636, as Mac Carthy has shown, is derived from the false Dionysian reckoning of the Dublin Fragment.

vacant lines are designed to accommodate a fictitious variant which is not as yet decided. "Ut alii aiunt" is not without a touch of humour.

A.M. 4305. "Patricius captiuus in Hiberniam ductus est, sed hoc falsum est." Naturally again, for the process of expanding the dates in order to work off the extra 252 years has already brought St. Patrick to his fortieth year, leaving him still 240 years to prepare for the great work of his life.

P. 389. A.M. 4430. "Eochu Mughmedhoen mortuus est." Had the Chronicle been completed, the vacant lines under A.M. 4394 would have no doubt contained a statement to the effect that Eochu reigned eight years, as in Fragment II, or thirty-six years "ut alii aiunt." Thus twenty-eight additional years are consumed.

A.M. 4431. "Cremthann mac Fidaigh regnauit in Emain annis u." For "in Emain" read "in Temoria," to accord with the late historians. The kingdom of Emain was destroyed by the battle of Achad Lethderg, which our Chronicler has recorded under A.M. 4333. Fragment II does not reach the end of the reign of Eochu, and so we can no longer follow the detailed development of the Dublin Fragment.

A.M. 4347. "Brian mac Echach Mughmedoin regnauit annis ix." This reign is not found in any other history or regnal list that I have seen. Necessity was doubtless the mother of its invention.

A.M. 4471. "Niall Noegiallach regnauit annis lxxvii. vel xxvii." The other regnal lists that I have examined agree in giving a reign of twenty-seven years to Niall. The alternative seventy-seven consumes another half-century. The year indicated is the third following the entry, "Ambrosius Mediolanensis moritur." St. Ambrose died in 397, so that Niall is represented as reigning from 400 to 477, or rather, since our chronicler professes to follow the Bedan chronology, from 520 to 597!

The non-Irish events are forced to keep pace with the Irish events in this wonderful chronicle:—

A.M. 4046. "Domitianus occisus est." The Eusebian date corresponds to A.D. 98.

A.M. 4509. "Hieronymus in Bethleem praedicatur." Prosper's date corresponds to A.D. 388.

An interval of 290 years has thus been expanded to 463 years.

The Dublin Fragment is derived from a text older than the MS. of Fragment I, and of course than Fragment II, as some of its spellings indicate.

DUBLIN FRAGMENT.	FRAGMENT I.
p. 372 hi Semdiu	p. 415 hi Seimniu
o C[h]rimt[h]uṇd	o Cremthand
Morann	416 Morand
376 mac Rochraidi	419 mac Rochride

FRAGMENT II.	
mac Rochridi	6 mac Rochraide
377 Rorannad Eiriu	7 Randta on Ath Cláth
i ndedha ond Ath	co chele.
Chliath co alaili.	
hi Maigh Lena	8 a Muigh Lena
cath Cinn Febrat	10 cath Chind Abrat
378 Auluim	Uluim
cath for deiscert nEirenn	cath for descent Erenn
docer Dodera	dochear Dareara
Art Oenfer	Art Aenfear
cath for Ultu	cath for Ultaiib
Eochu Toebfota.	Eochaid Taebfada.

XII.—CHRONOGRAPHIC FORMULAE OF THE ANNALS OF TIGERNACH

Except where interpolated quotations from Bede's Chronicle are accompanied by notings—still chiefly marginal—of the Bedan A.M., Fragment III has no numerical dates. The marginal position of the dates from Bede may indicate that these are of still later addition than the quotations. From the beginning of the Fragment as far as the annal corresponding to A.U. 650, the annals are headed by the letter K and the ferial

number (e.g. "K. i.", meaning "Kalends of January, on the first day of the week"). In a few instances the ferial number is omitted. In other instances the annal-heading is altogether omitted, there being twelve such omissions before the year 610. It follows that, of themselves, the Annals of Tigernach, in the period covered by Fragment III, afford no precise basis for dating year by year.

In the series of annals corresponding to the AU series 651-661 inclusive, except for the annal corresponding to AU 655, which has "K. i.", the heading is "K" only. Thenceforward to the end of Fragment III (AU series 662-765), the heading is "K1" only, except at the annals corresponding to AU 665, 748, and 762, where "K" is used.

In Fragment IV, from the first complete annal, that of 975, to the lacuna at 1002, the heading is "K1" only, as though in continuation from the last part of Fragment III. The lacuna, caused by loss of a folio, ends in the annal of 1017, of which the beginning is lost. From this point a new series of headings begins. The missing folio contained the year of the battle of Clontarf, 1014, and the entire record of the reign of Brian as high-king, 1002-1014. The folio may have been abstracted to furnish material for some version of the saga of Brian. It will be noted that at 1014 the antedating by one year ceases in the Annals of Ulster.

Systematic dating by the Christian era does not appear to have become established usage in Ireland before the eleventh century. Even then, the numeration was less settled than in later times, if we may judge from the Chronicle of Marianus († 1082), where the dates, even in the chronicler's lifetime, differ by twenty-two years from the dates of the Vulgar Era, which are found accurately given for that time in the Annals of Ulster and the Annals of Tigernach. We may, I think, be assured that, as late as the eleventh century, the practice now commonly followed, of *naming* years by their number in the Christian era, was almost unknown except to the few who had special concern with chronography, and was a matter of learning rather than of custom even to these. The chroniclers were perhaps the first to become sensible of the great convenience and advantage of having, as we may say, a distinct numerical name for every year, a name that enabled the interval of years

between two dated events to be measured by the simplest of calculations. One of the most interesting features of Fragment IV is the evidence of a growing sense of this advantage in the minds of a succession of annalists, but as yet the usage was personal. It had not become traditional or even the general practice of the school of Clonmacnois. The combination of ferial number and epact still seemed, through long familiarity, a more proper way for learned men to distinguish year from year, and the sequence of years still seemed to be best marked by their order in the soli-lunar cycle of 19; these criteria alone being used when the date is given in Irish.

The battle of Clontarf appears to have been one of the earliest Irish events to which a date in the Christian era became habitually attached—perhaps some generations after the event, for Marianus, who left Ireland in 1056, gives 1036 as the date of Brian's death.

At all events, the accurate dating of the Annals of Ulster has the year of Clontarf for its starting-point. The precise marking of dates in the Annals of Tigernach may have commenced at the same point. After the lacuna which ends in 1018, we find dating criteria supplied year by year. Since these data appear to have some bearing on the manner of compilation of the annals, I have thought it proper to set them forth in an abstract. (The dates in arabic figures are not found in the annals.)

1019. "Kl. iiiii. feria, x. lunae."

1020. "Kl. sexta feria, luna ii., annus xiii.¹ circuli decennouenalis, et uigesimus post mille finitum."² This is the first occurrence of the A.D. in the headings of the extant Annals of Tigernach.

1021. "Kl. prima feria, xiii. luna."

1022. "Kl. secunda feria, luna xiiii."

1023. "Kl. tertia feria, luna quinta, xiiii. decennouenalis circuli, uigesimo uero iii. post mille."

1024. "Kl. iii. feria, luna xui., anno decennouenalis circuli

¹ Read "xiiii." In many of the headings, the Roman numerals are inaccurate, doubtless through faulty transcription.

² "Finitum" accords with the Dionysian period, in which the year 1 is the second year of the Christian era.

[xuiii.]; millesimó uero ac xxiiii. anno Incarnationis Dominice annó.¹ Hi[c] annus bisextilis est."

1025, 1026, 1027. "Kl" only in each.

1028, 1029, 1030. Formula of 1019.

1031. "Kl. iii. M. XXXI." This is the first instance of the A.D. in Roman numerals.

1032, 1033, 1034. "Kl."

There is no heading corresponding to 1035. The editor sets out, as though in a separate annal, the entry "Cnutt mac Sdain, rí Saxon, mortuus est," which in the MS. seems to have been the last entry of 1034. The death of King Cnút (Canute) has already been recorded in the annal of 1031; and, as it appears there in the middle of the annal, it may be a genuine contemporary entry based on a false report. In 1031, Cnút went on pilgrimage to Rome. He died in 1035. It would seem that the annal of 1035 was blank. A later annalist, not observing the omission, may have entered the death of Cnút in the line immediately preceding the annal of 1036. The occurrence of a blank annal or even of an unheaded annal containing no Irish event, at this point, seems to indicate a break in the succession of annalists.

1036. "Kl."

1037. "Kl. iii. M. xxx. uii."

1038. "Kl. iii. M. xxx. uiii."

1039. "K. M. xxx. ix. anno."

1040. "Kl." The irregular notation of the series of years 1019-1040 indicates contemporary handling. No later compiler and no later reviser would have introduced the headings in such a promiscuous way.

1041. "Kl. enair, u feria. M. xli." Here the use of Irish in the dating begins: "enair" = "January."

1042. "Kl. enair iii. M."

1043. "Kl. uii feria, xui." The lunar notation here appears for the first time since 1024.

1044. "Kl. Enair, prima feria, luna xx. uiii. M. xlivii."

¹ "Incarnationis Dominice annó" is probably an incorporated gloss. In 1020 and 1023, the annalist finds no such explicitness necessary. This shows that in the numeration of years the Christian era had displaced all other eras, at least for certain of the learned, among whom we cannot well include the compiler of the Dublin Fragment.

1045. "Kl. iii. feria, luna ix., primus annus i. in cétbliadain don chicul náedécdha."¹

1046. "Kl." Over it, "Millesimo xlui."

1047. "Kl. u. feria, [luna] prima." Over this, "M. xl. ui." This begins a series of annals, ending in the annal of 1063, in which each annal of the series is headed with "Kl" and the ferial and lunar notation in Latin.² Except once, in the annal of 1054, the A.D. numeration is added in roman numerals above this heading. Since in five instances (1048, 1049, 1050, 1051, 1058) the same numeration is also found following the lunar notation, it is evident that the A.D. dating which appears above the line containing "Kl." etc., is of later insertion, and since this dating above the heading "Kl." etc., is not found after 1063, it was probably added in that year by the annalist then at work, and over the series of annals (1046-1063) which he had written. In 1063, the heading has "Mlxiii" above "Kl. a iiiii. feria, luna xxvii. Bliadain deirid chiccaill i. dxxxu."³ Dionisi inso." ("This is the last year of the cycle, i.e. of 532, of Dionysius.") As the final year of the Great Paschal Cycle ascribed to Dionysius bore a well-established date in the Christian era, 1063, it furnished a suitable starting-point from which to insert retrospectively the A.D. of the preceding annals.

After 1063, the notation of the annal-headings enters on a new phase, indicative probably of a change of chroniclers. Perhaps the annalist of the preceding section was Coileachair (Céilechar ?), Bishop of Clonmacnois, whose obit is recorded in 1067.

1064. "Kl" only.

1065. "Kl. [feria ui] luna [xx.]." The notation in brackets is supplied by the editor, who here and in the next heading does not indicate the nature of the lacunae.

1066. "Kl [feria i.] luna i." This is followed by the entry "Retla mongach ingnadh adhbal do faiscean isin aér dia mairt iar minchaisc hic octkl.⁴ Mái co ui. xx. fuirre" ("A wonderful enormous comet is seen in the air on Tuesday after Low Sunday, at the eighth of the kalends of May, with the 26th

¹ "i.e. the first year of the decennovennial cycle."

² The annal of 1061 has "Kl" only, with "Mlx" above.

³ Read "dxxxii."

⁴ So corrected by the editor: "pretkl" in ms.

[day of the moon's age] thereon").¹ We shall find similar Irish phrasing applied a little later to the notation of the years.

1067, 1068, 1069. "Kl" only. An additional "Kl" seems to have been added in error, making two annals of the annal of 1069. This sub-division has been followed in Chronicon Scottorum, causing there a disturbance of the numerical dates.

1070. "Kl. Enair for Satharnn ocus xxui fuirri" ("The kalends of January or Saturday, and 26 [days of the moon's age] thereon"). Here the whole notation for the first time is in Irish. This formula is continued down to and including the annal of 1090, except at 1083, which has "Kl" only, and at 1087, which has "Kl. enair, sexta feria, [xx] iii [luna]." At 1085 is added "ocus isi sin m.² mm. lxxxu. b. o gen Cr." ("And that is the 1085th year from the birth of Christ").

In the annal of 1088 is found the entry "Huc usque Tigernach scribsit ocht ar ochtmogait quieuit." It thus appears that Tigernach was the chronicler who began the substitution of a notation in Irish for the earlier notation in Latin. To him also may be ascribed the entry relative to the comet of 1066, where the wording of the date is similar to that of the annal-headings 1070-1088. We may note that, unlike the compiler of the Dublin Fragment, Tigernach knew very definitely the meaning of dating according to the Christian era. He shows this in the notation of the year 1085, where he also shows that he was not accustomed to use a mere numerical statement as the *name* of a year. Those who have regarded Tigernach as the most critical of our ancient historians seem to have overlooked his delightful explanation of the epidemic of 1084.³

¹ "Possibly an apparition of Halley's comet. This is the famous object which created such universal dread throughout Europe in 1066. In England it was looked upon as a presage of the success of the Norman invasion." Chambers, Catalogue i, No. 22. The comet was observed in China on April 2nd, and remained visible for six weeks or more.

² Read "in."

³ "This is the cause that gave rise to that pestilence, to wit, demons that came from the northern islands of the world, three legions, and 3000 in each legion, as Oengus Oc, son of Dagda, related to Gilla Lughan, who used to frequent the elf-mound every year on Hallow Eve, and saw himself one legion of them in Mullaghmast, the legion that was destroying Leinster. In this wise they were seen by Gilla Lughan, so that whatsoever side their heat and fury reached, there their venom took hold. For there was a sword of fire out of the throat of every one of them, and high as the clouds of heaven was every one of them. So that is the cause of that pestilence."

The successor of Tigernach in the chroniclership followed his Irish formula in heading the annals of 1089 and 1090. Then, as far as 1100, the headings give the ferial and lunar notation in Latin. In the series 1101-1116, the headings are sometimes in Latin, sometimes in Irish. From 1117 to the last extant annal, 1178 (both included), the headings are in Irish, and in what we may call the formula of Tigernach. In the series 1064-1178, the A.D. is used only three times, in 1085, 1102, and 1108.

The variations in annual notation bespeak a succession of contemporary chroniclers in the period 1019-1168. The evidence does not justify us in ascribing to Tigernach the writing of any section of the annals outside of the years 1064-1088.

The Dublin Fragment is dated throughout in the formula " *iiii m. xxxiii. Kl. enair, ui feria, luna x.*" It uses the Bedan Mundane reckoning, not the A.D., in dating events of the Christian era. The nearest approach to its formula in Fragment IV is found in the annal of 1044, rather early for Tigernach, and after the death of Tigernach, in the series of annals 1090 to 1100, and in the annals of 1110, 1112, 1113, and 1116. But the evidence is far from being sufficient to connect the writers of any part of these annals with the authorship of the Dublin Fragment. The annalist of 1102 knew the meaning of A.D. 1102 and of " *annus Incarnationis* " : " This," he writes in Irish, " is the 1102nd year from the Incarnation of Christ." Neither he nor Tigernach was at all likely to identify A.D. 252 with the beginning of the Christian era.

XIII.—SUMMARY OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE " ANNALS OF TIGERNACH."

The life-history of the Annals of Tigernach may now be summarized as follows :—

1. The Irish " *Chronicon Eusebii* " continued in Latin the work of SS. Jerome and Prosper until shortly after the death of Pope Sabinianus in A.D. 606. It retained the form, but abbreviated the scope, of the original, and added an Irish section.

2. The " *Old-Irish Chronicle*," beginning with A.D. 431, was

compiled about A.D. 712. It embodied from A.D. 431 the Irish "Chronicon Eusebii," and began to rely on contemporary testimony from about A.D. 668 onwards. It was continued in the eighth century by a succession of contemporary chroniclers.¹

3. Two versions of the "Old-Irish Chronicle" existed before the year 974. One of these, the more literally faithful, and probably almost complete, is embodied in the Annals of Ulster, *beginning A.D. 431*. The other, more modified in spelling and having frequent Irish translations of Latin phrases, is represented in Fragment III of the Annals of Tigernach. It wants the years before A.D. 489 and after A.D. 765. Each version has been independently supplemented. In each version the material from the Irish "Chronicon Eusebii" was independently reduced to the form of annals, with the result that the contents are not presented by each version in quite the same sequence as far as A.D. 592.

4. The pre-Patrician section of the Irish "Chronicon Eusebii," retaining the arrangement in columns, was freely supplemented from time to time with quotations from various sources, chiefly from the older version continued by Prosper, from Orosius, St. Isidore, and Bede, the latest Latin quotations traced being those from Bede. These quotations were to a large extent inserted in blanks within the columns. A number of statements relative to Irish history were also from time to time interpolated.

5. The whole material of the pre-Patrician section, thus supplemented, after various transcriptions which deranged the synchronic position of the columns, was reduced to consecutive paragraphs. All previous derangements were thus made permanent. In this form the text continued to be supplemented by interlinear and marginal notes.

6. An attempt was made, by introducing corrective clauses ("secundo anno priore," etc.), to restore the chronological order of some of the deranged entries. After this, the text was still further interpolated, destroying the effect of most of these corrections.

7. The false guise of annals was imposed on all this heterogeneous and deranged material, by the artificial separation of the material into years, distinguished by the headings "K," etc.

¹ I trust to show, in another paper, on the evidence of a series of historical poems by Flann Mainistrech (LL. 181-186), reason for believing that a version of this chronicle known to Flann (c. A.D. 1050) reached down to the decade 861-870.

This was done before the transcription of Fragment I, which is found in a twelfth-century codex.

8. The same person who introduced the fictitious form of annals in the extended text produced a new version by eliminating most of the non-Irish material, adding to the Irish material, and attempting to supply an elaborate and systematic chronography. His ignorance of chronography allowed him to make an extraordinary chronological blunder which he endeavoured, not to correct, but to reconcile by further fraudulent treatment. His work, in a still unfinished state, is represented in the Dublin Fragment.

9. A twelfth-century transcript of the text in the seventh stage above described is represented in Fragment I. Here the text is still undergoing interpolation.

10. A fourteenth-century transcript is represented in Fragment II where nearly all earlier accretions, including marginal and interlinear additions, appear to be incorporated.

11. Fragment IV, including the so-called "continuation," is a transcript of a contemporary chronicle kept at Clonmacnois during the period 975-1178,¹ one of the contemporary chroniclers being Tigernach.

12. The Dublin Fragment was prefixed by a scribe to a copy of the Annals of Ulster, and some dates based on its false chronography were interpolated in the Annals.

XIV.—THE OLDEST KNOWN HISTORY OF PRE-CHRISTIAN IRELAND.

Our unknown pseudo-annalist, then, is an example of the worst effects of an evil time in the learning of ancient Ireland. His work is a combination of ignorance and effrontery. Yet, since no other version of the ancient text has survived but that on which he worked, it appears that we must thank these unadmirable qualities for having preserved for us this valuable document. The document is valuable, because it gives us a clearer view of the antiquity of Irish chronicling, and because it preserves the most ancient example that we are ever likely

¹ In 1178 Clonmacnois was, for the first time, invaded by the "Normans" under de Lacy. Though de Lacy was forced to abandon the place, his raid must have left its mark, and may have caused the cessation of this chronicle.

to find of the endeavour to construct a consecutive scheme of Irish history for the period before St. Patrick. No doubt this Irish history is more artificial than the history that underlies the oldest Irish sagas; if so, it is very much less artificial than the later developments of the story of pre-Christian Ireland.

A brief analysis of this Irish history cannot fail to be instructive. Considering the successive interpolations of the text, it is clear that we shall be on the safest ground, if we rely on those portions which follow the Eusebian analogy and preserve the Eusebian form, the regnal data. I shall therefore show an abstract of these data similar to the abstract of the earliest extant section, as already shown, but with the addition of the number of years in each reign. The dates given in the left-hand column are based on the Eusebian dating but with reduction to the more familiar formulæ of "B.C." and "A.D." No attempt is made to correct the Eusebian dating, since it is unlikely that any different reckoning was introduced in the original Irish document. Vacant years are omitted.

We must allow for the possibility of displacement of the columns here as in the earlier section. If the placing of St. Patrick's birth within the reign of Muiredach Tírech, and of his captivity within the reign of Echu Mugmedón, is part of the original scheme, then these reigns must appear about thirty years too early in the synchronic tabulation. Some other incongruous details may be observed, but the extant text is so remote from its original form, and so irregularly developed, and its numerical data are of a kind so easily changed through scribal faults or deliberate revision, that we need not expect to find congruity; nor need we seek to restore it, except in so far as the sources of the text are ascertained.

XV.—AN IRISH "SYNCHRONISM" RELATED TO FRAGMENTS I AND II

O'Curry, followed by Mac Carthy, has pointed out a relation between the text of Fragments I and II and an Irish "synchronism" in the Book of Ballymote (9a).¹ Under the

¹ *MS. Materials*, p. 520. O'Curry understates, and Mac Carthy overstates, the relation: *Todd Lectures*, vol. iii, p. 251. The synchronism is printed and translated at p. 278.

belief that Fragments I and II were Tigernach's work, Mac Carthy supposed that Tigernach used the synchronism as one of his sources. It is now evident that the converse relation holds. The synchronism is based, largely but not wholly, on a version of our text. It contains a Mundane date of St. Patrick's mission, A.M. 5633 (= 5201 + A.D.), and a Passion dating, on the strength of which Mac Carthy holds that the document "can date from A.D. 598."¹ This determination of the date of composition, if valid, cannot be applied to the synchronism, which is written in Middle-Irish: applied to the source of the synchronism, it affords a further indication that Fragments I and II embody the corresponding part of the Irish Eusebian Chronicle, which came to an end soon after the death of Pope Sabinianus in 606.

The synchronism is a very brief summary of the world-history, with some notable Irish events included. Only in one section does it go into consecutive detail. It gives a list of the kings of Emain, with the length of each reign, from Cimbáed to Echu Sálbude. The names, except for changes in spelling, are the same as in Fragment I, and the Eusebian formula "regnauit annis" is used for eight of the fourteen reigns. The much-discussed dictum, "Omnia monumenta Scottorum usque Cimbáed incerta erant," is given in Irish. Where Fragment I (p. 403), has "Regnum Graecorum defecit. Incipit regnum Romanorum, quod permanebit usque in finem saeculi," the synchronism has "defecit rex Grecorum . . . Is ann sin tindscna flaithusa Roman. Is iad sidhein foillsighther² co dereadh in beatha." A list of the persecutions of the Christians under the Roman emperors is derived from some Latin work. It preserves many Latin phrases and one Old-Irish genitive *Iono* from *Ióin* = Iohannes. The synchronism says that Lóiguire son of Niall was the thirteenth king of Ireland from the time of the Pentarchy. For xiii read xiiii. Adding Niall, Nath-í, and Lóiguire to the list unfinished in Fragment II, Lóiguire is the sixteenth king of Tara.

¹ "Towards the close of the sixth century," Mac Carthy, *Annals of Ulster*, vol. iv, p. cix.

² I should say that *foillsighther* ("are revealed") is based on a misreading of an Old-Irish gloss *folilsat* (= permanebunt), or, with accented prefix, *foilset*, if the neuter usage of *foloing* were authenticated.

B.C.	ALEXANDRIA.	MACEDONIA.	SYRIA.	EMAIN.
322	I. Ptolomæus Lagi filius, annis 40.	—	—	—
315	8. —	I. Cassander, an. 19.	—	—
310	13. —	6. —	I. Seleucus Nicanor, an. 32.	—
305	18. —	II. —	6. —	I. Cimbáed, an. 28. "Omnia monumen-
296	27. —	I. Antigonus et Alex- ander, an. 4.	15. —	ta Scottorum usque Cimbáed incerta erant."
292	31. —	I. Demetrius, an. 6.	19. —	14. —
286	37. —	I. Pyrrhus, men. 7.	25. —	20. —
285	38. —	I. Lysimachus, an. 5.	26. —	21. —
282	I. Ptolomæus Phi- ladelphus, an. 38.	—	29. —	24. —
279	4. —	I. Sosthenes, an. 2.	—	27. —
278	5. —	—	I. Antiochus So- ter, an. 19.	28. —
277	6. —	I. Antigonus Go- natas, an. 36.	—	I. Echu Élftechuir, an. 20.
259	24. —	19. —	I. Antiochus The- os, an. 15.	19. —
257	26. —	21. —	I. Seleucus Calli- nicus, an. 20.	1. Huamchenn, an. 50.
244	I. Ptolomæus Ever- getes, an. 26.	34. —	14. —	14. —
241	4. —	I. Demetrius, an. 10.	17. —	17. —
231	14. —	I. Antigonus, an. 15.	14. —	27. —
224	21. —	8. —	I. Seleucus Cer- aunus, an. 3.	34. —
221	24. —	II. —	I. Antiochus Mag- nus, an. 36.	37. —
218	I. Ptolomæus Phi- lætopator, an. 17.	14. —	4. —	40. —
216	3. —	I. Philippus, an. 42.	6. —	42. —
207	12. —	10. —	15. —	I. Conchobor Róit, 7. an. 30.
201	I. Ptolomæus Epi- phanes, an. 24.	16. —	21. —	23. —
185	17. —	32. —	I. Seleucus Philo- pator, an. 12.	I. Fiachna, an. 16.
177	I. Ptolomæus Philo- metor, an. 35.	40. —	12. —	4. —
174	4. —	I. Perses, an. 10.	I. Antiochus Epi- phanes, an. 11.	5. —
173	5. —	2. —	I. Antiochus Eupa- tor, an. 2.	13. —
165	13. —	(Macedonum reg- num defecit).	I. Demetrius Soter, 3. an. 12.	16. —
162	16. —	—	6. —	I. Dáre mac Forrgo, 2. an. 71.
161	17. —	—	I. Alexander, 7. an. 3, men. 7.	4. —
160	18. —	—	I. Demetrius, an. 3.	7. —
158	20. —	I. Judas Machabæus, an. 3.	3. —	14. —
155	23. —	I. Jonathas, an. 19.	6. —	20. —
148	30. —	8. —	I. Antiochus Side- tes, an. 9.	21. —
142	I. Ptolomæus Ever- getes, an. 25.	14. —	8. —	26. —
138	5. —	18. —	I. Demetrius, an. 4.	27. —
136	7. —	I. Simon, an. 8.	3. —	34. —
135	8. —	2. —	I. Antiochus Gry- pus, an. 12.	36. —
128	15. —	I. Hyrcanus, an. 26.	10. —	40. —
126	17. —	3. —	I. Antiochus Cyzi- cenus, an. 18.	49. —
122	21. —	7. —	10. —	52. —
113	I. Ptolomæus Phys- con, an. 17.	16. —	I. Antiochus Gry- pus, an. 12.	60. —
110	4. —	19. —	9. —	61. —
102	12. —	I. Aristobulus, an. 1.	10. —	66. —
101	13. —	I. Jannaeus, an. 27.	15. —	I. Philippus, an. 2.
96	I. Ptolomæus Alex- ander, an. 10.	6. —	2. (Kingdom ends).	70. —
92	5. —	10. —	—	I. Énda, an. 5.
91	6. —	II. —	—	—

B.C.	ALEXANDRIA.	JUDÆA.	SYRIA.	EMAIN.
86	1. Ptolomeus, an. 8.	16. —	—	1. Fiacc, an. 6.
80	7. —	22. —	—	1. Findchad, an. 2.
78	1. Ptolomeus Dionysus, an. 30.	24. —	—	1. Conchobor Mael, an. 12.
74	5. —	1. Alexandra, an. 9.	—	5. —
67	12. —	8. —	—	1. Cormacc mac Lai-
65	14. —	1. Hyrcanus, an. 34.	—	3. dich, an. 18.
49	30. —	17. —	—	1. Mochta, an. 3.
48	1. Cleopatra, an. 22.	18. —	ROMA.	2. —
46	3. —	20. —	1. Julius Caesar,	1. Echu mac Dári, an. 3.
43	6. —	23. —	4. an. 4, m. 7.	1. Echu Sálbude, an. 3.
41	8. —	25. —	1. Octavianus,	3. —
39	10. —	27. —	3. an. 56, m. 6.	1. Fergus mac Léti, an. 12.
31	18. —	1. Herodes, an. 37.	II. —	9. —
27	22. (Kingdom ends).	5. —	15. —	1. Conchobor mac Nessa, an. 60.
A.D.				
7	—	1. Archelaus, an. 9.	48. —	34. —
16	—	1. Herodes, an. 24.	1. Tiberius, an. 23.	43. —
33	Passio Christi.	18. —	18. —	60. —
34	—	19. —	19. —	1. Causcraíd, an. 3.
37	—	22. —	22. —	1. Glasne, an. 9.
39	—	24. —	1. Caligula, an. 3;	3. —
40	—	1. Agrippa, an. 7.	2. m. 10.	4. —
	TEMAIR.			
43	1. Luguid Réoderg,	4. —	1. Claudius, an. 13,	7. —
46	2. an. 26.	7. —	4. m. 8, d. 28.	1. Iriel Glúnmár,
47	12. —	1. Agrippa II,	5. —	2. an. 40.
57	—	II. an. 26.	1. Nero, an. 13, m. 7,	12. —
d. 28.		24. —	d. 28.	
70	25. —	25. —	1. Otho, 3 m.	25. —
71	26. —	26. (Kingdom ends).	1. Vespasianus, an. 9,	26. —
72	1. Cremthann Nia	—	m. 11, d. 22.	27. —
81	10. Náir, an. 13.	—	1. Titus, an. 2, m. 2.	36. —
83	12. —	—	1. Domitianus,	38. —
85	1. Feradach Find,	—	3. an. 15, m. 5.	40. —
86	2. an. 22.	—	4. —	1. Fiachu Findamnas,
99	15. —	—	1. Nerva, an. 1, m. 4.	14. an. xx.
100	16. —	—	1. Trajanus, an. 19,	15. —
			m. 6.	
106	22. —	—	7. —	1. Fiatu Find, an. 13.
107	1. Fiachu Findfolad,	—	8. —	2. —
119	13. an. 16.	—	1. Hadrianus, an. 21.	1. Elimm, an. 10.
123	1. Tuathal Techtmair,	—	5. —	5. —
129	7. an. 30.	—	II. —	1. Mál mac Rochridi,
140	18. —	—	1. Antoninus Pius,	12. an. 33.
153	1. Feidlimid, an. 9.	—	14. an. 22, m. 5.	28. —
159	7. —	—	20. —	1. Bresal, an. 19.
163	1. Conn Céchathach,	—	1. Verus et Commodus,	5. —
178	16. an. 20.	—	16. an. 19, m. 1.	1. Tipraite Tírech,
182	20. —	—	1. Commodus, an. 13.	5. an. 30.
183	1. Art Oenier, an. 32.	—	2. —	6. —
194	12. —	—	1. Pertinax, m. 6.	17. —
195	13. —	—	1. Severus, an. 18.	18. —
208	26. —	—	14. —	1. Ogaman, an. 12.
213	31. —	—	1. Caracalla, an. 7.	6. —
215	1. Cormacc hua Cuinn,	—	3. —	8. —
220	6. an. 42.	—	1. Macrinus, an. 1.	1. Oengus Goibniu,
221	7. —	—	1. Marcus Aurelius	2. an. 15.
			an. 4.	

A.D.	TEMAIR.	JUDÆA.	ROMA.	EMAIN.
225	II.	—	1. Alexander, an. 13.	6. —
235	21.	—	II. —	1. Fíachu Aride, an. 10.
238	24.	—	1. Maximinus, an. 3.	4. —
241	27.	—	1. Gordianus, an. 6.	7. —
245	31.	—	5. —	1. Fergus Dubdétach, an. 4.
247	33.	—	1. Philippus, an. 7.	3. —
249	35.	—	3. —	1. Russ mac Imchado, an. 1.
250	36.	—	4. —	1. Oengus Find, an. 1.
251	37.	—	5. —	1. Fergus Foche, an. 75.
254	40.	—	1. Decius, an. 1, m. 3.	4. —
255	41.	—	1. Gallus, an. 2, m. 4.	5. —
257	I. Corpse Lifechar, an. 25.	—	1. Valerianus, an. 15.	7. —
272	16.	—	1. Claudius, an. 1, m. 9.	22. —
274	18.	—	1. Aurelian, an. 5, m. 6.	24. —
279	19.	—	1. Tacitus, m. 6.	25. —
280	20.	—	1. Probus, an. 6, m. 4.	26. —
286	I. Fiachu Roibtine, an. 27.	—	1. Carus, an. 2.	32. —
288	3.	—	1. Diocletianus, an. 20.	34. —
308	23.	—	1. Galerius, an. 2.	54. —
310	25.	—	1. Constantinus,	56. —
313	I. Colla Uais, an. 4.	—	4. an. 30, m. 10.	59. —
317	I. Muiredach Tirech,	—	8. —	63. —
329	I3. an. 30.	—	20. —	75. Cath Achid Lethdeirg.
341	25.	—	1. Constantius, an. 24, m. 5, d. 12.	
347	I. Echu Mugmedón,	—		
354	8. an. 8.	—	14. —	

EOIN MAC NEILL

PALAEOGRAPHICAL NOTES

I

The Rawlinson B 502 Tigernach

IN the last number of this Journal (VI, p. 161 ff) I drew attention to the various hands in *Lebor na hUidre*, particularly to the interpolations of a third scribe, referred to as "H" from his having transcribed the two late homilies on the Day of Judgment and the Resurrection. I now find this same hand glossing and interpolating the fragment of Tigernach's Annals, so called, preserved in Rawlinson B 502, to the facsimile of which I turned on reading MacNeill's criticisms (*supra*, p. 45 ff) of Stokes's edition. The following are unmistakably in the hand of H. (one has but to compare the facsimile edition with the plates in *ÉRIU*, pl. II, col. b, l. 8, *supra* lin. l. 32 ff; pls. III and VIIa, b, e, f) :—

Facs. p. 18 b 6 (fo. 9v) *Natiuitas Conculaind maic Soaltaim.*

P. 19 a 4 (fo. 10r) *ISin tsechtmad bliadain iar ndith Conairi rogap Lugaid Reoderg rígi.*

ib. a 5 *Slógad tana bó Cualngi.*

ib. a 11 .i. *Bocolica. .i. Georgica. .i. libri Aenedæ.*

ib. b 3 *Mors Emiri uxoris Conculaind.*

ib. b 4 .i. *ri Muman. .i. ri Temrach.*

ib. b 5 *Mors Eirc maic Corpri ríg Temrach 7 Lugdach maic Conroí la Conall Cernach. 7 inriud cethri coiced nEren(d) la secht Main(i) o Ultaib.*

P. 20 b 22 (fo. 10v) *Cath Artig for coiced nOlnechmacht la Cuscráid mac Conchobair. Cuscráid obit la Mac Cecht. Mac Cecht do thutim fochetóir la Conall Cernach ic Cranaig Maic Cécht. Glasni mac Conchobair .ix. annis regnauit.*

P. 21 a 23 (fo. 11r) *sed certe falluntur.*

P. 22 a 8 (fo. 11v) *p)oeta moritur.*

ib. a 9 Kiiii. Nero Iohannem apostulum in doleum feruentis [partly in ras.].

ib. a 11 Tomaidim Locha Rib maic Maireda dar Mag nAirbthen.

ib. b 19 nodechsad.

P. 23 a 20 (fo. 12r) i. mac Conaill Cernaig . . . o Cremthand Nia Náir no a Gallis ut alii dicunt. The words o Cremthand have been written by H on a blank space left by the scribe (cp. 22 b 23, 24 for similar blank spaces).

In addition to the above, H appears to have re-touched or re-written 18 b 1 sextum Pompeum, and 20 b 21 Ca)uscraid tribus. Note the ligatured ci here. Also esse in ras. 5 b 27 may be by H.

It is noteworthy that the above are not incorporated into the text of Rawlinson B 488, so far as one can compare the garbled edition of O'Conor; many of the other scholia are, however, though not all those of a given glossator: e.g. the gloss on 20 a 2 is incorporated, but not that on 20 a 19 by the same hand.

The presence of H in this fragment is important, for it supplies data as to the provenance of the MS. which were lacking before. The fact of H having glossed and interpolated a Clonmacnois manuscript, Lebor na hUidle, would not be in itself sufficient evidence that he was a member of that community; but when we find him again interpolating a tract, the compilation of which has been early ascribed to a superior of Clonmacnois, we may not unreasonably conclude that the actual manuscript containing it once belonged to that monastery. The handwriting of the MS. is that of the late eleventh or early twelfth century (cp. Lebor na hUidle, hand A), and so might very well be contemporaneous with Tigernach, who died in 1088. It is not, however, as has been stated (Facs. Introd., p. iii), all in one hand.¹ From the general character of the script and the variety of letter-forms employed it is possible to discriminate the work of two scribes, apart from the marginal and interlinear scholia.

The first (A) occupies fo. 1-4 v (Facs. p. 1-8), the second (B) fo. 5r-12v (Facs. p. 9-24). The difference in style can best be

¹ Dr. Meyer has since, at my request, re-examined the MS., and agrees with my conclusion as to there being two hands.

seen in the smaller script of each: A, upper margin of p. 6b, and B, upper marg. of p. 18a. A, it will be observed, is a bold, well-formed hand, very uniform, and inclined to slope forward. B is more loosely formed, with a tendency to lean back. What distinguishes B most clearly from A is the small hooked open *u*, p. 9 a 11, 13; *z*, terminating in a bow, *z*, p. 9 b 3, 4, though the *p*-shaped form of A is also used, 9 b 16; *Δ* ligatured to tall *l*, pp. 15 a 14, 21 b 23, and 2 b 22, where B has corrected A in *ras.*; tall *l* caudata, p. 10 b 1, 3. Most characteristic is his *z*-shaped *r*, with small round head, the tail descending almost straight, pp. 9 a 10, 13, 15, 30, 19 b 20, in strong contrast with that of A, p. 8 b 8, 16, 6 a 26, b 11, 32; *q* with round head, both open and closed, p. 9 a 11, 12, 11 b 28, 14 a 8, b 16, but he also uses the angular form of A, 11 b 25, etc.: note how the finishing stroke of this letter sweeps to the left in B, whereas in A the tendency is more to finish to the right, p. 8 b 22, 30; the constant use of small *Δ* with a boldly formed crook is also noteworthy, for instance, p. 23. Perhaps B was more influenced by his exemplar than A; cp. the form of *d* so familiar in the Stowe Missal and in earlier MSS., p. 9 a 17, b 8. Characteristic of A is *si* with curved subscript *i*, p. 8 a 27, b 3 (B uses only the straight *i*, also employed by A); the form of *p*, the bow of which has a well-defined sweep, p. 8 a 10, 11, 19, etc.; also the finishing stroke of *u*, p. 8 a 8, b 2, 6, 21, *Δ* 8 a 5, 12, and *τ* ending in a dot, p. 8 a 17, b 4, 12, 23. Note also the drawing of the *ejus*-symbol, which is not so circular in A as in B, cp. (A) 7 a 13, 16, 32, 33, 7 b 6, 29, and (B) 12 a 27, 28, 15 b 7, 19. Again, the pages of A have a distinctly more decorative character than those of B, as can be seen in the treatment of the opening lines of p. 1-5, the last line of 6a, and in the large ornamental initials of pp. 5, 6.

Neither scribe, it is to be feared, had more than an imperfect acquaintance with the Greek alphabet, to judge by the writing 'longimanus, id est Χαιροχήρ' (8 b 25, A) for Μακρόχειρ (Stokes), and ΘΗΥρεοη, ΘΗΥρεοκ (13 b 19, 30, 14 a 10, B) for θεός οὐρος (Stokes).

Difficult to understand from the Facsimile is the blank space left in p. 14 a 24-26, where nothing seems to have been omitted, and no ornamental initial is required. A similar space left vacant in 24 a 23-25 has been partly utilized by the same hand that interpolated Corpri Cend Cait, etc., on the preceding page.

A list of the abbreviations used in this Latin-Irish manuscript may prove of interest. They are as follows:—

<i>ante</i>	añ 'ante,' aña 'antea,' and añaq 'antequam.'
<i>apud</i>	aþ.
<i>autem</i>	h̄ the usual Irish symbol.
<i>caelum</i>	ctm, cti 'caeli,' cto 'caelo.'
<i>caput</i>	cþ.
<i>ciuitas</i>	ciuī 'ciuitatis' (A) 'ciuitatem' (B).
<i>ceterum</i>	ceþa 'cetera' ceþip 'ceteris.'
<i>contra</i>	o followed by t with the 'ra'-symbol suprascript.
<i>cuius</i>	cþ.
<i>cum</i>	č, č with m-symbol, and also cū.
<i>dico</i>	ðeþ 'dicit' (gl. in A), ðeþt 'dicunt,' ðeþp, ðeþnþ, 'dicens,' ðþ 'dicitur,' ðeþp 'dictus,' ðeþm 'dictum.'
<i>eius</i>	the usual Irish symbol, an e reversed (ð), with the lower curve touching the horizontal stroke.
<i>enim</i>	the usual Irish symbol þþ.
<i>ergo</i>	ð·
<i>est</i>	the 2-symbol with dot below, occasionally comma.
<i>esse</i>	ee.
<i>et</i>	the Irish symbol ȝ, and also ligatured ȝt.
<i>etiam</i>	etþ.
<i>facio</i>	þci 'facti,' þca 'facta.'
<i>filius</i>	þþp (B), þþþ (A) 'filius,' þþt, þþi 'filii,' þþo 'filio,' þþm (B), þþm (AB) 'filium,' þþor (B), þþþr (AB) 'filios,' þþip 'filiis.' Note that A, with a few exceptions, puts the mark of contraction over the letter following l, B most often attaches it to the l; but t with cross-stroke is never used in this MS.
<i>filia</i>	þþae 'filiae,' þþam 'filiam.'
<i>frater</i>	þþþ 'frater,' þþþem 'fratrem,' þþþep 'fratres.'
<i>genus</i>	ðþe 'genere.'
<i>gloria</i>	ðþo 'gloria' (B), perhaps only a 'capricious suspension'?
<i>habeo</i>	hñp 'habens,' hþ 'habet,' hþt 'habetur' (A).
<i>hic</i>	h̄i with i suprascript over its shoulder 'hic,' h̄ 'haec,' hþ 'hunc,' hþ 'huius.' For 'hoc' h̄ with dot placed over the shoulder of h sometimes with mark of length added.

