

THE *PATER NOSTER* IN IRISH:
THE PRE-REFORMATION PERIOD¹

1. INTRODUCTION

Some years ago Professor Brian Ó Cuív published an article entitled 'Some versions of the sixth petition in the *Pater noster*' in *Studia Celtica* 14–15 (1979–80) 212–22, in which he placed a number of quite widely different Irish translations of that petition in the context of translations into the other Celtic languages and into other European languages and of the Latin and Greek versions. He provided interesting comparisons (and indeed contrasts) between versions in the different languages, while also referring to the influence that one version may have had on another. More than twenty years ago he had set me to study the Irish versions of the familiar prayers (*Pater*, *Ave* and *Creed*). The approach I took was rather more linear than that in his article, concentrating on the influence that versions in other languages and earlier versions in Irish, and also other factors, might have had on new Irish versions as they made their appearance. Over the intervening years I have continued to collect evidence, particularly in relation to the *Pater*, but, in presenting this study, I do not propose to alter my approach because the factors which may influence the coming into existence of a version of the *Pater* are so many and so complex that to attempt a minute comparative/contrastive analysis of the complete text of the prayer would have the effect of inflating this study to unacceptable proportions.

Such factors would include considerations such as the following:

1. The *Pater* is an extremely ancient prayer, indeed it is as old as Christianity itself.
2. It is held in great reverence by Christians, its composition being attributed to Jesus Christ himself by two of the synoptic evangelists, Matthew and Luke.
3. The text of the *Pater* exists in various modes, viz., not only as part of the text of the Gospels of Matthew and Luke, but also as part of extended liturgical texts such as that of the Mass, and further independently for private or public recitation.
4. The texts of the *Pater* in Matthew and Luke differ considerably from each other.
5. Versions of the *Pater* occur in commentaries on those Gospels and in commentaries and sermons on the prayer itself.
6. Versions of the *Pater* in all languages, including Latin, derive ultimately from the original Greek text of the New Testament.

¹This is the first of a sequence of essays, the second of which is to appear in *Celtica* 22. My thanks are due to my colleagues, Liam Breatnach, Damian McManus and Joseph Pheifer, who discussed aspects of this paper with me, and to Dr P. J. McGoldrick, St Patrick's College, Maynooth, who provided some valuable references.

7. However, even the Greek is not the original version, but a representation, more or less heavily influenced by the experience of the early Church, of what Christ spoke in Aramaic.

8. In most countries of Western Europe down to the time of the Reformation, and in some countries, including Ireland, even more recently, the familiar prayers were commonly recited in Latin; consequently no vernacular version would necessarily acquire the status of being standard.

9. When an attempt is made to impose or cultivate a standard form of a prayer as commonly recited as the *Pater*, elements of previous versions will survive because of unconscious or conscious resistance to change