<i>homo</i>	hō 'homo,' hoēp 'homines,' hoūm 'hominum.'
<i>id est</i>	the 'est'-symbol preceded by the letter <i>i</i> . With A the <i>z</i> is occasionally written smaller, a little above the line.
<i>igitur</i>	ī.
<i>inter</i>	‡ the usual Irish symbol.
<i>mater</i>	m̄pē 'matre,' m̄p̄p̄ 'matris' (A).
<i>meus</i>	m̄m 'meum' (A).
<i>mihi</i>	m̄.
<i>modo</i>	m̄ in 'quodam modo.'
<i>nam</i>	N with cross-stroke through the last upright. B has also nā.
<i>nomen</i>	nō 'nomen,' noīp 'nominis,' nōe 'nomine,' nōa 'nomina'; nōauit 'nominavit,' nōatup 'nominatus' (A).
<i>non</i>	n̄.
<i>noster</i>	n̄pō 'nostro.'
<i>numerus</i>	nūp 'numerus,' nūo 'numero.'
<i>nusquam</i>	n̄q (A).
<i>omnis</i>	oī 'omni,' oē 'omne,' oēp 'omnes,' oia 'omnia,' oīum 'omnium.'
<i>pater</i>	p̄p 'pater,' p̄p̄p 'patres,' also in 'patrias.'
<i>per</i>	the Continental symbol, both p with cross-stroke and p, the stroke not traversing the shaft. B has once the Irish symbol p̄. The first is also used as a syllabic symbol for 'per.'
<i>populus</i>	p̄tp 'populus,' pl̄i 'populi' (A), pt̄m 'populum,' plō 'populo' (A).
<i>post</i>	p̄ (AB) 'post,' also p̄ (A) and p̄ea 'postea' (B).
<i>prae</i>	p̄, used also as a syllabic symbol: p̄lio 'praelio,' etc.
<i>pro</i>	~p, the winding stroke does not traverse the shaft; B has also, once, a horizontal stroke.
<i>proprius</i>	a combination of the 'pro' and 'pri' monogram.
<i>propter</i>	p̄p.
<i>quaero</i>	q̄pet 'quaeret.'
<i>que</i>	q̄, q̄;
<i>qui</i> , etc.	For 'qui' q̄; 'quibus' q̄b̄; for 'quae' q̄; for 'quod' and 'quam' the Irish symbols q̄ with winding cross-stroke, and q̄; for 'quem' q̄; for 'qua' q̄ (open and pointed a); for 'quas' q̄p̄, for 'quo' q̄, for 'quos' q̄p̄, for 'quorum' q̄rum.

<i>quia</i>	q.
<i>quoque</i>	qq.
<i>reliqua</i>	in the formula 'et reliqua' Ȑ pt (A). The Ȑ is ligatured to the shaft of p.
<i>res</i>	p̄p̄ 'rērum.'
<i>secundum</i>	the Irish symbol p with sinuous or straight stroke traversing the shaft; also used for the adjective, alone, or followed by dū, dʒ, do.
<i>sed</i>	Ȑ.
<i>sine</i>	p̄n.
<i>sunt</i>	p̄t.
<i>super</i>	p̄p̄; also as a syllabic symbol, e.g. in <i>superbus</i> .
<i>suus</i>	p̄p̄ 'suis, and puū 'suum.'
<i>tamen</i>	t̄m.
<i>tunc</i>	t̄c.
<i>vel</i>	t; the stroke never traverses the shaft.
<i>vero</i>	Ȑ, Ȑ.
<i>vester</i>	ūpm 'vestrum' (A).
<i>unde</i>	ūn.
<i>usque</i>	ūp̄.
<i>ut</i>	Ȑ, Ȑ (AB), Ȑ (A), and by a glossator to B. ¹

SYLLABLE-SYMBOLS :

<i>m</i>	medial and final, the usual hooked stroke (ꝝ).
<i>n</i>	the horizontal stroke, Ȑ 'in,' etc.
<i>con</i>	ɔ; stands also for 'com,' 'completa,' etc.
<i>ar, er, or,</i>	horizontal stroke, e.g. p̄ter 'partes,' etc.; Ȑ 'ter'; Ȑ 'ver'; Ȑ 'ber,' also 'buer' in 'praebuere' (A); Ȑ 'for.'
<i>em</i>	Ȑ 'dem,' e.g. 'idem,' etc.; Ȑ 'nem,' e.g. 'ignem.'
<i>en</i>	Ȑ 'men,' e.g. 'mens,' 'flumen' and 'fluminis.'
<i>ra</i>	the n-like mark suprascript, Ȑ 'tra'; Ȑ 'fra'; Ȑ 'gra'; Ȑ 'cra.'
<i>re</i>	Ȑ 'gre,' 'congregatus,' and 'Graecia.'
<i>ri</i>	Ȑ 'pri'; Ȑ 'cri'; Ȑ 'fri'; Ȑ 'tri,' the suprascript i often curved, and sometimes with a hook.
<i>ul</i>	t, e.g. <i>oculis</i> .
<i>um</i>	both the horizontal and the hooked suprascript

¹ This latter symbol, with comma above the first stroke, which Lindsay (*Early Welsh Script*, p. 40) describes as prevalent in Welsh, "though not unknown in Irish minuscule," occurs also in Rawl. B 512: see plate (col. b, 16) in K. Meyer's *Hibernica Minora*; and in later MSS., e.g. H 2. 15 (Sanas Chormaic).

stroke: \bar{p} \bar{p} 'rum,' \bar{c} , \tilde{c} 'cum,' also over r 'incensum,' 'rursum.' For 'rum' B has also the 2-shaped r with cross-stroke through the tail.

un $\bar{p}\bar{t}$ 'runt.'

ur τ' 'tur.'

us b_3 , b ; 'bus,' *etc.*, also for 'aus' in 'pausus.'

h is often expressed by the usual Irish symbol, in \bar{c} , \bar{p} , \bar{t} .

u suprascript somewhat resembling a Greek rough-breathing occurs twice (B), *sanguis* 14 a 33, and *auctus* 14 b 1. Cp. Bannister, Abbreviations in MS. Vatican-Palat. Lat. 65 (ZCP. viii. 259). 'sanguis,' 'lingua,' *etc.*, it should be noted, are frequently spelled without *u*.

CAPRICIOUS SUSPENSIONS:

<i>a.</i>	$a\bar{n}$	'annis,' <i>etc.</i>
	$ae\bar{z}i\bar{p}$	'Aegiptios.'
<i>ap.</i>	\bar{p}	'April,' also <i>appit</i> 'Aprilis.'
<i>at\bar{h}</i>		'Athenienses.'
<i>eb\bar{p}</i>		'Ebreos.'
<i>k, kat, kt</i>		'Kalendae.'
<i>o\bar{p}</i>		'Orosius.'
<i>hi\bar{p}</i>		'Hieronymus.'
<i>i\bar{u}\bar{d}</i>		'iugulatum.'
<i>m. mop, m\bar{o}pt</i>		'mortuus.'
<i>maci\bar{o}</i>		'Macidonios.'
<i>nabc\bar{o}d</i>		'Nabcodonozor.'
<i>\bar{p}r\bar{e}p\bar{r}i\bar{p}</i>		'praescriptsimus.'
<i>r.</i>		'rexit,' 'regnauit,' also <i>r\bar{e}\bar{d}</i> 'regnauit.'
	<i>temp\bar{o}</i>	'tempore.'

NOMINA SACRA CLASS:

<i>ap\bar{o}p</i>	'apostolos,' also <i>ap\bar{u}lo\bar{p}u</i> , 'apostolorum.'
<i>c\bar{p}</i>	'Christus.'
<i>d\bar{p}</i>	'Deus,' <i>ti</i> 'Dei.'
<i>\bar{d}\bar{n}p, \bar{d}\bar{n}m, \bar{d}\bar{n}e, \bar{d}\bar{n}i</i>	'Dominus,' <i>etc.</i>
<i>ih\bar{p}</i>	'Jesus.'
<i>x\bar{p}p</i>	'Christus.'
<i>io\bar{h}, io\bar{h}a\bar{n}</i>	'Iohannes.'
<i>\bar{r}p\bar{p}t</i>	'Israel.'
<i>hi\bar{p}m</i>	'Hierusalem' (A once), usually written out.
<i>\bar{p}c\bar{a}m, \bar{p}c\bar{e}, \bar{p}c\bar{a}</i>	'sanctam,' <i>etc.</i>
<i>\bar{p}p\bar{u}</i>	'spiritu.'
<i>ep\bar{p}, ep\bar{i}p</i> (A)	'episcopus.'

AN IRISH PENITENTIAL

THE manuscript 3 B 23 in the collection of the Royal Irish Academy is fully described in a paper on the Monastery of Tallaght (*Proceedings of R.I.A.*, July, 1911). It was written by Tadc Ua Rígbardáin in the late fifteenth century, and it contains four documents of the Old-Irish period: a copy of the tractate *De Arreis* (see *ÉRIU* v, 45); that on the Monastery of Tallaght; a copy of the *Abgitir Crábaid*; and the Penitential, which is now for the first time published.

HISTORY

1. It has long been recognized that some of the Latin Penitentials which began to appear in different parts of Europe, probably about the middle of the eighth century, are of Irish origin; the most important of these is that attributed to Cummean. Together with the Anglo-Saxon and Frankish Penitentials they form an associated group, distinguished by certain features from those of other countries. These distinctive features are described by Bishop H. J. Schmitz in his two elaborate volumes, *Die Bussbücher und die Bussdisciplin der Kirche* (Mainz, 1883), and *Die Bussbücher und das Kanonische Bussverfahren* (Düsseldorf, 1898), which I shall quote as "Schmitz i" and "Schmitz ii" respectively. The point to which I wish to call attention in the first instance is the order of arrangement, which is more or less clearly recognizable in Anglo-Saxon Irish and Frankish Penitentials. It is based on the "schema of the eight principal sins," which is ultimately due to John Cassian (Schmitz i 191). This order is partly followed in the collections ascribed to Theodore and Cummean, but it is best exhibited in the so-called *Pænitentiale Bigotianum*, which is printed in Wasserschleben's *Bussordnungen der*

abendländischen Kirche (Halle, 1851), pp. 441 *seq.*; a table of contents is given in Schmitz i 707. This Penitential, if not actually of Irish origin, has Irish affinities: the only known copy is found in the Paris ms. Cod. Reg. 3182 (formerly Bigot. 89), a codex which, though written at Fécamp in Normandy, contains other documents of Irish origin, such as the *Canones Hibernenses* and *Poenitentiale Vinnia(n)i* (Schmitz i 705). The *Poenitentiale Bigotianum*, which I shall quote as "Bigot," is entitled in the manuscript *De Remediis Vitiorum Capitula Octo*, and the chapters are arranged under the heads of the eight principal sins:—Cap. i, *De Gula*; Cap. ii, *De Fornicatione*; Cap. iii, *De Philargyria*; Cap. iv, *De Ira*; Cap. v, *De Tristitia*; Cap. vi, *De Acedia*; Cap. vii, *De Xenodoxia* (i.e., κενοδοξία); Cap. viii, *De Superbia*. This corresponds exactly to the list formulated by Cassian (Schmitz i 192).

2. *P.*—Now, our Irish Penitential has certain special relations with Bigot., as will be shown presently; it also corresponds for the most part with Bigot. in point of classification. It is arranged in our ms. under the following heads:—*Luxuria*, *Avaritia*, *Invidia*, *Ira*, *Tristitia*, *Vana Gloria*. The differences are that *Gula*, *Acedia*, and *Superbia* are wanting, and that *Invidia* is introduced. But it is easy to reduce these differences to one—the substitution of *Invidia* for *Acedia*. (a). On examining our text it becomes evident that the omission of *Gula* is merely apparent. *Luxuria* is called 'the *second* vice which kills the soul of man,' which implies that the *first* should precede; and in point of fact we find that between § 35 and § 36 of *Luxuria* there are interpolated twenty sections, most of which are found in other penitentials under the head of *Gula*. The explanation is obvious. A folio of the archetype containing the chapter on *Gula* (whole or part) has been displaced, and copied in wrong order.

3. *R.*—This inference is established by the evidence of the homily "on the deadly sins" printed by K. Meyer from Rawlinson B. 512 in *Zeitsch. f. Celt. Phil.* iii 24, *seq.* This homily is really abstracted from our Penitential in its original form, by putting together (in abridged form) the introductory discourses prefixed to each chapter. It was wrongly assumed in the paper on the *Monastery of Tallaght* (p. 117) already referred to that the homily was originally an independent whole: its true

relation to the Penitential is indicated by the opening sentence : *Conæmdetar sruithe Erenn a riaglaib na Sceptræ pennatoir dilgind [7] frepthaæ cech pecthaæ o biuc com-mór*. The homily therefore originally formed an integral part of the Penitential. So far as it goes, it coincides exactly with the corresponding paragraphs of our text, except for minor differences of reading due to scribal inaccuracies. Now, in the Rawlinson text (which we may denote by 'R,' calling the Penitential 'P'), the list of sins begins, as one would expect, with *cróes* = Gula ; there can, therefore, be no sort of doubt that this was also the case in the archetype (which we may call X).

4. (b). In the second paragraph of R the eight principal vices are enumerated in the following order :—*cróes* 7 *mesce* (= Gula) ; *sdr-tol* 7 *adaltras* (= Luxuria) ; *sant* (= Avaritia) ; *format* 7 *misce* (sic leg.) (= Invidia) ; *ferc* 7 *debthaige* (= Ira) ; *dogailse domanda* (= Tristitia) ; *indscbál uaibrech* (= Vana Gloria) ; *dtumus* 7 *uall* (= Superbia). Evidently, then, the common archetype X contained a chapter on Superbia, with, no doubt, certain rules on the subject. But this chapter is missing : R ends at exactly the same point as P, except that in the latter the word *eccosc* is added after *Imchaisiu Dé*. We must, therefore, again suppose that before either R or P was written a folio had been lost from the end of X, or else had been partly obliterated. X had, therefore, suffered both at the beginning and at the end. The natural explanation of this would be that X was a small booklet, containing nothing but the Penitential, whose first and last folios had been more or less damaged by use, as so often happened with MSS. not protected by covers. Such a booklet would be intended for practical daily use : cf. Mon. Tall. § 78, where the confessor is enjoined to read the Penitential aloud to a sinner. Schmitz also emphasizes the fact that the various Penitentials were intended as manuals destined for "praktische Benutzung" (i 165, 393).¹ Copies would, therefore, be the more apt to suffer from daily wear and tear.

5. X.—Assuming then, for the sake of argument, that X consisted simply of an entire copy of the Penitential, let us try to re-establish its original structure. We have seen that a folio

Flower, Cat.
480, no. 25, n.

¹ He denies, however, the practical character of the Penitential of Cummean and Capitula Judiciorum, but not, I think, on sufficient grounds (i 608).

containing a part of the chapter on Gula was detached at an early date, and that its contents are represented by the sections of our text numbered Cap. i, § 2-21 (pp. 134-138). But before this there must have stood another folio (the *first*) containing the general preface, and the introductory paragraph on Gula (*crôes*) both of which survive in R (but as the writer of R generally abridges the original homiletic matter, these paragraphs were no doubt considerably fuller in X). The lost folio may also have contained the first few rules under the head of Gula. It is not likely that these were more than a few, as what is preserved in P treats of most of the offences included under this head in other Penitentials. Probably the rules which are missing consisted of further directions as to forbidden or polluted food: cf. Cummean i, 20-28.

The *second* folio contained as much of the chapter on Gula as survives in P (Cap. i, § 2-21). The *third* folio began with Luxuria, and either this third folio or the *fourth* ended where the interpolated sections begin (Cap. ii, § 35). But the contents of the second folio are equal (roughly speaking, and allowing for broken lines) to 66 lines of ÉRIU; whereas the first 35 sections on Luxuria fill about 125 lines, all but double the amount. These 35 sections, therefore, represent two folios of X, the third and fourth. Applying the same measure, we may guess how many folios the rest of the Penitential occupied. (It is, of course, impossible to be exact, as one does not know whether the Penitential was written continuously, or whether each rule was given a fresh line. Contractions are also a disturbing factor. The size of the writing and number of lines to a column were probably nearly constant.) The *sixth* folio would go down to about the end of Cap. iii; the *eighth* to about the end of Cap. v, § 12. From that point to the abrupt conclusion is about 80 lines of ÉRIU. This is 14 lines more than the 66 which we are taking as the equivalent of a folio of X. Allowing for the margin of error inevitable in such a rough computation, it seems admissible to suppose that the *ninth* folio ended where our text ends, with the words *Imchaisiu De* (for *eccosc* is probably due to a scribal error). The *tenth* and last folio, which was lost before R was written, must have contained the rest of the chapter on Vana Gloria, and the missing chapter on Superbia. Both of these were probably quite short, judging from the other Penitentials.

(cf. Cummean, xi, 1-3, borrowed by Bigot, Capp. vii and viii). In the nature of things it is much more difficult to lay down definite rules and penalties for the spiritual vices than for the sensual. Thus X, the common ancestor of R and P, whether it was a booklet complete in itself, or part of a volume, probably contained ten folios; in other words, it was a *quinio* or gathering of five conjugates, a format so commonly used, that *cīn*, the Irish equivalent of *quinio*, came to be used for a volume of any size.¹

6. C.—Besides R, there are at least two copies of the homiletic part of our document in existence. One is contained in the Cheltenham MS. described by Stokes in his introduction to the *Martyrology of Oengus* (Henry Bradshaw Society), p. ix. Unfortunately I have not been able to consult this codex (which I call 'C'), and Stokes' account of the homily is very brief: "P. 47 a. On the deadly sins. Beginning: *Luxoria ttra issed ainm in cetna duailchi marbus anmain duine*," etc. Then follows: "P. 48 b. *Incipiunt verba Colmain fili Beognae uiri Dei*."

From this notice one learns that (1) as the document occupies only from one-and-a-half to two folios, it is a copy of the homily only, not of the whole Penitential; (2) it begins like P with Luxuria, and was therefore copied from X (or a derivative of X) after the first folio had been detached. (3) Luxuria is called the *first* vice, not as in P and R the second. This is probably a deliberate alteration made by the scribe of C, who did not understand why the homily should not 'begin at the beginning.' (4) C cannot be a copy of R; it seems to be, like R, abstracted from X for homiletic purposes, but independently and at a later date. It would be interesting to know whether it contains any matter which is in P but not in R; also whether it ends with the words *Inchaisiu Dé*, as one would expect. According to Stokes, C "can hardly be older than the fifteenth century" (Mart. Oeng. ix.), while R was written "by various hands in the fourteenth or fifteenth century" (*ibid.*).

¹ Another reading of the facts is also possible. The interpolation (Cap. i, § 2-21) may represent the verso only of the displaced folio, the recto containing the beginning, as in R. In that case this folio was the *first*, the first 35 sections of Luxuria occupied the *second*, and there were *five* in all, the verso of the last folio being obliterated before R was written, and the recto of the first suffering the same fate before CPQ were written.

7. *Q.*—While these pages were in the press, Mr. Best wrote to tell me that he had discovered another copy of the Homily in a manuscript belonging to the Royal Irish Academy, 23 P 3 fol. 15 seq. This is a vellum manuscript, of which the first 19 folios were written by Uilliam mac an Lega in 1467. It has been described by Stokes in his *Martyrology of Oengus*, p. xx : see also K. Meyer in *Archiv für Celt. Lex.* ii. 136-8. Unfortunately Stokes' description is inaccurate, so that it will be well to correct it by quoting from Mr. Best : "The MS. consists of 25 leaves (not 11 as Stokes says). Uilliam mac an Lega's hand occupies fol. 1r. to fol. 19r. col. *a*, line 33. Here another hand begins, at end of the poem *Noimh na ceithri raithi* (ed. M. E. Byrne, *ÉRIU* i 225-8). In this hand, very faded, there are first, a fragment of some religious piece (10 lines), and then at top of next column the *Derbšiur* metrical glossary, which breaks off at end of the verso, the last twelve quatrains missing. Fol. 20, 21, 22, 23 are from another codex, and contain a fragment of a law tract, text in large script, commentary smaller. Fol. 24 and 25 are also from another codex, larger leaves of cream-coloured vellum, containing a fragment of the *Book of Aicill* (fol. 24 = Laws III. 206 seq.; fol. 25, *ib.* 140, 5 seq.)." I learn further from Mr. Best that Stokes is mistaken in saying that the prose-preface to the *Féilire* is missing. Part of it is found in fol. 12, which is displaced, and should be the first in the volume.

Mr. Best has very kindly supplied me with a complete transcript of the homily, which I shall refer to as *Q*. A comparison with *R* and *P* yields the following results :—

(a) *Q* is compiled on the same principles as *R* and (presumably) *C*, that is to say, by extracting the homiletic prefaces with which each chapter of the *Penitential* begins. But the texts thus put together differ widely, as *Q* contains whole paragraphs which are omitted from *R*: while the general preface and paragraph on *Gula* (*crōes*) are found in *R* only. Thus we have three homilies *R*, *C*, *Q*, all extracted from *X*, but mutually independent.

(b) Except in the case of *Tristitia*, as to which see (d) below, *Q* contains all the paragraphs of the homiletic prefaces found in *P*, but with many scribal errors, and a great number of minor omissions. These omissions are so numerous that it is not easy to be certain whether they are due to the scribe's

desire to abridge, or to his omitting what he did not understand, or to sheer carelessness. The text is greatly inferior to that of P, and deserves the severe judgment which Strachan has passed upon the manuscript as a whole (ÉRIU iii. 1). It cannot have been copied from P, since it preserves the correct reading in several places where P is corrupt: see critical notes. In one or two places it supplies words omitted from P: see Cap. iii. 1a, vi. 1a, vii. 1a. It also furnishes us with a proof that P is not copied direct from X, the common ancestor of R, C, P, Q: for in Cap. iii. 1c Q agrees with P in omitting the first clause which is preserved in R, *Is hi tra cland 7 geneluch genedar ón dualaigh-se*: this defect must therefore have existed in the common parent of P and Q (call it *x*), which was a copy of X made after the loss of the first and last folios.

(c) Under the heading Luxuria Q has not only the preface (Cap. ii. § 1 of our text), but also the section beginning *Nech atchí aislingti colnaidhe* (Cap. ii. § 17). This is a further proof that Q is based on a full copy of the Penitential.

(d) The Sins are arranged in Q in this order: Vana Gloria, Luxuria, Avaritia, Invidia, Ira, Tristitia. Gula and Superbia are absent, for the reasons already given; but why is Vana Gloria put first instead of last as in R and P? The obvious explanation is that the last folio of *x* had come loose, and been inserted out of place, and that Mac an Lega, being, as we have seen, a poorly trained scribe, did not perceive the state of the case, and began at Vana Gloria, which was on the recto of this last folio. This supposition is corroborated by his treatment of Tristitia. Instead of copying the preface to this chapter in full, as with the other Sins (see (a), above), he has stopped abruptly at the words *bidh failiak-sidhi la aia for nimh* (Cap. vi. 1b). Clearly that is where the penultimate folio of *x* ended, and the rest of the chapter on Tristitia was written on the last folio; and when the scribe took up the last folio, now lying loose, he passed over the latter part of Tristitia and began at the capital letters of Vana Gloria.

Q's readings are recorded where they are of critical interest, but it does not seem worth while to register all its blunders and omissions.

8. *L. Br.*—One other manuscript must be taken into account. At page 186 of *Leabhar Breac* the first few lines of the chapter on Luxuria are copied, beginning as in P, *Luxoria tra is sed ainnm ina dualcha tanaisi*, etc., as far as *Isí tra clann gainiether on dualraigisi*. Presumably, then, the scribe was copying either from X itself, or from a copy of X made after the first folio had been detached and displaced. I owe the following details as to this fragment to Mr. R. I. Best. It is written on the verso of a piece of vellum about half the size of the L. Br. page, inserted between pp. 184 and 187. It is not in the usual hand of L. Br., but in another hand of the period (or rather later), careful, compressed, and somewhat meticulous. The ink is black, contrasting strongly with the brown tint of the piece immediately above it, *Cumtach labras in lon sa*, which is written by the principal scribe. This inset (pp. 185-6) belongs to the codex, and is not a later addition, any more than the similar inset pp. 199-200, which is carried on without a break from the preceding page (= *Pass. and Hom. 7002 seq.*).

9. The sources of this Penitential are indicated in the Notes, so far as I have been able to trace them. Three at least are distinguishable: two of these are expressly quoted by name.

(1) 'Theodore': that is, the Penitential ascribed to Theodore of Canterbury, printed and discussed by both Wasserschleben and Schmitz. It is quoted by name in Cap. ii, 21 and 37: Cap. iii, 2. (These references do not agree accurately with the extant Latin texts of Theodore.) As Cummean borrows extensively from Theodore, often practically verbatim, it is sometimes impossible to say which of them the compilers of our Penitential are copying in a given instance. Perhaps the only sections which may be reckoned as certainly taken from Theodore, and not from Cummean, are Cap. ii 12, 13, 14 (and probably 15); also Cap. v. 5.

(2) 'Cummean'; that is the Penitential ascribed to the Irish saint Cummine. It has been doubted which of the many saints and clerics of that name is meant, but our text repeatedly identifies him as Cummine Fota, a very well-known personage in Irish hagiology and legend, as to whom it is sufficient to refer to Bernard and Atkinson, *Liber Hymnorum* ii

108. He is quoted by name in Cap. ii 21; Cap. iii 2, 12, 15. It is to be noted that in the first three cases, the penalty fixed differs more or less from that given in the Latin Penitential which goes under his name. In the fourth, a dictum is attributed to him which is not to be found in the Latin (Cap. iii 15): see Notes *ad loc.*

Further, certain rules which seem to be derived from Cummean are less close to the *Poenitentiale Cummeani* than to the *Capitula Judiciorum*, a collection which Schmitz classifies as derived from Cummean. See Notes on Cap. ii 31, 33, 34; Cap. iv 7. It seems likely, then, that by 'Cummene' a collection is meant which differed somewhat from the Latin Penitential that bears his name, especially in containing some rules which are excluded from the latter, but have been included in the Cap. Jud.

The *Poenitentiale Cummeani* is printed and discussed by Wasserschleben and by Schmitz: by the latter twice over (i 615, ii 604), the second time under the title *Excarpus Cummeani*. Our Penitential contains a good many rules which are found in Cummean, but not in Theodore.

(3) *Poenitentiale Bigotianum*: printed by Wasserschleben 441 *seq*: a table of its contents and a description of its general character will be found in Schmitz i 705 *seq*. Three sections on *Gula* in our text (Cap. i 2-4) seem to be derived from Bigot., as the Irish is here much closer to it than to the sections of Theodore and Cummean which treat of the same subject. Note that here Bigot. is following the *Canones Hibernenses*: see Notes *ad loc.* Again in Cap. ii § 36 (the latter part) and Cap. v 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, the Irish is closer to Bigot. than to Theodore or Cummean. Especially important are the three sections Cap. v 16, 17, 18, to which there is nothing to correspond (so far as I can find) in any Penitential except Bigot. They are ultimately derived from the *Canones Hibernenses*: v 16 deals with the peculiarly Gaelic custom of keening. Also, the introductory section to *Tristitia* (vi 1) is in part related to the corresponding section in Bigot.: see Notes.

It has been already remarked that the arrangement of the Irish Penitential as a whole finds its closest analogue in Bigot., and it may be added that what Schmitz has said as to the 'moral-philosophic' character of Bigot. applies in a measure

also to our Penitential: see especially the chapters on Invidia and Tristitia. And it should not be forgotten that the only known copy of Bigot. is found in a manuscript which, although written in Normandy, was compiled from Irish sources (Schmitz i 495).

The great majority of the definite rules which the Penitential contains are accounted for by one or other of these three sources. A few other parallels, more or less close, are quoted in the Notes from other Penitentials—Bede, Egbert, Merseburg, Valicellanus: but as these and similar collections borrow from one another endlessly, it would be unsafe to say that the Irish compilers were acquainted with any one of them, on the strength of a sporadic resemblance. More important are the signs of influence exerted by the civil laws of the country, recognizable in the occasional substitution of fines, compensation, and even personal service for the ecclesiastical penalties (see iii, 2-4, 16; iv 2; v 2, 8). In one passage the authority of the secular prince is referred to as concurrent with that of the bishop (Cap. v 2). In the main, however, the Penitential strikes one as intended primarily for monastic use: hence the references to *eclais éontad* 'the church of a community,' and to 'the brethren': the stress laid on such failings as grumbling about food and malicious gossip: the denunciation of any attempt at gathering personal property; the penalties of 'separation' and 'exile'; and so forth. All this is of course thoroughly in keeping with the monastic character of the early Church in Ireland, and it confirms the statement with which the Rawlinson text begins, that this Penitential was drawn up 'by the venerable men of Ireland,' *la sruithe Erenn*. Although foreign models are used, they are adapted to the special conditions of the Irish Church.

10. The dates of the Latin Penitentials to which ours is related have not been fixed with any great precision. Schmitz (ii 121-2, 128) has given reasons which seem convincing for holding that those of the Saxon-Irish-Frankish group were compiled later than the Synods of Verberie (A.D. 753) and Compiègne (A.D. 757). As the Penitential of Cummean (or Cummine) borrows from that of Theodore, our Irish Penitential, which in its turn borrows from Cummean, can hardly have been put together much before A.D. 800. If we follow Schmitz (i 707) in regarding Bigot. as in part based on Cummean, we shall have

to allow for another link in the chain: but Wasserschleben would reverse the relations between these two. Schmitz in his first volume (p. 608) expresses the opinion that Cummean and the closely related *Capitula Judiciorum* cannot be earlier than the end of the eighth century, and may very probably ('mit grosser Wahrscheinlichkeit') be assigned to the first half of the ninth. The grounds on which he relies are not such as I am competent to judge, but it may be remarked that his conclusion is not consistent with some of the data which he furnishes as to the age of MSS.: e.g. the *Poenitentiale Parisiense II*, which he describes as largely derived from the *Capitula Judiciorum*, is found in a manuscript of the eighth century (ii, 326-7). And in his second volume (ii 175) the *Capitula Judiciorum* is named as one of three "Bussbücher welche durchweg dem viii Jahrhundert angehören." From this side therefore we learn no more than that our Penitential cannot have been originally compiled earlier than the last quarter of the eighth century.

LANGUAGE

The document obviously belongs to the Old-Irish period: that is evident from the verbal forms and other marks of antiquity. On the other hand, the terminal vowels have fallen into confusion, and the spelling has in other respects suffered at the hands of the fifteenth-century copyist. It is not, however, at all so eccentric as in the "Monastery of Tallaght," which we owe to the same scribe. The chief peculiarity is the constant interchange of *d* and *th*: in particular, *ma* and *mad* are hopelessly confused, and both are often written *math* or *maith*.

It may be useful to collect here the more significant linguistic facts.

Lenition of initial consonants is comparatively seldom marked; *c* is the only letter with which it is frequently (though not regularly) indicated: with *t* it is seldom found; with *p* only once or twice; with medials only once or twice (*agh*, iii 3; *nighi*, ii 3): with *f*, *s*, never. No inference can therefore be drawn from its absence in particular cases.

We may note the following instances where it does occur, neglecting those which are not significant of date. It is found once after the gen. of a *d*-stem (*apad chraibdich*, ii 10); after *mani* (*mani theis*, ii 36, *mani thechta*, iii 4: there is perhaps an infixd pronoun in *mana chomarlecet*, v 11), after a verb (*ibes choirm*, i 15; *dorata chomraicc*, iii 5, seems corrupt): also in *issed chetarráli*, iv 8; *for chaillich*, v 17; *nech cheiles*, iii 20; *nech chuilles*, v 8. The last three instances are presumably mere blunders; the others would be indications of relatively late date, if copied from the archetype. *Madthodiusca*, ii 12, is not an instance of lenition; it is for *ma dodiusca* (or *dotiusca* < *do.d.diусca*), with *mad* = *ma*, *th* = *d*.

Gemination, in Thurneysen's sense, is found in *nó ttete*, i 17 (cf. Thurn. Hdb. § 234, 3a) *a ccaillecht*, ii 11; *a pbas*, iii 18.

Relative *n* occurs in *nech donic* (-*n*- 'quem'), i 20; *airet romboi*, iii 10; *airet ronchelt*, iii 21; *fot rea rombói*, iv 2; *cene bas mbeu*, vi 1c; *amail dondrim*, iii 10; *amail nonmestar*, v 8 and v 12; *acht donecmaing*, v 10; *ma rufestar bas n-ethech*, iii 14; *is indocbail huaebrech n-anmnigter*, vii 1a; *is treithe rommarbsat*, iv 1a. It is omitted after *intan*, i 14, ii 36; after *amail*, iii 2, vii 1a, etc.; after *uare*, ii 1a; iv 11; after *cene*, v 12.

Article. The form *inna* is frequent: as gen. fem. sing. 19 times; as gen. pl. 4 times; as nom. pl. fem. twice; as nom. pl. neut. once (*inna grada*, ii 10); as acc. pl. twice.

Dative pl. *dinab ecnaib*, ii 10; *donaib banscalaiib*, ii 36 (but *dona*, ii 4; *ona*, iii 22).

Pronoun. The infixd pronoun is regularly used, although occasionally obliterated. There is no instance of the substitution of the independent pronoun.

There is one instance of the affixed pronoun *bristi*, i 13.

Prep. + pron: note *issa*, iv 1a: *tree*, iv 1a: whereas *treithe*, iv 1a, is a Middle-Irish form, ascribable to the copyist.

'Self' is expressed by *fadesin* (9 times), *fodessin* (once), *fadesne* (once), *fudein* (once).

'Other': note *indala hai . . . araile*, vi 1a (R has *indalana . . . araile*).

Demonstrative: *són*, ii 36.

Noun. The neuter gender is preserved in *banscal*, v 6; *cert*, iii 17; *cét*, ii 31, etc.; *gne*, vi 1c; *dub-ethech*, iii 15; *forcenn*, vi 1c; *dronua*, ii 1c (but R has here *dronua briathar*); *format*,

iv 1a; *imthormach*, ii 3; *indnaide*, iii 1e; *lög*, iii 10; *lind*, i 3; *mtl*, i 4; *nuall* ('pride'), v 1b; *taithbech*, iv 10; *teidm*, v 14; also in *becc n-usci*, iv 7; *a n-olc*, iii 19, etc. Wrongly, *mór imbeith*, iii 5. Add from R *immed* (fifth paragraph); *nertad*, ii 1d.

deitheden, ii 1c, is an Old-Irish form (Mid. Ir. *deithitiu*): note also *laubuir*, *lebuir* (see note on ii 1e): *ocmaid*, *ocmith*, ii 12, 16; *doguilse*, *dogailse* (see note on vi 1a); *bethu* as dat. iii 3 (so always in Wb. Pedersen, ii 102); *a fier*, i 17, ii 21, iv 3, v 2. *Leni* (acc.), ii 3, *sechi* (acc.), i 10, should perhaps be regarded as old forms.

Adjective. Dat. pl. in *co mbriathraib anglannaib*, ii 1e; *di ugaib tirmaib*, ii 7; *col-lamaib escomnaib*, i 11; *feilib noem(ai)b*, i 15.

Fem. pl. with masc. noun; *maic beca*, iii 15. This is late, but there are two or three examples in Wb. and Ml., see Ped. ii 115.

Superlative: *moam*, iii 1b, iv 1a.

Numerals: *cethorcho*, ii 29, preserves the old final vowel, if Pedersen (ii 103, § 448) is right, but *cethrachae*, i 7, etc.; acc. pl. *cethorchota*, ii 26. In ii 28 *cethri* is Mid. Ir.; in ii 36 *di notlaicc* . . . *di chaisc* is a mere blunder.

Adverb: *co tairptiuch*, iii 23; *ind nocht*, iv 5; *talmaidi(u)*, i 20.

Negatives: *nícon-*, passim; *nacon-*, vi 1c; *nadchon-*, iii 1a.

Conjunctions: *arindi*, *arndi*, ii 1a; *inna* 'nor,' ii 1b (elsewhere *ná*); *immargu*, iv 5 (plene; elsewhere contracted *im̄*). *a* 'when,' ii 14; *céne*, v 12, vi 1c; *úare*, ii 1a, etc. (5 times, never *úair*); *oldás*, i 19, ii 6, iii 10; *rodbu*, iv 5, v 2; *nammá* (6 times, never *amáin*); *immatha samlaid*, iii 1a, iv 1a.

The Verb. As is natural in a text of this kind, the consuetudinal present of the substantive verb is very frequent, and we have some unusual forms: *n-am-bi*, i 14; *forbi*, v 2; *cennibí*, i 8; *iarmibi*, vi 2; *cenmorobai*, iv 9; *remibí*, iv 3, iv 4; *remebe*, iii 19.

Deponent forms are well marked: *-airigetar*, ii 1b; *rocluinetar*, v 12; *-cuimnígethar*, iv 3; *-coirigther* (for *-cairigedar*?), iii 21; **comecnigedar*, i 7; *eacnaigter*, *eacnaigedar*, iv 3; *doestar*, *duduo-easter*, i 2, i 4; *fedligethar*, iii 10; *rofeolaigther* (?), v 6;

rufestar, iii 14; *rofindadar*, etc., *passim*; *rufothaicedar*, v 6; *gainethar*, etc., *passim*; *tomainnethar*, iii 23; *nonmestar*, v 8, v 12; *commidetar*, i 15; *immaruimdethar*, ii 2; *immeroemathar*, ii 6; *insamlatar*, ii 30; *rosuidigestar*, iii 2; *dutluchadar*, iii 22; *conidistar*, ii 4, is late. Add *conæmdetar* from R (first word).

Sigmatic forms of the subjunctive: *toaithib*, iv 5; *atheirr*, *aithir*, *atherr*, ii 32, iv 4, vi 2; *doestar*, *duduoester*, i 2, i 4; *rufestar*, iii 14; *tecmai*, v 18; -*té*, v 14; *conidistar*, ii 4; *lúis*, *lús*, i 3; -*lusar*, i 15; *aslau*, *aslu*, i 2, i 4, i 7, i 17; *atlu*, i 21; *rosd*, iii 6; *roastar*, iii 3; *nonmestar*, v 8, v 12, -*té*, iii 6, iv 3, v 4; -*theis*, ii 36 (should be -*té*); *chonet*, -*comet*, ii 34, iv 5; *tosar*, iii 15: and perhaps, -*tuidich*, v 6.

Sigmatic future: -*ísa*, i 14.

Ro-, *com-*, *ad-*: Owing to the nature of the text, historic tenses and perfects are few. As to *dufuetar*, iv 8, see Thurneysen, Handb. § 687, Pedersen, ii 559. The perfective force of *ro-* is seen in *nicondergenus*, iii 23, etc.: of *ad-* in *conammas*, ii. 7 (also in *conæmdetar*, the first word of R): the potential force in *nicon rulnþiti*, iii 1a; *dorata*, iii 5; *rocathe*, i 19; *mascomra*, *aschomra*, iii 2, iii 4.

Alternation of preverbs: *adchomga*—*asidchomga*, v. 9: *adrén* (*asrenim*), iii 3. As to *errenad*, iv 2 (*asrenim*), cf. *errenaid*, Ml. 20c 2 (Pedersen, ii 294).

The more superficial signs of lateness in form may safely be put down to the fifteenth-century scribe: e.g. *tria aimseraib*, *faicsin*, *leortu*: on the other hand, it is not so certain that he can be held responsible for such phenomena as *arailé* (*passim*); *conidistar*, ii 4; *tregtas* twice in v 1a; *mad da* (= *dia*), vi 3, perhaps also in *math do thuidicht*, v 6: lenition after *mani*, as noted above. These indications, so far as they go, would point to the Middle-Irish (or at best to a late date within the Old-Irish) period, but they are outweighed by the general preponderance of forms historically correct. The condition of the verb, especially the sigmatic and deponent forms, and the use of *oldás* (not *indás*), *úare* (not *úair*), suggest that the original Penitential was earlier than the Tallaght document (which was written probably between 830 and 840: see edition quoted, p. 122), and at least as early as the Milan glosses, whose date is still a matter of speculation.

The text of the manuscript has been reproduced *ad litteram*, including the punctuation, which is often faulty. Only, in order to save the reader trouble, contractions have been expanded, and words have as a rule been divided, unless there seemed to be special reason for allowing the grouping of the manuscript to stand. The numbering of chapters and sections is of course mine: it is often arbitrary, but I have tried to follow the arrangement of paragraphs in the original whenever this could be done without causing confusion. Where capital letters are written by the scribe *en vedette*, encroaching on the left-hand margin, they are here distinguished by thick type. It is often difficult to be sure whether the contraction *pēn* is intended to represent a substantive or a verb; and, if a verb, whether the indicative or imperative. When the substantive is written in full in the ms., the form *pennaind* is usually employed for the nom. and dat., occasionally *pennid* (*pennith*); in the genitive *pende* (varying to *pende*, *penne*, etc.) is employed, and I regret that I have introduced the form *pendite* in expansions.

Finding myself for the time being at a distance from Dublin and from my books, I have been obliged to seek help from various friends, to whom I return grateful thanks. Mr. W. J. Purton has collated the whole text with the manuscript. Dr. Bergin has not only read the whole article in proof and made many valuable suggestions, but has also recollated the entire text. Dr. L. C. Purser has verified the references to Wasserschleben's book, and Mr. E. L. Gwynn has supplied me with other references. Mr. R. I. Best has taken endless pains in supplying me with information about the homily in 23 P 3 and the L. Br. fragment, as well as many other matters.

I reprint here from Meyer's transcript in ZCP iii 24, the beginning of the Rawlinson text, which is wanting in 3 B 23, and add a translation.

Conaemdetar sruithe Erenn a riaglaib na screptræ pennatoir dilgind frepthæ¹ cech pechtæ o biuc commór. Air rosuidigthe na hocht n-airig sualach *cona* fodlaib fri hicc 7 slanugud na n-ocht n-airech ndualchæ co neoch gainedar uaidib.

Mesrugad co n-ainmneit fri craos 7 mesci. Congbaideta co

¹ Read, 7 frepthæ.

ngenus fri sártoil 7 adaltras. Easlabrai co cartoit fri saint 7 cainduthracht cride fri format 7 meiscl.¹ Cennsa co n-ailgeni fri ferc 7 debthaige. Failte spirdalta fri dogailse ndomanda. Uaman bais 7 airchræ fri indocbail n-uaibhrigh. Fir-umoldoit co n-uaman in Coimded fri diumus 7 uaill.

It e dano *nomina* na n-erech ní dualachæ indso triasmbi bas cuirp 7 anma cech duine .i. croes 7 etrad 7 rl.

It e indso anmann na fodladh genither o chræs .i. failte nemmeasraighe, ilar comlabrai, bæs cedluda, daoscaire imrait, inglaine menman, derchainedh, deogh cen *commus*, meiscl cen frithgabail.

It e *immorro* fodlai genethar ó ainmnit .i. fáilte spiraltaide, sochraide cuirp, glaine *anmæ*, tó co toiscide, cetfaide ecnai. immed n-indtliuchta, saigid for runa Dé.

It e andso freptha in craóis .i. aine mesraighe, congain cride, uaite séire, mence cestaighe, frithaire, fled do bochtaib, didnad cech goirt, timargna fri oentratha, *cummessair* saingnústæ, ainmne fri cech ret cor imraiter.

“ The venerable of Ireland have drawn up from the rules of the Scriptures a penitential for the annulling and remedying of every sin, both small and great. For the eight chief virtues, with their subdivisions, have been appointed to cure and heal the eight chief vices, with whatsoever springs therefrom.

“ Moderation with abstinence, against gluttony and drunkenness. Continence with chastity, against lust and adultery. Generosity with charity, against avarice, and benevolence of heart against envy and hatred. Meekness with gentleness, against anger and strife. Spiritual joy, against worldly sorrow. Fear of death and perishing, against vain glory. True humility with the fear of the Lord, against haughtiness and pride.

“ Now these are the names of the chief vices whereof comes for every man the death of body and soul: Gluttony, Lust, etc.

“ These are the names of the subdivisions that spring from Gluttony: immoderate joy, excess of talking, wanton folly, lewdness of thought, impurity of mind, despair, drinking without stint, unbridled drunkenness.

“ But these are the subdivisions that spring from abstinence:

¹ *Read*, miscl (Meyer).

spiritual joy, decency of body, purity of soul, silence with heedfulness (?), comprehension of wisdom, abundance of intelligence, application to the mysteries of God.

“These following are the remedies of Gluttony: moderate fasting, remorse of heart, rare meals, frequent self-questioning, watching, feasting the poor, solacing all the hungry, confinement at certain hours with a specified allowance,¹ abstinence in regard to everything until it be considered.”

E. J. GWYNN

AROSA, SWITZERLAND

¹ That is, I suppose, confinement in the *locc pende* mentioned in Cap. iv 3. Meyer punctuates after *oentratha*, and in his ‘Contributions’ renders *cummessair* by ‘equal measure (?).’

[Fol 16^a] INCIPIT DE LUXORIA

CAP ii § 1 a. Luxoria¹ tra hissed ainm inna dualcha tanaisi marbas anmain duini .i. arindí furumai sár for each toil etír toil dé 7 toil duini acht anas dír dí fadesne no arndi forumai sár forsin duini fadesin connach facaib in-neuch cith sui cid espoc cith ecna úaré nad imradi ecna na crábad na suith² inté bis cumachta 7 foa reir

b. Ni imradi dano anech na anmain na nem na talmain na piana inna fochraici ar samaitlir fria teinith aicned na ndualcha sa úaré los-[16^b]-cas³ cach sualaich bís i nduiniu amail teinith cona airigetar nach sét occa⁴

c. IS si tra cland gainethar on dualaich so ID EST dronua mbriathar fursi dochraití daille menman anbsithe aicnith comlabrai borba cutim hi crinder hilar comairli tarngere cen folta⁵ cetlud fri sochaithi⁶ deitheden di duiniu fall for^{8a} día

d. IS sí dano sualaich soerbad⁷ do dibuth inna ndualcha-sa⁸ ID EST congbaidet hi genas con-neuch genedir uad .i. forus comairle comlabrai cobsaid fosta fri anfonta^{8a} tairngire fir fir do chomalath himradu dé feli^{8b} aicnith nertath irsi miscais in chenntuir serc ind altair

e. ITE inso tra freptai ind etraid colnaidi id est damad⁹ crois Praind mesraigti. mesrugad digi imgabail mesca. miscais céithe brisiuth aicnith. Fatigus i n-uathad Roithinche hi sochaidi. Lenamain do sruithib imgabail ocbada aircenn muid¹⁰ di lebuir no do legund no errnaigti. miscais dáiescuire co mbrithraib anglannaib. menmæ sochraigti¹¹ co nglaine comlabra serc fochraici ara n-asnam¹² piana do imchaisiu ara n-imgabail.

¹ R adds .i. druis ² read súithi ³ loiscfes LBr. ⁴ cona hairigther nach
raet ocae LBr. ⁵ folta RQ ⁶ sochraithe R ^{8a} fri RQ ⁷ roer bath, &c. RQ
⁸ frisin ndualach se dia dibduth R ^{8a} fosta fahansstaigh Q ^{8b} feidhliugud Q
⁹ damnath RQ ¹⁰ aircheimniugud R, aircennmuig Q ¹¹ sochraithe R,
tshocraigde Q ¹² ara n-asnam R: read ara n-asnam

CAP. i [see pp. 135 sq., 146 sq.].

De Luxuria

CAP. ii § 1a. *Luxuria*, that is the name of the second vice that kills the soul of man ; either because it does violence to every will, both the will of God and the will of man, except that which is accordant with itself, or because it does violence to the man himself, and leaves no [will] in any one, whether man of learning or bishop or sage, because the man who is constantly under its power and dominion has no thought of learning or piety or wisdom.

b. Also, he takes no thought of honour nor of his soul nor of heaven nor earth nor penalties nor rewards : for the nature of this vice is likened to fire, because it burns up every virtue that is in man, like fire, so that men perceive no trace thereof in him.

c. Now this is the offspring that is born of this vice, to wit, filthiness of words, scurrility, shame, blindness of mind, fickleness of nature, rude discourse, relapse into ruin, multiplicity of counsels, promising without performance, promiscuous concupiscence, care for man, neglect of God.

d. This again is the virtue that has been appointed to quench this vice, to wit, perseverance in chastity, with what springs therefrom, namely, steadfastness of counsel, quiet discourse, endurance against , faithful promises, keeping of troth, meditation on God, generosity of nature, confirming of faith, hatred of this world, love of the world to come.

e. These are the remedies against fleshly lust, namely, subduing of gluttony, moderate meals, moderation in drink, avoidance of drunkenness, hatred of conviviality, mastering of nature, heedfulness in solitude, cheerfulness in company, attendance on elders, avoidance of young folk, a fixed measure of labour or reading or prayer, hatred of the rabble with unclean words, a stable mind with purity of conversation, desire of rewards, so as to win them, contemplation of penalties so as to avoid them.

§ 2 Nech *immaruimdetar* o *banscáil* fu *grad epscoip* digra-thaighther 7 *peindith* di *bliadain* deac *for* dobit no .uui. *mblriadna* *for usciu*¹ *bargin*

§ 3 **Mad** sacart no deochain asrocoile a bith-manchai teora bliadnai col-leith *for usciu* 7 *bargin* troscad cacha sechtmaine díib *acht* *etir* da notlaic 7 *etir* da caisc 7 cenciges 7 bith tuaslucud doib hi sollamnaib na [17^a] na² bliadna 7 i ndomnaigib 7 isin .l. aidchi *etir* caisc 7 cenccidis .i. brothchan di as maith no cethramthu sella indraicc mani bé ass 7 is licet doaib sercla tírmái di cach toruth ind cach amsir 7 is liceth doaib *dano* imthormach mbeorgine asin *troscad* aidchi *domnaig* 7 cethramtha menadcha 7 medc-usci arna bé croth di otnu no blathaig cach dia cingit di as maith mad lobar aicnith inna doinachta 7 foillech di menadaich *fa bargin*³ Manib lobar *immurgu* *is bargin* 7 *usce* no amasc no medc-*usce* asrubartmar diambé fo laim. Ní bé for cluim na colcaich na deg-dergad fri ligi ní talla a leni de *acht* mad *fria* huaim nó a nighi nó eascaith.

§ 4 Tormach sæthair hi trib corgusaib na bliadna *amail* conidistar a nert. Erlata 7 umaldoit doib sechnon techt du secarfic ciunn teora *mblriadna*⁴ col-leith *dona superioribus* (?) ciunn bliadna col-leith *dona fogradaib* olcena arna *herbalat* na hanmanna cen corp *críst* tria *aimseraib* fota inna haithrigi 7 tiagait do *pax* maith brathre inda *degaid sin* 7 canait salmu ind urd brathre olcheana

§ 5 **Dlegair** doaib *dano* *congain* *crídi* 7 cói a pecad 7 *tothlugud* inna braithre in⁵ guidi dé léo *conderaigter*⁶ doib a pectai *tria* pennait 7 aithrigi

§ 6 (nó)⁷ **Mad** fear *grайд* bas isliu oldas sacart no deochuin *immeroemathar*⁸ ann ó étruth pennith teora bliadna *acht* aimarcar mesar a *bargin* [17^b] 7 medc-usci *condiroíra*⁹ fri *figill* 7 lebuir .i. *prim-bochtan* di as maith dó *cinmitha* medc-usci *corob* lor leis

¹ supply *onus* ² *sic* MS ³ read for *bargin* ⁴ above this word is written u

⁵ read im ⁶ read *co nderlaigter* ⁷ Before this section nō is written in the left-hand margin, perhaps for nota ⁸ read *immeromastar* ⁹ read *condidróirea*

§ 2 Anyone holding the rank of a bishop, who transgresses in respect of a woman, is degraded and does penance twelve years on water diet, or seven years on bread and water.

§ 3 If he be a priest, or a deacon who has taken a vow of perpetual celibacy, he spends three and a half years on bread and water, with a fast in every week of the time, except between the two Christmases and between the two Easters and at Pentecost, and such persons have relaxation on the high festivals of the year, and on Sundays and on the fifty nights between Easter and Pentecost: that is to say, they get porridge made with good milk, or a fair quarter of a *selann* if there be no milk, and they are allowed dry relishes of all sorts of fruit at all seasons, and they are also allowed an extra portion of bread in the Saturday night's fast, and a quarter ration of gruel and whey-water (on which there is no cream of curds or buttermilk) every day: a jug of good milk, if the nature of a man's constitution be sickly, and a scrape of gruel on bread. If, however, he be not sickly, the allowance is bread and water or or the whey water we have mentioned if it be within reach. He may not lie on feathers nor on a cushion, nor on a good bed. He may not take off his shirt except it be to stitch or wash or cleanse it.

§ 4 Additional labour is laid on penitents in the three Lents of the year, as their strength can bear it. Obedience and humility are required of them, besides going to Communion at the end of three and a half years for the higher orders, at the end of a year and a half for the lower orders generally, that their souls may not perish for want of Christ's body by reason of the long period of penitence; and thereafter they receive the salutation of good brethren, and they sing the Psalms in their place among the rest of the brethren.

§ 5 There is required of them also remorse and lamentation for their sins, and that they should desire their brethren to pray God for them that their sins may be remitted by means of penance and penitence.

§ 6 If it be a man of a lower rank than a priest or deacon who transgresses in this point through lust, he does penance three years, but the measure of his bread and whey-water is increased, that it may suffice him for vigils and labour: that is, he gets a prime *bochtan* of good milk, besides whey-water, as much as he needs.

§ 7 (nō)¹ Air conammas pit ind aisi *graíd* bis oc pennind mani denat lebuir .i. bargein 7 sæ ungai inna damnu foillec bec fuirre do menadaich 7 losai luibgoirt bec di ugaib tirmaib cingit di as maith mad lobar 7 bochtan di blathaich no fothnu

§ 8 (nō)¹ Mad sacart no dechain cen erchoiliud doer-mancha pennind manaich cen *gra* issi pennes. Masrochoilet doer-manchi iar n-imamus pendit *bliadain* col-leith inn-aithrigi *for usciu* 7 bargin

§ 9 Mad app *craibdech* is tualaing timdibi cach pennid dib *amail* bís nert 7 etla 7 erlatu indíi torgaba in chinaith.

§ 10 Asbert *tra* arre aili² dinab ecnaib *fri* huaiti æsa *graíd* *consacratar* inna huli *grada-sa* frisna timtherechta cetna iar pennind 7 aithrigi 7 tiagait fo laim nesp*scuip* .i. *eps*scuip** tuath 7 asrochoilet a mbith-manchai fu mam apad *chraibdich*

§ 11 Mackleirech adella banscail fu oen *bliadain* *pennite* *for usciu* 7 bargin ma dufusme clann is a cethoir **IS** samlaid dano *pennit* mac-cailligi cuilles ac-caillecht.

§ 12 Sacart dibir póc do banscal 7 dughná a ocmaid co teisim sil comperta .xl. aidche dúr-pennid. Ma tuisim sil comperta *tria* imradud sechtmoín dur-pennite **Madthodiusca** *cora* laim is fiche aidchi

§ 13 Nech toesma sil compertæ *tri* oirndnecht *no*³ nimbrathe duggress .x. laa *for usciu* 7 bargin

§ 14 Nech doessim sil comperta in ecliss [18^a] a cuntuli indi *pennit* *tri* laa imaithe⁴ fodeisin dodiusca .xx. aidchi

§ 15 Nech adcobra etrad o duthracht *cridi* 7 menman 7 ní chumic *bliadain* *pennite* iste⁵ dicit *christus* qui uidirit mulierem ad *concupiscentiam* eam in cordi suo

§ 16 Nech dousim sil compertæ *tria* dronbe mbriathar no *tria* faicsin feli banscail *no* *tria* ocsmith a cuirp *cín* duthracht pecaith troscad ind

§ 17 Nech atchi aislingi colnidi co forbæ toili 7 accobar troscud ind ma imrathtaer ria cotlud **Mani** imrater da pater deac hi *crofigill* 7 da *lectin*⁶ dec

¹ Before these sections nō is written in the left-hand margin, perhaps for nota
² read *araile* ³ read perhaps na ⁴ read mad hé ⁵ read is de ⁶ da *thslechtain* Q

§ 7 For the rations of those in orders who are doing penance have been appointed, if they do not do labour, as follows: they are to get six ounces' weight of bread, with a little gruel spread on it, and kitchen herbs, and a few dry eggs, a jug of good milk, if a man is sickly, and a *bochtan* of buttermilk or curds.

§ 8 If it be a priest or deacon not having taken the vows of a *dóer-manach*, the penance of a monk not in orders is what he performs. If they take such a vow after committing the transgression, they do penance for a year and a half living on bread and water, in penitence.

§ 9 If it be a pious abbot [who is over them] each of these penances admits of curtailment, according to the strength and self-abnegation and obedience of him who commits the sin.

§ 10 One of the wise said, on account of the fewness of persons in orders: All these orders are reconsecrated after doing penance, with the same functions; and they go under the hand of a bishop (meaning a bishop of the laity), and they vow perpetual monkhood under the yoke of a pious abbot.

§ 11 Clericus qui feminam semel adierit, annum poeniteat in pane et aqua: si genuerit prolem, quattuor annos. Similis est poenitentia sanctimonialis que virginitatem suam polluerit.

§ 12 Sacerdos qui feminam osculatur et eam tangendo coinquinatur, quadraginta noctes durae poenitentiae solvat.

Si per cogitationem coinquinatur, septem dies durae poenitentiae. Si manu excitat, viginti noctes.

§ 13 Qui per cogitationum incessanter coinquinatur, decem dies poeniteat in pane et aqua.

§ 14 Qui in ecclesia dormiens coinquinatur, tres dies poeniteat: si excitat ipse, viginti noctes.

§ 15 Qui cordis ac mentis affectu fornicare concupiscit, et non potest, annum poeniteat. De illo dicit Christus: Qui viderit mulierem ad concupiscentum eam jam moechatus est eam in corde suo (*Matt. v. 28*).

§ 16 Qui per turpiloquium vel mulieris partes aspiciendo vel corpus ejus tangendo coinquinatus fuerit, sine proposito peccandi, jejunium agat.

§ 17 Qui somnium carnale viderit cum expletione voluntatis ac libidinis, si ante somnum talia cogitabat, jejunium agat. Si non cogitabat, duodecim *Pater* canat in cruce, et duodecim genuflexiones faciat.

§ 18 **Nech** duessim a sil cen orchlisin slechtit 7 canaith *pater ter* hi *crofigill*

§ 19 **Nech** guides banscal 7 nisneta .1. *aidche pennite nō bliadain.*

§ 20 **Nech** caras banrad menci *fri* banscalæ da laa deac *pennite.*

§ 21 **Nech** dogni etrad *contra* a mathair no a ingin *no* a fier asber teotir .xiii. anni is samlaid dano in brathir *contra* araile. Math la cumoine fota it .iii.¹ *bliadna pennite* 7 bith-ailithre teora bliadna col-leith isna coibdilcha olchene

§ 22 **Nech** dogni etrath o belaib .iii. anni in cet-fecht ma gnathach acnapthe .iiii. annis

§ 23 **Nech** touisim a sil hi gin a banscal penneth dib līnaib .u. annos ma gnathach .uui. annos

§ 24 **Nech** dogni etrad *fri* cethri .ii. anni pendid

§ 25 **Fir** dogniat ferchol *itir* sliastaib no toin .ii. anni *pendite* IS amlaid dano cid mna no ingena dognet immenetur.

¶ daingin sin a pennadoir

§ 26 [18^b] **Nech** dogni etrad fris fudein o lamaib no o sliastaib .uui. man dur-pendite itosud² cennitha na tri cethorchota aidchi ar ciund

§ 27 (nō) ³**Maith** tria chath n-imrati bith elnithi nech arachin⁴ tria comrac laime no sliaste fri bullu 7 nu⁵ ba ar duthracht immurmusa sechtmain *pendite* nama 7 dub-throscuth innamedon *nō* arra troiscthe **Maith** o duthracht etraid is bliadain *pendite* *nō* arre.

§ 28 **De** chuilchi innam-mac mbecc immenetur. maicc sacarfic doberat poca do mnaib nō ingenaib tria sempli ainit troscuth tareisi

Maith accobuir etraith it cethri troiscthe

Mad poc tolchar co lan-chartius feli *cin* comtinol it .uui. troiscthe

§ 29 **Mad** iar fichit bliadnae dorogbad inna targabala so is cethorcho aidci *for usciu* 7 bargin no etarscartar ond lucc inid-targabat co ropendat

§ 30 **Maic** bic insamlatar etrad immanetur resiu tosni a aicneth .xx.⁶ *pendite*

¹ read perhaps uii. in the left-hand margin nō.

² read hi tosug
⁴ read ar écin

³ Before this section is written
⁵ read ní
⁶ supply lá

§ 18 Qui sine coinquinatus fuerit, genuflectionem faciat, et *Pater* ter canat in cruce.

§ 19 Qui mulierem sollicitat, et non impetrat, quinquaginta noctes vel annum poeniteat.

§ 20 Qui colloquium frequens cum mulieribus amat, duodecim dies poeniteat.

§ 21 Qui cum matre aut filia aut sorore fornicaverit, quattuor decem annos poeniteat, dicit Theodorus: similiter si frater cum fratre. Secundum Cumineum Longum autem, quattuor annos poenitentiae cum peregrinatione perenni. Tres annos et dimidium propter ceteros consanguineos.

§ 22 Fornicans labiis quattuor annos primo poeniteat: si fit consuetudo et usus, septem annos.

§ 23 Si quis in os etc., ambo quinque annos poeniteant: si fit consuetudo, septem annos.

§ 24 Qui cum pecoribus fornicaverit, duo annos poeniteat.

§ 25 Viri qui inter femora aut in terga inter se fornicant, duo annos poeniteant. Similiter etiam si mulieres aut puellae eadem faciunt inter se. (Durum hoc, o Poenitentiale !)

§ 26 Qui manibus aut femoribus actum libidinis ipse secum commiserit, imprimis septem dies durae poenitentiae agat, atque insuper ter quadraginta noctes sequentes poeniteat.

§ 27 Si quis impugnatione cogitationis pollutus fuerit invitus membra sua manu aut femore tangendo, idque sine proposito peccandi acciderit, septem dies tantum poeniteat et jejunium atrum vel arreum jejunii in medio observet. Si autem cum proposito libidinoso, annum poeniteat vel arreum solvat.

§ 28 De lascivia parvorum puerorum inter se. Acolyti qui osculantur mulieres aut puellas propter suam simplicitatem jejunium postea agant: si autem cum affectu libidinoso, quattuor jejunia.

Si osculum illecebrosum dederint cum plena membrorum conexione sine coitione, septem jejunia.

§ 29 Si post vicesimum annum ea facinora commissa fuerint, quadraginta noctes cum pane et aqua poeniteant, vel ab illo loco quo commissa sunt separantur dum poenituerint.

§ 30 Parvi pueri fornicationem inter se imitantes, priusquam natura impellit, viginti [dies] poeniteant.

§ 31 **Mac** sacarfic dogni etrad fri ceithre cét n-aithche pendite

§ 32 **Mac** dogni etrad co lamaib 7 tobeir a coibsin ria techt do sacarfic .xx. la pendite

Ma atheirr ind cét n-aidche pennid

Ma dugnet bes de etarscartar on eclais inidtargabat 7 pendit bliadain for uisci 7 bairgin

§ 33 **Maic** ind ais asrubartmar dogniat etrad itir sliastaib cét n-aithche in cet-feacht leith-bliadain in fecht tanisi bliadain in tres fecht

§ 34 [19^a] **Maicc** .x. bliadnae forbrister o faindecht¹ indii ass tressi .uui.mon pendite ind ma chonet .xx. aithche pendite.

§ 35 **Math** elnithe is cét n-aithche

Math forcenda a thoil ainnas nacnapthe² as bliadain

[*De Gula*]

Cap. i. § 2. **Nech** doestar carnea nech³ no aslau ful cethri no a fuail teora bliadnai col-leth

§ 3 **Nech** ithes feoil etti⁴ coin no biasta no hithes morchiund no lúis a lind imbé in morchend no lúis fuidel sinain nō fiaich no enche no chailech cerc⁵ nō lús fuidel laich nō laichisi nō mna torche no praindes leo ind oen-tich cen etarscarad suidi na ligi pendid cethorchaite n-aidci for usciu 7 bargin

§ 4 **Nech** aslu lind imbi luch marb pendid .uui. laithi ind

Nech aslu fulred⁶ cait pendid .u. laae

ZFCP xiii. 103 **Nech** aslu fuidel lochad no duduoester⁷ pennid laa co n-aidchi. **Asbeir** teotir ce cotri lám æscomuni⁸ fri biad no ce chotri cū na cat na⁹ luch no míl ninglana¹⁰ hibes ful ni aurchoet don biud sein

§ 5 **Nech** cuilles aini ascongarar ind eclais pendid diabul na aine dara hesi

§ 6 **Nech** bas lobar is licet dó praind hi cach trad lai 7 aidche

§ 7 **Nech** aslu coirm combi mesc tar aurgaire crīst 7 apstal. Mad æs graid cethrachæ laa. Mad æs lanamnasa dligthig secht láa. Mad nech comecnigedar a cheli ar doenchairi combi mesc compennid fris inti arali mesca

¹ read ainecht ² read ó indas acnapthe ³ read n-eich ⁴ read itte
⁵ read chailig nō cherce ⁶ read fuidel ⁷ read dodnestar ⁸ read escomuin
⁹ above na is written vel o ¹⁰ read n-inglan

§ 31 Acolytus qui cum pecoribus fornicat, centum noctes poeniteat.

§ 32 Puer semet ipsum manibus coinquinans et confessus antequam communicet, vigintidies poeniteat. Si iteraverit, centum noctes poeniteat. Si fit consuetudo, separentur ab illa ecclesia in qua peccaverunt et annum cum pane et aqua poeniteant.

§ 33 Pueri qui supradictam aetatem attigerint, si inter femora fornicaverint, primo centum noctes poeniteant, altera vice dimidium annum, tertia vice annum integrum.

§ 34 Puer decem annorum qui validioris facinore oppressus fuerit, septem dies poeniteat. Si consentit, viginti noctes poeniteat.

§ 35 . . . si pollutus fuerit, centum noctes. Si libidinem expleverit ut moris est, annum integrum.

[*De Gula*]

Cap. I § 2 Anyone who eats the flesh of a horse, or drinks the blood or urine of an animal, does penance for three years and a half.

§ 3 Anyone who eats flesh which dogs or beasts have been eating, or who eats carrion, or who drinks the liquid in which the carrion is, or who drinks the leavings of fox or raven or magpie (?) or cock or hen, or who drinks the leavings of a layman or laywoman or of a pregnant woman, or who eats a meal in the same house with them, without separation of seat or couch, does penance for forty nights on bread and water.

§ 4 Anyone who drinks liquid in which there is a dead mouse does seven days' penance therefor.

Anyone who drinks the leavings of a cat does five days' penance.

Anyone who drinks or eats the leavings of a mouse does penance for a day and a night. Theodore says that although food be touched by the hand of one polluted or by dog, cat, mouse, or unclean animal that drinks blood, that does the food no harm.

§ 5 Anyone who breaks a fast that is proclaimed in church keeps a double fast thereafter as penance.

§ 6 Anyone who is sick is allowed to eat meals at any hour of the day or night.

§ 7 Anyone who drinks beer till he is tipsy in spite of the prohibition of Christ and the Apostles, if he be in orders, does forty days' penance. If he be in lawful wedlock, seven days. If anyone out of hospitality constrains his fellow to get

Mad tria namtini dugne pendid inti [19^b] arali in mescai amal bith duinoircnid

Manid-derba in mescai *acht* nad cumic nech sallaind *nó* aurcelebrad *nó* *ní bus* cosmail fris troscuth ind

§ 8 (nō)¹ Nech imbe roira² dichmajrc praindi 7³ digi ara brathair tria mescai troscad ind cenmibí fiach a mescai. Mad cen⁴ ina brathri *immabera* dichmairc tri troiscti no coicthigis dur-pendant

§ 9 (so)⁵ Nech gatas biad .xl. laa in cetnæ fecht .xl. ali dano in fecht tanaisi *bliadain* in tres fecht ailithri fo mam apad echtraind in cethramad fecht. Mad maic .x. bliadnae .u.ii. laa pennid. Mad iar .xx. bliadnae is .xx. pendite

§ 10 Nech praindes co fúiri galar ndó no *conadgeib* inggi a sechi troscuth no da laa *for usciu* 7 *bargin*. Mad sceith it .u.ii. láa

§ 11 Nech⁶ tuarai col-lamaib escomnaib teit cet mbeimend for a laim. Mad fuba ni di dath ind lenna di nach rét escomun pennid in coicc .xl. laa

INTi nodib cen fiss 7 rinnatha⁷ iarum pendid .u. laa.

§ 12 Nech dobeir dialailiu *ní* *hi* raba luch marb no ness marb tri troiscti forsinti dobeir 7⁸ inti rodínadar⁹ iaram troscuth fair. Mad¹⁰ in-nach biud tirmaidiu ailiu. il-lichtin no i n-as tiug aní bís imbi focertar *immach* arberar bith olchenae

§ 13 Nech asrochoili troscuth no *tredan* no cethrachat n-aidche *nó* bliadain 7 bristi [20^a] fadesin cen comeicniugud o nach aili diabul peindid fair

§ 14 Nech asrochoiliud¹¹ nadnísá feoil no saill no imb no niba¹² coirm no ass. Dlegar daū tri mirend no tri lomand di cach æ ar chaisc 7 notlaicc fri galar 7 anches dia tichtu no fri huais ngortæ no nóna for tuatha *condinappail* cach toruth bis leu cenmotta aní asrochoili nech do gabail de. no frisreire¹³ n-anamcharat lasna bí naill¹⁴ do thorud arabera bith inti

¹ before this section is written in left margin nō ² over roira is written b
The scribe seems to mean immeroibreá ³ over 7 is written vel ⁴ supply
fis ⁵ before this section is written in left-hand margin so ⁶ a word has
dropped before tuarai ⁷ read rafinnathar ⁸ above 7 is written nō (or nō?)
⁹ read rodínnadar ¹⁰ above Mad is written so. ¹¹ read asrochóili ¹² read
ní fba ¹³ read perhaps fri scíre ¹⁴ read na aill

tipsy, he who causes his tipsiness does the like penance. If it is through enmity that he does it, he who causes the tipsiness does penance as if he were a homicide. If his tipsiness does not hinder him [from his duties] except that he is unable to chant the Psalms, or say Mass, or such-like, he keeps a fast therefor.

§ 8 Anyone who commits a theft of meat or drink from his brother while tipsy keeps a fast therefor, as well as the punishment for tipsiness. If he commit the theft without the brethren's [knowledge], it is three fasts or a fortnight's strict penance.

§ 9 Anyone who steals food gets forty days the first time, and forty more the second time, a year the third time, and exile under the yoke of a strange abbot the fourth time. If it be boys of ten years old, they get seven days: if over twenty years, twenty days' penance.

§ 10 Anyone who eats till he makes himself ill, or till his skin gets tight, keeps a fast or two days on bread and water. If he vomits, it is seven days.

§ 11 Anyone who [touches] food with unclean hands, a hundred lashes are laid on his hand. If the colour of the liquor be at all troubled with some unclean thing, the cook does forty days' penance. The man who drinks it unwittingly, and afterwards learns what he has done, does five days' penance.

§ 12 Anyone who gives another anything in which there has been a dead mouse or dead weasel, three fasts are laid on him who gives it, and he who thereafter learns what has been done, a fast on him. If it is in any other dry food, in porridge or in thickened milk, the part round it is thrown away, the rest is consumed.

§ 13 Anyone who resolves to keep a fast [for one day] or three days or forty nights or a year, and breaks it of himself without being compelled by anyone else, does double penance.

§ 14 Anyone who takes a vow that he will not eat flesh or bacon or butter, or will not drink beer or milk, is bound to take three morsels or three sips of each of them at Easter and Christmas against the occurrence of disease and suffering; or against distress through famine or scarcity falling upon the people, so that all the victuals they have perish, except the particular thing which he has vowed [not] to partake of; or in case of a repast provided by a confessor, who has no other sort of victuals which the man may eat who has taken that

asrochoili inn anmimitar¹ dia. combí ar dia in tuaslucad intan dognither. *ocus* combi fochraig nambi de

§ 15 **Nech** praindes 7 ibes choirm conidscei mad fir-manach tricha laa pendite

Mad galar fodera nó ma iar nn-aine móir *nó* ma ar foilti inn-ocht sollamnaib infa bliadna *nó* mad sére anchorath² *nó* mad feilib noemb³ mani lusar forcrith forsin mesair comnidetar an anmcharat ni herchoit insin huile

§ 16 **Nech** aines i ndomnuch tri faill no chaillti pendith .u.ii. main for uisci 7 bargin.

§ 17 **Nech** aslu fuidel con *nó* fir deirc di duinib no diberg-gaich no nech marbus a mathair no athair no a brathair *nó* ttete hi coibligi coa mathair *nó* a fiaer *nó* a ingin *nó* epscob *nó* sacart bith re cach⁴ iar tairmtecht a *gráid* cen aithrigi pendid bliadain for uisci 7 bargin

§ 18 **Nech** bas lobar is licet dó praind in cach trath lai 7 aidchi

§ 19 **Nech** praindes ría cách *nó* araber bith biad bes ailgini oldás biad na mbrathre manip galar *nó* lobrai naicnith immetholnga⁵ no mani [20^b] rocathe acht insein do gress troscut ind *nó* da laa for usci 7 bargin

§ 20 **Nech** donic talmaidi *nem* galair *troscud* dáu an chet-aidchi mad ó demun beith is hetrumaidi mad o dia atcether a deithbire.

§ 21 (so) ⁶**Nech** atlu ful cait tri throisci ind. **Nech** ithes a mila *nó* gauin⁷ a choirp *cét aidche* for uisci 7 bargin

Cap. ii *continued.*

§ 36 **Nech** bí hi lanamnas dligith itte a besa inso .i. denma in⁸ trib corgusaib na bliadna 7 aine 7 cetaín 7 domnuch 7 eter di notlaicc 7 itir di chaisc mani theis di sacarbaic ar notlaicc 7 caiscc 7 cengciges. Dlegar doib dano denma i n-aimsir galair mista donaib banscalait 7 ind aimsir comperta 7 trichae aidchi iar mbreith ingine .xx. aidchi iar mbreith maic.

Dlegair doib dano beith cen saill cen carna i trib corgusaib na bliadna

¹ read anmmit ar ² read anmcharat ³ read nóemaib ⁴ perhaps epscuip
nó sacairt bith- freraig (or bith-frecarthaig) ⁵ read immidfolngai ⁶ before
this section is written in the margin so ⁷ read gur ⁸ read hi

vow of abstinence for God's sake: so that it is for God's sake that the relaxation is granted, when it so happens, and so that he gets a reward for what he does.

§ 15 Anyone who eats food and drinks beer until he vomits, if he be a regular monk, does thirty days' penance. If this is caused by disease, or if it happens after a long fast, or in rejoicings at the eight festivals of the year, or if it be a confessor's repast, or if it be on holy feast days, if they do not drink beyond the measure which the confessor prescribes,—in all such cases there is no harm.

§ 16 Anyone who fasts on a Sunday through carelessness or austerity does a week's penance on bread and water.

§ 17 Anyone who drinks the leavings of a dog, or of one red with [the blood of] men, or a robber, or one that slays his mother or father or brother, or who lies with his mother or sister or daughter, or a contumacious (?) bishop or priest after he has violated his orders without repenting, does a year's penance on bread and water.

§ 18 Anyone that is sickly is allowed a meal at any hour of day or night.

§ 19 Anyone who eats before the rest, or eats food that is daintier than the brethren's food, unless it be disease or natural infirmity that causes him to do so, or unless he is [un]able to eat anything else, habitually, must keep a fast or two days on bread and water therefor.

§ 20 Anyone who is suddenly seized by an attack of disease, a fast for him the first night: if it comes of a demon, he is the lighter thereby; if of God, let the cause of it be seen.

§ 21 Anyone who drinks the blood of a cat, three fasts therefor. Anyone who eats his vermin or the scab of his body, a hundred nights on bread and water.

Cap. ii *continued.*

§ 36 Anyone that lives in lawful wedlock, these are his rules of conduct: chastity during the three Lents of the year, and on Fridays, Wednesdays and Sundays, and between the two Christmases and between the two Easters, if he does not go to the Sacrament on Christmas Day and Easter Day and Whitsun Day. Also they are bound to observe chastity at the time of their wives' monthly sickness, and at the time of pregnancy, and for thirty nights after the birth of a daughter, twenty nights after the birth of a son. They are also bound to go without bacon or flesh-meat during the three Lents of the year.

Banscala intan bí a ngalar místae foraib ni tiagat do sacarbaic

Nech coricc fríu isind aimsir sin *pendid* fíchet n-aidchi. Æs lanamnais dligthig .xl. aidchi dogres hi ngenas cen saill cen chárna re *techt* do sacarfic cenmotá cengciges it .x. láa són namma. Biid *dano* hi genas eter da notlaic 7 eter da caiscc cenmothá lúan min-cascc

INcipit de auaritia

CAP. iii § 1a Auaritia¹ dano issed nomen inna tresi dualcha marbus anmain duini .i. sant-chaiti ar is iside samailter fri hifernn ara met 7 ara fairsingi 7 nadchon tasici ass ani fochartar ind immata samlaid gen na sainti ce nodaitlis ind huili feba in betha nicon rulínpiti 7 nícon taisbed² ní for culu ass ar is tene do loscuth is muir do badud is talam do slucud is leo du airchelath is best [21^a] du biathad is cláideb du fuidbiu³ du lemim is carcar du imchomet is slabrad do chuimriuch is cuithchi airicc archind^{3a} bais coirp 7 anma

b. Air ise meccon aranfasat inna huli dubalcha īstant⁴ conith fobithin is moam bertir anmain in cheneli doine dochum n-iphirnn.

ISs aire marbaid in mac a athair 7 a mathair is aire tiagat in doini derc-martræ 7 glas-martræ 7 bán-martrai etir gauin⁵ 7 loscath 7 badud is fuabíth tiagait dochum n-iphirnn *cona* pianaib 7 doergat flaith nime *cona* fochraiccib

c.⁶ . . . *id est* accobor cen mesrugud. rochall *co* nderchoiniud inratha⁷ cen cumsanad. airchelad cen trocaire. gáu cen imchomus. Éthech cen erchuiliud. Fáitbe cach maith. Airec cech uilc. daille menman díultad aicnid **Forbris** iud cach thruad. Aslach cach threiu. Sant im talman. Brecc iman anmain

d. **IS** si *tra* suálach roerbrad⁸ do chathugud frisin dubaich⁹ se *id est* Eslabrai *co* ndeirc con-neuch genethar huadi .i. trocaire

¹ R adds .i. saint ² read nícontaiscibed ³ supply is nathair from Q
^{3a} airrigh airchinnigh Q ⁴ read in t̄sant ⁵ read guin ⁶ insert here,
following R : c. Is sí tra cland 7 genelach genedar ón duálaig-se ⁷ inrath R om. Q
⁸ roherbad RQ ⁹ ndualaich RQ

Women do not go to the Sacrament when their monthly sickness is upon them. Anyone who has intercourse with them at such times does penance for twenty nights.

Persons living in lawful wedlock spend forty nights continuously in continence, without eating bacon or flesh-meat, before going to the Sacrament, except at Pentecost: then it is only ten days. They live in continence also between the two Christmases and between the two Easters, as well as the Monday after the lesser Easter.

Incipit de avaritia

CAP. iii § 1a. *Avaritia* is the name of the third vice that kills the soul of man, that is, avarice: for it may be compared to Hell as to its extent and capacity, and because it gives up nothing that is cast into it: so likewise the maw of avarice, though the world's whole wealth were poured into it, could not be filled, and would give nothing back again. For it is a fire to burn and a sea to drown, an earth to devour, a lion to ravish, a beast to feed, a sword to spoil, a serpent to spring, a dungeon to keep, a chain to fetter, a pitfall to compass the destruction of body and soul.

b. For on this root of avarice grow all the vices, and on its account are most souls of the human race brought to Hell. For its sake the son kills his father and mother: for its sake men suffer red martyrdom and white martyrdom and green martyrdom, even slaying and burning and drowning. For its sake men go to Hell with its pains, and desert the kingdom of Heaven with its rewards.

c. [This is the offspring and issue that is born of this vice,] even desire without measure, corruption with despair, raidings without rest, robbing without mercy, falsehood without control, perjury without restraint, derision of every good thing, pleasure in every evil thing, blindness of mind, denying of nature, oppression of the wretched, solicitation of the strong, covetousness of earth, deceit concerning the soul.

d. Now this is the virtue that has been appointed to combat this vice, namely liberality with charity, and what springs therefrom, that is to say, mercy with forgiveness, rectitude with

co ndilgadchai¹ dírgi co firindi. Tidnacol *co* n-algine . cen huail cen grain cen indíri Aircisecht *co* ndigairsi. cen mrath cen togais. Cen tóchailche. Cain-duthracht cen² eslabrai cen gáí cen ethech cen éccmailti

e. IT e inso dano freptai inna santi *id est* frestal nuigen críst Fled do bochtaib Trebad' im tairic menme im nochtae.³ Toeb fri bennachtain [21^b] Remdecsin pene. Frescisiu fochraici Indnide mbrithé ar gnuis in duilemuin hi laithiu bratha

§ 2 **Nech** dorona bés di gait 7 taidiu⁴ tre saind 7 forgabál⁴ asber teothir .uui. mbliadna penne ind **Maith** la cumene fota is bliadain an cet-fecht a díi an fecht tanaisi. Maith maicc dognet is .xl. aithche no .xx. aithche penne *nó amail* bíis a n-aes is amlaid bith a pennit. Mascomra inna erci rosuidigestar dia hi recht 7 riagul his laugudi a pennit iarum

§ 3 **Mad** rogata nech cairich ceotheora cairich tarnessi. Math agh coicc oigi **Mad** ech da ech dara esi. Mad muc di muic dara hesi. Mad roastar cach mil díb i mbethu lasin merlech adrén diabul .i. mil im-muin alaili. Diabul *dano* im marb-indili .i. set im-muin alaili

§ 4 **Mani** be maschomra⁵ ind fognam dar essi. Madidipre do dia co pennind du reir anmcharat 7 mani thechta ní aschomra meren⁶ do duiniu acht pennind namma *co n-airdiu cain-comraic*

§ 5 **Asper** pól apstal inte robúi oc gat 7 taidiu anad de 7 sæthrageth ho lamaib cor-roib les ní dorata chomraicc ind almsain do bochtaib 7 adilenechaib. Ar *amail* ardibda uisci tenth is amlaid ardibada ind almsain inna pecthu. asber críst nech lasmí móir imbeith *nó indelb*⁷ a leth do fogail do bochtaib 7 adilenechaib

§ 6 **Mad** intii adcobra rosá cléthe foirbhetad fodali huli do bochtaib 7 adilenechaib 7 tet i n-ailithri no bith innmnochta⁸ ind eclais oentath co te dochum nime

§ 7 [22^a] **Nech** doricc⁹ altoir *nó* scrín *nó* gatas sosceli .uui. mbliadnai pennite. Mad cloc *nó* bachall *nó* menistir it cethrochæ bliadnai for usciu 7 bargin

¹ ndilgadaig R ² con R om. Q ³ bochtæ R ⁴ read 7 forgabál tri saint

⁵ read ní aschomra ⁶ read ní eren ⁷ read indeib ⁸ read nō bíd i n-imnochtai ⁹ read dorig

truthfulness, bounty with gentleness, without pride, without dread, without malice ; compassion with eagerness, without treachery, without guile, without graspingness (?) ; benevolence with liberality, without falsehood, without perjury, without insolence.

e. These again are the remedies against avarice, to wit, service of Christ's babes, feasts for the poor, labouring for one's food, a mind set on poverty, trust in a blessing, prevision of punishment, hope of reward, expectation of judgment in presence of the Creator on the Day of Judgment.

§ 2 Anyone who makes a habit of thieving and stealing and robbing through covetousness, Theodore says, seven years' penance therefor. According to Cummene Fota it is a year the first time, two the second time. If boys do such things, it is forty nights (or twenty nights) of penance, or else their penance is according to their age. If the culprit can pay the erics which God has appointed in law and rule, his penance is consequently less.

§ 3 If anyone steals a sheep, he must restore four sheep in its place ; if a cow, five cows ; if a horse, two horses in its place ; if a pig, two pigs in its place. If each of these animals be found in the thief's possession alive, he pays double, that is, a beast in addition to the other. He pays double also for inanimate chattels, that is, the price together with the original price.

§ 4 If there is nothing that he can pay for it, he gives service in place of it. If he offers it to God and does penance as his confessor prescribes, and does not possess anything that he can pay [as fine], he pays nothing to man, save only penance with a token of good will.

§ 5 The apostle Paul says: Let him who has lived by robbery and theft cease therefrom, and let him labour with his hands, so that he may have what he can give in alms to the poor and needy. For as water quenches fire, so almsgiving quenches sins. Christ says: Anyone who has much wealth or substance should distribute half of it to the poor and needy.

§ 6 As for him who desires to reach the pitch of perfectness, he distributes all he has to the poor and needy and goes on a pilgrimage or lives in destitution in a communal church till he goes to Heaven.

§ 7 Anyone who plunders an altar or shrine, or steals a Gospel-book, seven years' penance. If it be a bell, or crozier or service-set, it is forty years on bread and water.

§ 8 **N**ech fochlaid daurtach .iiii. bliadna penna ind. Mad praindtech it a cethair for usciu 7 bargain.

§ 9 Nech dia tabar lóg ar bas duine *nó* ar guarcall¹ *nó* gu-acru *nó* gu-brith pennid teora bliadnai col-leith

§ 10 **N**ech fedligethar hi saint co forcenn ha sægil dodchoid dia ailithri *nó* fothrodail² set .uii. cumala di raith a anma do bochtaib 7 adilcnechaib. Cleirech *nó* caillech bíis ind eclais oentath lasambí *ní* for a leortu sechib ret taibreth di bochtaib 7 adilcnib dond eclais imbíi

Mani denai escomnaigther oen³ eclais imbíi. Ma dogne aithrigi pennid sechtair airt rombói for a chubus cen fórnáire senora air is ansu do eclais oentath imbi lóg ndirnai di sain-chrund *nó* dichmairc oldas bith tene dia loscud ar met imefolngai di fodurd 7 formut 7 *aninni* indi lasambi *amail* dondrim eóin casian

§ 11 **N**ech nad éren a ndlegar dau peindid gaiti fair ind *amail* bith gait nogatad in dlegair⁴ dó

§ 12 **N**ech dothoing ethech ind eclais fo cethar-lebrai soscelai .x. bliadna cethora bliadnai deac la colum cilli a .uii. *nó* a .iiii. la cumaine

§ 13 **N**ech tober a cheli ind eithech [22^b] penneth .uii. mbliadnai inté tothoing ethech tria ainfis bliadain pennid

§ 14 **M**a rufestar bas n-ethech acht dagni ar baig *nó* chomitecht bliadain pennite. Mad ar luad .uii. bliadna pennite. Mad ar eicin tobertar fair bliadain pennite. Mad fo laim epscoip *nó* sacairt *nó* deochain *nó* ac altoir *nó*⁵ coiseartha .iii. bliadnai pennite

§ 15 **A**sber cumaine fotai secip fethal foa tosar a ndub-ethech dligid .uii. bliadna penna ind forsinní nothoing mani be dia bais noes cuindi.⁶ Mad *maic* beca ar omun no chometecht bliadain dur-pennite forsinní nothoing for uisci 7 bargain no arra. Mat mna baitha *nó* ingena teora bliadna *nó* narrá.⁷

§ 16 **N**ech forgella gau-forgoll no gáu-fiadnaisi *nó* gaú-

¹ read gú-forciull ² read fodrodail ³ read den ⁴ read a ndlegar
⁵ supply crois ⁶ read *nó* escuindi ⁷ read *nó* a n-arre

§ 8 Anyone who breaks into an oratory, four years' penance therefor. If a refectory, four years on bread and water.

§ 9 Anyone who takes a reward to kill a man or to bear false witness or to bring a false suit or to give false judgment, does three and a half years' penance.

§ 10 Anyone who persists in avarice to the end of his life must go on a pilgrimage or must distribute the value of seven cumals to the poor and needy for his soul's good.

A cleric (or nun) who lives in a communal church and has somewhat more than suffices him, whatever it be, let him give it to the poor and needy of the church where he lives. If he does not, let him be excommunicated from the church where he lives. If he repents, he is to do penance apart, for as long as the sin has been on his conscience, without express command of the elders: for it is worse for a communal church in which there is the worth of a *dirna* of private property or stolen goods than if a fire were burning it, by reason of the quantity of murmuring and envy and ill-feeling that is caused by the man that owns it, as John Cassian accounts it.

§ 11 Anyone who does not pay what he owes does penance therefor as for theft, as if what he owes were a theft he had committed.

§ 12 Anyone who takes a false oath in church on a book of the four Gospels, does ten years' penance (fourteen years according to Colum Cille, seven (or four) according to Cummíne).

§ 13 Anyone who leads his fellow into perjury, let him do seven years' penance. He who commits perjury in ignorance, a year's penance.

§ 14 If he knows that it is perjury, but commits it under promise or to shield another, a year's penance. If for a bribe, seven years' penance. If under compulsion laid upon him, a year's penance. If under the hand of a bishop or priest or deacon, or at an altar or consecrated [cross], three years' penance.

§ 15 Cummíne Fota says: Whatever be the emblem on which a downright perjury is sworn, the man who swears it is bound to seven years' penance, unless it be through his folly or imbecility.

If little boys [commit perjury] through fear or to shield another, a year of strict penance on bread and water, or its equivalent, is laid upon him who takes the oath. If it be light women or girls, three years or the equivalent.

§ 16 Anyone who gives false testimony or false witness or false judgment against his neighbour, must ask his pardon in his

breithemnas fora chomnesnam danguid col-log nech¹ forgella foir inna gnuis *nó* pennith fon cinaid tofoing fora celi

§ 17 **Mad** tria anfis asbertar in gó² ni tárci ni di ulc ondíi³ frisa n-eperar dughiter aithrigi leir disuidiu troscud taue lasodain *nó* da salm deac no cét mbeimend co n-abuind fora lama indí asbeir an gói tria anfis. Mad ar oenlus asbera nech in goi cen erchod biid tre láá i taui acht cert n-ernaigti no legind *nó*.u.ii. cét beimend plága fora lama 7 leth-troscud *nó* tri coicait salm

§ 18 **Nech** asber immarbæ mbreithre triambi les di gu-slonduth fri naimti *nó* du immurchur chora eter debtachu *nó* du neuch beres duine ap-bas ni mor pendid acht rob⁴ dia durontar

§ 19 [23^a] **Nech** rofindadar ní do gói no dichmairc fadesin taibred hi cobsin di anmcharait for leth *nó* du senoir remebe dó. Mani be sidi taibreth hi du dia a cobsin fadesin fiad andernad a n-olc combi isidi⁵ bas anmcharath dó 7 dugne figill 7 aine 7 ernaigti du dia col-leir

§ 20 **Nech** cheiles a choibsena ara anmcharait condid nach aile rodafindadar diabul pennid fair. Manip eside etir a indarbae a hoentu na braithri.

§ 21 **Nech** concheil airi ndualcha fora cheili penneth for usciu 7 bargin airt ronchelt ar is cumma a chin la dia indí dogni a n-olc 7⁶ conithcheil fair mani fuacra 7 mana coirighter⁷

Math becc an pecad conceltar and pennith dib línáib in pecad sin amail bis a phennith

§ 22 **Da** chomgraíd 7 di chompersain immeresnad cen fiadnæ connebir nechtar de ní do gói pennit dib línáib co cend bliadna *nó* conidatma nechdar de 7 da láá *cacha* .u.ii. maine dib for usciu 7 bargin dedan *cach* mis 7 guidithitir⁸ dia leó col-ler cor-ruccu bretha fira forru áinit am bliadna inna n-imresain tiagait du churp *críst* bas breithem dóib i mbrath 7 lectir fu mes nde. Ma beith ara tabre nechtar de a chobsena fira hilighthir a pennind fo met torraraic fora chomnesam di

¹ read neich ² supply 7 ³ read dondí ⁴ supply do ⁵ read héside
⁶ supply indí ⁷ read cairgedar ⁸ read guidithir

presence, and pay a price for anything he may testify against him, or else do penance according to the sin he swears to against his fellow.

§ 17 If the falsehood is uttered in ignorance, and does no harm to the person about whom it is uttered, full penitence is required thereupon, and a silent fast is kept as well, or twelve psalms, or a hundred blows with a thong on the hand of him who utters the falsehood in ignorance.

If anyone utters such a falsehood deliberately, without doing harm, he spends three days in silence except for the appointed prayers or readings; or else he receives 700 blows of a lash on his hands and keeps a half-fast or recites the hundred and fifty psalms.

§ 18 Anyone who utters a falsehood in words whereof good results, by giving a false description to a man's enemies, or by carrying pacific messages between disputants, or by anything that rescues a man from death, there is no heavy penance, provided it is done for God's sake.

§ 19 Anyone who is himself conscious of any falsehood or unlawful gains let him confess privately to a confessor or to an elder who may be set over him. If there be none such, let him make his own confession to God, in whose presence the evil was done, so that He shall be his confessor; and let him perform a vigil and a fast and prayers to God diligently.

§ 20 Anyone who hides from his confessor the sins he should confess until someone else discovers them, double penance upon him. If no one does so (?), he is to be expelled from the community of the brethren.

§ 21 Anyone who conceals a capital sin for his fellow's sake, let him do penance on bread and water for as long a time as he hid it; for the guilt is the same in God's eyes, whether a man does the evil or conceals it for his sake who does it, if he do not proclaim and correct it. If the sin that is concealed be trivial, both do penance for that sin, according to the penance assigned to it.

§ 22 When two persons of equal rank and equal standing have a dispute without witnesses, and one of them asserts a falsehood, both do penance for the space of a year, or until one of them admits the lie, and they are put on bread and water for two days in every week, and keep a two days' fast every month, and they pray to God diligently that He may pass just judgments upon them, and they fast a whole year in their dispute, and receive the body of Christ who shall be their judge at the Doom, and it is left to God's award. If it comes to pass that one of

sæthur 7 dutluchádar dilguth o suidu col-leir 7 ona brathrib olchenæ

§ 23 Nech immer-[23^b]-esna nach rét co tairptiuch 7 asber nícon dergenus inso *nó* aní aill no nech tomainnethar ní nad accai no findadar *acht* ar neurt imresain 7 mani ebre mambée¹ no math cet *pennid tri* troiscthiu ind

CAP iv § 1 a. INuidia format issed aínm na cethramta dualcha marbus anmain duine ar isí dualaich insin triasa romarb caín abial mac n-adaim is treithe rommarbsat ind iudei críst is tree as moam marbus cach duine a chele isin bith. Samlitir *dano* a aicneth ind formait consindiri² fri aicneth teneth ar is besad in tineth is cuma loisces a mbis issa 7 huasa 7 inna erchomair immatha samlaith a format is cummæ frisoirc dundí bes isliu 7 bes huaisliu 7 bas cutruma combí náma dà cach duiniu *etir* maith 7 saich *etir* cían *ucus* *ucus*

b. Nach oen imbí aicneth ind formaitt 7 inna hiniri ní bi atreb do dia inna cridiu nícon bía *dano* atreb dosum la dia for nim

c. ISí tra clann 7 genelach genethar on dualaich-se i. miscuis commesaim fodort im cach maith altugad *cach* uilc taithbech *cach*³ carat brón fri naimtiu⁴ falti fri dímes.⁵

d. IS sí *dano* subalaich foerbath⁶ do chathugud frisin dualaich-se i. cáin-duthracht cridi cen inndiri co neuch gainetar huadi do sualchib i. serc bratharda fortacht cech commesam [24^a] Deg-teist di cárth. Miscais ecnach. Innarbæ fodoirt. Morath cach maith Tansem cach uilc briathar algen menma aircisechtach⁷ di cach duine *acht* ní bas dír peccath

§ 2 Nech bas formtech banir⁸ bas frithoircnech dia braithrib digded co n-athrigi dilacht donhí dia ndarnai frithorchain hi format 7 iniri 7 pennind for usciu 7 bargin fot rea rombói *ina* cridi in miscais

Maruthboi olc do format errenad in met dochoid trid hi mudu ma beith hi folud mani be dígteth tria chaithrigi⁹

¹ read mani bē ² cosin innire Q ³ om. RQ ⁴ fria n-airmitin RQ
⁵ fria ndimess RQ ⁶ roherbad RQ ⁷ aircisech R, aircisectan Q
⁸ read bas indir ⁹ read perhaps chái 7 aithrigi

them makes full confession, his penance is increased according to the amount of labour he has brought upon his neighbour, and he earnestly begs forgiveness of him and of the brethren generally.

§ 23 Anyone who disputes violently about anything, and says: 'I did not do this or that':—or anyone who imagines something which he does not see, or know, except in the heat of contention, and does not say 'unless perchance' or 'under correction':—does penance therefor with three fasts.

De Invidia

CAP. iv § 1a *Invidia*, envy: this is the name of the fourth vice that kills the soul of man, for this is the vice which caused Cain to kill Abel son of Adam, and the Jews to kill Christ. By it chiefly is each man led to kill his fellow in this world. Now the nature of envy, with malice, is likened to the nature of fire. For it is the way of fire that it burns indifferently what is below and above and near it; so also envy assails indifferently him that is lower and him that is higher, and him that is equal, so that it is an enemy to every man whether good or bad, near or far.

b. Anyone in whom is the nature of envy and malice, there is no dwelling for God in his heart, and so there will be no dwelling for him with God in Heaven.

c. This is the offspring and issue that is born of this vice, namely, hate of one's neighbour, murmuring at every good thing, thanksgiving for every evil thing, backbiting of friends, chagrin at their winning honour, exultation at their loss of esteem.

d. This is the virtue that has been appointed to combat this vice, namely kindliness of heart without malice, with all kinds of virtue that spring therefrom, such as brotherly love, helpfulness to our neighbour, speaking well of everyone, hatred of reviling, rejection of murmuring, magnifying of everything good, rebuking of everything evil, kindly words, a mind compassionate to all men, save for aught that involves sin.

§ 2 Anyone who is envious, or malicious, or offensive to his brethren, let him ask pardon penitently and earnestly of him whom he has offended in envy and malice, and let him do penance on bread and water for as long a time as there had been hatred in his heart. If evil has resulted from his envy, let him pay as much as was lost by his fault, if it was in the form of property: if not, let him ask pardon tearfully and penitently.

§ 3 **N**ech eacnaigter a máthair no athair *nó* a fier *nó* a brathair *nó* a flaith *nó* airchindech *nó* a senór remibi do i n-æs *nó* forchetul taibreth hi coibsin 7 penneth .uui. laa *for usciu* 7 *bargin* nú arra dodlegi. Mad nech aile ecnaigedar *tri* laa col-leith. Mad bés dó du gres co ni cuimnígethar a chosc de a indarba ásan eclais do lucc phendi conrana¹ don dualaich sin. Manip ar fodord *nó* format ratir acht is ar airchisecht cuirp 7 anma indii immarathter and ni pennither fri nach duine acht is ar fochraic adrimtar mani té nach les aili fou di lebuir 7 ernaigti

§ 4 **N**ech dogní taithbech format *nó* nech lasmbí bind pennith cethri laa *for usciu* 7 *bargin* 7 denad aithrigi [24^b] dondísí dia ndiusci debuith Math dondí remibi dó dognether dodiuscuth inna debta pennithter .uui. laa disuidiu acht asberat alaili ni thoth diuscuth² epert na firindi

Math fo riaguil sosceli dognether i. a rad etruib dib línaib hi tosugh mani aithir arsodain congairi nach n-uili³ lat manip ferr disuidiu rátir fiach⁴ popul uli

§ 5 **N**ech diuscai⁵ debuith dia brathair *tria* labrai no mescai biid laa i troscuth tau. Math *tria* scelugud toaithib canith da salm deac *nó* cét mbemen fora lama. Ata dano cetharda arnid coír taithbec ind uilc bíis isin duiniu nád eroim a ícc *tria* guidi *accus* algini rodbu ar nach comet nach ali dó isin ulc sein rodbu ar chairiguth ind uilc fadesin rodbu ar demniguth in maith rodbu ar airchisecht indí dogní a n-olc.

His taithbingith immargu nachiddeni ar oen in cethardise pennid coethri laa *nó* canith *tri* choecait salm ind noct⁶ (?)

§ 6 **N**ech ingaib a cheli *tria* format 7 iniri danguideth *tria* ailgini 7 canad .xxx. salm *nó* pennid laa *co n-aidci* *for usciu* 7 *bargin*

§ 7 **N**ech fodordai cen deithfiri 7 aridaile *for* nach n-aili 7 lasma bind coitsecht fris 7 nachidergail pennit huile *tri* laa *for usciu* 7 *bargin* 7 inti dogni iterscartar⁶ a gnim ucus bith *for leth-bargin* *nó* *for leth-praind* inna braithri di *bargin* mamma 7

¹ read cor-rana ² read ní todiuscud [debtha] ³ read n-aile ⁴ read fiad
⁵ read todiusca ⁶ here some words have fallen out

§ 3 Anyone who reviles his mother or father or sister or brother or his prince or prior or an elder who is above him in age or instruction, let him make confession and do penance seven days on bread and water, or the equivalent which cancels it. If he reviles anyone else, three days and a half. If it becomes a fixed habit with him, so that he does not remember to restrain himself, he is to be expelled from the church to a place of penance until he can give up that vice.

If the words are spoken not in carping nor in envy, but out of compassion for the body and soul of him for whom they are intended, no penance is imposed in respect of any man, but it is reckoned as meritorious, if no other profit results, in labour and prayer.

§ 4 Anyone who is guilty of envious fault-finding, or anyone who loves to hear it, let him do penance for four days on bread and water, and let him make amends to him against whom he makes mischief. If it is against one who is set over him that the mischief-making is directed, seven days' penance is imposed thereupon. But some say that telling the truth is not mischief-making, if it be done according to the Gospel rule, that is: Speak your mind first between you twain: if he does not amend, then call in someone else to support you; if this does not mend matters, let the thing be spoken before all the people.

§ 5 Anyone who makes mischief against his brother through [love of] talk or drunkenness, let him spend a day in a silent fast. If it be through gossiping that he finds fault, he recites twelve psalms, or receives a hundred blows on his hands.

There are, however, four cases in which it is right to find fault with the evil that is in a man who will not accept his cure by means of entreaty and kindness: either to prevent someone else from abetting him in this evil; or to correct the evil itself; or to confirm the good; or out of compassion for him who does the evil. But anyone who does not do it for one of these four reasons is a fault-finder, and does penance four days, or recites the hundred and fifty psalms naked.

§ 6 Anyone who rails at his fellow through envy and malice, let him ask his pardon with gentleness and recite thirty psalms or do penance for a day and a night on bread and water.

§ 7 Anyone who murmurs without just cause and one who prompts another to do so, and one who likes to listen to murmuring, and does not examine into it,—all such persons do three days' penance on bread and water, and he who actually commits the offence is separated, and his work [is rejected], and he is put

becc n-usci leis corob hícta on fodord huare conarectar¹ du cach ráth² a aithisc fri seanoir 7 di *cach* [25^a] rét bas toisc dó iter brat 7 bíad

§ 8 his aire is beithi *menmæ* frisin fodor *immun* tuarai uare issed chetarráli diabul *for* adam 7 eua hi tosuch *dommuin* conid disuidiu dufuetar an obul *dichmair*³ conid ari rogabad al-lam a *pardus* dochum gortæ 7 bochtæ 7 ítath 7 bais 7 hifirn asa cind

§ 9 **IS** sed *dano* arráli *for* tuaith nde isin dithrub *cona* tanic *acht* dias diib téir tairgeri .i. esu 7 caleb du ir-robatar secht cet mili fer n-armach cenmorobai mna 7 maccu comdar a n-ói 7 a n-iarmói tothanatar⁴ iar tain

§ 10 **IS** sed *dano* ceta arráli *for* iudas scarioth condid disuidiu rocrochad *críst* hiar tain ar nach dú ir-rabai fodurd 7 *format* 7 ecndach 7 miscuis comnesaim 7 taithbech ndebtha 7 failti do cach ulc 7 bron di *cach* maith nicon rusechmallad cen digu uil⁵ di nim 7 talam

§ 11 **IS** airi *tra* is imgabtha ar *format* ria cach ret uare dogní namdini *itir* an mac 7 ind athair 7 *itir* ind ingin 7 a mathair *itir* ind rig 7 a rignai *itir* an da brathair *itir*⁶ commarba cechta de arali **Dogni** *dano* namdini *itir* an manach 7 a apaid *itir* an despcul 7 an maigistir. **Dogni** *dano* namait di cach oen adchi 7 nad acai ar *format* fris an maith bis and *conéráli* debuid forsna hanchraidi immenetar

CAP. V § 1a. **IR** a ferc ised ainm inna coicti dualchai *marbus* anmain duini amal tregtas foobar corp nduini⁷ is amlaid tregtas rind na ferca ind anmain co n-imolngai bás dosuidiu.

b. **IS** genadar⁸ on dubalaich-se ina ferca .i. diuniorcain cen doenchairi crád *cech* comnesaim cen airchisecht. borrfad *menman* [25^b] cen tairniud nuall mbriathar cen *traothad* debtaidi cen erdibud cosaiti cen connarcli athaisi cen imrádud ecnadacach⁹ cen imchommus

¹ read *conairleichter* ² read *rád* ³ read *dichmairc* ⁴ read *dodancatar*

⁵ read cen digu uilc ⁶ omit ⁷ amal tregdas anmain duine foebur tria corp R ⁸ Isi tra clann 7 geneluch gainethar R ⁹ ecndach &c. RQ

on a half-ration of bread, or half the brethren's allowance of bread only, and a little water therewith, until he be cured of murmuring; since everyone is allowed (?) to make a request to his senior in regard to anything he may need, whether clothing or food.

§ 8 Care must be taken to check murmuring about food for this reason, because it was this sin that the Devil first prompted in Adam and Eve in the beginning of the world, whereby they ate the forbidden apple, and on this account they were driven out of Paradise to hunger and poverty and thirst and death and Hell thenceforth.

§ 9 It was this moreover that he prompted in the Lord's people in the desert so that only two of them reached the land of promise, Joshua and Caleb, out of 700,000 armed men besides women and children, so that it was their grandchildren and great-grandchildren who reached it afterwards.

§ 10 It was this moreover that he first prompted in Judas Iscariot, whereby Christ was afterwards crucified: for in whatever place there has been murmuring and envy and reviling and hate of one's neighbour and mischief-making and exultation in everything evil and chagrin at everything good, that place has never been left without the utmost evils from Heaven and earth.

§ 11 Therefore is envy to be shunned beyond everything, because it creates enmity between son and father, and between daughter and mother, and between king and queen, and between two brothers so that each of them slays the other. It causes enmity also between monk and abbot, between disciple and master. It makes an enemy also of everyone a man sees and does not see, out of envy for the good that is in him, so that it causes strife [even] among anchorites one with another.

De Ira

CAP. V § 1 a. *Ira*, anger, this is the name of the fifth vice that kills the soul of man. As the edge of a weapon pierces a man's body, so the sharp point of anger pierces the soul and causes its death.

b. This is the [offspring and issue] that is born of this vice of anger, to wit, man-slaying without humanity, persecution of one's neighbours without mercy, conceit of mind without abasement, haughty speech without subordination, contentiousness without appeasement, bickerings without lenience, reproaches without reflection, contumely without restraint.

c. IS sí dano sualaich roherbath du chathugud frisan dubalaich-si .i. cennsa *co n*-algini co neoch genithar úadi .i. sláne chridi imgabail debtha. Briathar algen timmarcain borrfaid sochaiscci aicnith taua fri labrai ainmni fri fochaidi miscuis écnaich dilachtaí cen athcomsan cáin-duthracht cen togais cuimliuch cen iniri.

d. IS sí insó frebaid na ferca¹ co nech genithar úade

§ 2 Nech marbus a mac no a ingin peinnid bliadain ar .xx. it

Nech marbus a mathair *nó* athair pennded .xiiii. anni

Nech marbus a brathair no a fier *nó* a fier a mathar *nó* a athar *nó* a brathair a athar *nó* a mathar pendid .x. bliadna 7 lendar sin com-morfeiser etir maithre 7 aithri co hua 7 iarmu 7 indau 7 maccu anua co ingin ar meraib hissin fingail sin ainmnichthir .uui. bliadna penne catcha duinoircni olchena .uui.² bliadna³ cenmotha oes graid .i. epscop *nó* sacart ar is la *nó uil* ríg forbí tuatha 7 la epscop commus a peindi-side .i. rodbu⁴ bith-ailithri rodbu bith-pendainn masconra séutu is laugu de a pennaind.

§ 3 Nech marbus duine i ndigail a athar *nó* a máthar *nó* a brathar *nó* a sethar .iiii. anni *nó* cethracha aidchi pennna ind

§ 4 Nech marbus duine hi cath *nó* ind imairic *nó* oc gobail a cuachiunn bliadain col-leith *nó* cethracha aidchi acht ni te for ind guin ó rumaid riam.

§ 5 [26^a] Nech nothoirc fadesin tria dasacht ernaigti aire 7 almsana hara hanmain mad craibdech riam. Mad ar derchainiuth ronoirnecht fadesin *nó* ar nach tuait ali is lecti immessair⁴ ndé ar ni lamther ernaigti airi .i. oifrend *acht* mad nach n-ernaigti aile 7 almsan do thruadaib 7 do bochtaib

§ 6 Banscal togluasti⁵ lind comperta o rufothaicedar i mbru teora bliadna .i.⁶ colleth. Ma rofeolaigher iseacht⁷ mbliadnai. Math do thuidicht⁸ anim ind .xiiii. bliadna pendite

Ma atbela a mbanscal din togluasacht .i. bas coirp 7 anma cethora cumala .x. il-lúag a hanma du dia *nó* cethora bliadna deac pendi

¹ here some words seem to have fallen out written above .i. rodbu and underneath tuatha togluasi

⁶ read bliadnai

⁷ read is secht

² omit

³ the gloss *nó uil* is

⁴ perhaps im-mess nDÉ

⁵ read

⁸ read mad dia tuidich

c. Now the virtue that has been appointed to combat this vice is meekness with gentleness and all that springs therefrom, to wit, soundness of heart, shunning of contention, gentle speech, repression of conceit, docility of nature, silence amid talkativeness, patience amid sufferings, hatred of reviling, zeal without chiding, benevolence without guile, munificence(?) without malice.

d. This is the remedy against anger, with all that springs from it.

§ 2 Anyone who kills his son or daughter does penance twenty-one years. Anyone who kills his mother or father does penance fourteen years. Anyone who kills his brother or sister or the sister of his mother or father, or the brother of his father or mother, does penance ten years: and this rule is followed to seven degrees both of the mother's and father's kin—to the grandson and great-grandson and great-great-grandson, and the sons of the great-great-grandson, as far as the finger-nails Seven years of penance are assigned for all other homicides; excepting persons in orders, such as a bishop or a priest, for the power to fix their penance rests with the king who is over the laity, and with the bishop, whether it be exile for life, or penance for life. If the offender can pay fines, his penance is less in proportion.

§ 3 Anyone who kills a man in revenge for his father or mother or brother or sister does four years' or forty nights' penance therefor.

§ 4 Anyone who kills a man in battle or in a brawl or, a year and a half or forty nights, provided he does not pursue the slaughter after the fight is won.

§ 5 Anyone who kills himself while insane, prayers are said for him, and alms are given for his soul, if he was previously pious. If he has killed himself in despair or for any other cause, he must be left to the judgment of God, for men dare not offer prayers for him—that is, a Mass:—unless it be some other prayer, and almsgiving to the poor and miserable.

§ 6 A woman who causes miscarriage of that which she has conceived after it has become established in the womb, three years and a half of penance. If the flesh has formed, it is seven years. If the soul has entered it, fourteen years' penance. If the woman die of the miscarriage, that is, the death of body and soul, fourteen cumals [are offered] to God as the price of her soul, or fourteen years' penance.

§ 7 **Nech** tober epthai *nó* dogni arracht *nó* tober tonnuath conidapail nech de .uui. anni pendite *amail* *cach* dunorcuin. Manib marb *nech* de tri bliadna pendite

§ 8 **Nech** chuilles a cheli tria debaid co facaib ainim fair fochraic lega fair 7 a obair do denam condip slan 7 leith-bliadain penne 7 luad inanmni¹ *amail* nonmestar liaeg firian mani be lúag leis bliadain pende tara éisi

§ 9 **Nech** adchomga a cheli ocus nip ar oenlus .xl. pende *nó* .lx. pendi. Mad cleirech asidchomga is *tri* .xl. *aidche* *nó* bliadain pende

§ 10 **Nech** marbus a brathair cen imradud cen debaid cen ir acht donecmaing *tria* bet bliadain penne insein.

Math *tria* feirg cen imrathuth teora bliadna penne

§ 11 **Nech** marbus a cheli *tria* feirc 7 imradud 7 duthracht iar n-erchoiliud ætla imnochtai i mbith-ailithri issi a pendaind mana chomarlecet ancarait *craigdig*

§ 12 **Nech** crades a cheli im ní bas deth-[26^b]-ber *nó* indethber ic a guitheth corup slan o menmain ar is amlaid rocluinetar dia an ernaigthi acht rop slan menma an coibnesaim. Mani eroema saidi a dígdi n-uad pendeth fadesin fo met in craid craides a cheli *nó* *amail* nonmestar senoir

INte nad eroema a digdi penneth sidi for usciu 7 bargin conith-arroema 7 cene bes misscrais inna cridiu

§ 13 **Nech** mallachas a cheli danguideth 7 bith .uui. *man* dur-penne

Nech isbera briathra acharba fria chele 7 ní bí ochriu² collec tanguideth 7 troscuth. Má roidertar³ a brathair riam *nó* ma imbán⁴tar *nó* ma rangba crith acht rutuaisi 7 ni fritorga bith laithe for usciu 7 bargin dogni

§ 14 **Nech** cetabi o menmain namma *acht* *cumscugud* cain-denad a menma *fri*s

Nech nad tabair hi coibsin dondi conidróscáich ni bi i n-oentu na mbrathri ina ecalse arna tí teidm nde insamaltéri fri teneth hi crund aicneth na ferca inchlith⁴

¹ *read* lúag inna ainme
⁴ *read* inchlithe

² *perhaps* ó chridiu

³ *read* roimdergthar

§ 7 Anyone who gives drugs or makes a bogey or gives a poisonous drink so that someone dies of it, seven years' penance, as for a homicide. If no one dies of it, three years' penance.

§ 8 Anyone who hurts his fellow in a quarrel so as to leave a blemish on him, has to pay the leech's fee, and to do his work until he is well, and does half a year's penance and pays a price for the blemish, according to what the leech judges fair. If he has not the price to pay, he does a further year's penance.

§ 9 Anyone who strikes his fellow, but not deliberately, forty or sixty [days'] penance. If it be a cleric who thus strikes another, it is thrice forty nights or a year of penance.

§ 10 Anyone who kills his brother without premeditation, without quarrel, without wrath, yet it happens by his deed, that is a year of penance. If he does it in anger, without premeditation, three years' penance.

§ 11 Anyone who kills his fellow in anger and with premeditation and intent, after taking a vow of renunciation, the penance for him is a life of exile in destitution, unless pious anchorites grant him remission.

§ 12 Anyone who vexes his fellow about any matter, reasonable or unreasonable, the remedy is to beg his pardon that he may be healed in spirit: for God hearkens to prayer on this condition, that our neighbour's spirit be healed. If he will not accept his excuses, let [the offender] himself do penance in proportion to the vexation he causes to his fellow, or according as an elder adjudges: and let him who will not accept his excuses do penance on bread and water until he does accept them, and as long as there is hatred in his heart.

§ 13 Anyone who curses his neighbour, let him beg his pardon, and let him undergo a week's strict penance.

Anyone who speaks bitter words to his fellow (while it is not from his heart), let him ask his pardon and keep a fast. If his brother turns red or pale before him, or if he is taken with a trembling, yet keeps silence and does not contradict him, his penance is a day on bread and water.

§ 14 Anyone who feels in his mind no more than a stirring of anger, let his mind make peace with [his brother].

Anyone who does not make confession to him who has stirred his anger cannot remain in the community of the brethren of the church, lest a plague come thereof. The nature of concealed anger is likened to fire in wood.

§ 15 **Nech nad roich inní¹ frisa mbi ferc do dilgad dosuidiu inna cridiu denad aithrigi du dia col-leir**

§ 16 **Nech connocaib a guth frisiní bís huad hi cein nō fri fer mbodar pennithir² ma co feirc im³ chumgabal cith hi cein cid ind *occus* peindidir fon cinith *7* fon targabal mad galar todiuscái ha nuall ni secmaldtai⁴ fochetoir**

§ 17 **Cetmunter no caillech aithrigi dogní gol for laiech nō laithes pennait .l. n-aidche**

Mad for cetmuindtir nō for chaillich aithrigi adbaill dí asáit nō for fiur muindtiri pennit .xl. n-aidchi. Mad for cleiriuch tuatue .xx. pende.

Mad for ępscop nō ríg nō anmcarait nō aircindech ard-cathrach .xu. pendi

§ 18 [27^a] **Math mac-cleiriuch dia tecmai oen inna cinath-sa asrubartmar is diabul penne dó fri cetmuindtir**

CAP vi § 1a **Tristitia⁵ issed 'ainm ana sesidi dualca marbus⁶ duini atat didu da gne forsin ndubalaich-so .i. doguils domanda co nderchoeiniud *occus* amiris. doguils deoda co nderc *7* cáin-iris indala hai imfolngai bithoilti⁸ i mbeith-betha for nim**

Araile imfolngai⁹ bith-bron i mbith-pianaib infernó.⁹

b. Hisi didu in doguils imfolngai failti inna hanma for nim indíi bís tria chai peetha co n-iris dilguda *7* indíi bís trea airchisecht caich thriuin *7* cach thruaig *7* cach commesaim bís hi robur¹⁰ pheetha *7* dualcha *7* cotuit in-ndaescairi *7* hi trogai cen iris cen aithrigi ar antíi connessai a peetha fadesin *7* peetha a choibnesaim bid failid sidi la dia for nim

IS de asber críst beati qui lugent nunc quoniam ipsi consulabuntur.

c. IN doguils domanda immurgu atat tri gne for suidiu .i. doguils *7* brón scartha frisna cairde collnайди ar gnais a ndoenachta¹¹ *7* ara seirc *7* a n-inmaine¹² nō fobithin etarscartha fria col *7* a peetha *7* a tola colnайди. ISsed dano a ngne tanaisi

¹ read aní ² perhaps ní pendither ³ read in ⁴ t is written over this word ⁵ R adds .i. tuirse ⁶ supply anmain from RQ ⁷ bithfáilte R ⁸ immefolngai R ⁹ read in inferno ¹⁰ ar obur R in dobrom Q ¹¹ ar ingnais a doennachta R ¹² here R inserts no fobithin etarscartha fria a maine *7* a feba talmandai

§ 15 Anyone who cannot attain to forgiving his brother in his heart for that which caused his anger, let him repent earnestly before God.

§ 16 If anyone raises his voice in speaking to someone at a distance or to a deaf man, there is [no] penance. If the raising of his voice is attended with anger, whether at a distance or near by, penance is done according to the sin and the transgression. If it be illness that provokes any outcry, it is not to be passed over for the moment.

§ 17 A married woman or a penitent nun who makes lamentation over a layman or laywoman, fifty nights' penance. If it be over a married woman or a penitent nun who dies in childbed, or a member of the household, forty nights' penance. If over a cleric of the laity, twenty nights' penance. If over a bishop or king or confessor or ruler of a chief town, fifteen nights' penance.

§ 18 If it be a novice who happens to commit one of the offences here mentioned, he has double penance, compared with a married woman.

De Tristitia

CAP. vi, § 1a. *Tristitia*, that is the name of the sixth vice that kills [the soul of] man. Now there are two forms of this vice, namely, worldly sadness with despair and lack of faith; godly sadness with love of God and serene faith. One of them causes eternal joy in the eternal life in Heaven: the other causes eternal grief in the eternal pains of Hell.

b. The sadness which causes the soul's joy in Heaven is that which comes of lamenting over sins, with faith in forgiveness, and that which comes of pitying every strong man and every miserable man and every neighbour of ours who is in the power of sin and vice and falls into vileness and misery, without faith, without penitence. For he who disdains his own sins and his neighbour's sins shall be joyful with God in Heaven. It is of him that Christ says: *Beati qui lugent nunc, quoniam ipsi consolabuntur.*

c. But of worldly sadness there are three forms. The first is sadness and grief at parting with carnal friends for loss of their human affection, and for love and attachment to them; or, because of parting with one's guilt and sins and fleshly lusts.

inna dogailsi domanda .i. brón 7 derchainiud di cach acobar adcobra duini cen a orba acht tol dé namma.

ISsed dano a¹ tris gne inna dogailsi domanda bron 7 derchainiud di cach feb fogaib duine ar oman a foxail airi 7 a erchrai 7 ar homan scartha fria cith iarma-[27^b]-ul con-na-combi cen bron 7 dogulsi cene² bas 'mbeu 7 co tet iarum ar chenn mbith-bron dochum pene sutháine cen na^{2a} forcenn

d. IS si tra bland genedar 7 genelach³ on doguils domandai .i. serbai co n-iniri anserci co n-ecmailti cruini co foichlidi rolabra iar⁴ tói forluamuin espai cen taiscithe anbsaidi aicnith utmaildi choirp foindletha menman fri cach dæscuir imthinscetul cach uilc tophliun 7 laxa fri cach maith derchaineth co terc-menmain hi timnæb de failti co sonarti i gnimaib diabuile.

e. Hit é tra frepthai inna dubalaich-se⁵ .i. failti spiradaltai co roithinci chridi 7 menman fri dogulsi ndomanda grescha ernaigti co n-aini 7 frithairi fri tophliun 7 chotaltaigi eslabrai co lethat⁶ menman im dia frith serc-menmain⁷

Mad⁸ airchiund dia⁹ laubuir 7 ernaigti fri forluamain n-espai hires co ngnim failti co n-ailgine fri derchainiud 7 hiniri menman

§ 2 Nech didu connach tibi¹⁰ diabul tria bron 7 dogailsi .i. dith charath nō coibdelach nō reta aili conna leci dó ni do maith do-denam acht derchainiud

Bith tredenus hi tosug cen dig cen biad

Ma atherr ind iarmibi sin is cethracha aidci for usci 7 bargin

§ 3 Mad da mbeth i mbron 7 i ndoguils conna bí a chum-scuduth pennit inmanach im-maigin aili for uisciu 7 bairgin corup failith o corp 7 anmain 7 ni taiet arithisi i nd-oentu na mbraithri

CAP. vii a [28^a] Uana gloria .i. indocbail huaibrech issed ainim an¹¹ sechtmaidi dualcha marbus anmain duine¹² acht nach maith dogni duine asa chorp isin domun adbaill¹³ tria indocbail nuaibrech manip satech¹⁴ bether fria Air ciped dognem ar

¹ in R ² cein R ^{2a} om. R ³ bland 7 geneluch gainethar R ⁴ co R
⁵ inna dogailse domundai R ⁶ collet R ⁷ fri tercmenmain R ⁸ mod R
⁹ di R ¹⁰ read conaitbi or conatib ¹¹ read inna ¹² something seems to be
 missing here ¹³ Q adds foctoir ¹⁴ faiteach Q

Again, the second form of worldly sadness is the grief and despair that arise from every desire that a man desires, if he cannot satisfy it, save only the will of God. The third form of worldly sadness again is the grief and despair which arise from every good thing a man gets, through fear of its being taken away from him, and of its perishing, and through fear of parting with it, even in the future (?), so that he is never free from grief and sadness while he lives, and he goes thereafter to find eternal grief, to everlasting torment without end.

d. Now this is the offspring and issue that is born of worldly sadness ;—bitterness with malice, lovelessness with insolence, miserliness with gaingetting, much talking after silence, idle volatility without thrift (?), unsteadiness of nature, restlessness of body, wandering of mind towards everything base, readiness to engage in everything evil, sluggishness and slackness towards everything good, despair along with inattention to the commands of God, joy and vigour in doing the works of the Devil.

e. These now are the remedies of this vice: spiritual joy, with cheerfulness of heart and mind, against worldly sadness ; fervency of prayer, with fasting and watching, against sluggishness and torpor; liberality with openness of mind toward God against inattention ; a fixed measure of labour and prayer against idle volatility ; faith with works, joy with gentleness, against despair and malice of mind.

§ 2 Anyone therefore whom the Devil has mocked by means of grief and sorrows, such as the loss of friends or relatives or of anything else, so that it allows him to do nothing good, but [only] to despair, let him first keep a three days' fast without food or drink ; if he relapses into the same state afterwards, it is forty nights on bread and water.

§ 3. If he should be in grief and sadness so that he cannot be roused, the monk does penance in another place on bread and water, and returns no more into the community of the brethren, until he be joyful in body and soul.

De Vana Gloria

CAP. vii § 1a *Vana Gloria*, that is, vain glory, is the name of the seventh vice that kills the soul of man but any good thing that a man does with his body in the world is lost through vain glory, unless men are on their guard against it.

thucait cumtaich nū molta ho duinib is indocbail huaebrech
n-anmnigter¹ ar fochraig dē namma ar molad o duinib *amail*
asbeir *crīst* fadesin

Amen dico uobis percipierunt mercedem suaam.

b. Hisi cland 7 genelach *tra* genethar on dubalaich-se .i.
anerlatu co tairisim huall co mor-menmain airrecht debtha
eccosc sechta cosnam eiris cen dligid moidem degnimraith
cumtach labartha saeibath ecoisc soerath coirp doerath anma.

c. Hite dano frepthai roherptha dia hicc .i. erlatu cen
tairisem himaldoit co fethemlai imgabail debtha rede cen
sechta foglaim la sruithib² cobsaidi aicnith menmai hisil
IMchaisiu dé eccoscc³

¹ a space for about four letters is left in P; supply 7 isí from Q ² sruithe RQ
³ eccoscc is not in RQ

For whatever we do for the sake of pomp or praise from men is called vain glory, and the only reward we gain from it is the praise we have from men, as Christ himself says: *Amen dico vobis perceperunt mercedem suam.*

b. This is the offspring and issue that is born of this vice: disobedience with contumacy, pride with arrogance, readiness for strife, a guise of simulation, upholding of heresy unlawfully, boasting of exploits, pompousness of speech, disguising of appearance, ennobling of the body, debasing of the soul.

c. These again are the remedies that have been appointed to cure it: obedience without contumacy, humility with quietness, shunning of strife, smoothness without simulation, learning from the venerable, steadfastness of nature, a lowly mind, respect for God

NOTES

Cap. II § 1a. *furumai sár*, etc.: this is intended as an etymological explanation of the word *luxuria*. Dr. Bergin quotes Isidore, Etym. x. 160 (Lindsay's edition): Luxuriosus, quasi solutus in voluptate: unde et membra loco mota luxa dicuntur. ib. xx, ii 22 Lixa enim aqua dicitur ab eo quod sit soluta; unde et solutio libidinis luxus, et membra loco mota luxa dicuntur. Note that *sár-tol* is used to render *luxuria* in the preface to R (p. 135).

Dr. Bergin points out that between *connach* and *facaib* an infixed pronoun is lost, referring presumably to *tol*. As *tol* is fem., one might expect *nacha facaib*, but see Pedersen ii 65, for neuter infix referring to masc. or fem. noun. The syntax is embarrassed by the clause *na arni furumai sár fórsin diúri fádesin*, which seems to be an after-thought.

§ 1b. *airigetar* impersonal 'men perceive.'

sét 'likeness': here 'trace, shadow.'

§ 1c. *dronua mbriathar*: cf. § 16 *tria dronbe mbriathar*, which renders the Latin *turpiloquium*. The word can hardly be different from *droni* gl. *turpilio* Wb. 22b 16.

fursi: I have not met this word elsewhere, but suppose it to be connected with *fuirseire*, *fuirseoir*.

tangere een folta: read with Rawl. *folta*, pl. of *folad* 'substance': the meaning is here 'realisation,' 'real effects.'

§ 1d. *anfontai* is perhaps a corruption of *anfolta*: see Contrib. *anfola*.

miscais in chenntuir, sere ind altair: this phrase occurs also in H. 3. 17 p. 855.

§ 1e. *aireenn muid*, etc.: cf. cap. vi § 1d *Mod airchend do lubair 7 ernaighthi* (sic leg.). In the present instance *airchend* is a substantive: see Contrib. *airchend* 1 and 3. Rawl. reads *aircheimniugud* 'making progress.'

Here and elsewhere in our text *lebair* or *lebair* is rendered 'labour': a comparison of such passages as ii 6 *fri figill 7 lebair*, ii 7 *mani denat lebair*, will show that it is a peculiar spelling of *lebair* and has nothing to do with *lebor* 'book.' So also in ZCP iii 453, 31, *lind n-aillse hil-lebair*.

sochraigti: I would read *socraigthe* part. of *socraigim* 'I establish,' Dinneen. Rawl.'s reading *sochraithe* may be meant as gen. of *sochraide* 'decency,' used adjectivally.

§ 2-3. Cf. Cummean ii 22-23, Wass. 470: cf. Gildas 1^o Episcopus faciens fornicationem degradari debet, sive vii aut xii annos peniteat. Presbyter aut diaconus fornicationem naturalem faciens, prelato ante monachi voto, iii' annos peniteat, veniam omni hora roget, superpositionem faciat in unaquaque cibdomada, exceptis quinquagesimis diebus post superpositionem [passionem Gildas, rightly]. Pane sine mensura utatur et ferculo aliquatenus butiro inpinguato, hoc est, quadrante, et die dominica sic vivat. Ceteris vero diebus paxmati panis mensura et missa parvo inpinguato, horti oleribus, ovis paucis, formatico, hemina lactis pro fragilitate corporale, tenuela vel batuto lactis sextario pro sitis gratia, et aquatili potu, si operarius est, lectumque non multum foeno habeat instratum. (Cp. also § 7 below.). Similar details as to diet in the Rule of the Culdees, ed. Reeves, 83.

§ 2. *fu grád* : for this use of *fo* cp. *dul fo gradaib*, Wi. s.v. *grád*.

dobrit : as to this word see O'Dav. *dobrith*, Thes. Pal.-Hib. II 38 *dobor-fit*, and Stokes, Suppl. to Thesaurus, p. 67.

§ 3. *da notlaic*, i.e. the Nativity and Epiphany.

da caise, i.e. Easter Day and Low Sunday.

sellá : as to the meaning of *selann* see Mon. Tall. note on p. 146, 33.

croth di otnu : cf. § 7 *bochtan di bláthtaich nō fothnu*. In Laws II 254, 5 cream that has thickened and turned sour is called *fothana*, which is glossed in *medg*. O'R. has *očun* and *oðan* 'froth' 'scum' : here the word seems to mean 'curds' or some sort of thickened milk.

amasc : I do not know this word; the form suggests a derivation from **admescaim*.

eascaith : this word is specially used in regard to vermin: cf. *oc escaid a líne* LU 68a 15. It must be connected with *aiscid*, which is used in precisely the same sense: see Contrib. *aiscim*: but perhaps *escaid* contains the prep. *ess-*, *aiscim* the prep. *ad-*. Cf. Pedersen II 606, and add ÉRIU II 22 § 5, *oc aiscid a chind-seom*.

§ 4-5. Cf. Cum. II 23 (Wass. 470) *Per tres quadragesimas anni addat aliquid prout virtus ejus admiserit, semper ex intimo corde defeat culpam suam, oboedientiamque præ omnibus libentissime exhibeat, post annum et dimidium eucharistiam sumat et ad pacem veniat, psalmos cum fratribus canat, ne penitus anima tanto tempore cælestis medicinæ jejuna intereat.*

As to the 'three Lents' see Theodore II 14. 1 *Jejunia legitima tria sunt in anno . . . xl ante Pascha . . . et xl ante Natale Domini, et post Pentecosten xl dies et noctes.* Cf. Plummer, Vit. Set. Hib. I. cxx note 1.

conidistar: a Middle-Irish form, deponent subjunctive of *conicim*: cf. *nach cumang conisamar*, Contrib.

superioribus : the MS. has *fpr*; the word answers to *fográdaib* in the next clause.

maith-brathre : this seems suspicious, but I cannot suggest a plausible correction.

§ 6. Cf. Cum. II 24 (Wass. 471) *Si inferiore gradu positus quis monachus, III quidem annos peniteat, sed mensura non gravetur panis, si operarius est: sextario de lacte romano et alio tenuila et aqua, quantum sufficit, pro sitis ardore sumat.*

In the margin opposite this and the two next sections is written *nō*, and this symbol is repeated several times later on. It may possibly stand for *nota*, but then why should it have the mark of length? and why are certain sections thus distinguished? Equally puzzling is the mark *so* which occurs several times either in the margin or between the lines.

immeroemathar : after *Mad* the subjunctive is required; read *immeromastar*.

aimarcar : this seems a corruption of the present passive of the verb corresponding to *immforcraid* 'excess'; (written *immarcraid* Tog. Tr. Index, and *immurera*, Wi.).

condi[d]róirea : cf. Wb. 29b 16 *condinróirea*, and see Pedersen II 518.

§ 7. See Cum. II 23 quoted on §§ 2-3 above.

conammas : pret. pass. of *conmidur* with perfective *ad*.

§ 8-9. Cf. Cum. II 25-26 (Wass. 471) *Si vero sine voto monachi presbyter aut diaconus, si peccaverit, sicut monachus sine gradu poeniteat, et postea recipiat gradus suos. Si autem presbyter aut diaconus post tale peccatum voluerit monachus fieri, in districto proposito exiliu annum et dimidium peniteat; habet tamen abbas hujus rei moderande facultatem, si obedientia ejus placita sit Deo et abbatu suo. Here *exiliu* suggests that in § 8 we should read *ailithri* for *aithrigi*.*

§ 9. *Mad app craibdech*. Sections 2, 3, 6, 8 treat of sins of lust committed by clerics in a descending scale of rank, the heaviest penance being laid on the highest orders. It is therefore unlikely that this section should treat of the sin committed by

an abbot, and should assign to him a lighter penalty. The meaning is rather that if the culprit is under the authority of an abbot distinguished for his piety, the latter need not keep him strictly to the rule of diet just laid down, but may vary it at his discretion. One would expect the introductory clause to run: *Mad fo mām apad cráibdīg*: cf. § 10 *infra*.

etla: Stokes renders this word by 'repentance,' 'penitence,' (index to *Félige*, index to *Lism.*) and Thurneysen, accepting this interpretation, explains the form, "etlae 'Pönitenz' aus *ek(s)-dāl-*, eigentlich 'ohne Anteil (*dāl'*) sein,'" *Hdb.* p. 88. But this etymology would point to 'self-denial,' 'renunciation' rather than 'penitence' as the true meaning of the word: and that is, in fact, the sense which seems to fit best the passages where it occurs: cf. note on *Mon. Tall.* 134, 5. *Etla* has always, I think, a religious connotation, and was probably coined in early Christian days to express the ascetic conception of holiness as self-abnegation. I should therefore prefer to regard it, with the adjective *etal*, as derived from *ess-tol* 'devoid of carnal will or desire.' In the corrigenda to his *Handbuch* (Part II, 98) Thurneysen substitutes *etlai* for *etlae*, but acc. *etla* in our text, and dat. *etlai* in the phrase *foss oc etlai* (see *Mon. Tall. l.c.*) point to nom. *etlae*. The form *etoil* found in ZCP iii 448, § 2, will be a later duplicate.

§ 11. Cf. *Cum. iii* 29 (Wass. 474) *Clericus semel fornicans i ann. peniteat in pane et aqua; si genuerit filium, vii ann. peniteat exul, sic et virgo.*

§ 12. Cf. *Cum. iii* 39-41 (Wass. 475) *Sacerdos si osculatus est foeminam per desiderium, xx dies penit. Si per osculum vel tangendo coquinatus fuerit, xl d. penit. Si per cogitationem semen fuderit, vii d. penit.* So too *Theod. i, viii 1, 3. Theod. i, viii 4* (Wass. 192) *Si tangit manu iii ebdomadas jejunet.*

§ 13. Cf. *Theod. i, viii. 7* *Qui sāpe per violentiam cogitationis semen fuderit, poenit. xx dies.*

§ 14. Cf. *Cum. ii* 21 (Wass. 470) *Qui semen in ecclesia dormiens fuderit xi d. jejunet. Theod. i, viii 8* (Wass. 193) has 'vii d.' and adds (§ 9): *Si excitat ipse, primo xx d. iterans xl d. poen. etc.*

§ 15. Cf. *Cum. ii* 8 *Qui concupiscit mente fornicare, sed non potuit, annum peniteat, maxime in tribus quadragesimis.*

§ 16. Cf. *Cum. ii* 9 (Wass. 469) *Qui per turpiloquium vel aspectu coquinatus est, tamen non voluit fornicare corporaliter, xx vel xl d. poen.*

douisim: here and in § 12 above, *ma tuisim*, and § 23 *touisim*, the scribe confounds *douisim* and *doeisim*.

§ 17. Cf. *Egb. ix* 9-10 (Wass. 241; Schm. i 582) *Si in somno peccans sine cogitatione, xv psalmos cantat. Item in somno peccans si ex cogitatione pollutus, xxv psalmos.* Cf. also *Cap. Jud. x* 4 (Wass. 513; Schm. i 662).

The same subject is treated in *Cum. ii* 19 (Wass. 470), but in different terms.

lectin: the MS. has *lēt*, for *blechtin*, the *s* being lost through lenition.

§ 18. I cannot find any equivalent for this section in the Latin Penitentials, and the word *orchisim* is strange to me.

§ 19. Cf. *Cum. iii* 3 (Wass. 471) *Si quis concupiscit mulierem alienam et non potest peccare cum ea aut non vult eum suspicere mulier, si laicus, xl d.; si clericus aut monachus annum pen.*

§ 20. Cf. *Bigot. ii* 1, 9 (Wass. 449) *Qui diligit aliquam mulierem inscius alicujus mali praeter sermocinationes quasdam, xl diebus poeniteat: osculatus autem et amplectans, anno, maxime in tribus quadragesimis.*

§ 21. Cf. *Theod. i, ii* 16 (Wass. 186) *Si cum matre quis fornicaverit, xv ann. poen. et nunquam mutet nisi dominicis diebus, &c.* At hoc tam profanum incestum ab

eo similiter alio modo dicitur, ut cum peregrinatione perenni *vii annos* peniteat. *ibid.* 17 Qui cum sorore forn. *xv ann. pœn.* eo modo quo superius de matre dicitur, &c. *ibid.* 19 si frater cum fratre naturali forn. per commixtionem carnis, *xv annos* ab omni carni abstineat. Cum. iii 8-9 (Wass. 472) and ii 3 (Wass. 469) agrees with Theodore as to the period of penance, but says nothing as to 'peregrinatio perennis,' nor can I find the clause as to 'relatives in general' which is here attributed to Cummine.

isna 'in punishment for': this use of *in* is illustrated in note on Mon. Tall. 130, 18: see also Windisch, Wtb. 608 b. *ind* is frequently used in the Penitential in the same way.

§ 22. Cf. Bigot. ii 2. 4 (Wass. 449): *Fornicantes labiis, quod dictu scelus, primo iv annis, iterantes consuetudine vii ann. pœniteant.*

§ 23. Cf. Cum. ii 4 (Wass. 469) *Sed ad hoc si semen in os miserit, vii ann. pœn. : alii dicunt usque ad finem vita.*

§ 24. Cf. Cum. iii 28 (Wass. 474) *Si quis laicus cum jumento forn. ii ann. pen.* But Cum. iii 10 says *Si quis cum pecoribus, xv ann. pœn.* So also Theod. i, ii 3, ep. Greg. 93: perhaps these longer penances apply only to clerics. The shorter penance elsewhere, e.g. in Rom. ii 13, Columb. 17, Paris 42, Bed. ii 25, Gild i. 11.

§ 25. Cf. Cum. ii 5 (Wass. 469) *Viri inter femora fornicantes, primo annum penit., iterans ii annos.*

cid mna no ingena: cf. Cum. iii 35 (Wass. 474) *Si mulier cum muliere iii ann. pœn.*

daingin sin a pennadoir: this seems to be the remark of some copyist, which is incorporated in the text, but distinguished by the sign ¶.

§ 26. Cf. Theod. i. ii 9 (Wass. 185) *Si se ipsum coquinat, xl d. pœn.*

The 'three forty nights' must mean the 'three Lents' mentioned in § 4 above, during which there was an 'increase of labour.' The meaning then will be that those who offend under this clause have to do a week of 'strict penance,' and also have an 'increase of labour,' as specified in § 4, during the regular periods of special discipline.

ar ciund means 'following,' 'infra,' as in Wb. 10 a 12 *titul in dligid ar chinn.*

§ 27 *tria chath n-imrati*: cf. Cum. ii 9 (Wass. 469), last clause: *si autem inpugnatione cogitationis violenter coquinatus est, vii d. pœn.* Here *violenter* suggests the emendation *ar écin* for *arachin*. Cf. also Bede iii 36 (Wass. 224; Schm. i. 558) *Qui inpugnatione cogitationis et naturæ nolens [pollutus est], dies vii, quinquagenos psalmos, et iv feria et vi jejunet usque ad nonam vel ad vesperam.* Egb. ix 6 (Wass. 240; Schm. i 582) *Qui inpugnatione [mentis] violenter quoquinatus est, vii dies pœniteat, vel quousque cogitatio vincitur.*

As to the principle of the *arra*, or equivalent for a penance, see the treatise *De Arreis*, ed. Meyer, Rev. Celt. xv, 485 ff.

§ 28. *chuilehi*: abstract of *euilech*: cf. Contrib. *cuilige*.

Cf. Cum. ii 13 (Wass. 469) *Osculum simpliciter facientes vii superpositionibus : illecebrosum osculum sine coquinamentum (sic) viii, cum coquinamento sine amplexi x superpos[itionibus].*

lán-chartius: cf. *cardes mo slíasta-sa*, Contrib. s.v. *cairddes*; *ben Nechtain cosin cairdes*, Metr. Dinds. iii 36, l. 26.

§ 29. Cf. Cum. ii 14 (Wass. 469) *Post ann. xx., id est adulti, idem committentes xl d. separati a mensa extoresque ab ecclesia cum pane et aqua vivant.*

§ 30. Cf. Cum. ii 15 (Wass. 470) *Minimi vero fornicationem imitantes, et inritantes se invicem, sed coinqunati non sunt propter ætatis [im]maturitatem xx d. pen., si vero frequenter, xl d.*

resiu tosn̄i a aicneth: literally, 'before the nature of it (sc. lust) comes to them.'

§ 31. This rule is omitted from Cummean, but is supplied in Cap. Jud. x. i (Wass. 512; Schm. i 661) *Puer qui sacrificium communicat peccans cum pecude, c diebus pœn.*

§ 32. Cf. Cum. ii 16 (Wass. 470) *Pueri ante xx ann. se invicem manibus coinqunantes, et confessi, ante quam communicent, xx d. : si iteraverint post penitentiam, centum d. : si vero frequentius, separantur et annum peniteant.*

atheirr is 3 sg. pres. sbj., corresponding to pres. indic. *adeirrig*: see Pedersen ii 593, Contrib. s.v. *aitherraigim*.

§ 33. This also seems to be taken from Cap. Jud. x. i rather than from Cum. ii 6. The former has: *Supradicta aetas inter femora fornicans, c diebus paenit., id iterans, i ann. paenit.* Cum. ii 6 (Wass. 469) is somewhat differently expressed. Penance for boys two years, for men three.

§ 34-35. Cf. Cum. ii 17 (Wass. 470) *Puer oppressus a majore infra x annos, ebdomadam jejunet; si consentit, xl d.*

But Cap. Jud. x. i corresponds still more closely to the Irish: *Puer parvus oppressus a majore, decimum annum ætatis habens, ebdomada dierum jejunet; si consensit, xx diebus pœnit.* *Puer de seculo veniens cum aliqua puella nititur fornicari nec coquinatus, xx diebus pœnit.* Si autem coquinatus est, c diebus paenit. Si vero, ut moris est, suam compleat voluntatem, i ann. paenit. The last two clauses answer to the Irish *Math elnithe . . . Math forcenda . . .*, and the Irish must have originally contained an equivalent for the clause printed in italics, which has been omitted by accident. We may therefore restore *ó indus acnapthe* (= *ut moris est*), an expression which could not be applied to unnatural vice.

faindecht, perhaps for *an-écht* 'evil deed,' (Contrib.), or possibly, *forlaindecht* (cf. Wi. *immforlann* 'overwhelming'): this would be written *flaindecht*, and if the mark of contraction were lost, might be corrupted to *faindecht*.

Cap. i. For § 1 see pp. 135-6.

§§ 2-4. The subject of polluted food is briefly handled by Cummean i 14-19; our text is closer to the fuller treatment in Bigot. i, v (Wass. 446-7): cp. Canones Hibern. 12-24 (Wass. 137-8).

§ 2. Cf. Bigot. i, v 3 (Wass. 446) *Pœnitentia hominis vel urinam pecoris bibentis, tres et semis annos in pane et aqua.* In this there is nothing about horseflesh; but cf. Canon. Hibern. § 13 (Wass. 137) *Pœnitentia esus carnis aequi [sic] IIII anni in p. e. a.* This supports my emendation *carnea n-eich*. Why should such a heavy penalty be inflicted? Possibly horseflesh was eaten in some pagan rite which the Church disapproved. Cum. i. 23 (Wass. 467) has: *Equum non prohibet [manducare], tamen consuetudo non est: so also Theod. Dach. 22 (Wass. 147): id. Pœnit. ii 11. 4 (Wass. 212).*

doestar: for this deponent subj. of *ithim*, see Pedersen ii 558.

§ 3. Cf. Bigot. i, v 5-6 (Wass. 447) *Pœnitentia bibentis, quod intinxit canis, annus in p. et a.* *Pœnitentia bibentis quod intinxerit aquila vel ingarola vel gallus vel galina, l d. in p. et a.* Cp. Can. Hibern. § 19 (Wass. 137). Cum. i 14 (Wass. 406) has simply: *Qui manducat carnem immundam aut morticinam aut dilaceratam a bestiis, xl d. pœn., etc.* Bigot. i, vi 1-2 *Pœnitentia bibentis, quod laicus vel laica intinxerat, i dies* [“*l. dies*” Can. Hibern. 21] *in p. et a.* *Pœnitentia bibentis quod*

intinxerit glancella (i.e. ancilla in utero habens filium) vel cohabitationis cum ea [*“glantelle prgnantis vel cohabitatoris sui”*: Can. Hibern. 23 (Wass. 138)] xl d. cum p. et a. Bigot. i. vii Pœnitentia manducandi vel dormiundi in una domo vel spatula cum laico laicave, xld. in p. et a. Cp. Can. Hibern. 22.

• *sinán*: this may be a by-form of *sinnach*, or perhaps we should read *sinchain*.
 • *enche*: this seems to correspond to the Latin *ingarola*. This word is not given in Ducange in this form, but it appears as *ingarrula*, and is explained “*pica quae garrula et loquax dici solet*,” with the quotation from Bigot., except that it omits “*vel gallus*.¹”

mna torché answers to the Latin *glancella*, as to which see note on Cap. v 17 *infra*. The form *glandella* as well as *glancella* is given by Ducange.

§ 4. *Nech aslu lind &c.* Cf. Bigot. i, v 11 (Wass. 447) Pœnitentia bibentis liquorem in quo mus demersa obiit, vii d. in p. et a. Somewhat differently, Cum. i 19 (Wass. 467).

Nech aslu fulired cait &c. Cf. Bigot. i, v 7 (Wass. 447) Pœnitentia bibentis quod intinxit muriceps, v d. et noctes in p. et a. *Ibid.* § 10 Pœn. bib. intinctum a mure, unus d. in p. e. a. These two clauses make it clear that *fulired* is a corruption of *fuidel*: even though in § 54 *infra* we have *Nech atlu ful cait &c.*; and *fulred* occurs in Fled Bricr. § 67, *dia fulriud*.

Asbir Teotir &c.: cf. Theod. i, vii 7 (Wass. 192): *Si casu quis immunda manu cibum tangit, vel canis vel pilax mus aut animal immundum quod sanguinem edit, nihil nocet, &c.* Bigot. i, v 8 (Wass. 447) virtually quotes Theodore.

§ 5. Cf. Cum. i 37 (Wass. 468) *Qui contempto indictio jejunio in ecclesia et contra decretum seniorum fecerit sine quadragesima, xl d. pen.*; si autem in quadragesima, annum peniteat. So Theod. i, xi 4.

§ 6. Cf. Cum. i 29 (Wass. 467) *Infirmis licet omni hora cibum sumere, et potum, quando desiderant vel possunt, si oportune non possunt.* This rule is repeated § 18, *infra*.

§ 7. Cf. Merseb. a. lii. (Wass. 397) *Si quis clericus aut sacerdos se inebriaberit, xl d. pen. in p. e. a. : laicus vii.* This is closer to the first three clauses of the Irish than Cum. i 6-7 (Wass. 465-6).

Mad nech comecnigedar &c. Cf. Cum. i 8 (Wass. 466). *Qui cogit hominem, ut inebrietur humanitatis injustæ gratia, ut ebriosus peniteat: si per odium, ut homicida judicetur.*

aes lanamnasa diligthig: this phrase (with or without the adjective) seems to be used of the pious laity, who accept the direction of a confessor. Cf. Cap. ii 36. Mon. Tall. 132, 24; 134, 25; 145, 24, and 163, 7.

arali: see note on Cap. iv 7.

Manid-derba in mescai &c.: cf. Cum. i 9: *Qui psallere non potest, stupens in linguis, superponat.*

derba: pres. sbj. corresponding to indic. *ní derban*: see Pedersen ii 445.

aurcelebrad: I have not met this compound elsewhere: *celebrad* is used of saying Mass, and also of the Hours: see Contrib. and Plummer, Vit. Set. Hib. i. cxv, *note*.

§ 8 *imbe roira dichnaire* with *b* written over *roira* is obviously equivalent to *immabera dichnaire* two lines further on: I restore *immoibrea*, though why *ro* should be introduced in one case and not in the other is more than I can explain. There are, however, other cases where *ro*-forms are used in the introductory formula: Cap. iii 2 *Nech dorona bés*, iii 3 *Mad rogata nech*.

§ 9. Cf. Cum. i 13 (Wass. 466) *Qui furatur cybum, xl d. pen.: si iterans iii xlmas. si tertio, annum pen.: si vero quarta vice, juge [= perenni] exilio sub alio abbate pen.*

Mad maic &c. This clause is not in Cummean, but Valicell. i 58 (Schmitz i 296, not in Wass.) has; *Si quis cibum furaverit, xl dies peniteat et si postea, annum i, et si infans fuerit, vii dies peniteat.*

§ 10. Cf. Cum. i 11 (Wass. 466) *Qui superfluam ventris distentionem doloremque saturitatis sentit, 1 diem; si autem ad vomitum sine infirmitate vii d.*

§ 11. *Nech . . . tuarai*, etc.: a verb has been lost. Cf. Egb. xiii 9 (Wass. 244; Schm. i 585) *Si quis tinxerit manum in aliquo cybo liquido et non idonea manu, c palmasadas [palmatis Cod. And.] emendetur. Cap. Jud. xxiii 3 (Wass. 520) Qui non idonea manu tangit lymphaticum alimentum, c manualibus plagis emendetur.*

Mad fuba &c.: Cf. Cap. Jud. xxiii 3 (Wass. 520; Schm. i 669) *Si autem aliquid decoloratum fuerit liquoris et distributor alicui dederit, vii d. poeniteat. Qui autem sumpsit hoc inscius et postea cognovit, v d. poenit.*

In the Rule of the Culdees (Reeves 83) the cook is penalised if liquor is spilt.

For the meaning of *fuba* cf. Ml 15 a 11, *fombia* gl. *vitiare*.

rinnatha iarum: this corresponds to 'postea cognovit': one would expect *rodfinnadar*, the clause being relative, but the corruption would not then be so easy to understand.

§ 12. Cf. Cum. i 30-31 (Wass. 467) *Qui dederit aliquos liquores [Si quis dederit alicui liquorem; Cap. Jud. xxiii 3] in quo fuerit mustela vel mortua invenitur, iii superpositiones pen. Qui vero noverit postea quod tale usus est potu superponat. Si in farina aut in aliquo siccato cibo aut pulmato coagulato vel lacte iste inveniantur bestiole, quod si [read est] circa corpora illorum foras projiciatur, omne reliquum sana sumatur fide.*

lichtin is of course a misspelling of *littin*.

§ 14. With this section compare Mon. Tall. §§ 12, 51. I have not found anything on the subject in the Latin Penitentials.

niba: one would expect *nadniba*, corresponding to *nadnisa*, but *ni iba* is a much slighter change: here, as in restoring *rafinnathar* in § 11, I believe that there is a change from the dependent to the direct construction.

condinappail for *conidappail*.

cenmotha ani asrochoili nech &c.: there seems to be some corruption here: one would expect something like *cen gabáil de*, or a *nebgabáil de*.

frisreire: the emendation *fri séire* is supported by § 14 *mad séire anchorath* (read *anncharat*).

§ 15. Cf. Cum. i 2 (Wass. 465) *Si monachus per ebrietatem vomitum facit xxx d. pen. ibid. i 4 Si vero pro infirmitate aut quia longo tempore se abstinuerit, et in consuetudine non erit ei multum bibere vel manducare, aut pro gaudio in natale Domini aut in Pascha aut pro alicuius sanctorum commemoratione faciebat, et tunc plus non accepit quam decretum est a senioribus, nihil nocet &c.*

inn ocht sollamnaib. As to the use of malt liquors opinion seems to have been divided in the early Church, as it is to-day: see the argument between Maclruain and Dublitir, Mon. Tall. § 6. In the Latin life of S. Cronan of Roscrea there is a curious description of a late supper given by the saint, which was interrupted by the inopportune zeal of a recent proselyte. It is difficult, however, to believe that an 'anchorite's supper' could have been a regular institution of a festive character; I therefore read *séire anncharat*. A confessor might often find it necessary to entertain penitents who came from a distance. Cf. note on § 14, above. The words *anchara* and *annchara* are easily confused: cf. notes on Cap. v 11, v 17.

§ 16. Cf. Cum. xii 7 (Wass. 488) *Si quis autem dominica die per negligentiam jejunaverit, ebdomada tota debet abstinere &c.*

§ 17. The whole of this section seems to relate to the eating of food polluted by the contact of unclean animals or persons. I should therefore read *nó neich marbus a máthair*, etc., and *epscuip nó sacairt*. The penalties appointed for various sins in this Penitential do not always strike one as either rational or consistent, but it would be really beyond the limits of absurdity to fix the same penalty for eating food polluted by a dog as for parricide or incest. Even if we adopt these emendations, a difficulty remains as to what is meant by *fir deirecc di duinib*. The rendering adopted is suggested by Dr. Bergin. Cf. *imatuareat doib combo derc each dib di arailiu*, Wind. Lex. s.v. *toscai*.

§ 18: cf. § 6 *supra*.

§ 19: cf. Cum. i 10 (Wass. 466) Qui anticipat horam canonicam et suaviora ceteris sumit, gulæ tantum obtentu, caena caret, vel *ii[d.]* in p. et a. pœnitieat.

nó lobrai n-aicnith: the *n-* is irrational, unless we are to regard *manip* as having here the force of a preposition governing the accusative. Cf. *manibad trócaire n'Dáe* Ml. IIb 28: see Thurneysen Hdb. § 251, and cp. Cap. v 5 *acht mad nach n-ernaigti aile*.

§ 21. *tri throisci*: whereas in § 2 anyone who drinks the blood of a beast incurs three and a half years' penance!

Nech ithes &c.: Cum. i 38 (Wass. 468) Qui de sui comedens cute vel scabie vel vermiculo qui peduclu nuncupantur, suam nec non bibens urinam stercorave comedens, cum impositione manuum episcopi annum integrum cum p. e. a. pœnitieat.

gauin: in Cap. iii 1b. *gauin* is written for *guin*: here I take it to be a corruption of *gaur* = *gur*, corresponding to *scabiem*.

Cap. II. (continued) § 36. With these directions cf. Mon. Tall. §§ 14, 50.

Dlegar doib dano denma i n-aimsir galair mista &c.: cf. Theod. II. xii 3 (Wass. 213 = Bigot. ii, ix 3) Mulier tres menses debet se abstinere a viro suo quando concepit, ante partum et post tempora purgationis, hoc est XL diebus et noctibus, sive masculum sive feminam genuerit.

Banscalia intan bis a ngalar, &c.: cf. Bigot. ii, viii 1 (Wass. 450, = Theod. i, xiv 17) Mulieres menstruo tempore non intrent ecclesiam nec communicent. *Ibid.* § 2 (= Theod. i, xiv 19) Qui menstruo tempore coierit, xx d. pœn. *Ibid.* ii, ix 1-2. (= Theod. ii, xii 1-2) Qui in matrimonio sunt iii noctes abstineant se a conjugione antequam communicent. Vir abstineat se ab uxore XL d. ante pascha usque in octavas paschæ.

Cap. III. § 1a. *ara met 7 ara fairsingi 7 nadchon tasici*: the syntax is awkward; one would expect *arindí* or some such word before *nadchon*.

is claidib do fuidbiu: the meaning is obvious, but I have not met *fuidbe* elsewhere: it is presumably the verbal noun of a compound *fo-di-ben-*

is cuithchi airrice archind bais: here *airrice* seems to be gen. of *airec*, and *archind* gen. of *airechenn* in the sense of 'end' or 'doom.'

1b. *is e mecon* &c.: Radix omnium malorum est cupiditas, i Timoth. vi. 10.

glas-martræ: so in the Cambrai Homily, Thes. Pal.-Hib. ii. 246 *filus trechenelæ martre daneu admiriter ar cruiich du duiniu madesgre* [leg. *ma dosgnē*, Thurn. Hdb. ii. 36] *baanmartre ocus glasmartre ocus dercmartre*.

1d. *indíri*: this word occurs frequently in our text: it is spelled *indire* and *inire*, and is associated with *format* Cap. iv 1a, iv 1b, iv 2; with *serba* vi 1d; with *derchdined*

vi 1e. We have also *cáinduthracht eridi* *cen inndiri* iv 1a: *cuimliuch cen iniri v 1e:* and in Tec. Corm. § 8, 24 *indire fri naimtiu*. The corresponding adjective is *indir* or *inir* as in *Mag n-Inir*, LU 53b 44, 54a 1; Tec. Corm. § 16, 43 (women are) *fanna immargaile, inire débtha*; it should probably be restored in iv 1a *bas formtech ba[s ind]ir*; it is also spelled *infhir*, cf. *ba tnsiúthach 7 ba hinfir in comrac*, Rev. Celt. xiii 458, *a ngluind, a n-écta, a n-oirgne batar infir* LL 183b 19 (quoted by Meyer). This spelling led Stokes to ascribe to the word the meaning 'manly,' and this is adopted by Meyer for the substantive (index to Tec. Corm.); but the examples given above are sufficient to show that this can hardly be right. The spelling *infhir* is, no doubt, due to a mistaken etymology: such a form ought to mean, not 'manly,' but 'nubile,' and this sense is given by Dinneen. *Indir* is perhaps the opposite of *dír*. The meaning seems to be something like 'malicious,' 'hostile.'

tochailche: I have not found this word elsewhere, but suppose it to be a derivative of *tochell* 'gain.'

§ 1e: *'im tairic* for *im thairec*: perhaps one should read *imthairic* (gen.), and *menme immnochtæ*.

taeb fri: cf. *taobh do thabhairt ris* Oss. Soc. iii 110: Aisl. M. Congl. index.

§ 2. Cf. Cum. iv 4 (Wass. 476) *Si laicus semel furtum fecerit, reddat quod furavit et in iii quadragesimis cum p. e. a. pœnitiat. Si sepius fecerit, et non habet undreddat, ann. ii in p. e. a. pœnitiat, et in alio anno iii quadragesimis, et sic postea in pasca reconcilietur.* § 5 *Qui sæpe furtum faciebat, vii ann. poen. vel ut sacerdos judicat, juxta quod componi potest quibus nocuit et semper debet reconciliare ei quem offendebat et restituere juxta quod ei nocuit et multum breviabit pœnitentiam ejus. Si vero noluerit, aut non potest, constitutum tempus pœnitiat per omnia.* See also Theod. i 3. 3 (Wass. 187), which is identical with Cum. iv 5.

Maith maicc dognet &c.: cf. Cum. iv 3 (Wass. 475) *Si quis furtum fecerit, si puer, xl vel xx dies (peniteat) ut ætas et qualitas eruditio-*

Mascomra i.e. *ma ascomra*: pres. sbj. of *asrenim* with *com-* potential: cf. Laws, Glossary.

§ 3. Cf. Cum. iv 1 (Wass. 475) *De pecunia ecclesiastica furata sive raptâ reddatur quadruplum, popularia dupliciter*: but this section of our text is based directly on Exodus xxii 1. 4.

im-muin alaili: for this phrase see Glossary to Laws, s.v. *muin*.

marb-indili: this should be *marb-dili*: see Glossary to Laws.

set = 'unit of value.'

§ 4. *fognam*: cf. Laws v 218, 14-15 *is aithgin inich uaid . . . 7 fognam ua-sum. . . aithgin o'n flaith 7 fodnam o'n ceile*.

co n-airdiu caincomraic: cf. Cum. iv 4 (quoted above), last clause: *et sic postea in pasca reconcilietur*. It looks as if the culprit and the person wronged were to exchange tokens of amity, perhaps the kiss of peace. Cf. Wb. 7b 4 *airde cainchumricc et chôre dogrés ubi fit 'salutate.'* It is not the solemn 'reconciliation' of the penitent to the Church, which formed a public ceremony; see Schmitz ii 40, 97-8.

§ 5. *Asper Pól*: see Ephesians iv. 28.

Ar amail ardibda &c., translates the saying quoted in Preface to Poen. Cum. 'Sicut aqua extinguit ignem, ita eleemosyna extinguit peccatum' (Wass. 461). Dr. Gwynn tells me that it is taken from Cyprian, de Op. et Eleemos. § ii. It is a paraphrase of Eccl. iii. 33.

asser Crist: the reference is to Matt. xix. 21 'If thou wilt be perfect, go and sell that thou hast and give to the poor,' etc.: but there the command is not limited to half one's goods.

§ 6. This section should not have been separated from the preceding: the words *intiú adcobra rosá cléthe fairbhetad* refer to the words of Christ just quoted.

§ 8. *nech fochlaid daurtach*: cf. Cáin Adamnáin ed. Meyer, § 45. *Ar is ed bás dlegair do banscail dia marbad fir . . . no di fochlaid ecalse.*’

§ 10. *nech fedligethar*: cf. Cum. viii 1 (last clause): Qui permanet in avaritia alienetur.

dodhoid . . . fothrodail (= *fodrodail*): here the neuter infix means apparently ‘on that account,’ and the *ro*-tenses signify ‘must.’

Cleirech . . . lasambi ní for a leortu, &c.: cf. Cum. viii 5 *Clericus habens superflua, donet ea pauperibus, sin autem, excommunicetur. Si autem post penitentiae (read postea peniteat,) tempus, quo vixit in contradictione, in penitentia remotus vivat.* Mon. Tall. 128, 7: *A forbí tra dano for lortaid na muindtire bíd id choimidechta ised is choir laissom di thabairt donda bochtaib*: ibid., 148, 17: *Ni haurchul laisim dano eíd arfaomtar ní o lex-aos 7 a tabirt detsiu iarum do bochtaib neich forbé lortid do muindtir[e].*

oldas bíth: cf. Wb. 4 b 17 *oldaas bid ar n-áinsem*, and see Pedersen ii 432.
dondrim should of course be *dondrimi*.

Eóin Casian. Dr. Gwynn tells me that the dictum here quoted is not to be found in Cassian’s works.

§ 12–14. Cf. Cum. v 2 (Wass. 477) *Qui perjurium fecerit in ecclesia, xi ann. pœn.*; *ibid.*, v 3 *Si in manu episcopi aut presbyteri vel diaconi [seu] in altari vel in cruce consererata mentitus est iii ann. pœnitateat &c.*; *ibid.*, v 6–8 *Qui ducit alium in perjurio ignorantem vii ann. pœn.* *Qui ductus est in perjurio ignorans et postea recognoscit, annum pœn.* *Qui vero suspicatur quod in perjurio ducitur, tamen jurat per consensum, ii ann. pœn.*

la Colum Cilli: there is no reference to the subject in the so-called Rule of Colum Cille printed by Haddan and Stubbs, Councils ii 119, and by Meyer (ZCP iii 28) from another ms.

§ 15. *Asber Cumaine Fotai, &c.*: there is no such provision in the Pœnitentiale Cummeani.

diligid is here used impersonally: cf. Metr. Dinds. iii 479 (note on Carmun 283).

§ 16. Cf. Cum. v 11 (Wass. 477) *Falsum testimonium dicens placeat proximo suo primo: quale fratri imposuit tali iudicio damnetur iudicio sacerdotis.*

tofoing: cf. Ml. 36 a 21 *dodfongad*, and Pedersen ii 250.

§ 17. Cf. Cum. v 12–13 *Mendax vero per ignorantiam et non nocuit, confiteatur ei cui mentitus est et sacerdoti et hora tacendi damnetur vel xii psalmos canat.* *Si vero de industria, iii dies tacendi vel xxx [psalmos] si præst [cantet, præsules enim tacere non possunt].* The words in brackets from Bigot. iii v 3 (Wass. 452).

§ 19. *taibred hi coibsin*: this is sometimes used as a formula for confessing, equivalent to *taibred a choibsin*: cf. Cap. iv 3, v 14; ZCP iii 30, 11 *Inrroraid Grigoir . . . do peccab̄ incilihib na ndoine na tabrat i cobais.* In the next line the superfluous *hi* after *taibreth* seems due to the influence of this collocation.

fiada ndernad: here *fiad* is combined with the relative pronoun.

§ 20. *Manip eside etir*: perhaps we should write *Mani b̄e side*, as in the previous section, where the phrase seems to mean ‘if he do not exist,’ i.e. ‘if there is no such person,’ ‘failing him.’ But even so the present section is not easy to understand: if the sinner does not confess, and if nobody else detects his sins, how are they to become known?

§ 21. Cf. Cum. xi 12–13 (Wass. 486) *Reticens peccatum fratris, quod est ad mortem, arguat eum cum fiducia, et quanto tempore reticuit, tanto cum p. e. a. vivat.*

Si peccatum parvum reticuit, arguat quidem eum sed psalmis sive [jejunio] judicio sacerdotis pœniteat.

airi ndualcha, for *airig ndualcha* ‘a capital sin’: ep. Wb. 25 c 27 *cen airich dualche*; ZCP vi 271 *ocht n-airich go ngolaige* (meaning ‘the cardinal sins’): see also ÉRIU i 204: *na noct huirig dualchæ*. In the Preface to our Penitential (in R) we have: *Air rossuidigthe na noct huirig sualach cona fodlaib fri hicc 7 slanugud na noct n-airech ndualchæ co neoch gainedar uaib*; and see Contrib. s.v. *aire*(5).

§ 22. Cf. Cum. xi 9-10 (Wass. 485) *Dilator et dilatus consimile persone*; *si dilatus negaverit, annum simul pœniteat, in unaquaque ebdomada ii dies in p. e. a. et biduana in finem uniuscujusque mensis, omnibus fratribus subponentibus et Dominum eis judicem fore contestantibus. Permanentes in obstinatione, anno emiso, altaris communione sub judice flamma scientur, et Dei judicio relinquantur. Si quando alter fuerit confessus, quantum alteri laboris intulerit tantum sibi multiplicetur.*

dedan each mis: this corresponds to ‘*biduana in finem uniuscujusque mensis*’: *dedan* is formed on the analogy of *tredan*, which is itself a loan from *triduana*.

am bliadna: We should perhaps divide a *mbliadna*, regarding it as a time-genitive like *céne, iaire*. Cf. Echtrá Nerai § 14 (Rev. Celt. x 224): *Forremdeth in coibden hisiu a mblednai cusin samain aitherrach*.

torraraic for doráicc (or *do-n-ráicc*): cf. Pedersen ii 553.

CAP. IV. 1. a: *is cuma loisce a mbis issa 7 huasa*: neither Thurneysen (Handb. § 431) nor Pedersen ii 151 gives any example of *is* compounded with a pronoun except *íssum*.

1c. *taithbech*: see note on § 4 *infra*.

brón fri naimtiu: R.’s reading *brón fria n-airmitin* is clearly right.

§ 2. Cf. Cum. ix 1-2 (Wass. 483) *Qui fratrem suum contrastat juste vel injuste conceptum rancorem ejus satisfactione [leniat] et sic potest [sic leg.] orare Qui odit fratrem suum quamdui non repellit odium tamdui cum p. e. a. sit et ei quem oderit caritate non fieta compelletur [leg. copuletur, as in Bigot. iv. iv 2, Wass. 454].*

tria chaithrigi: read perhaps *tria chái 7 aithrígí*: cf. Cap. vi 1. b, *tria chái pechta co n-iris diligua*.

§ 3 *do lucc phendí*: cf. Mon. Tall. 154, 1 *hi teg pendi*. As to the use of penitentiaries, see Schmitz ii 45-54. Seclusion in a penitentiary is expressed by the term ‘separetur,’ in Irish *etarscarthar*: see § 7 *infra*; perhaps also Cap. vi 3, *pennit . . immargin aili*.

corrana for corrana, i.e. *cor-ro-ana*.

mani té nach les aili fou di lebuir 7 ernaigti: I cannot make sense of this as it stands; perhaps something has fallen out.

§ 4. Cf. Cum. ix 8 (Wass. 484) *Qui causa invidiae detrahit vel libenter audit detrahentem, iii diebus cum p. e. a. separetur. Si vero de eo qui præest, vii sic pœniteat et serviat ei libenter de reliquo. Sed ut quidam ait, non est detrahere verum dicere, secundum evangelium: Corripe illum inter te solum et ipsum prius, et post dicit: Si autem te non audierit dic ecclesia (Matt. xviii. 16, 17). Here ‘Qui causa invidiae detrahit’ corresponds to *Nech dogni taithbech formait*; and in § 5 *taithbech[h] ind uile* clearly means ‘blaming of the evil,’ while in the same section *taithbingith* renders the Latin *retractor* (sic leg.). Further, in §§ 4 and 5 *taithbech formait*, *taithbech[h]* and the corresponding verb *taithib* are used as convertible terms along with *todiusruscud debtha*, *todiusruscud* (sic leg.) and *[to]diusruscud debuith*, which also render Latin *detrahere*. Elsewhere, *doaithbongim* (or *doaithbegim*) and its verbal*

noun are used in the sense of 'loosing,' 'dissolving,' especially in legal language: see Glossary to Laws, and Pedersen ii 460. How, then, do they come to mean 'blaming,' 'faultfinding,' 'backbiting'? The answer will be found, I think, in the phrase *taithbech ndebtha* which occurs in § 10, and means literally 'letting loose of strife,' and is equivalent to *todiuseud débha* 'wakening of strife': hence *taithbech, doaithbongim*, acquire the same meaning when used absolutely.

§ 5. Cf. Cum. ix 9 *Si vero verbositatem diligens frater derogit ei, i diem vel ii tacens peniteat, si autem fabulationem, xii psalmos cantet.*

Ata dano cetharda &c., the corresponding section of Cummean ix 10, as printed by Wasserschleben (484), recognizes three cases: *Mala non recipientium sanitatem retractans, ne ceteri eis consentiant, vel vituperatione mala boni confirmandi obtentu* (vel vituperatione mali, bonique confirmandi obtentu, Cap. Jud. xxx 2) aut lugubri meditatione (miseratione, Cap. Jud.) medicus est estimandus: *Si ista tria defuerint detractantur* (detractor, Cap. Jud.). In the Irish four cases (*cetharda*) are enumerated, in which a man may blame the offences of others for their spiritual good, and not out of a love of fault-finding, namely: (1) *ar nach comet nach ali* = ne ceteri eis consentiant; (2) *ar chairiguth ind uile fadesin* = vituperatione mali; (3) *ar demniguth in maith* = boni confirmandi obtentu; (4) *ar airchisecht indi dogni a n-ole* = lugubri miseratione. If none of these reasons can be alleged as justification for fault-finding, *si ista tria defuerint, detractor [est estimandus]* = *His taithbingith immargu nachiddeni ar oen in cethardi-se.*

arnid cōir for *arndid cōir*: see Thurneysen, Handb. § 776.

§ 7. The first part of this rule is nearly a repetition of the first clause of § 4. With the sentence *inti dogni iterscartar &c.*, compare Cap. Jud. xxx 2 (Wass. 523; Schm. i 673): *Si quis murmuraverit, separetur et opus ejus abiciatur, cum semi panis debito (debiti?) aquaque maneat.* This shows that a. verb rendering 'et . . . abiciatur' must have dropped out after *iterscart(h)ar*.

aridaile: cf. Cap. ii 40 *inti arali mesca . . . inti arali in mesca*; § 8 *infra*: *issed chetarráli diabul for Adam 7 Eua*; § 9 *Issed dano arráli for tuaith nDe*; § 10 *Issed dano ceta arráli for Iudas Scorioth*; § 11 *co n-éráli debuid forsna hanchraidi*; also the examples quoted by Pedersen ii 676. He refers them to the stem *la-*, but the form *ar-id-aile* (for *aridáili*) shows that we have to do with a compound *ar-áilim*, corresponding (as Prof. Marstrander points out to me) with the verbal noun *eráil* (*uráil* &c.). From this verbal noun is derived the secondary formation *eráilim*: see Wind. Wtb. The verb *ardáilim*, like its verbal noun, is regularly followed by the preposition *for*.

nachidergail: this I take to be 3rd sing. pres. subj. of *asgliunn*, 'I examine,' with infix. *-d-* and *ro*; cf. Ml 56 c 8 *nad ecail*.

huare conareetar &c.: the right reading and interpretation of this sentence are doubtful. The '7' after *seanoir* seems superfluous.

ráth a aithise: cf. *atrubairt Príaimh rád n-aithise friu*, quoted in Contrib.

§ 8. *is beithi menmae frisin fodor[d]:* cf. *bith a menma-sam fri seilg*, Thes. Pal. Hib. ii 293.

dufuetar: as to the form cf. Pedersen ii 559; Thurneysen, Handb. § 687.

rogabad al-lam: for this phrase see Wind. Wtb. 652 b.

asa cind: cf. Wb 25 d 16, *een ascur sáitha asa chiunn act etardibe*, gl. qui penas solvent in interitu in aeternum.

§ 9. *du irrobarat*: literally, 'in a place where there were': cf. § 10, *dú irrabai fodord*.

cenmorobai: cf. Ir. Text iii 550, 27, *genmo bui Maini cona muintir*. In Cap. i 8 we

have *cenmibi*. None of these forms are mentioned by Thurneysen, Handb. § 820, or Pedersen i 472.

tothanatar is probably a mistake for *tothancatar*, i.e. *do-d-ancatar* (with *th* = *d*, as frequently in this text): the infix. *-d-* refers to *tír* above.

§ 10. *cen digu uil*: so written in the ms., pointing rather to *cen digu uilc* than to *cen digail*.

§ 11. *itir an da brathair [itir] commarba cechtar de arali*: this refers to Cain and Abel, see § 1a above. The scribe seems to have taken *commarba* as = *comarbai* (in its original sense of 'co-heirs') and introduced the superfluous *itir*.

each oen adchi 7 nad acaí: even those who do not see each other may become jealous of each other's reputation—rival anchorites, for example.

CAP. V 2. Cf. Cum. vi 9 (Wass. 479) *Si mater filium suum hocciderit, xv ann. pœn.*

lentar sin . . . co ingin ar meraib: there is nothing in the Latin Penitentials corresponding to this clause, which is presumably borrowed from the secular code. I confess that I do not understand its precise meaning. The general sense no doubt is that all killing within the degrees of affinity denoted by the terms *com-morfeiser* and *co ingin ar meraib* comes under the head of *fingal*, and is punishable by ten years' penance, whereas an ordinary homicide incurs seven years. The words *hissin fingail sin ainmichathir* seem to be corrupt.

The meaning of *com-morfeiser* is, I think, determined by a passage in the Poenitentiale Mediolanense, Schmitz i 816 (last paragraph) *Qui voluntarie filium suum, vel filiam suam, vel germanum aut germanam suam occiderit, quinque annis extra metas ipsius terrae exul fiat, deinceps viginti annis paeniteat. Qui vero voluntarie avum suum vel aviam suam, vel nepotem suum, vel patrum [patruum], avunculum, seu amitam sive materteram aut filium, vel filiam germani sui aut germanae, seu consobrinum suum, sive consobrinam suam occiderit, id est a tertia usque ad septimam, si vero tertia fuerit, duodecim annis inermis poeniteat; si quinta, decem, si sexta, novem: si septima, octo annis poeniteat, etc.* Whether the system of reckoning degrees of relationship employed here is quite the same as the Irish I do not know: probably not. But it seems that in both cases the slaying of a relative constitutes a specially heinous form of homicide, called in Irish *fingal*, and this category includes relatives as far as the seventh remove from the slayer; usque ad septimam = *com-morfeiser*. The phrase *co morfesiur* occurs also in LL 320e *ar ba cerdd cach fer dib co morfessiur*.

maccu anua should apparently be *maccu indiú*.

co ingin ar meraib 'as far as the nails on the fingers': this is a legal phrase: cf. Laws iv 286, 1 *ingen ar meraib; isuide dodnidnaig cluais do cluais do comeeniul; dedlaid fri fine, conrannaside finnteda on med addaimther ifini*; ib. 290, 9 *Ingen ar meraib i. cach ga radha is dan fini hi.*

cenmotha oes graid, etc., cf. Theod. i 4. 5 (Wass. 188), copied by Cum. vi 4 (Wass. 478) *Si quis monachum vel clericum occiderit, arma relinquit et Deo serviat, vel vii ann. pœniteat. In judicio episcopi est. Qui autem episcopum vel presbyterum occiderit, regis judicium est de eo.*

§ 3. Cf. Cum. vi 27 (Wass. 480) *Si per vindictam fratris sui hominem occiderit, iii ann. pœn., si conponit propinquis dimidio spacio.*

§ 4. Cum. vi 7 (Wass. 478) has: *Qui jussione domini sui hominem hocciderit, xl dies pœnit., et qui hocciderit hominem in publico bello cum rege, xl dies pœnit.,*

but I cannot find any regulation in the Latin Penitentials which throws light on the words *oc gobail acuachiunn*.

acht ni te for ind guin: ep. *dochuaid ar na harmaib* 'had recourse to arms,' Cathréim Congail Čhláirennig 62 (*ar* = *for*).

§ 5. Cf. Theod. ii x 1-3 (Wass. 211) *Si homo vexatus est a diabulo et nescit aliquid nisi ubique discurrere et occidit semet ipsum quacunque causa, potest [prodest?]* ut oretur pro eo, si ante religiosus erat. *Si pro desperatione aut pro timore aliquo aut pro causis incognitis se occiderit, Deo relinquimus hoc judicium et non ausi sumus orare pro eo.* Qui se occiderit propria voluntate missas pro eo facere non licet, sed tantum orare et elimosinas largire.

nothoire for no-dn-oirg. For *acht mad* followed by the accusative cf. *manibad trocrai ndde*, Thurneysen, Handb. § 251.

§ 6. This subject is treated in Cum. iii. 23 and vi. 11, but the Irish is much closer to Bigot. iv. 2. 2-4 (Wass. 453 f.): *Poenitentia perditionis liquoris materiae infantis in utero mulieris* iii annis in p. e. a. *Poenitentia perditionis carnis et anime in utero* xiv [annis] in p. e. a. *Pretium animae mulieris morientis de perditione carnis cum anima* xiiii ancillae. Cf. also Laws iii 204.

Math do thuidicht: I suggest *mad dia tuidich*: or possibly *mad di thuidecht anmae*.

nó cethora bliadna deac pendí: cf. Mon. Tall. § 86, where the widow and children of the dead man are directed to do seven years' penance for the good of his soul.

§ 7. Cf. Cum. vi 8 (Wass. 478) *Si per poculum vel per artem aliquam malam [hominem occiderit]*, vii ann. pœn. aut plus.

§ 8. Cf. Cum. vi 22 (Wass. 479) *Si per rixam ictu debilem vel deformem hominem fecerit reddat impensas medici et egritudinem [var. egritudine] restituat, et medio anno in p. e. a. pœniteat.* Si non habuerit unde reddat i ann. pœn. Here again Bigot. iv 3, 1 (Wass. 454) is closer to the Irish: . . . reddet impensa in medicos et maculae pretium et opus donec sanetur et demedio anno pœn. &c.

§ 9. Cf. Cum. vi 18 (Wass. 479) *Si quis alium percuesserit et sanguinem effuderit, xl d. in p. e. a.: si diaconus vi menses, presbiter i annum pœniteat.*

As to the alternation *adchromga* . . . *asidchromga*; see Thurneysen, Handb. 472, Pedersen ii 147. These forms are pres. subj. corresponding to prototonic *-econi*, *-econai*: see Thurn. 446, 470; Pedersen ii 555. Other forms of this verb are given by Meyer, Contrib. s. v. **adcombongim*. O'Mulconry's Glossary, 578, has *adcoimged bein forais*.

§ 10. Cf. Cap. Jud. 3 (Wass. 506) *Si quis nolens occiderit proximum suum, i ann. pœn.* Si quis homicidium fecerit per furorem et non ex meditatione, iii ann. Bigot. iv 3, 2-3 (Wass. 454): *Et non prætereundum quod si quis per furorem et rixas et non ex meditatione odii alium occiderit, tribus annis debeat pœnitire.* Si autem casu quis volens (read nolens) occiderit proximum suum, anno uno pœniteat.

acht do-n-eomaing: for *n-* after *acht* see Thurneysen, Handb. § 898.

§ 11. Cf. Bigot. iv 3, 4 (Wass. 454) *Si quis autem ex meditatione odii et post vota perfectionis alium occiderit, cum peregrinatione pœnni mundo moriatur.* Here 'post vota perfectionis' evidently corresponds to *iar n-erchoiliud ætla*. As to the meaning of *etla* see note on ii. 9.

anearait is, I think, a mistake for *anmcharait*.

mana chomariecet: the meaning assumed for this verb is questionable.

§ 12. Cf. Cum. ix 1 (Wass. 483) *Qui fratrem suum contristat juste vel injuste conceptum rancorem ejus satisfactione [leniat] et sic potest orare.* Si autem est impossibile recipi ab eo, sic tamen pœniteat judicio sacerdotis. Is autem qui non recepit eum quanto tempore implacabilis fuerit tanto cum p. e. a. vivat homicida ille.

§ 13. Cf. Cum. ix 3-4 (Wass. 483) *Fratrem cum furore maledicens cui maledixerit placeat et vii dies pœnitentia remota cum p. e. a. Qui verba acerbiora in furore, non tamen injuriosa, protulerit, satisfaciens fratri superponat: si autem cum pallore vel rubore vel tremore tamen tacuit, i diem cum p. e. a. pœnitentia.* Here the words 'non tamen injuriosa' are represented in the Irish by *7 n̄ bi ochriu collec.* I suggest doubtfully *ó chridiu* for *ochriu*, which I would render, 'and it is not from his heart.'

acht rutuaisi: for *acht ro*, 'provided that,' see Thurneysen, Handb. § 892. But the simple verb *tuaisim* does not seem to be found elsewhere, so perhaps we should read *acht artuaisi*.

§ 14. Cf. Cum. ix 5 (Wass. 483) *Qui in mente tantum sentit commotionem satisfaciat ei qui illum commovit: qui vero non vult confiteri ei qui se commovit, abscidatur pestis ille a cœtu sanctorum: qui si pœnit, quanto tempore contradicit tanto tempore pœnitentia.* Neither the Latin nor the Irish is perfectly lucid, and the use of the pronouns is ambiguous, but the final clause in the Irish about the danger of concealing anger makes it clear that the whole section is directed against harbouring a grudge. In the Latin 'ei qui illum commovit' and 'ei qui se commovit' mean exactly the same thing in spite of the change of pronouns.

§ 15. *Nech nad roich, &c.* Dr. Bergin suggests a better rendering: "Anyone who cannot reach the brother (*inni*) with whom he is angry (i.e. to ask his pardon), let him forgive him in his heart [and] repent," etc.

§ 16. Cf. Bigot. iv 6, 1 (Wass. 455). *Clamor excitatus cum tanto terrarum spatio a loquente, si cui dicitur separatus, aut cum surdus sit salutatus, nullius impedimenti est.* (This makes it clear that we must read *n̄i pennither* in the first clause.) *Clamor vero iracundia commotus silentio et jejunio quantum sacerdos judicaverit sanatur.* Et clamor dolore excitatus non prætermittendus, de quo pauca dicemus. This last clause corresponds to the Irish *mad galar todiuscái na nuall ni sechmaldtaí fochetoir.* But the Irish adapter seems to have misunderstood the Latin, as the 'dolor' in question is not due to disease, but to sorrow for the dead, as appears from the following section. *fochetoir* is meaningless as it stands; perhaps some words have dropped out, corresponding to 'de quo pauca dicemus.'

§ 17. Cf. Bigot. iv 6, 2-5 (Wass. 455); cp. Can. Hibern. cc. 26 ff. (Wass. 138). *Pœnitentia bardicationis glandellæ post obitum laici vel laicæ l dies in p. e. a. Si post glandellam morientem in partu vel cohabitatem vel cohabitatem fidem habentem, xl dies in p. e. a. Si post clerici plebilis obitum xx dies in p. e. a. Si post anchoritæ vel scribæ vel episcopi vel principis magni vel regis magni obitum, xv dies in p. e. a.* These rules are evidently directed against the custom of keening over the dead.

cailleach aithrigi renders 'glandella,' a word which is found also in Bigot. i vi 2 (Wass. 447), quoted on Cap. i 3, where, however, it is spelled 'glancella,' and explained as meaning 'ancella in utero habens filium.' Ducange quotes this explanation, but only cites the Penitential in support. The word seems, judging from these passages, to mean 'concubine,' as opposed to *cétmuinter*, 'a lawful spouse.'

fer muintire is used in the Laws i. 6, i. 16: *um breth do gabhail ina fer muindtiri do marbhadh*, tr. 'his servant.' Wb. 33 a 5, *rubu fer-som muintere* gl. tanquam famulus.

anmcaraí is no doubt a mistake for *ancarait*; the Latin has *anchoritæ.*

aircindech ard-cathrach renders 'principis magni,' so a secular ruler is meant; otherwise one might translate 'prior of a chief monastery.'

§ 18. Cf. Bigot. iv 6, 6. (Wass. 455) *Si sanctimonialis quædam hujusmodi vocibus.*

turbata clamaverit, duplii poenitentia emendetur praedicta. The Irish, however, makes the offender a *male novice, mac-cleiriuch*.

CAP. VI. § 1. With this paragraph compare the preface to Bigot. v (Wass. 456) *Tristitiae genera duo sunt, unum salutiferum, alterum mortiferum. Salutiferum, cum nos nostra peccata vel aliorum contristant et nobis lacrymarum abundantiam digna penitentia inducit. De hoc genere tristitiae Salvator dicit: Beati qui lugent, &c. Mortiferum, cum orbitate amicorum aut demitione rerum corporalium aut damno si demtae sunt contristamur* (The rest is different from our text.)

§ 1a. *doguilsi*: this word occurs 12 times in this chapter, and is spelled 9 times with *-u-*, 3 times with *-a-*. The *u*-spelling is generally found in Wb. and the *a*-spelling generally in Ml. (Thurneysen, Handb. § 170).

1b. *tria chait pectha*: cf. Cap. ii 5 *obi a pecad*, and note on iv 2 *tria chaithrigi*.

hi robur pheetha: Rawl. reads *ar obur pecthae* (according to Meyer, ZCP. iii 27, 15): but it is very unlikely that *ar obair* should be corrupted to *hi robur, ar obur*, while the reading of the text gives better sense. For *robur* (a loan from the Latin) cf. Rev. Celt. xii, 123.

beati qui lugent &c.: Matt. v. 4.

1c. *ar gnais a ndoenachta*: Rawl.'s reading *ar ingnais a [n]doennachta* is perhaps to be preferred.

cen a orba = cen a forbe. “I think this means ‘from not satisfying it,’ ‘because he cannot satisfy it’: cf. Wb. 28d 22 &c.” (Bergin). The point of the sentence seems to be that all human desire leads to disappointment unless it be in harmony with the will of God.

eith iarmaul: I have not met the word *iarmaul* elsewhere.

eruine = eruinde, Contrib.

1d. *cen taiscithe*: is this an abstract noun corresponding to *tascide* ‘hoarded,’ the participle of *taiscim*? cf. *sen-tascide*, Tog. Tr. glossary; Mon. Tall. 128, 12; or is it = *toiscide* ‘heedfulness’ (?). In the preface to R we have *tó eo toiscide*.

imthinscetul: perhaps we should divide *im thinscetul* and make this dependent on *foindletha menman*.

§ 2. *connachtibi* I take to be a corruption of *conaitbi*, perf. of *contibim*, with inserted *ad- = ro-*: cf. *foraitbi* Thes. Pal.-Hib. i 488, 24; Pedersen ii 370.

iarmibi: I have not met this form elsewhere: *iarmitha* is found Ml. 58 c 16.

§ 2-3. Cf. Cum. ix 6 (Wass. 483) *Qui diu amaritudinem corde retinet, hilari vultu et leeto corde sanetur; si autem non cito eam deponit, jejunio sacerdotis judicio se emendet. Si autem iterat, abscidatur donec alacer lætusque cum p. e. a cognoscat delictum suum.*

CAP. VII. 1a. *nach maith dogni duine &c.*: cf. Cum. xi 3 (Wass.) *Jactans in suis beneficiis humiliet se, alioquin quiequid boni fecerit humanae gloriae causa perdet. nach maith* should be *nam-maith*.

cumtaich may be used in the sense of ‘exalting’ or ‘decorating’: cf. *cumtach labartha* below, with which cp. Ml. 94 b 11 *cu cumtuch 7 cho n-imbiud briathar*.

Amen dico uobis etc.: Matt. vi. 2.

1c. *ecose*. This word is not found either in R or Q, so it is probably due to a slip by the scribe of P, who has introduced it from the previous paragraph.

GLOSSARY

[When an edition of a text is quoted without reference to the page, the glossary or index is meant]

acnapthe, 'usual,' ii 22, ii 35: *accnabad*, 'ration, customary portion of food,' Contrib.

adchomga, *asidcomga*, v 9, pres. subj. of **in-com-icc-*, Pedersen, ii 555.

adgabaim, 'I accept,' Mart. Oeng. index: 'I seize,' 3 s. pres. ind. *conadgeib*, i 20: perf. *conadragaib*, Ir. Text. i 74: 3 pl. imperf. *conagbaitis*, Metr. Dinds, iii 70, 52.

adrén, see *asrenim*.

aimarear, ii 6, corrupt?

ainmne, 'abstinence,' iv 1c. Contrib., Addenda.

airchisechtach, 'pitiful,' iv 1d.

amase? ii 3.

anches, 'distress,' i 14: *aingcess* Wi., *ancess* Contrib.

anerlatu, 'disobedience,' viii 1b.

anfontai? ii 1d.

aráilim, 'I urge, prompt, enjoin': i 7, and see note on iv 7: inf. *eráil*.

ardibdaim, 'I quench,' iii 5: Contrib.; inf. *erdíb(d)ud*, v 1b.

aslongim, 'I eat (or drink)': 3 s. pres. sbj. *aslú*, i 4; *atlu*, i 21: pl. *adlúsat*, Mon. Tall. index.

asrenim, 'I pay': 3 s. pres. ind. *adrén*, iii 3: 3 s. pres. sbj. (with potential *com-*) *ascomra*, iii 2, iii 4: 3 s. imper. *errenad*, iv 2: Pedersen, ii 597.

aurelebrad, 'celebration,' i 7.

bind, 'pleasant to hear, welcome,' iv 4.

bith-manchai, 'perpetual monkhood,' ii 3, ii 10.

caillecht, 'nun's vows,' ii 11, for *caillchecht*, Contrib.

caillech aithrigi, 'a penitent nun,' v 17 (apparently a particular class).

cáin-dénaim, 'I make peace,' v 14; cf. *caen-denmach*, Pass. & Hom. Gloss.

chaithrigi, iv 2, corrupt?

cenmibi, *cenmorobai*, 'except, besides,' i 8, iv 9.

cethramthu, 'a quarter,' as a measure, ii 3. Contrib.

coirigther, iii 21: for *cairigedar*, 'reproves' (?): inf. *cairigud*, iv 5. Or for *córaigther*, 'is corrected' (?)

compennaim, 'I do joint penance,' i 7.

compersan, 'person of equal rank, peer,' iii 22.

chomraico, iii 5, corrupt?

conarectar, iv 7, corrupt?

comidiur, 'I decide, appoint, adjudge,' Contrib.: *ad-* perf. pass. *conammas*, ii 7.

enachiunn? v 4.
cuilche, 'lewdness,' ii 28; *cuilige*, Contrib.
cuimliuch v 1c: *cuimlecht*, 'munificence' (?), Contrib.
cumtach, 'decoration, glorification,' vii 1a; 'ornament,' Contrib.

dedan, 'biduana, two days' fast,' iii 22.
-derba, 'hinders,' i 7, 3 sg. pres. sbj. **di-ro-benim*, Pedersen, ii 445.
doaithbineh, 'I abrogate, dissolve,' Pedersen, ii 460: 'I stir up strife, make mischief,' 3 sg. sbj. *taithib*, iv 6: inf. *taithbech*, iv 1b, iv 9: nom. agent. *taithbingith*, 'mischief-maker,' iv 5.
dobrit, 'water-diet,' ii 2: *dobrith*, O'Dav.: *doborfit*, Thes. Pal.-Hib., ii 38.
doenchaire, 'humanity, hospitality,' i 7.
doérgim, 'I desert,' iii 1b; Pedersen, ii 595.
dóer-mancha, 'the condition of a *dóer-manach*' ii 8: see Laws Glossary.
doguidim, 'I deprecate, beg pardon': 3 sg. pres. ind. *danguid*, iii 16: imper. *danguideth*, iv 6; v 13: *digged*, iv 2; inf. *digde*, v 12, Contrib.
doidbarim, 'I offer': 3 sg. pres. sbj. *ma didipre* (for *do* + *d* + *ipre*), iii 4: Pedersen, ii 469: Wind. *taidbrim*.
dolegim, 'I delete, abolish,' Pedersen, ii 562: 3 sg. pres. ind. *dodlegi*, iv 3.
doluigim, 'I remit, forgive,' Pedersen, ii 572: 3 pres. pl. *ro-* subj. pass. *co nder(l)aigter*, ii 5.
dorigim, 'I strip, plunder,' Pedersen, ii 592: 3 sg. pres. ind. *doricc*, iii 7.
dorimim, 'I account, examine,' Pedersen, ii 603: Wind. *tuirmim*: 3 sg. pres. ind. *dondrim(i)*, iii 10.
dorogbaim, 'I transgress,' Pedersen, ii 532: pres. ind. *torgaba* ii 9, *-targabat* ii 29: perf. pass. *dorogbad*, ii 29: inf. *targabdl*, ii 29, v 16.
dotluchur, 'I beseech,' iii 22: Pedersen, ii 650; *tothluchur*, Wind.
dotongim, 'I swear': 3 sg. pres. ind. *dothoing* iii 12, *tothoing* iii 13. (Pedersen, ii 270, 652, does not recognize *dotongim* as a distinct compound.)
dub-ethech, 'black perjury,' iii 15.
dub-throscud, 'a black fast,' ii 27.
dufuetar, 'they ate,' iv 8, 3 pl. of *duaid*: Pedersen, ii 559.

erchuiliud, 'prohibition,' iii 1c: Laws Glossary: inf. of *arcuillim*, Contrib.
erdibud, see *ardibdaim*.
-ergail? iv 7: see Notes.
eascaith, 'cleansing,' ii 3: see Notes.
escomnaigim, 'I excommunicate,' ii 10.
escomun, 'unclean,' i 11.
encha? i 3.
etla, 'self-abnegation, renunciation, holiness,' ii 9, v 11: see Notes.

faindecht? ii 34.
fatigus, 'caution,' ii 1a: *faitches* Wind.
feólaigim, 'I form flesh': *rofeolaigther* (for *rofeólaigedar*, deponent ?), v 6.
fiach, 'debt, penalty,' i 8: *fiach aibne*, Mon. Tall.; *fiach* for *coice*, Reeves, *Culdees*, 85.
fográd, 'sub-grade, lower degree of Orders,' ii 4; Salt. na Rann.
foichlide, 'gain-getting' ? vi 1d: *foichlige*, 'earning,' Tec. Corm.: *lumba foichlidi*, ZCP, iii 450. Or perhaps 'cunning, astuteness,' from *foichlech*, 'wary,' Wind. Táin, p. 871n.

foillech, 'smearing, thin coating,' ii 3: *folliucht*, Wind., inf. of *foслигim*.
 forbí, 'is over,' v 2; Pedersen, ii 443.
 forgabál, 'seizure, rape,' iii 2: 'forcible taking,' Laws Gloss.
 forluamain, 'volatility, instability,' vi 1d: ZCP iii 449, 23; 450, 11: *fortluamnae*, ZCP ii 168.
 festa, 'steadiness,' ii 1d, Triads.
 fothnu, 'curds?' ii 7: cf. *otnu*: see Notes.
 fristorgim, 'I come against, oppose,' 3 sg. pres. ind. *ní fritorga*, vi 3: *fristoirged ddail*, Metr. Dinds. viii 8, 28.
 frithoirenech, 'offensive,' iv 2.
 fuba, 'disturbs, spoils,' i 11: 3 sg. pres. sbj. *fobenim*, Pedersen, ii 462.
 fuidbe, 'lacerating, hewing,' iii 1a: inf. of **fo-di-benim*.
 furi, 'causes,' i 10: 3 sg. pres. sbj. of *foferaim*; Pedersen, ii 518, *fórim*, Wind.
 fursi, 'scurrility?' ii 1c.
 furumai, 'imposes, inflicts,' ii 1a: 3 sg. pres. sbj. of *forruimim*? Cf. Stories from Táin, index, *forroim*.

gauin, iii 1b, for *guin* 'slaying.'
 gauin, i 21, corrupt?
 grescha, 'urgency, fervency,' vi 1d: Félice, index.

iarmaul, 'afterwards?' vi 1c. Possibly for *iar mbaull*: cf. *ar ball* 'on the spot, at once.'

iarmibí, 'after,' vi 2: cf. *iarmithá* Pedersen i 472.
 imbánaim, 'I make pale,' v 13: inf. *imbánad*, Triads.
 imchommus, 'control,' iii 1c, v 1b.
 immatha samlaid, 'so, thus,' iii 1a, iv 1a: *imtha*, Wind. *naich imtha z*, Sg 20a 1
 gl. s. enim in metro saepe uim consonantis amittit. Cf. Stokes, KZ xxviii 107.

imnochta, 'nakedness,' v 11: *immnocht* 'naked,' Wind.
 imthinscetul, 'undertaking, engaging in,' vi 1d: inf. of **immtinscanaim*.
 indire, inire, 'enmity?' iii 1d, iv 1b, etc: see note on iii 1d.
 indethber, 'unnecessary, unimportant,' v 12: *dethber*, 'lawful, necessary,' etc., Contrib.
 indúa, 'grandson's grandson,' v 2. Mart. Oeng.
 ingabaim, 'I blame, rail at,' iv 6, Pedersen ii 529.
 inge, 'narrowness, tightness,' i 10: hence as adverb 'hardly': *ingi ma*, O'Dav. 708.
 cf. *ing* 'neck of land,' O'Reilly; 'dangerous pass,' Lib. Hymn. index: 'peril'
 Wind.: as adverb 'hardly,' Wind.; *is ing ma*, Pass. and Hom. 13.

láiches, 'lay-woman,' v 17: Salt. na Rann.
 laubuir, 'labour,' vi 1e; *lebar* ii 1e; see Notes.
 leortu, 'sufficiency,' iii 10: *lortu*: Mon. Tall.
 licet 'allowable, licitum,' i 6, ii 18, iii 3: ÉRIU i 208.
 littin, 'porridge,' misspelled *lichtin*, i 12.
 longim, 'I eat or drink': rel. pres. sbj. act. *lús*, *lúis* i 3: pres. sbj. pass. *-lusar* i 15-
 Pedersen, ii 568.

menistir, 'service-set,' iii 7: Aisl. M. Congl.

nóina, 'famine,' i 14. *nuna* Ir. Text. iii 443: Lism. Lives.

oehriu, v 13 corrupt?

oemaid, oemith, 'touching,' ii 12, ii 16: inf. of *ocuben*, Pedersen ii 444.

oirndnecht, 'violence' ? ii 13.

ronoirnecht, 'has done violence to himself' ? v 5.

orchlisin ? ii 18.

otnu, ii 3, for *fothnu*, q.v.?

pax, 'the kiss of peace,' ii 4.

pennadóir, 'penitential,' ii 25: p. 135, 33: Mon. Tall. 160, 13.

plág, 'plaga, scourge,' iii 17: Vendryès, De Hib. Voc. : *pldg-buille*, Tog. Tróí.

remibí, 'precedes,' iv 3: pres. sbj. *remebe*, iii 19: cf. *remitaat* Wb. 25c 15: *remirobáí* (sic leg.) Táin (ÉRIU) 2881 (cf. *Hermathena*, 1913, p. 401-2).

robur, 'strength, power,' vi 1b: *robhar*, Rev. Celt. xii 123.

rochall, 'corruption,' iii 1c: *rochall breth*, O'Dav. ?

róíra, 'may suffice,' ii 6, 3 sg. pres. *ro*-subj. of *feraim*, 1389: Pedersen, ii 518.

sain-chron 'private property'; dat. *sain-chrund*, iii 10: *sain-cruin*, Laws Glossary.

sant-chailte, 'avarice,' iii 1a: *cailte*, 'hardness,' Contrib.

scélugud, 'gossip,' iv 4: *scélaige*, Wind.

seland, 'a special indulgence in food,' gen. *sellá*, ii 3: *seillne*, Mon. Tall. 145, 21. Explained in Laws as a special measure: but cf. Mon. Tall. note on 146, 33.

semple, 'simplicity,' ii 28: Ir. Text. ii 1, 201.

sinán, 'fox,' i 3: perhaps for *sinchán*, 'young fox,' Aisl. M. Congl.

sochaiscee, 'docility,' v 1c: Triads.

sochraigti, ii 1e, for *soccraigthe*, 'established,' Dinneen.

tairisem, 'obduracy,' vii 1b: *tairissem*, 'Stehen-bleiben,' etc., Wind.: inf. of *doairissiur*, Pedersen, ii 628.

taiscim, 'I restore': 3 sg. pres. ind. *-tasici* iii 1a: 3 sg. condit. *-tais(ci)bed* iii 1a: cf. *taisec* 'restitution,' Laws Glossary, Triads, Aisl. M. C.

taiscithe, 'thrift' ? vi 1d: see Notes.

taithbech, taithbingith: see *doaithbiuch*.

terc-menma, 'inattention, disregard,' vi 1d: *terc-menmach*, Ir. Text. iii index.

tochailche, 'covetousness' ? iii 1d: see Notes.

togluaisim, 'I disturb, cause abortion,' v. 6: *togluásim*, Wind.

tonnuath, 'poisonous drink,' v 7: *tonnad*, Wind.

tophliún, 'lethargy,' vi 1d: Brud. Da Derga (Stokes).

túaisim, 'I am silent,' v 13.

uais, 'poverty, need,' i 14: Laws Glossary.

A THIRD COPY OF THE GUESTING OF ATHIRNE

IN publishing this text in *ÉRIU* VII, p. 1 ff., Professor Kuno Meyer has overlooked the fact that, besides the two manuscripts he has made use of, there is a third copy in the well-known ms. 23. N. 10 (p. 15-16) in the Royal Irish Academy. Having made a transcript of this in the summer of 1911, I print it here, as I think it will be of some use to the readers of *ÉRIU* to have its readings also before them. The wording is very like that of Harleian 5280, but it has not the queer spelling of that manuscript. I add some variant readings from my own transcript of Harl., which I consider more accurate than those given by Meyer.

RUDOLF THURNEYSEN

1. Do-deachaid Atairne hisind *fogm^{ur}* for turus di thig a dalta, *con-ro-triall* dia tig hi frithisi *for cula*. *con-n-epert* Aimirgin oga fostá :

Raithe fo fois fogamar.
 feidm *ann* ar gac aonduine.
 fri taob na lá lángairit.
 laoigh breca a broinn oisceilte
 diánad ruadgais raitnigi.
 reithit doim a dumachai^b
 fri dordán na damaire.
 dercain suba a sithcoilltib.
 slata etha im ethghortaibh
 os iath *domain* duind.
 draigin drissi deilgnecha
 fri taoib in lair leithlissi.
 lan do mes *trumm* teinnithir.
 tuitit cnæ cuill caímesa.
 do roibhili^b rathi. R.

2. Anais cor an foghmair. Triallais imdiucht isin gaimred. inquit Aimergin :

Dubaib raithaiph rogainre.
 rabarta tonn tuargab *ann*.
 iar taoib bethad blai
 bronaigh eoin gach iathmuighe
 acht fiach fola foirrderge.
 fri fuaim gaimrid gaing.
 Garb dub dorcha deataighe.¹
 diummussaig² coin cnamcomraig.
 cuirtheas ar aodh iarnlestar
 iar la dorcha dub. D.

3. Anais gan imtecht isin gaimred. ro-triall diu imtecht isin earrach. *con-ebert* Aimirgin an tres fecht :

Glas uar errach aigide.
 fuacht a n-agaidh gignithir.
 glaidsit locain linnuisci.
 luind cendach corr cruadeigme.

¹ det-i *Harl.*

² diumusaic *Harl.*

cluinit quana a nditruibaib
 fri heirge¹ moch madanraid
 duscit eoin a hinnsenr.
 mor bfiad riasa·bfirteitt
 a fidrad a feor glasa. G.

4. Ro·triald imdecht issin samrad. *con·ndebert Amírgin?*:

Fo sín samrad sitestar.
 sadal fid forart foirclide
 nach fet gaite gluaiseba.
 glas cluim coildi clithaige.
 soaid sr-a sæbusci
 tes hi fodan fo. F.

5. Ro·cetaig ier sin imdecht isi[n] samrad. O ro·siacht oc Aitirne co himdecht,³ is ann ro·totlaigestar a daltada co hAimírgin aro·totlaigset⁴ co hAitirne ni dia eicsi do taidbsin doib. *Conid hé totlugad dí·rigne Amírgin,*⁵ tarb do tabart istech dia maruhad do Aitirne. *Conid ann is·bert Aitirne occ* tairmmesc maruhta in tairuh :

IN tarban treballach⁶
 bailc erblach adaircech
 mer motlach muinelach⁷
 oinmit na himirgi.
 airechtoib cech tana an tarb. IN.

6. At·nagar gamain istech die marbad dar eis in tairp·cond·epairt Aitirne :

Biroch oach airceltrach
 and eilit am bem. buiredach
 samrad sirfes hi cein.
 Dersaidh bec beomartaig
 muna·tuicter⁸ d ilbiadoib.
 niba didnad dám.

¹ luind cennach corr cruaedgme. cluinit cuano a dithrubaib frie hergi *Harl.* Meyer (p. 4, n.⁹), not the scribe of *Harl.*, has skipped a line. ² ic a chetugud dó om. *Harl.* (like *N*). ³ co imtecht *Harl.* ⁴ arrototlaig- *Harl.* ⁵ i. om. *Harl.* (like *N*). ⁶ treballuch *Harl.* ⁷ muneluch *Harl.* ⁸ tuigtiur (muna om.) *Harl.*

hine¹ bron dian degduine
dligesd som a deighberbad²
mani·biaid bir. B.³

7. Ad·nagar cæra histech⁴ dia marbad ierom. *Con·ebert*:

Cethnait cromm lom loscc.
liuntach lintach lenamnach.⁵
ni·hecmongar cen aindri et.
esba *dana* æi iarna dithnind⁶ tlacht
tæbtoll tana taidmige.
tadbanar for sliastaib snim.
soinemla beo bas.
buaid diu a·llacht a·lloe.
uar aigide i ngabras airbe
roilbe r⁷ fo fess⁸ acna filedoib.
foiritnech cach cethnait. C.

8. At·nagar muc histech ier sin.⁹ *Con·ndeber* Aitirne:

Mochen mata moaigther¹⁰
dona·mainigther miad
airachtaib¹¹ cech debta duire¹²
ní dia dainib detnestar
die letharda loe.
lasamna biad boiligthe
riana baile bal don matta is mochen. M.

9. Adaigther¹³ tene do ier sin. *Con·epert* Aitirne¹⁴:

Tene trom trichemruad
[16] tairnes uacht n-oínfir.
eirge laitir lasur¹⁵ lainnnerda.
glan fri silléd sula.
iar lige gréne soillsi in cach tigh.
tairches ten.¹⁶ T.

Do·chuaidh Atirni dia tigh iar sin iar forba a ceilidi 7 a
imaccallma friá hAimirgin fon innnus sin. Finit.

¹ *I read ina or ma in Harl.* ² dlices som die degberbad *Harl.* ³ Beroch *Harl.* ⁴ istigh *Harl.* ⁵ liuntach lintoch lenomnach *Harl.* ⁶ dithniud *Harl.*
7 End of a line in *N.* ⁸ roilbi ruad fo fes *Harl.* ⁹ asa aithli *Harl.*
¹⁰ moigter *Harl.* ¹¹ airrechtoch *Harl.* ¹² cec deptæ duri *Harl.* ¹³ Ataigtuir *Harl.* ¹⁴ om. *Harl.* ¹⁵ lassar *Harl.* ¹⁶ ten. Teni. trom. *Harl.*

CÚRÓI AND CÚCHULINN

PROFESSOR THURNEYSEN (CZ. ix. 189 ff.) has shown that the Aided ConRói in Egerton 88 (fo. 10a, 1 ff.) is one of the two oldest versions of the saga of CúRói's death, and that this version belongs to the oldest stratum of CúRói's cycle. As to its origin, he thinks that there was a saga relating to Caher Conree: "and it was related that a monster with magical powers, named CúRaui, son of Dáre, once dwelt there. He was invincible, for he could not be overcome save by his own sword. This at last a youth accomplished with the help of the monster's wife with whom he had eloped. Since then the castle has been desolate. As CúChulinn has become the 'youthful hero,' *κατ' ἔξοχήν* in the Irish saga, it fell to his lot to slay CúRói" (p. 231). As regards the nature of CúRói, Thurneysen inclines to O'Grady's opinion that the wonder-working magician and king of the Ernai was originally a water demon (p. 233). This is, I think, the only possible explanation. The evidence is furnished by Fled Bricrenn (LU. 110b 1 ff.): *Fer cumachta mori dano in t-Uath mac Imomain sin notolbad in cach richt ba halic leis 7 nogniad druidechta Ba sésin dano in siriti* 'This Uath son of Imoman then was a man of great power, he used to assume every shape he pleased, and he used to perform wizardry He also was the *siriti* etc.' Uath mac Imomain plays in one version of Fled Bricrenn the rôle of CúRói, his characteristics being identical with those of CúRói, namely, shape-shifting and wizardry. It is highly probable that the person who is invested in a particular version with the same rôle and attributes as our hero, is of the same origin. He is referred to as a *siriti*, and lives *oc a loch* (LU 110a 50 and cp. 110a 6 *Ranctár iarom co Uath co a loch*). Furthermore in a modern Irish story which belongs to this group, the person corresponding to CúRói is described as *Fathach* 'giant' (Sgéalaíde Óirghiall p. 8; in the version published in Quiggin's A Dialect of Donegal p. 200 ff. this person is the brother of three giants). This is a

characteristic of all demoniacal and supernatural beings in folklore. One must not forget that such demons were conceived as having human form, only this form was greatly magnified.

The question of the origin of the CúRóí saga, as regards the textual criticism, has been finally solved by Thurneysen. It remains only to solve some questions relating to the different formulæ and to investigate traces of various folk-elements preserved in the story.

Thurneysen has defined the nature of CúRóí, namely, "he can be killed only with his own sword." But in Egerton 88 the circumstances of CúRóí's death are more complex : CúRóí's soul is hidden in a most inaccessible place, namely in a salmon, which appears only once every seven years in a certain well (*tipre*) near Slemish ; in this salmon is a golden apple (*uball óir*), and in the apple, which can be split only by his own sword, is his soul. This is a very common formula in folk-tales, the hero having an external soul which he hides in an out-of-the-way place.

Now it is remarkable that in folk-tales the secret of the hero's life is usually drawn from him by the wiles of a woman. And so it is in Aided ConRóí. It is very probable therefore that our story belongs to the group generally known as that of the external soul.¹

Now, several stories of this kind occur in Modern Irish, e. g. *Aodh Beag Ó Leabhartha*, published in 'Sgéalaidhe Óirghiall' (Gaelic League, Dublin, 1905) and *Éamon Ua Ciúrrthais* in Quiggin's 'A Dialect of Donegal' (Cambridge, 1906).² The following is a short summary of these stories :—A widow's son after having slain three giants (*fathaigh*) wins the hand of a princess. On returning from the third encounter he liberates a man hanging from a tree, namely *crochaire tárnochtha*, 'the naked Hangman,' who in Quiggin's story is the brother of the three dead giants (see p. 207). But no sooner is the Crochaire free from his bonds, than he rushes upon the young man, strips his clothes from off him, and binds him to the very same tree. Then he hastens to the palace of the princess and carries her off (in the Oriel story, p. 6-7, the Crochaire comes disguised as Aodh Beag).

¹ Cp. Frazer, *Golden Bough*, vol. iii, 351 ff.

² Cp. also Mac Innes, *Folk and Hero Tales*, p. 103 ff.

When the young man has been discovered and taken down from the tree, he starts off in pursuit of the princess. On arriving at the Crochaire's castle he meets the princess, who afterwards draws from the Crochaire the secret of his soul or life. The young man then obtains possession of the giant's soul and kills him.

Where now is the Crochaire's 'soul hidden? In Quiggin's story it is in a tree by the seashore; and in this tree is a fox which can be captured only by the little Hound of Rough Wood (*Cú Beag na Garbhchoilleadh*). If this fox is caught a duck will fly out of him, and this duck can only be overtaken by the hawk of the Yellow Coloured Glen (*Seabhad Gleann Dath Bhuidhe*); in the duck is an egg, which will fall into the sea, and can only be brought back by the aid of the water-dog *Dobhrán* (= *Dobhorchú*) *Donn Loch an Iubhair*. And in the end the Crochaire can only be killed if a black spot in the lower part of his intestine is struck with this egg (*ní bhéidhinnse marbh go mbuailtí an uibh sin ar an bhalla dubh atá thíos air thóin mo ghoile*). The young man (*Éamonn*) secures the help of these three animals: the first shortly after leaving his mother, the other two when in quest of the princess.¹

According to the Oriel story the Crochaire's soul is in a tree by the seashore, in the tree there is a duck, and the duck has an egg, and in this egg is his soul; and he cannot be killed unless Aodh Beag comes and fells the tree with the broken gapped axe which is under the bed. (*Tá crann thíos annsin ar bhruach an fairrge is tá tonnóg istigh 'sa chrann 7 tá uigh ag an tonnóig 7 istigh 'san uigh atá m'anam, 7 chan fhaghaim-sa bás a choidhche go dtí go dtiocfaidh Aodh Beag O Leabharacha atá i n-Eirinn*'s

¹ The last two animals were originally conceived in the animistic manner. It is two old men who promise the help of these animals. Though there is no trace that these men are identical with the animals, it must be assumed that they are. Evidence of this is the fact that in the Oriel story the animals themselves promise their help, just as the dog does in the Donegal story. I have heard a Connacht story containing the same formula: A youth (*Seaghan*) meets an old man who warns him to fight his (*Seaghan's*) enemy: "sin é Ridire Ruadh Gleann Uathbháis níor iomchuir sé a chroidhe ón teach 7 ní féidir é (a) mharbhadh nuair nach mbeadh an croidhe ann." And as the youth insists on his proposal, "Is mise" adeir an seanfhear "Brádán Ruadh na Linne Goirme mā theastuigheann uait blaoidh orm 7 béidh mé agad" . . . One can see that the salmon is here conceived as a human being, as a being perhaps which is at one time a man and at another an animal. This is an old trait belonging to the animistic view of early man, which drew no sharp lines between animal and man.

go ngedárrfaidh se an crann leis an tuaigh bhriste bhearnaigh tá faoi'n liobaid.) We find further that the death of the Crochaire is effected by striking him in the forehead with the egg. (*Bheir Aodh Beag ar an uigh 7 bhual i gclár an éadain é.*)

Now we see in these stories that (1) the owner of the external soul is betrayed by a woman ; that (2) the hero who kills the giant is helped by a grateful animal.

The external soul is here hidden in an animal, and in one of our modern tales must be obtained by means of a certain instrument belonging to the giant, namely his axe. In both stories the gaining possession of the external soul does not itself cause death, it is only a means of killing the giant. Now in *Aided ConRói* we find several of the first-named formulæ¹: CúRóí has a separable soul, and can be killed only by some one who gets possession of his soul ; the woman he has taken to wife against her will betrays him. The only question is how his death will be brought about ; the sword was no doubt originally only the instrument, the chief thing being to get possession of the external soul. Whether CúRóí was killed immediately by the splitting of the golden apple, which corresponds to the egg of modern stories, or whether this act reduces him to the condition of an ordinary mortal, it is impossible to say. At any rate we must regard both stories, the old and the modern, as identical.

Unfortunately the passage describing the death of CúRóí is corrupt, or at least very obscure : *Dogede cù ineo* ² Thurneysen would render *Goite ó ChoinChulinn int éo* "the salmon was killed by CúChulinn." If this is correct, the following words : 'It took courage and strength from CúRóí,' need not be taken to mean that this was the only effect of getting possession of CúRóí's soul. If it were merely a salmon that had been killed, CúRóí could still live ; but of course he felt weak, since his soul was in another person's hands. *Gegni CúChulinn iarum*, 'CúChulinn killed him then,' may then be understood to mean that CúChulinn killed him by the mere act of splitting the golden apple.

If this is the true interpretation of the passage, then the Old Irish version of the death of CúRóí has a trait which is distinctly older than the modern one, namely, CúRóí's death being the

¹ Egerton 88, fol. 10b.

² Egerton 88, fol. 10b 35.

immediate result of destroying the external soul. We can trace this feature also in other stories of the group, for example in Scotch-Gaelic tales (Campbell, *Popular Tales of the West Highlands*, I, pp. 18, cp. 93, 98, 102) and also in non-Gaelic stories: Russian (Immortal Koshchei); Lithuanian (Brugmann und Leskien *Lithauische Volkslieder und Märchen*, pp. 192 ff);¹ Norwegian ("The Giant with no heart in his body," Asbjörnsen's Collection). This agrees also with the primitive conception of the external soul as we find it in a Bengal story, though in another setting. In this story the hero's life is in a golden necklace, which is again in a fish. His father's second wife wishes to kill him, and finding out the secret of his life obtains means to secure the fish. As soon as the fish is caught, the hero feels sick; when it is brought on dry land he feels that he is about to die, and as the queen puts the golden necklace round her neck he dies. But he can return to life every night, because then the queen puts her necklace off. Here we have the same traits as in the CúRóí story: the moment the external soul comes into possession of another man the rightful owner of it feels ill. (Cp. also the Turkish stories, and the instance from Hahn's collection below.)

We can trace the formula of the external soul into the most distant lands (see Frazer l.c. and MacCulloch, *The Childhood of Fiction*, pp. 120 ff.). Even our own version of this formula is very common (*ibid.* 133. Hahn, *Griechische und Albanesische Märchen* 11. 23 f., 204, 259, 294);² Kunos, *Türkische Märchen aus Stambul* pp. 164 ff. and 125, also Gaelic, Slavonic, Lithuanian, and Norse; see above.)³

¹ As to the formula of immortality in Slavonic folk-tales, see *ibid.*, p. 569.

² Dr. Pokorný (*Mitteilungen der anthropol. Gesellschaft in Wien* XLII. 349) remarks concerning the other version of CúRóí's death: Allerdings entspricht CúRóí in der Geschichte, in der er geschildert wird, wie ihn seine Frau betrügt an seinen Haaren ans Bett bindet und CúChulinn, der ihn dann erschlägt, . . . dem Simson und "dem Starken Hans." Then he quotes Hahn ii, p. 189 f., but this is quite a different formula. When he refers to "Starker Hans," cp. 1, 59, he means, perhaps, the story "der Starke Hans" (Hahn No. 64), which has indeed an external soul formula (ii, p. 23). But he attaches little importance to these parallels, and explains CúChulinn after the manner of the mythological school.

³ The same formula in another context, Hahn ii, 215.—A very old story with separable soul formula, but with a different context, is the old Egyptian story of "Two Brothers" (from Papyrus d'Orbigny, see *Records of the Past*, London, 1874, ii, 137; Maspero, *Les contes populaires de l'Égypte ancienne*, Paris, 1889, p. 5 ff.; Flinders Petrie, *Egyptian Tales* II, 36; cp. also MacCulloch l.c., Frazer ii. 377 f.).

The external soul formula is often connected with another which folklorists classify simply as helpful animals : the hero of the tale is kind to some animals and they help him in return (see MacCulloch *i.c.*, also the Slavonic and Lithuanian stories cited above ;—Kunos pp. 125 ff.) In modern Irish stories it is only the hero's kindness that procures him the help of these animals ; in some other stories the mutual relations are much closer, the helpful animals are his brothers-in-law (so for instance in Lithuanian and Turkish). There are usually three animals ; and if we find only two in the Oriel story, it is uncommon. The story-teller has probably forgotten that the egg falls into the sea. The old Irish tale has, however, no traces at all of this formula. Either the modern stories are then a combination of two originally independent formulæ, or in the oldest form of the story this trait has been discarded. The former is the more probable, and, so far as I know, the one generally accepted. In any case the various means for obtaining the external soul of CúRói do not admit of any help from three animals. When CúChulinn destroys the salmon in the presence of CúRói, the egg cannot drop into the sea, for the reason that the golden apple was not hidden in a bird or such like—there is no opportunity in fact for the help of a bird. If help were necessary at all, it would be for securing the salmon. It is most strange, however, that we should find the same combination of these formulæ all the world over. It is impossible of course to say how far this may be due to inter-communication. Many of these episodes can only be explained, I think, in this way. Still it would be instructive to consider the possibility that two formulæ became united. And this brings us to the question of the origin of the 'external soul' and the 'helpful animals.'

As to the latter formula, folklorists explain it as an old reminiscence of a wide-spread totemistic culture. This is most probable in cases where the helpful animals are closely related to the hero. The same explanation accounts for the instances we have in modern Irish stories, namely, where the hero obtains the help of the animals through his kindness to them. These and similar formulæ are reminiscences of the old zoolatrical stage at which the animals were regarded as powerful protectors of families or of individuals even. Of course, these are only reminiscences of a time when totemistic culture was dying

out.¹ The formula of the external soul has sprung from various sources, but so far as the soul is hidden in an animal it belongs most probably to the same stratum of culture as the totem. But it is again only a survival, and may be a survival which in later ages was often misunderstood. I would especially call attention to the *manitou* which some savage tribes believe to be closely connected with the person who receives it.

Now, it would be in no way surprising if two conceptions reflecting the same culture stratum should have become united ; for one of them, the helpful animals, gives a good, one might almost say, natural, combination of the other, and both postulate the same conception of the world. Ireland is one of the countries in which similar beliefs survive² in various old tales, and it is therefore not to be wondered at if we find these formulæ combined in this way. The fact that they are not combined in *Aided ConRói* can be explained on other grounds. Either the idea of the external soul was formerly much more familiar, and the killing of the giant was therefore not regarded as a task requiring extraordinary help ; or the giant-killer was endowed with so many gifts³ that he experienced no difficulty at all, and so by the storyteller it was taken for granted that the young hero could perform his task.⁴ It is not necessary, however, to suppose that these formulae were always connected.

At all events it is evident that the main theme of *Aided ConRói* is that of the external soul : it is identical with the folk-tale formula, still found in Modern Irish. And it must not be overlooked that both in the old saga and in the modern folk-tale the young hero is at first overcome by the giant, but his life is spared.⁵ The same

¹ Cp. MacCulloch, pp. 249 ff.

² See *Rev. Celt.* xii, 243 ; xxii, 20 (Conaire Mór) xxi, 286 (CúChulinn).

³ Sometimes the hero can assume the shapes of different animals. But he is instructed again by the helpful animals ; cp. the Basque story : Webster, Basque Legends, p. 82 ; the Gaelic, Campbell, i, p. 96. But this is again the helpful animals formula, and we need not assume anything of the kind for CúChulinn.

⁴ It is to be observed that CúChulinn's *cleasa* enable him to accomplish feats which in folk-tales would require extraordinary help, as for example the catching of birds (TBC. in Macgním. ; S. C.) or deer (TBC. *ibid.*).

⁵ The description of CúRoi and CúChulinn wrestling recalls that of modern Irish tales ; the difference being that in the old Irish tale it is not the giant who is beaten, but the young hero ; cp. *adsoi fris int bclach, facairt úad isin talmain, aill co a glún, a fecht n-aill co a tháin, a fecht n-aill co a criss, a n-aill co (a) dí oxail* ; and Oriel (p. 3) : *Char bh'fada go dtug Aodh Beag fásadh dhó; chuir se go dtí n-a ghlúine is-talamh e, an dara fásadh go dtí bhásta a bhrísti, an treas fásadh go dtí ubhall a sgórnaighe.* (This is a commonplace in descriptions of wrestlings with giants of all kinds.)

feature is found in analogous stories of other nations. Whether the oldest form of the Irish story contained originally a similar reason of it (namely that the hero had set free the giant from prison) I do not venture to decide.¹

It is also remarkable that in the Old-Irish story the demon has noble features ; he is a prince, and we can hardly find a trace of the repellent character of the popular *fathach*.² This I would ascribe to the political motives of the old story-tellers. The Ulster people claimed a close relationship with CúRóí and *clanna Dedad*. CúRóí belonged to the same epic cycle as CúChulinn, namely the Ulster cycle. So it came about that the people who had put the Ulster epics into historical form, and who claimed probably some relationship with the Ulster epical heroes, were attached to this powerful magician CúRóí, and endowed him with the noble mien of a great king.

It matters little for my point of view at what time the heroes of this tale got their respective names, or when the whole saga was brought into connection with the Ulster cycle. But I am of opinion that it must have been at a very ancient period, the names of both heroes exhibiting the same formation, namely *Cú-Róí* : *Cú-Chulinn*. In our version the sword is a necessary instrument for getting possession of the hero's soul, because it is *his own* sword and was probably—in my opinion—part of him. For the same reason the sword plays an exclusive rôle in the other version of our tale. It was only natural then that the slaying power of the sword should have been explained, not as a possession of the hero who is to be killed, but as a supernatural quality of the sword itself. This point is very clear in the Welsh story of *Llew Llaw gyffes* (Mabinogion : Math vab Mathonwy), which contains a similar formula : the hero can be killed only by a charmed spear, and in a particular position. As regards the rôles of the heroes, Sir John Rhys has already pointed out

¹ As regards the relations between Blathnait and CúChulinn it is to be observed that she is in the older version a daughter of Chonchobor ; in other words, she plays the same rôle as in the folk-tales. There is nothing said as to whether she was CúChulinn's leman (or spouse as in mod. tales) ; it was probably sufficient for the story-teller that she was a king's daughter, and that one of the king's champions is to bring her to her father.

² But there are other features which are identical with those of giants, for instance, CúRóí's journeying throughout the world. He is in some far-off region, but at night he returns (Fled Bricr.) : we find the same in modern folk-lore.

(Hibbert Lect. 474) that it is “somewhat as if Llew and Goronwy had changed places in the story of Blodeuedd’s infidelity.” Indeed, the tendency which we have already observed in the Irish stories here gets the upper hand—the sympathy of the story-teller is altogether with the deceived husband. But the Welsh story is not quite identical with the Old-Irish tale. Perhaps the Welsh story was influenced by some other, or it is a quite different tale with a similar formula.¹

We see that the Irish story has its origin in a very old stratum, namely totemistic culture. M. Salomon Reinach² has already pointed out that CúChulinn’s tabu not to eat dog’s flesh has the same origin. CúChulinn’s character has then one totemistic feature more. The story of his killing the hound was most probably invented to explain his name. But there is one thing puzzling: why is this only his second name? In Irish tradition it is well known that his boyish name was Setanta. Why then has he another name? It might of course be explained as a nick-name; but then would it not be strange that this nick-name should impose a tabu upon him?

A clue to this enigma is again afforded us in the folk-lore of savage tribes belonging to the totemistic stratum. I have already mentioned that some savage tribes have an individual totem, i.e. *manitou*. This *manitou* is not received at birth, but at the age of puberty.³ As ‘CúChulinn’ is not his birth-name, we must then assume that CúChulinn’s *manitou* was dog, and that he got his name in some ceremonial way, similar to that in which the savages received their *manitous*. The story “How CúChulinn slew the Hound” is then probably a transformation of an old story relating how CúChulinn got his *manitou*. And indeed the boyish deeds of CúChulinn show that he was at this time fully qualified for it.

* * *

All this proves that we have here a very old stratum of folk-lore which intrudes into the historical Ulster cycle. By historical I mean only that the background was historical: the struggle

¹ For other formulæ, as power in hair, see MacCulloch l.c., Frazer l.c., and Hahn i, 187, 217; cp. also 179.

² *Rev. Celt.* xxi, 286.

³ See Frazer, *The Golden Bough*, iii, 419; cp. 422 ff. MacCulloch, pp. 88 f, 146.

of two races, the Connacht and the Ulstermen. The themes of Ulster epics are very often taken from popular tradition. The late Alfred Nutt has already shown that in *Tochmarc Étáine* and *Tochmarc Emere* motives and situations occur which are well known in modern Gaelic stories (see *Fians* xvii), and he argues that "sagas recorded in writing from the seventh to the fifteenth centuries presuppose a background of traditional fancies, beliefs, and conceptions of the same *essential* character as those still current." (*ibid.* p. xviii.) I would add to this, that in the ancient tales we frequently find the same elements and formulæ as in modern Gaelic stories and in those of other nations, introduced into the national epic in order to infuse more life into the character of the ancestors of those peoples who were interested in creating the epic.

There are other formulæ which might be added to the above, but of these I hope to write later on.

J. BAUDIŠ.

PRAGUE.

CINÁED ÚA HARTACÁIN'S POEM ON BRUGH
NA BÓINNE

A CHASM in the latter part of *Leabhar na hUidhre* has deprived us of the beginning of that curious and beautiful cycle of tales which tell of the fortunes of Etáin and her lovers, earthly and immortal. The lost tales can, as Stern pointed out, be to some extent supplied from the extracts given in the fifteenth-century manuscript glossary numbered H. 2. 17 in the library of Trinity College. Both Stern, however, and others who have dealt with these legends, seem to have overlooked the existence of a poetical version of the opening tale, preserved in the Book of Leinster.¹ This curious omission, coupled with the permanent interest of the saga, both as folklore and literature, in detail and outline, and the high repute in which it was once held, may perhaps justify the edition from that single, if faulty, copy, which is here offered.

The author of this composition was the famous poet and scholar Cináed úa hArtacáin, whose death is recorded in the year 987. He addressed the poem to one Óengus, son of the high king of Ireland, to whom Brug na Bóinne then belonged: in the dedicatory stanzas at the beginning, that prince and his father are deliberately confused, out of flattery, with Óengus Mac Ind Óc and the Dagda of the story. The occasion of its composition (to complete the account in traditional style) seems to have been a banquet held by that chieftain at his palace (*Feis Tigi Oéngossa*, v. 8). The tale as told in the verse, in consequence of metrical exigencies, is at once diffuse and condensed. For purpose of comparison it may be summarized as follows:—

“Bóänd, the wife of Nechtan, came to stay with her brother Elcmaire, vassal and ambassador of the Dagda, King of Ireland. The Dagda saw her, and sent thrice to demand her of her

¹ The poem has, however, been noticed, and in part summarized, in his commentary by E. J. Gwynn, *Metrical Dindshenchas* (Todd Lect. x 482, ix 93, 95).

brother, but Elcmaire refused him, and stayed to keep watch over her during her stay in the Brug. The three druid-messengers whom the Dagda had sent returned to inform him of this, and counselled him to obtain his end by sending Elcmaire on an errand away from home.

“Elcmaire, when summoned, was unwilling to leave his sister, but consented on condition that he should not be sent too far to return before night to his home. So the Dagda sent him to Bres mac Elathan at Mag Inis, to demand of him a woman who should watch over his household, charging that prince to feast and entertain his envoy.

“Meantime the Dagda, by secret spells, held the sun in the heavens¹ for nine months, so that the whole time seemed to Elcmaire, as he sat at his ale, like a single day; meanwhile the Dagda was with Bóänd at the Brug; and at the end of nine months Bóänd bore a son to the Dagda, whom they named Óengus In Mac Óc.

“Then Elcmaire, on his way home, saw the strange advance in the seasons on the flowers of the hillside: he hastened his return, and the Dagda and Bóänd parted in haste and fear, leaving the child behind them at the wayside, where he was found by Midir, who, knowing the secret, fostered him as a king’s son for seven years.

“Then one day, being ridiculed as of unknown parentage by the other foster-children, Óengus forced Midir to reveal his father’s name; and Midir offered to bring him to the Dagda’s banquet, and claim to be recognized. They did so, bringing with them a gift of ale for the king, who received them well, and wished to make return for their present²: they demanded, according to Midir’s plan, the king’s mansion of the Brug. This was indignantly refused. Midir then begged for a night and day’s loan (*iasacht lá ocus aidche*) of the Brug, which the Dagda granted, and vacated it straightway for their occupation; but when he returned to reclaim it, Midir refused to leave, saying that a night and day’s loan meant a loan night and day

¹ A similar feat is recorded in Flann (Mainistrech ?)’s poem on the Dindshenchas of Cnogba: a poem which, moreover, has a further point of contact with the rest of *Tochmarc Étaine*; see *infra*.

² Apparently the bringing of a gift entitled Midir to ask in return whatever he wished: *breth a beoil*.

in perpetuity; and, bound by his oath, the Dagda had to surrender his right: thenceforward Óengus held the Brug."

So far the verse corresponds with Stern's fragments. As each supplements the other, I reprint the latter here for convenience of reference.¹

TOCHMARC ETÁINE SÍSINA

[H. 3. 18 Trin. Coll. = ZCP. v. 523] Atchobhair in Dagda ben Elcmair do chairdes collaidhe: arroét in bhen do'n Dagdha, acht mun' bó uaman Ealcmaire ar mhet a chumhachta. Fáidhis in Daghdha farum Ealcmaire n-úadh for turus co Bres mac Ealathan co Mag nInis, 7 dogéne in Daghdha tinchetla móra for Ealcmaire co na tísadh afairthi, 7 dithrachtais dorcha n-aidhchi aire, 7 argait gorta 7 íta de, 7 dobert imarcora móra fair. Luidh in Daghdha co mnáí Ealcmaire coléic, 7 ruc mac do, Áengus a ainm; 7 ba slán in ben dia galar ar cinn Ealcmaire, 7 nir' ráthraighe furri a bine . . .

Luidh Áengus for cáí 7 dubaid docum Midir iarna aithisiugadh do triath. 'Cidh sin?' ol Midhir. 'Tríath rom-cháin 7 conrubaídhe frim' enech gin mháthair no athair lium.' . . . 'Tar-sa liumsa dano,' ol Aengus fri Midhir, 'conam-ardamha mh'athair, ar nach rabhus fo chleth ba síre fo aithisib Fear mBolg' . . . Congair in rí Midhir leis for leth do agallaim in mic. Fearais Eochaídhe esemain fris, 7 isbert: 'Cidh is ail do'n ógláech sa na táníc ríam?' . . . , ar ní comhdhais do mhac gan ferann 7 ríghe nErenn lat' . . . 'Tíat dia Samna isin Brugh, 7 tucadh gaisced fair. Atá cáenochomrac la firu Erenn, 7 ní bí nech a fúaithe a chéile ann, 7 báidh Ealcmaire. Cnuc Sidha in Broga,¹ gin ghaiscead fair, acht gabhlán finnchuill ina laim. Táet² Áengus go ró Ealcmaire isin innus sin, 7 tomáithe dia mharbadh, 7 tachair do nimrubaídhsan, acht go roghealla a réir do Áenghus.'

Doluidh Áengus isin mBrugh go ngaisced fair, 7 focerd éisci im Ealcmaire, go ngeall dó dia anmain ríghe lái co n-aidhchi ina ferann . . . Atbert in Daghdha: 'Táetais do ferann ar do anacul, ar ba cáime lat do ainim oldáss do thír.'

THE WOOING OF ÉTÁIN

The Dagda desired Elcmair's wife in carnal union.¹ The woman would have given consent to the Dagda,² but that she feared Elcmair for the greatness of his powers; so the Dagda sent Elcmair forth on an errand to Bres mac Elathan at Magh nInis.³ And the Dagda made strong incantations against Elcmair, that he might not return straightway,⁴ and kept (?) the darkness of night from him,⁵ and deprived him of *sensation* of hunger and thirst,⁶ and charged him with weighty missions.⁵ Meantime the Dagda held converse with Elcmair's wife,⁷ and she bore

¹ The text is taken from Stern's edition, omitting the later gloss. I have made my own translation.

² Cf. LU. 114a.

³ Sic leg.: MS teit.

⁴ Corresponding passages in the poem *infra*, verse 12. ⁵ Cf. verse 16. ⁶ So in v. 28. ⁷ Verses 19 and 20.

⁵ This is expanded into verses 20 and 31. ⁶ Following and adapting this sentence, verses 24, 25, 29. ⁷ In poem, v. 30.

him a son, who was named Aengus¹; but the woman had recovered from her childbed, when Elcmair returned, and he perceived not her sin² . . .

Aengus, insulted by a chieftain, went in grief and oppression to Midir.³ ‘What now?’ asked Midir. ‘A chief has mocked me, and cast the slur upon mine honour that I have neither mother nor father’⁴ . . . ‘Come with me then,’ said Áengus to Midir, ‘that my father may acknowledge me, and that I live no longer obscure and reviled by the Fir Bolg.’⁵ . . . The king calls Midir aside, and receives the boy. Eochaid (the king) bade him welcome, and spoke: ‘What desires this lad, who has never come here before?’⁶ . . . ‘for it is unjust that thy son should be landless, whilst thou hast the kingship of Ireland.’⁷ . . . ‘Let him come then at Samain to the Brug, and let arms be girded upon him; for then is a time of truce amongst the men of Ireland, and there subsists no enmity against each other at that time⁸; and Elcmair will be present in the Brug unarmed, save for a forked branch of hazelwood in his hand. So let Aengus approach Elcmair in that guise, and threaten him with death, and offer to leave him unmolested (?), if he promise to yield to the will of Áengus.’

Áengus came to the Brug bearing arms, and threatened Elcmair with death, so that he promised him a day and night’s kingship of his land⁹ to save his life. . . . Quoth the Dagda: ‘He has gained(?) thy territory by sparing thee, for thy life was dearer to thee than thy lands.’

It will be seen, even from this fragmentary text, that the poetic version is somewhat attenuated in plot, compared with the prose. Moreover, it may, I think, be fairly maintained that they are not independent versions, but that Cináed úa hArtacáin’s is a free and simplified adaptation of the prose. Consider, for instance, the confusion by which first Elcmaire, then the Dagda is represented as lord of the Brug, which is accounted for by the elimination of the dialogue in the prose, in which the king advises Óengus how to gain the Brug.¹ The correspondence of incidents, too, is very close, especially at the beginning. With

¹ v. 38. ² Versified vv. 33, 39 (again 69), but with modification to fit in with subsequent story of Bóand’s fate. ³ Intervening portion missed out in MS. This passage corr. to verse 46. ⁴ In verse 48, followed by a further omission to v. 50.

⁵ After v. 56. ⁶ From this out no corresponding passage in the poem, which simplifies the narrative: this sentence represented by verses 54, 55. One may compare Midir’s advice to Óengus (verses 52, 53), which takes the place of these sentences, and derives from them. ⁷ Corresponding to verse 60: cf. v. 64.

¹ Eochaid in the prose stands for Eochu Allathair, a name for the Dagda (cf. LL 9^b19, 127^b3). Observe that in the prose the Dagda incites Óengus to cheat Elcmaire, whilst in the verse it is the Dagda himself who is cheated. This version is also represented by the *remscéil* to the Táin (LL 245^b), called *Do Fhagail in tSida* (where Elcmaire is not mentioned); which may have influenced the poet, though it seems less original and later in every way than the *Tochmarc nÉtaine* fragments, with which it has some verbal correspondence, and whence it possibly derives. But the poet’s confusion with Elcmaire seems to me additional evidence that his version is not an independent one, but an attempt to simplify the other, already known to him.

the late and fragmentary state of the text, many verbal parallels cannot perhaps be insisted on: I should like, however, to point out the correspondence of verse 28 with *co Bres mac E. co Magh nInis* of the prose; similarly the use of the word *ráthaig* in the same context in prose and verse (verse 33, *cf.* also v. 69); also the expression *lá co n-aidchi* in Óengus's demand, common to both versions.

On these grounds, I think, we can claim that the versions are at least not independent. That the verse was not the original of the prose seems more than probable, not only on account of the details in the prose which clear up discrepancies in the verse, but also from comparing the general style of the tale in each version. The Dagda in the poem is simply king of Ireland (*Rí Indsi finni Fáil* v. 56; so too v. 61; v. 57; v. 14); his counsellors, druids (v. 17, v. 24); the *cdéenchromrac la firu Érenn*, or general truce of the Samain assembly of the prose, becomes a feast given to the nobles of Ireland by the king (*see v. 54 seq.*); Elcmaire is *Techtaire na túath*, the envoy to the peoples: note too the etymologizing of the name Óengus Mac Ind Óc as if it were 'In Mac Óc'¹), whilst the commoner form is actually used in verse 3, and again in verse 66. Finally, the use of the name Bóänd (*see infra*), with the alterations it has involved, points in the same direction. Everywhere the euhemeristic treatment is obvious: the saga is retold in the terms of the *milieu* familiar to the court-poet of the provincial king: the difference is that of tradition and artistic modification.

If this view be correct, it establishes definitely that the prose tales of *Tochmarc Étaine* were in existence, as in the fragments, as early as the middle of the tenth century. The treatment which the story has received in the verse, where we can compare it with the prose, shows that we must reckon with considerable modification of the original in passages where the verse is our sole authority. The verses which tell how Midir comes into the story, and the account of the quibble whereby Óengus gained the Brug, are, however, useful and interesting, as they supplement a fragmentary part of the tale, enough surviving of the prose to show that they are accurate.

¹ This may, however, have been in the prose: note that *In Mac Óc* is the form in the fragments, and occurs regularly in the tale in LU. 129.

After the latter episode of Óengus and the Brug, the two versions diverge completely, the prose fragments telling of a quarrel between Midir and Óengus, apparently for the hand of Étáin; the material is too scanty to afford a clear insight into the plot.¹ The poem, on the other hand, recommencing (v. 66) with a conventional address to the 'historians of the entire world,' proceeds to give an account of the further adventures of the mother of Óengus, as follows:—

When Elcmaire returned home from his long-delayed journey, he saw the strange alteration of the season in the flowers and trees; and his suspicions were aroused, because no one came to meet him: he guessed the cause (v. 69), and accused his sister of adultery with the Dagda. She denied it, and offered to prove her chastity by walking thrice widdershins around the enchanted *Topuir Segsa*, the well-springs of Segais, which would bring immediate disfigurement upon anyone who appealed to them to prove a lie. Bóänd went round² the wells: the water burst out over her, and drowned her, as she fled in shame, and carried her body on its stream down to the sea; that stream is the river which has ever since been called from her, Bóänd.³

That this story did not form part of the *Tochmarc Étaine* is indicated by the poem itself, in which it can be seen to be an

¹ It would seem that Óengus demanded Étáin of her father Ailill (*vide* lemmata ed. Stern ZCP. v, 524), but was refused in favour of Midir. (Cf. Ir. Texte i, 127, § 13 = LU. p. 129, and Stern 1. c.; also especially *Dindshenchas Cnogba*, Metr. Dinds., Todd Lect. x, 40; ib. p. 483; Bodl. Dinds., no. 43: the story there given seems an adaptation from this.) Óengus then carried her off by force, and concealed her: as a result of Midir's attempt to release her, the re-birth takes place by the spells of his enemy. (LU. 129 = Ir. Texte i, 130; Stern, ib. p. 525.) The tale is called *Tesbaid Étaine ingine Ailella*, i.e. 'the Absence, or Disappearance, of Étáin daughter of Ailill,' in an independent text adapted from *Cin Dromma Snechta*, LU. p. 99a. The note with the verses from that codex which are added in LU. 129a to *Tochmarc Étaine* (printed Ir. Texte i, 132, 133) must be treated as separate testimony: as in the other *Druim Snechta* texts, we have here an old and independent version, which may be compared with, but not worked into, the later and fuller forms of the narrative. Compare the story of the quarrel of the boys at play, *infra* v. 42 *et seq.*

² This portion of the tale is almost illegible in the MS., but it is easily supplied from the *Dindshenchas*-poems of the river Bóänd, which are demonstrably taken directly from this part of the poem.

³ That there is no logical sequence between this and the preceding episode is shown by the insistence in verse 68 that Bóänd's age when she gave birth to Óengus was forty years, and her age at her death was the same: i.e., the events narrated in v. 66 *seq.* are supposed to follow on those ending with verse 39. So verses 32, 33 are recalled and in part repeated in v. 69, as the tale goes back to Bóänd.

addition to an already known tale, by the fact of the Midir episode ending with the repetition of the first word of the poem (*secht*), and also the form of recommencement with which the next verse proceeds : ' *Senchaide in talman tig*' (v. 66).

I think, moreover, that in this tale of Bóänd's death we have an ingenious adaptation of Cináed úa hArtacáin's, of the name-story of another river. We are told in the *Dindshenchas* that the river Sinand is so named from a princess Sinand, daughter of the king Lodan of Lúachair, who came to the Wells of Segais to wrest from them their magic powers ; and when the waters, eluding her, flowed from before her, she plunged into them and was drowned.

This legend is so similar to that of the drowning of Bóänd in our poem, that one can hardly assume them to be independent of each other : especially since each river is said to have arisen from the flood caused by the violation of the enchanted well of Segais : although, in point of fact, their sources are far apart.¹

Two considerations, to my mind, render it probable that the story of Bóänd's death is derived from the Sinand-legend, not *vice versa* : one being, that the true etymology of Bóänd (*bó find*) was perfectly familiar, as the *Dindshenchas* shows, to scholars of Cináed's period.

The second indication is, that in the prose the mother of Óengus is simply ' *ben Elcmair*' ; her name is not given. In the poem she is called Bóänd sister (not *wife*) of Elcmaire, and wife of Nechtan. Now, in a short text in MS. Harleian 5280 (published by Kuno Meyer ZCP. viii, 120), we are told of an adventure of Cú Chulaind's by the Boyne, in which he encounters and overcomes Elcmaire, and compels his wife Fedlim Foltchain to use her gift of prophecy for him. This discrepancy of names makes it probable that the ' *ben Elcmaire*' of the prose *Tochmarc Étaine* was all either compiler had to go upon, and that each gave her a name to suit his tale : the compiler of the Harleian text making her the Fedelm Ban-fáith of the *Táin*² ; Cináed úa hArtacáin,

¹ The Boyne rises in the County Kildare ; the Shannon in the Curlieu Mountains (Corrshláibh na Segsa).

² Perhaps because one of the names of the Boyne was *Smir Find Fedlimthi* (Metr. Ds. 26, 20). This Cú Chulaind story is obviously of secondary origin, and a late fabrication, as Elcmaire belongs to the separate Étán-cycle, which it thus confuses.

on the other hand, calling her Bóänd sister of Elcmaire and wife of Nechtan the warden of the Wells of Segais (this to bring in the reference to that mysterious spring); whilst the whole fantastic fable is adopted to give currency to a new explanation of the name of the river Bóänd.

To sum up, then: this poem, composed in the tenth century by Cináed úa hArtacáin, contains in its seventy-eight stanzas, after a conventional address to a patron, a version of the story of the birth of Óengus, and the trick whereby he obtained Brug na Bóinne from his father the Dagda: the story being derived and modified from the opening tale of the cycle *Tochmarc Étaine*, which we know otherwise only from the fragmentary lemmata of the glossary in H. 2. 17. Following on this, the poet has added (verse 66 to the end) an origin-story of the river Bóänd, perhaps borrowed and adapted by him from that of the river Sinand: this would account for certain alterations and discrepancies in the preceding tale, necessitated by its addition. At all events, the story of the death of Bóänd did not form part of the *Tochmarc Étaine*: even the name Bóänd for the mother of Óengus appears to have been invented by Cináed úa hArtacáin.

The text has suffered somewhat at the hands of the copyist: indeed the scribe of the Book of Leinster would seem to have deliberately sacrificed the text to the appearance of his page, thereby even spoiling the sense, and defeating the poet's claim to metrical perfection. Add to this the upper margin of col. b on page 209 is badly worn, and in places illegible; whilst, by an error, the scribe has begun the poem with verse 10 on page 208 b, and adds the opening stanzas at the foot of 209 b with the note "this is the beginning of the preceding poem." Nor has he left us any clue as to the meaning of the *o.f.n.* of the first line: this and several other matters, obscured by his careless transcription, have rendered the translation occasionally uncertain.

For the text the facsimile has been collated with the original, and the resulting corrections adopted. For this, and for much other assistance, I am indebted to the kindness of Dr. Bergin.

The metre, *Rannaighecht mór chetharchubaid*, in which the poem is composed, with its strict observances, is ill-suited to the purposes of narrative, and often leaves something to be supplied or inferred. Following his quaint promise in verse 7, Cináed has

made a point of observing its strictest usages in this poem. Accordingly, we have not only alliteration in every line, but usually each stanza is linked in some way with the one following; consonance and internal rhyme are regular, while *brecad*, or extra adornment of rhyme and alliteration, is constantly resorted to. These restrictions, coupled with the fact that the outline of his story was probably familiar to the poet's hearers,¹ have produced the curiously allusive style of the narrative. I have therefore occasionally been obliged to make a somewhat free translation, to give the poet's meaning rather than a verbal rendering ; but, for the sake of accuracy, these passages—and they are not many—are commented on, and explained, in the Notes.

Something may be said in conclusion in praise of the poet's spirited telling of the tale, and the deft mastery of form which he displays. As literature, the poem is very typical of the mediæval taste for adapting heroic tales of the past with that strong local association which vivified and adorned them to their hearers.

LUCIUS GWYNN

¹ The modifications which he introduced probably were to them added testimony to his skill as a poet.

CINÁED ÚA HARTACÁIN

CECINIT.¹

[LL. 209 b 24.]

1 Sect o. f. n.

 nim-thabair i socht nó² i sním,
 lucht na déine, samail³ sneid,
 dosgen fein radúain a rríg.

2 Missi dó ra radúain rann,

 co barr críchi clad-uair Cuind,
 nipo fócrach fagla fill
 co dind meic in Dagda duind.

3 Ricob do thig Meic ind Óc,

 in fót dia tartus serc sút,
 tech ata fo blaid—ní bréc—
 lór a mét ar Maig nI út.

4 Deich fichit fichi cét cæm,

 sluag sær cen [f]rith-serc 'moa rig,
 tigerna fil and fo-fúair,
 is hé a lín tuaid tall 'sin tsíd.

5 Ferand fors' mbít fianna Fáil,

 as-ṁberand cach blíadna búaid
 in Mac Ócán, nach braith bríg,
 maith ar fir in fotan fúair :

6 In fer isa ferand [sund]

 in Brug risa mbenand tond,
 mac ríg Banba, buide a barr,
 thic dia thig thall tuli thond.

Verse 1, *Suprascript*, Is hé so tossach na duáine remoind. line b, 1^o ms.
 line c, samail ms, but nó d is written in the same hand above the m. 4 c, in t. f. a.
 fosfáir ms *hyperm.* 5 a, forambít ms *hyperm.* 5 b, čacha ms *hyperm.*
 asṁberand bis ms.

7 Dar Dia ra-dirig cach ndáim,
 noco bia 'na thririg thréin
 rind eclinne cen a n-uáim
 im dúain rig Feíc-Linne fén.

8 Feis tigi Oengossa áin
 ro-fitir cach fili fir,
 bail nach bí brath-chocor beóil,
 acht feóil [is] fathrucud fín.

9 Tech i-tá rí in Braga bricc,
 ris-na bí mo bara becht ;
 tech itá lan locht can locht,
 [tech] ran can socht co fo šecht. S.

10 A éicsiu hÉrenn co n-æb,
 má tá nech ramheil[enn] úaib,
 in fetabair cade in dluig
 diar' gab Oengus in mBruig mbúain ?

11 Bale i mbaí in Dagda nar' diúit,
 7 in rop' adma a Féic,
 cid fotera Oengus án
 do bith 'sin Bruig bán can bréic ?

12 Board, ben Nechtain co neim,
 tánic can mertain am-muig,
 do thig Elcmaire na n-ech,
 fer no-beired breith 'sin Bruig.

13 Board blath-glan ass in Brí
 i tig a brathar ro bæ,
 silliss furri in Dagda dían,
 co na-ragaib [mían]moan. mnæ.

14 Triallaid fo thrí in Dagda dron,
 ic-a raba Banba bil :
 guidid Elcmaire co n-uáil
 'moan mnæ, rabæ tuaid 'coa thig.

7 b, bia na | na MS. 8 a, perh. fess. 10 a, A éicsiu herenn conæb, 7rl ut ante in præcedenti pagina: hence the poem is continued on p. 208, line 1, where this line is repeated with Banba perperam for Herenn. 11 a, imbíd MS hyperm. 14 c, nonuail MS, the first n corrected to c in marg.

15 *Atbert a brathair co n-áib
ra Boaind snáth-glain a Síd :*
“Fat garde bess tessu i füss,
airisfet-sa im thoss im’ síd.”

16 *Tecait tri druid Dagda deiss
dar sruth Atha Gabla glaiss,
co n-ebratar frisin ríg,
'ma-thairsed in mnái mínnais.*

17 “*Da-féta Elcmaire oll,*”
ar in drúi bectaide bind,
“a dul *for* turuss ó’ thig :
fói-siu lasin mnái nígil nígrind.”

18 “*Da-fétar,*” ar Dagda dúr,
“Elcmaire, ba babda báig ;
noco bia aidchi feil fiss
i n-ecmaiss a liss d’ar láim.

19 “*Lá-so é for conair cain*
(bes ni bo doraid in dluig),
cen co tuca cáin no chíos,
bid co cend nái mis im-muig.

20 “*Missi fossaigfes in gréin,*
co cend nái mis, mór in buaid,
do gorud in ra-feóir rain
i cleithi áin aeóir úair.”

21 *Aílter Elcmaire na n-ath,—*
uair ba techtaire na tuáth—
atbert riss in rí co réil
“Eirgg dam ri toisc leír co luáth !”

22 “*Lesc lem dul ra toisc ar tuaith !*
ni chél, a Chind, coisc na crich !
O thanic mo siur an’ess,
noco níféaim less na líth.”

23 "Rot-ba techt tuidecht ar thir,"
 ar in fer fuair fuires Fáil :
 "Na cotaliadaig im-muig,
 no co torais in ḡBruig ḡbáin."

24 "Ma rogap sé imthecht uáit,"
 ar in drúi [ba] bind cen breíc ;
 "bid ergnam ar cind ind fir
 co herlam is'tig da teít.

25 "O ra-sia in tech teinmech tó,
 dálter dó lind nemnech núá ;
 áilter d'fiss gessi na ḡgním,
 do thig in ríg acht co rua."

26 "Ráid rim th'aithesc n-uallach n-ard!"
 ar in ri luamnach din leirg :
 "In raga mar thicfa in lá,
 dam do chungid mná cen meirg?"

27 "Ma dic dula dam-sa riss,"
 ar Elcmaire in Broga braiss,
 "apair, a Rí gla[i]n cen gáe,
 cia foracuinni mnai maiss?"

28 "Cunnig dam mnái menmnaig moír,
 bess ria coír mo theglaich thúaid,
 ond uair ra-śiris coa síd,
 ar ríg Maigi Inis uair."

29 Éirgis Elcmaire, is teit sair,
 mar theít techtaire ria thail ;
 ó rainic co tech in ríg,
 dálter fin 7 mid fair.

23 a, Rotbí MS corr. to a in marg. : tect MS.

26 d, mnai MS.

27 c, congáre MS.

29 b, techtair MS.

26d, mam-æ MS.

28 c, cach síd fcs.

; might be coa MS.

30 Fot gairde ra bæ in fer find
 'con lind cen chairdde cen choll,
 ro bæ in Dagda oc feiss ra fiair,
 nir' fég geiss nó gliaid nó glond.

31 Gebid immi in brugaid bil;
 tic dar *cach* tulaig da thig;
 co tanic *forba* nóni míš,
 scuchaid in *grian* sis iar sain.

32 Saigid din Bruig budi brass,
 mar nach tisad duine d'físs
 érlama ar gurt co ngeiss,
 ba holc leiss 'na ndernad riss:

33 Ra rathaig Elcmaire eím
 ar in tsleib etlaide uaid,
 co ro cloemchlai lí cach luib,
 in tan tanic *in mBruig mbuáin*.

34 "Maith": ar Boänd Broga braiss,
 atbert fri ríg ro-šeng Ruiss,
 "Bo[m]-gebsa bró thelcha tend,
 nom-loiscc eter chend is choiss."

35 "Ceil-siu, is ceilfet-sa do chin;
 sen-su, is senfat-sa sain:
 ar apa a ndernais de drúis,
 espach athis dod' gnúis glain."

36 Gabdait idain in mnái mbuáin
 atuaid isin tilaig threín,
 co ruc im-muig a mac maith
 isin Bruig *for* fót raith réil.

30 *d*, nō extended twice from compendium for vel.
 with -ss, not is. 33 *b*, aritsleib etlaide uait MS.
hyperm.

32 *a*, brass *distinct*
 35 *c*, nandernais MS

37 Ra raid si: "Or fēmus fleid
 is hé sút m' oen-gus a fir!" [209a 1]
 fot gairdde bess talam thend,
 noco nambér lemm dom' thig."

38 "Óc in mac," ar Dagda dond,
 do-ber bond ri Banba ḡbind :
 "bid Óen-gus Mac Óc a ainm,
 cipé gaires de gairm grind."

39 Ros-gab ecla dar gæth ḡglass,
 o da-riacht in læch dia liss :
 scailit uad fo-dess, fo-thuaid,
 fácbait é ar maig úair can físs.

40 Is and ra bæ Midir míín
 acco for sligid hi síd,
 co ruc leis in mac dia thaig
 baile i fuair blaid is bríg.

41 Ro bæ secht ḡblíadna 'sin Brí,
 ra bæ ferand fianna fái ;
 dar leiss ba[hé a] athair [ran-alt],
 atar leiss ro bo mæc do'n mnai.

42 Maic ro búi oc Midir mend—
 suairc in cheithern fial-glan find—
 ba gnath in díni bec bæth
 immi 'na thig læch ic lind.

43 Laa doib ar faidchi ind liss loir
 argur graiphni co ḡgním,
 atrubratar olc co heím
 ra Oengus find feig co fir.

40 *a*, MS mbaile with *punct. del. over m.* 40 *c*, MS diath diathaig. 41 *c*, *For this line MS has only darleiss ba athair.* 43 *b*, argur in MS *siglum for ar followed by g with a hook curved back over line : an leg. atagur ?*

44 "Cia rot-lessraig Midir mín
 sunn for messair *macc* [na] ríg,
 ni fess cenél dait na cland,
 cia rat-ailed tall 'sin tsíd."

45 Frithir frisin *macc* mín maith
 i *n*-ebras riss na síd t[h]oich ;
 "Ni fess do bunad iar mbríg,"
 ar in *macrad* mín im-muig.

46 Tic uadib in *macc* dia thig,
 rap' aire dó a bratt co mblaíd,
 fuapraíd ar turssi co tend,
 o ro bæ trell issin taig.

47 "Tacram a scél fir co fí
 atai dam triá gnim cen gæ :
 Aile, a *meic* " ar Midir riss,
 "apair rim cia tast i-táe?"

48 "At-ber frit," ar Oengus án,
 "o dot-rat i socht, i sním :
 Ni fess mo bunad ria beím ;
 is pudar lemm fén co fir."

49 "Fég hErind tiar 7 tair,
 atber frit co dian do dluig,
 is he t'atha[i]r a rrí reil,
 noco n-olc do meín im-muig.

50 "Missi latt," ar Midir mass,
 "ar sligid co rop slán seiss,
 co fargbur tu i n-adba éim
 i tig Dagda déin ar feiss.

44 b, Verse short of one syllable. 44 c, cenl- MS. 45 b, ebras MS : *an l.*
 ebrad? 46 b, rafaire fcs. : see Notes. 47 a, firí MS. 49 c, rríg MS.
 50 d, tig in D. ms. déin corr. from fén MS.

51 "Berat lim braich 7 biad
 do'n dun i mbí in fer maith mór ;
 aspénfat dó a mac fial find,
 tan bas irlam a lind lór."

52 "A meicc," ar Midir na' med,
 "not-molfat filid oc fleid,
 dia tarda rath in ríg [réil],
 cid gebmait fein ar ar fleid ?

53 Comairli míن-chert nach meirb,
 uair nach sir-therc scél ar selb,
 dia tarda dait Dagda dúr
 cunnig fair a dun co derb!"

54 Do-gnither ind fled co llí
 airdairc hí ar Maig Breg na mbó :
 tinoltar teglach in ríg ;
 ba línmair a lín ar ló.

55 Læchrad Banba cona mblaid
 tecait do thig Dagda druin,
 cach oen na talla 'sin dún
 airisit fri mur im-muig.

56 "Mac acum," ar Midir mín,
 "tucsam lind 'sin sligid slain,
 mac ro-ail sinni 'nar síd
 do Ríg Indsi finni Fáil."

57 Ar sain atbert Dagda dúr,
 fer 'coa mbai Banba can brón,
 "A Midir maigi na mind,
 cid connaigi ar do lind lór?"

52 c, [réil] required by rhyme and as seventh syll. 53 b, uair nach sirtherc ar
 scél ar selb MS hyperm. ; the first ar seems to be a mistake. 55 a, under com is
 written am ; the scribe clearly meant cona mblaid. 57 b, in fer MS.

58 “Tráth bas irlam lind na láech—
 ni chel, a rí find na fáth—
 noco beo oc cungid do chruid,
 gebat úait do Bruig co bráth.”

59 “Na cuinnig mo Bruig tria bæis,
 ní maith lem a chur fo chís,
 noco tibrind duit, a fir,
 ar a fil fo nim a-nís !”

60 “Can co tardda ní bas mó,
 ar isat rí for cach ré,
 iasacht lá 7 aidche cen ail.
 [dúinn a láich] di'n taig i-tæ.

61 Tabair rum ratha, a rí Ríach,
 a fir imres gnathga ñgnath !
 tabair rum esca 7 grián
 mar do-beir cach fial iar fáth !”

62 Falmaigis Dagda a dún,
 ra pa rún can tarba di ęn,
 Oengus 7 Midir mín
 rucsat ar in ríg in ræn.

63 Ria-siu tisad in tres tráth,
 tic cuccu in bress nar' bu bæth,
 suail na-tised toir na tu
 dlomaid riu co brath in léch.

64 “A láich,” ar Midir co mbáig,
 “ma daime dálí ndligid dún,
 adaig ocus la co lí
 noco derna, [a] rí na rún.”

59 d, fuli MS, with punct. del. above and below u. 60 c, over 7 is written s. : i.e. 's. 60 d, For this line MS has only din taig itæ: the remaining words are a mere suggestion. 62 b, hyperm.: leg. d'æn ? 63 c, suil MS with a in marg. 64 c, oucus; fcs. is.

65 Ro brecad Dagda do'n tslicht
 'mo an tir talmga do thecht,
 dia finnad nech rún in ríg,
 do-rat sain i snim foa secht. S.

66 [A] senchaide in talmán tig,
 a sluag barr-glan cosin mblaid,
 7 máthair Meicc Inn Óc,
 apraid rum cia fót fo a fail !

67 "Atbér-sa rib tria rím rand,
 amm eolach for tfr for tuind :
 Boand ben Nechtain co n-æb,
 is hé a hainm i lLeith chém Chuind. [209 b]

68 Cethracha bláadan co mbáig,
 mbúadai lan riaglach tria rím,
 a ssægul ar radarc rán,
 co ruc féin a mæc do'n ríg.

69 Ro rathaig Mac Namat náir,
 fer ro siacht Fánat na fian,
 a ben fuair adba co n-uáil
 [do] feiss tiar ra Dagda ndían.

70 Debthaigis Dagda, nar diúit,
 ri (luas) for serc-maig na sét,
 atbert ria Mac Namat nair,
 u . . . [ferr (?)] de baíg mbréc.

71 "Bendacht fort!" ar in ben buán,
 ni ba suail na . . .
 " . . . bersa at gaire mo lam
 . . . feoire fir

68 b, This verse is out of order : the m of mbúadai may be meant to expunct, riaglach should probably be riagal (: bliadan) : rím fcs. run. 70, 71, 72, The upper margin of MS here illeg. ; fir in 71 is the rhyme of the verse, as the alliteration with Ferdait shows ; similarly dis of 72, which must be dis (? dí) after the long vowels of siú and bréic.

72 Ferdait topair Segsa siu

cach oen teit chuci ra breíc
ni cumma tic is téig dis.

73 Deogmaire oc dail usci uair
in topair, chuisicle (*nach crúaid*)
cethrur dóib ar foendel fóir
ni thiagat (*re hoenben uáid*).

74 Ricob cosin Seghaiss suairc,
d'fis mo genais as cach geis :
ticub 'na thuathbel fó thrí,
in topair bi buan can breis."

75 Bruchtais chucci in topor trén—
is é scel na foccul fir—
rap' aithrech r'a gruad in gáir,
uair na fuair 'sin dáil a (dín).

76 Dolluid for teiched co tend
sruth coa feithem dar cach fónd
ni fríth [scél] di'n mnai gil grind
co roacht Lind Meicc Lir na long.

77 Ra len a hainm tend di'n tsruth,
[in] ceín bess bend ar in bith,
Boand ainm ind usci eím
cach conar [co] reim na rith.

78 Sægul mná Nechtain co nnirt,
Cinæd ro chertaig co cert
æs na mna, cialla co tacht,
cóic bliádna di i curp cóic secht. S.

73, *The words in italics represent a guess at the original.*

short of one syllable as it stands in the MS : I suggest scél.

missing in MS.

76 c, *The verse is*

77 d, One syll.

78, The repetition of the age of Boand in this verse (from verse 68) is a roundabout way of saying that she bore a son to the Dagda in the same year as that in which she died. The mention of Cinæd's name confirms the ascription at the head of the poem.

TRANSLATION

CINÁED ÚA HARTACÁIN CECINIT

1 The seven *o. f. n.*¹ [?] it casts me not into grief or anxiety : a race that does not make comparison trivial [?], I will compose them a mighty song of their King.

2 I will bring [?] a ballad of noble verses unto the cold-walled confines of Leth Cuind ; it shall not be with proclamation of a treacherous foray, unto the stronghold of the Dagda's son.

3 I will go forth to the house of Mac Ind Óc, the spot on which I have set my heart : a mansion truly renowned, extending amply across Mag Í yonder.

4 Ten score, an hundred score of nobles, a following free and unemulous around their king, the lord who owns it found before him : that is his numerous host yonder northward in the *Síd*.

5 That land, where now dwell the warriors of Fál, thence Mac Ócán of renown bears off the triumph of each year² : noble of a truth was the demesne, which he obtained.

6 The man whose territory is the wave-splashed Brug, the yellow-haired son of Banba's king, unto his house cometh the surface of the flood.

7 By God, who hath directed every poetic company, there shall not be in his stirring lay a kinless stanza lacking in rhyme : in my song of the king of Fíacc's Pool.

8 Every true poet knoweth of the Feast of Óengus' House, whereat is no betraying murmur of lips, but meat, and wine, and bathing.

9 The house where bides the king of the many-coloured Brug, unreserved is mine esteem of it : an household of folk without reproach : unquestionably seven times glorious.

¹ I cannot find any indication as to what *o. f. n.* means.

² An Óengus mac Ócán is mentioned Ann. Ult. 956.

10 Poets of pleasant Ireland, if any of ye should demand it of me : know ye the trick whereby Óengus obtained the Brug in perpetuity ?

11 The mansion where the Dagda, who lacked not cunning, dwelt, ay and the possessions that were Fíacc's ; what then caused it, that Óengus came by the white Brug ?

12 Bóänd, wife of fierce Nechtan, came without sorrow thither, to the house of Elcmaire of the steeds, he who gave his judgments from the Brug.

13 Bóänd fair of bloom from the Brí was at the Brug, in her own brother's dwelling,¹ when the Dagda cast eyes on her, and was seized by desire for her.

14 Thrice sent the stern Dagda to whom all Banba belonged, and besought proud Elcmaire for the lady who was in his northern dwelling.

15 Pleasantly spake her brother to fair and slender Bóänd of the *Sídh* : 'Long or short be thy stay here, I will stay at leisure in mine abode' [?].

16 The three druids of the noble Dagda² return across Ath Gabla's grey river, to tell the king how he might meet [?] the fair and lovely lady.

17 'Send thou the strong Elcmaire,' quoth the keen soft-voiced druid, 'to go a journey from his house ; then lie thou with the woman.'

18 The Dagda answered angrily : 'Let Elcmaire be sent, 'twill be a fierce triumph ! he will not be to his knowledge a pleasant night absent from his stronghold at our bidding (?).'

19 'Send thou him forth upon the level road; though he raise neither cess nor tribute, let him be nine months abroad.'

20 'For I will keep the sun in the lofty ridge of the heavens till the end of nine months ripening the strong grass.'

21 Elcmaire of the fords was summoned, for he was envoy to the peoples : the king said to him : 'Go speedily on an errand for me !'

22 'Loth am I to go on thy hest into the country : this I conceal not, O Chief who controlllest territories : for since my sister is come from the south, I cannot win gain nor pleasure.'

¹ *i.e.* Elcmaire, in whose house she was, was her brother.

² *sc.* Whom he had sent to demand her of Elcmaire (as verse 14).

23 'Thine errand is to go into the country,' answered he who held the feasting of Fál: 'Sleep not at night abroad, till thou reach the white Brug.'¹

24 'If he has accepted thy mission,' spoke the druid softly, 'let entertainment deftly prepared await him in the house to which he goes.'

25 'When he reaches the silent [?] echoing house, let strong new ale be poured out for him: let him be summoned to prove the good faith of the deeds (*sc.* the errand) if he will but arrive at the king's house.'

26 'Tell me thy proud message,' quoth the swift-footed chief from the hillside.² 'Wilt thou go when day comes to seek me a stainless wife?'

27 Elcmaire of the strong Brug answered: 'If I can go with thy message, tell me, O king chaste and without guile, of whom wouldest thou seek a fair woman?'

28 'Seek me a woman wise and strong, who can watch over my northern household, from the king of cool Mag Inis,³ what time thou hast sought him out in his *std*-dwelling.'

29 Elcmaire rises and fares eastward, as an envoy with his hest: when he reached the king's dwelling, mead and wine were poured out for him.

30 For such time as the fair hero stayed at his ale without wrongful tarrying, the Dagda lay with his sister, heeding not point of honour, nor deed of war.

31 The strong hospitaller girds himself, and turns homeward across the hills, till the completion of nine months, when the sun at last went down.

32 As he approached the yellow stronghold of the Brug, seeing that none came to meet him, and that a strange ripeness was across the fields, he resented what had been done to him.

33 For the keen Elcmaire marked how upon the lofty mountain beyond him, the bloom of all the flowers had changed, by the time he reached the Brug.

34 'Ay,' said Bóand of the strong Brug to the tall king of

¹ *I.e.*, the message would not take him so far, but that he might return to the Brug before nightfall.

² This seems to mean Elcmaire, and the next words "Wilt thou go," etc., are clearly spoken by the Dagda.

³ The prose gives his name: Bres mac Elathan.

Ross: 'the quern of the strong hills¹ will find me out, and he will burn me head and foot.'

35 'Hide thy fault and I will conceal it,' answered the *Dagda*, 'deny it and I will do the same: 'twere ill that thine unfaithfulness should be cast up to thy face.'

36 Birthpangs seize the woman in that strong hill-fortress in the north: on a site of bright auspice, she brought forth a goodly son.

37 She spoke: 'Since I yielded to happiness,² he is my sole valour (*sen-gus*): but so long as earth is strong, I shall not bring him with me to my house.'

38 'Young (*óic*) is the child (*in mac*),' answered the swart *Dagda*, 'who sets his foot on Banba's soil: *Óengus in Mac Óic*, let him be called, whosoever would call him a pleasant name.'

39 Then fear came upon them over the grey estuary, as the warrior *Elcmaire* came home to his *liss*: they parted before him to south and north, and left the child³ unknown upon the cold plain.

40 It chanced that crafty Midir was at hand in his *síd*-mansion by the wayside; he brought the child home to his dwelling, where he grew to strength and fame.

41 Seven years dwelt he in the Brí, and trod that land of warriors: he thought that it was his father who had fostered him, and that he was son of the woman there.

42 Lads had Midir with him, a merry bright-haired troop: he was wont to have about him, as he feasted in his soldier's house, this little childish company.

43 One day as they held (?) deedfully their sports upon the ample lawn of the *liss*, they spoke with rash malice to fair and active Óengus.

44 'Though the kindly Midir has cherished thee here after the manner of sons of kings, thy race and parentage are unknown, although thou hast been reared yonder in the *síd*.'

45 Bitter to the upright and noble boy, what was said to him in the hospitable *síd*-dwelling, 'Thine origin and its value is not known,' quoth the noble lads therein.

46 The boy goes from them homewards: his noble mantle

¹ *I.e.* Elcmaire.

² *I.e.* since she yielded to the *Dagda*.

³ Lit. 'him.'

was a burden to him: presently he proclaims his grief loudly through the house.¹

47 'Let us hear this cause, a bitter truth, with which thou imprudently reproachest me: come, lad!' spoke Midir to him, 'tell me wherein is thy grief.'

48 'Since it has cast thee into pain and sorrow,' said Óengus, 'I shall tell thee: I know not my race to proclaim it, that truly grieves me.'

49 'I will tell thee eagerly what intrigues thee: behold Ireland from the east unto the west, her king is thy father, nor small his renown abroad.'

50 'I will go with thee on thy road,' quoth stately Midir, 'that thou mayest be stablished safely: that I may leave thee in a fitting mansion in the keen Dagda's house at the feast.'

51 'I shall bring ale and food to the stronghold, where bides the hero, great and noble: what time his copious ale is prepared, I shall make known² to him his fair and noble son.'

52 'Lad,' spoke Midir of the mead-cups, 'poets will praise thee at the feast; and if he will grant thee a royal boon, what shall we ask for our ale-feast?'

53 'Be this the plan right purposeful—for not scant is our claim on his possessions—if the grim Dagda would grant a boon, ask boldly for his own fortress!'

54 The brilliant feast is held: noble it was upon Mag Breg of the kine: the king's household assembled full many throughout the day.

55 Famed warriors of Banba, they came to the strong Dagda's dwelling; all that found not room in the *dún* bided without at the walls.

56 'A lad have I,' quoth courteous Midir, 'whom I have brought safely with me all the way: a son whom we have fostered in our *slád* for the king of the fair Isle of Fál.'

57 Then spoke the stern Dagda, he who held unsorrowing Banba: 'O Midir of the plain of diadems, what seekest thou for thine ample ale-feast?'

58 'When the ale-feast of the warriors is made ready,' answered Midir, 'I conceal not, O fairhaired King of poets, that I shall not claim thy cattle, but I will accept thy Brug in perpetuity.'

¹ Lit. 'when he had been a while in the house.'

² Lit. 'show.'

59 'Seek not heedlessly for my Brug: I will not have it laid under tribute: nay, man, I shall not grant it to thee for all that is beneath the sky.'

60 'Then, though thou grant no more, for thou art sovereign across every highway; a day and night's loan without fail of the house wherein thou stayest.'

61 'Give me thy bonds, O prince of Rí, thou who wieldest an accustomed spear, swear to me by moon and sun, as all true men must swear according to cause.'

62 The Dagda vacated his mansion: 'twas a compromise without value: Óengus and pleasant Midir had overreached the king.

63 Ere the third day was come, the chieftain returned to them, and even before help could come unto them (?), the hero ordered them forth forever.

64 'Sire,' quoth Midir proudly, 'if thou wouldest permit our rightful compact; King of just purposes, night and day are not yet ended.'

65 In this wise was the Dagda cozened of the fruitful (?) lands of his right: it cast him into sevenfold grief, lest any should divine his secret.

66 Historians of the wide world, O famed and glorious company: relate to me of the mother of Mac Ind Óc, and under what sod she lies.

67 I will make known to ye in measured verse, for I am learned by plain and wave: Bóänd pleasant spouse of Nechtan, that is her name in lovely Leth Cuind.

68 Forty years¹ her age, a glorious vision, until she bore the king his son.

69 Stately Námu's son, he who had reached Fánat of the warriors, perceived that his lady who held his proud residence, had lain there with the swift Dagda.

70 As the Dagda, not lacking in cunning hastened across the withered plain of the roads, stately Námu's son said to her 'twould profit her little² to make lying protest.

¹ Line *b* of v. 68 corrupt. Cf. v. 77: the emphasis on Bóänd's age is a clumsy way of saying that she died in the same year as she gave birth to Oengus: this perhaps to account for the omission of the tale in the saga: cf. Introd., *supra*.

² In part illeg.: italicized words to supply the sense.

71 'A blessing upon thee,' quoth the lady, 'it will not be hard' . . .¹

72 'Yonder rise the springs of Segais whosoever approaches them with a lie, goes not from them in like guise' . . .²

73 'There the cupbearers dispense the cold water of the well, no arduous tale is this, the four of them pace round, guarding it' . . .³

74 'I will make my way to the pleasing Segais to prove my chastity beyond doubt; thrice shall I walk widdershins around the living water, inviolate!'⁴

75 But the dire well burst forth towards her—true is my tale: with a cry she lamented her dishonour,⁵ when she found not protection in her undertaking.

76 Fast fled she, and the stream pursued her across the land: nor was more seen of the lovely lady, till she reached the sea.⁶

77 And the stream keeps fast her name, for as long as the hills shall stand: Bóänd is the swift water's name by every reach in its flowing course.

78 The period of mighty Nechtan's spouse, Cináed hath rightly established it: the woman's age, until (the river) extinguished her life, in this body she was five years and five times seven.

¹ Illeg. Bóänd evidently protests her innocence, and offers to put it to proof. See Notes.

² Illeg. Bóänd offers to go to the Segais, and speaks of its powers.

³ Partly illegible. *cuisicle* from *com-scèle, W. *cychwedl*, 'great talę' (K. M.).

⁴ as *cach geis*: *lit.* 'above every gess,' *i.e.* as greatest proof.

⁵ *Lit.* 'repentant for her honour the shout.'

⁶ *Lit.* 'the shipful pool of (Manannán) Mac Lir.'

NOTES

These notes are meant to catalogue, and as far as possible to the editor, to explain, passages which have presented difficulty in translation.

(The numbers refer to the verse ; the letters *a*, *b*, *c*, *d*, to the lines of each verse.)

Verse 1 *a* I cannot discover what were the seven ‘*o. f. n.*’ which ‘cast not into grief’ : nor why *-thabair* is not plural. *b snéid* (: *féin*) ‘minute.’

2 *a Dóra* : or this is perhaps, if the accent should be on *-ra*, fut. of *doroichim* ‘reach,’ perh. here in the sense of ‘convey.’ Cf. *Mad hi Tuadmuman dosroë* *ÉRIU* VI, 1. : *ra-duain* rhymes to *clad-udair*.

3 *d Mag nÍ* ; I cannot find this name in the *Onomasticon*.

11 *b Adma* I take to stand for *aidmi*, to give a rhyme to *Dagda*.

11 *d* (and 24 *c*) *cen bréic* cheville, ‘without falsehood.’

7 *a Tírech* a special class of metres (in the *Verslehren*). *Rind éctinne*: *éctland* is ‘an outcast, a kinless man,’ hence (of a stanza) without its proper links of rhyme.

13 *d* The form *zaragaib* stands for O. Ir. *condidragaib* : *mian* is missed out in the MS., but both rhyme and alliteration demand its insertion.

15 *b Snáthglain* (: *brdthair*), lit. ‘bright as a thread (of silk ?).’

15 *c Fot gairde* literally ‘length of shortness’ (recurs v. 30 and v. 37) : hence ‘long or short a time’ . . . (adverbially) ‘as long as.’

15 *d Im thoss*, perh. read *im soss* (cf Windisch s. v.) to alliterate with *im sítid* which seems to mean ‘in my peace,’ ‘at my leisure.’ Compare the modern slang: ‘na sháimhín shuilt.

16 *b Áth Gabla* a ford north of Knowth in County Meath.

16 *d* This line perhaps corresponds to ‘Arroét in ben do’n Dagda, acht munbo úaman Elcmair’ of the second sentence in the prose.

17 *d Gil grind* ‘bright and merry,’ inserted *metri gr.*

18 *d D'ar ldim*, lit ‘at our hand,’ hence (?) ‘to our convenience,’ or ‘at our command.’

19 *b* Cheville, ‘Perchance the deceit will not be difficult.’

21 *c Co réil*, lit. ‘brightly’ : rhyming with *léir* ‘diligent.’

22 *d* Literally ‘I cannot get advantage or feasting,’ i.e., I cannot do your need, nor attend to my own pleasure ; *fétain* from *adcta*.

25 *a Tó* ‘schweigend’ Windisch (?).

25 *c D'fhiß gessi* : this seems to mean ‘to put to proof the good faith of the bidding’ ; cf. *d'fiss mo genais as each geis* in v. 74 which certainly means ‘to prove my chastity by the strongest of evidence’ (lit. ‘above every evidence’ : on this idiom see Pokorny *ZCP*. IX, 337) : *d'fiss* is used in sense of ‘to prove.’

27 *a Riss* seems to refer to *aithesc*. Line *d fora-cuinni* for *fora-cuintgi* 2nd pers. sg. of *cuintgim*.

28 *c Síd* must end with a slender consonant to rhyme to *ríg* (dsg.).

28 *d Mag Inis* in County Down (Onom.).

32 *c Co ngeis*, lit. ‘with prohibition,’ hence ‘against custom, unusual.’

33 *b Etlaide*, literally ‘fearful’ : adj. to *etla* ‘fear’ (Féliре).

35 *c, d* Lit. ‘for reason of what thou hast committed (in the way) of adultery, an insult to thy fair face were wanton,’ *Gnúis* metaph. in the sense of ‘honour’ : so *enech, gríad*.

36 a (also 33 d) *Buáin* metr. gr. ‘lasting, strong.’41 a ‘*Sin Bri*, i.e. *Sid Breg Léith*, Midir’s fairy dwelling.43 b *Argur*?44 b *Messair*, ‘standard, measure,’ Lat. *mensura*. This line is one syllable short in the MS.45 b *Ebras* seems to be a peculiar *s*-form of *ébrad*: *t[h]oich* is not a perfect alliteration to *síd*, but is probably sound. *Sid* rhymes to *mín*.46 b I take *aire* to be a spelling (another ex. in Windisch *s.v.*) of *eire* ‘burden’: the MS reading is obscure, but *bratt* must be the word meaning ‘cloak’ (with unvoiced dental), as it rhymes to *macc*.47 a *Tacram*, lit. ‘let us discuss’.48 c *Béim*, lit. ‘to strike’; cf. *béim forais*.49 b *Do dlwig*, lit. ‘thy deceit,’ hence, ‘what deceives, puzzles thee.’50 b *Corop slán seiss*, lit. ‘that thou mayst be seated safe’: prob. recalled from the opening line of Orthanach’s fine poem ‘*Slán seiss, a Brigit co mbuáid*,’ (ed. Kuno Meyer, ‘*Hail Brigit*’): *seiss* 2sg. subj. of *saidimm*.53 b This line is too long by a syllable, and I omit the first *ar*, which probably crept in from the *ar selb*. Lit. ‘Since the tidings (i.e. claim) of our possessions are not trifling.’59 b *A chur fo chis*, lit. ‘its putting under tribute,’ hence ‘put in dependence’: *fo nim anis*, lit. ‘under heaven downwards.’62 b Lit. ‘It was an intention without profit to anyone’: line *d rucsat in ráen* = Mod. Ir. ‘rug siad buaith air.’63 c *Na tú* (: *riú*) (?). Line *d. Dlomain* is the regular word ‘to cast forth, to exile.’65 b *Talmga* (: *Dagda*) (?)68 b This line seems to mean: ‘Twas suitable, complete, regular to be reckoned.’ *Riaglach* rhymes with *bliadan*. Line *c*, lit. ‘her period in noble vision.’69 a This verse takes up the tale from verses 33 and 39. Námu’s son is, of course, Elcmaire her brother: in the *Dindshenchas*, her husband (cf. verse 11) is Nechtan mac Labrada.70 Partly illegible: some word of one syllable for ‘haste’ or ‘fear’ is required after *ri* in line *b*; *sercmaig* is right, as the alliteration shows. Line *d* four syllables illeg.71 There is too little left of this verse to hazard conjecture. Cf. Metr. *Dindsh.* (Todd Lect. x), p. 36, l. 41, *ib.* p. 30, l. 54.72 b Illegible: probably the line meant ‘with its secret powers of divination’: cf. Metr. *Dindsh.* l. c. p. 28, l. 45 to 50; *ibidem* p. 36, l. 43. Line *d* I am not clear what the last two words are: *teg* (? *téit*) seems to provide the necessary rhyme to *bréic*, and *dis* seems correct in giving alliteration with the first word of the next stanza.73 d *Oenben* seems to be the necessary rhyme to *foendel*: the italicized words are guesswork, as the verse is in great part illegible. It corresponds closely to the verses in the *Bóand dindshenchas* l. c. p. 36, l. 45; *ib.* p. 30, l. 50.

77 b Lit. ‘As long as there shall be a peak upon the world.’

78 c *Cialla*, etc.: lit. ‘till it numbed her senses,’ i.e. drowned her.

ON A LINE IN PATRICK'S HYMN

THE concluding phrase in the first strophe of Patrick's Hymn has, it seems, been curiously misunderstood by every editor and translator. O'Donovan's edition (Petrie's "Tara Hill," *R.I.A. Tr.* xviii, p. 57) has the reading *in dulemain dail*, rendered 'of the God of the Elements'. O'Beirne Crowe (*Kilk. Arch. Journ.* 1869, pp. 294-5) renders *in Dúlemain dál* by 'in the Elementer of Elementation', explaining *dál* as = *dúil*, gen. of *dúil*. In Todd's *St. Patrick*, p. 426, the line is rendered 'Creator of the elements'. In *Goidelica*, p. 150, and *Tripl. Life* i, p. 48, the reading is *indulemain dail*, rendered 'in the Creator of the universe'. This rendering is also followed in the edition in the *Scottish Celtic Review* i, 1885. Atkinson, *Liber Hymnorum* i, p. 234, suggests, with a query, 'in Doom's creator', and remarks that 'the last word *dail* is quite undetermined'. In *Thes. ii.* the editors read *in duleman dail*, with the rendering 'of the Creator of creation (?)', while Dr. Kuno Meyer, in his *Ancient Irish Poetry*, p. 25, reproduces this rendering with the query omitted. In each of these renderings it is assumed that *dál* is the gen. of a word signifying 'creation' or 'universe'. This occurrence of the -o-stem **dål* is apparently unique. Certainly no parallel examples have been adduced. Neither does anything appear to sustain the theory that *dúil* could give a gen. *dál*. A simple explanation of the line, satisfactory to sense, and involving no abnormal assumptions, is to read *i ndúleman dál*, = *i ndáil duleman*, 'with' or 'towards (the) Creator'. Such inversions are common in archaic Irish verse; *i nEchdromma dairiu*, 'in Echdrum's oakwood', Fél. May 7, is a typical example. Further instances will be found in *RC. v*, 350-1. It may be objected that this would be the sole instance of such inversion in the hymn, and that there is no metrical requirement for inversion, but until decisive examples of **dål*, 'creation' are forthcoming this explanation appears the most likely.

ELEANOR KNOTT

THE LAMENT OF THE NUN OF BEARE

DR. MEYER has published the text and translation of this poem in *Otia Merseiana* i. 119 ff., and the translation in his *Ancient Irish Poetry* pp. 88-91. 'On account of the unique character of the poem I think it worth while to print another copy, unfortunately incomplete, which I have found in a vellum MS. in Trinity College. The only important variant is in the first line, where the introduction of *cen*, though it spoils the metre,¹ improves the sense from the prosaic point of view—'ebb-tide to me *unlike* that of the sea': for *her* there is no flood to follow. I have numbered the quatrains to correspond with the edition of *Otia Merseiana*.

(H. 4. 22 p. 44)

1. Aithbi dams¹ cen bes mara
santu fomdera croan
tuirsi oca cia donéo
sona dotaet a loan.
2. Is me Caillech Bérra Bhuí
domheilinn léine mbithnuí
indíu tatham dom seime
ni mheilinn gid aithléine.
3. It maíne
carthar lib nídat daine
sinne inbaidh marsamni
batar doeine carsamni.
4. Batar inmaine doíne
ata maighi ²mariaam
ba maith nomeilmís leo
ba bec nomraithmis iarum.
5. Aniu tra gan tiumgaradh
7 ni mor nach deathad
ciasa becc donighnaigheadh
as mor a meid nomraithet.

¹ Read perhaps *dam* for *damsa*.

² Before this a letter has been erased.

6. Carpaít luáith
7 eich noberdís búaidh
robuí deanus tuile dib
bennacht ar a rígh dodahuaidh.
7. Tocair mo corp co nece
dochum aidbiu dia raichme
tan bus mithigh la Mac nDe
doté do breith a aichne.
8. It é cnamacha caela
o dechtur mo lámha
ba hinmain tan dognitis
bidis um righaib rána.
9. On ló dechtur mo lama
it é cnamacha caela
nídat fiu turcbail taca
suas tar maca cáema.
11. Ni feraim cobhra mhilis
ní marbtur muilt dom banais
is bec is liath mo trilis
ní liach drochcaille thairis.
12. Ní holc lim
cia beth caille finn forma chinn
bói mórr methar cach datha
form chinn ic ól deghflatha.
27. Trí tuile
ticdís co dún Airde Ruidhe
tuilei iach is tuile each
tuile milchon *Meic Luigheach*.
23. Rombói denus la ríghu
ic ol mhedha 7 fína
andíu ibhim medhagusce¹
iter.²

OSBORN BERGIN

¹ MS. *medgh us*.² *iter* ends the line in the MS. The next line is blank; then follows *Luidh fer innemain, &c.*, printed p. 242.

THE DEATH OF CONCHOBAR'S SONS

(H. 4. 22 p. 45)

LUIDH fer inn-Emain Maoachaei do milroth. Maoarbaais .iii.
 pait. Louidh dia n-imfouine for bróu cairrce. *Amail*
 ruobaouéi ann co cualaigh an gouth. Asbert ries don cairrc
 inda¹ rounna sou:

Robdar saera robdur sruithi
 nibdar caera ar seichi
 robat luatha i n-Emain Maithe
 na tri flatha ithe.

Robdor caema robdur calma
 robdur saera solma
 robdur cathaide cach fedma
 ba fathaide b-na.

Robdur imda a sluaigh i n-Eamain
 robdur mora a muirir
 robadh righdamna gin meabail
 ba firdamna ruirigh.

Is truag a ndernais a duine ar in guth .i. tri mic Concobair
 mic Neassa robadur ann sin .i. Cormac *Conluinges* mac Concobair 7
 Cairpri mac Concobuir 7 Cusgraith Meand Macha mac Concobuir
 7 dodeachadur isin sith naceile a richtuib tri mil maighi, 7 issiat
 sin romarbais ar in guth. Graineass in sealgaire 7 luigh ass ar
 fagbail a fiadaidh.—**FINIT.**

¹ d. before which a letter has been erased in Ms.

TRANSLATION

A MAN went hunting in Emain Macha. He killed three hares. He went to cook them on the brink of a rock. As he was there he heard a voice, which said to him from the rock these quatrains :

They were noble, they were venerable,
they were not berries on a hide,¹
they were swift in Emain Macha,
the three princes.

They were comely, they were bold,
they were noble and agile,
they were fighters fit for every service,

• • •

Many were their hosts in Emain,
great were their households,
they were royal heirs without deceit
they were the true material of princes.

'Pitiful is what thou hast done, O man,' said the voice.
'The three sons of Conchobar mac Nessa were there, Cormac Conluinges son of Conchobar and Cairpre son of Conchobar and Cuscraig Mend Macha son of Conchobar, and they had come to the *sid* . . . in the form of three hares, and it is they whom thou hast killed,' said the voice. The hunter was horror-stricken, and he went away leaving his game.

OSBORN BERGIN

¹ Cf. *caera for gaimen*, Aisl. Meic. C. p. 73, 21.

WHAT BROUGHT THE SAXONS TO IRELAND

(H. 4. 22 p. 181a)

HUA ANDOCC 7 Hua Cellchin Cille Mori, Hua Sluaisti 6-
Chuil O Sluaiste, Hua Glesain, is iad sin rogadsad eich 7
muil 7 asain in chardinail tainic o Roim cu tñr nEirenn dia
foirceadal i n-aimsir Domnaill Moir Hi Briain righ Mumhan.
Coni[d] de sin rorecustar comorbu Pedair cis 7 dliged Erenn
fri Saxanaib. Conidh he sin cert 7 dliged lenaid Saxain for
Ghaoidhelaibh iniu. Ar ba cu comorbu Peaduir go Roimh
teghedh cis 7 dliged Erenn cosin 7 *reliqua*.

TRANSLATION

UA ANDOCC and Ua Cellchin of Cell Mór, Ua Sluaisti of
Cúil O Sluaisti, Ua Glesáin, they it was who stole the horses
and mules and asses of the cardinal who came from Rome
to Ireland to instruct them in the time of Domnall Mór O Briain,
king of Munster. That is why the successor of Peter sold
the tax and tribute of Ireland to the Saxons. And this is
the right and the claim that the Saxons follow to-day upon
the Gaels. For until then the tax and tribute of Ireland used
to go to the successor of Peter in Rome, etc.

REPORT

SESSION 1913

THE Annual Summer Course of Lectures in 1913 was given by Professor Holger Pedersen of Copenhagen, the subject being, "The History of the Celtic Verb." The Lectures were of the profoundest interest, embracing the history of the forms and pre-verbal particles, their syntactical usage, and the development of meanings. A summary of some of the important points discussed will be published by Professor Pedersen in ÉRIU. Nineteen students followed the Course, several being well-known Irish scholars, some coming from England, Scotland, and the Continent specially to attend.

The Governors and Trustees desire here to express their appreciation and thanks to Professor Pedersen, who, though actively engaged in completing and seeing through the press the final part of his Comparative Grammar of the Celtic Languages, fulfilled, at no small inconvenience, his promise to lecture in the School.

M. Joseph Loth, Professor of Celtic in the Collège de France, honoured the School by a visit during the summer, and was present at some of Professor Pedersen's lectures.

In addition to ÉRIU there was issued during the year Professor Kuno Meyer's inaugural lecture of 1912, "Learning in Ireland in the Fifth Century and the Transmission of Letters."

Two new works are in course of preparation: one a new edition of *Emanuel*, by Florence Conry, Archbishop of Tuam, printed at Louvain in 1616, which is being undertaken by Mr. T. F. O'Rahilly, editor of "Gadelica." The other, *Scathán Shacraminte na hAithridhe*, by Aodh Mac Aingil, Archbishop of Armagh, printed also at Louvain in 1618, to

be edited by Professor Osborn Bergin. Both these works, published by masters of the language in the early seventeenth century, are now so rare as to be almost inaccessible: only a few copies of the former are known. They have consequently never been the subject of linguistic study or investigation. The editions projected will contain grammatical introductions, notes, and glossaries of the rarer words. It is believed that they will contribute to a more exact knowledge of Irish prose at this most important period, known hitherto principally by the writings of Keating, transmitted indirectly in manuscripts.

The Governors have pleasure in announcing that Professor Osborn Bergin has most kindly consented to give the Summer Course in 1914. He will lecture on Early Modern Irish, particularly the poetry of the Bardic Schools.

The Governors and Trustees beg to renew their grateful thanks to Mr. Thomas Kelly, of New York, for his continued generosity in providing the School with its present rooms; also to acknowledge with thanks the following donations to the general funds:—Mr. E. W. Digby, M.A., £4 4s. ; Captain Bryan J. Jones, West Leinster Regiment, £3 ; Mr. E. J. Gwynn, F.T.C.D., £2 2s. ; Miss Eleanor Hull, £2 ; Mr. Owen O'Byrne, £1. A list of previous donations has been printed in volume V.

SUBSCRIBERS TO ÉRIU THROUGH THE SCHOOL OF IRISH LEARNING

E. G. Allen & Son, Ltd.
E. C. R. Armstrong, F.S.A.
Asher & Co., London.
Rev. R. Aylward.
Josef Baudis, Ph.D.
R. I. Best.
Mrs. M. M. Banks.
Berlin University.
John Bartholomew.
J. I. Beare, F.T.C.D., Ed. of *Hermathena*.
F. J. Bigger.
C. S. Boswell.
The Hon. Miss Brodrick.
Prof. A. C. L. Brown.
Michael Brophy.
Mícheál Ó Buachalla, M.I.C.E.I.
Mathew J. Byrne.
Rev. George Calder, B.D.
Cardiff Central Library.
Rev. Anthony Clancy, P.P.
Clongowes Wood College.
John Conaghan.
Cornish & Co.
Rt. Hon. Michael F. Cox, P.C.
Edmund Curtis, M.A.
John P. Dalton.
Deighton, Bell & Co., Cambridge.
The Countess Dowager of Desart.
E. R. McC. Dix.
Henry Dixon.
P. Donnellan.
Miss M. Dobbs.
The Earl of Dunraven.
R. Flower.
John Fraser, M.A.
A. Martin Freeman.
O. H. Fynes-Clinton.
Henri Gaidoz.
James S. Gaffney.
Joseph Garrity, Philadelphia.
Edward Garnett.
Lt.-Col. J. S. Green, R.A.M.C.
Lucius Gwynn.
J. D. Hackett.
Most Rev. Dr. Healy, Archbishop of
Tuam.
Heidelberg University.
Miss Eleanor Hull.
Mrs. M. A. Hutton.
H. B. Jennings, M.A.
I. R. B. Jennings.
Capt. Bryan J. Jones.
H. T. Havard Jones.
The late P. W. Joyce, LL.D.
Miss Maud Joynt.
Rev. Andrew Kelleher, B.D.
A. H. Leahy, M.A.
James F. Kenny, Toronto.
Limerick Free Library.
Liverpool University Library.
London Library, The.
Prof. R. A. S. Macalister, F.S.A.
Anthony MacBride.
Rev. James Mac Caffrey, Ph.D.
H. F. Mac Clintock.
Rev. J. Mac Dermott.
Dr. S. P. Mac Énri.
Andrew A. Mac Erlean, New York.
P. T. M'Ginley.
Prof. D. Mackinnon, M.A.
R. C. Mac Lagan.
J. Maclehoose & Sons.
G. U. Mac Namara.
Rev. Fr. Rector Mac Namara.
Prof. Eoin Mac Neill.
James Mc Neill, I.C.S., Bombay.
E. G. Mac Sweeny, M.D.
W. H. Mahony.
W. Erskine Mayne.
Mitchell Library, Glasgow.
Joseph Mintern.
M. T. Moloney, Illinois.
Norman Moore, M.D.
P. Morris.

LIST OF SUBSCRIBERS

Henry Murphy.
 Rev. Prof. J. E. H. Murphy.
 J. J. F. Murphy.
 Newberry Library, Chicago.
 Newcastle-on-Tyne Public Library.
 New York Public Library.
 Rev. Prof. Gerald Nolan.
 Pierce L. Nolan.
 J. D. Noonan.
 William O'Brien, M.A.
 Owen O'Byrne.
 Joseph O'Carroll, M.D.
 Seaghan Ó Conaill.
 Tadhg Ó Donnchadha.
 Kevin E. O'Duffy.
 Prof. Tomás Ó Máille, M.A., Ph.D.
 The O'Morchoe.
 Joseph O'Neill, M.A.
 T. F. O'Rahilly.
 Rev. Thos. A. O'Reilly, O.F.M.
 Rev. Andrew O'Rourke.
 M. O'Sullivan.
 Parker & Son, Oxford.
 Julius Pokorny, Ph.D.
 Rev. P. Power, M.R.I.A.
 John Purcell, M.A.
 Queen's University Library, Belfast.
 John Quinn.
 Rennes University.
 Sir John Rhys.
 W. J. Robertson.
 Prof. F. N. Robinson.
 T. W. Rolleston, M.A.
 Ignatius J. Rice.
 Royal Library, Stockholm.
 St. Benedict's Abbey, Fort Augustus.
 Miss A. M. Scarre.
 Rt. Rev. Richard Scannell, Nebraska.
 George Sigerson, M.D.
 Simpkin, Marshall, & Co.
 Slatter & Rose, Oxford.
 G. E. Stechert & Co.
 B. F. Stevens & Brown.
 Swansea Public Library.
 Prof. R. Ellis Thompson.
 University College, Cork.
 University College of Wales, Aberystwyth.
 Rev. Thomas Wall, C.C., Ph.D.
 University College, London.
 University College, Cork.
 A. G. Van Hamel, Ph.D.
 Rev. Richard Walsh, C.C.
 Miss Mary Rh. Williams, D. ès Lettres.
 Williams & Norgate, London.
 Sir B. C. A. Windle, D.Sc., F.R.S.
 C. T. Hagberg Wright, LL.D.
 D. Wylie & Son, Aberdeen.
 H. Young & Son.
 The Rt. Hon. Robert Young, J.P.
 Miss A. F. Yule.

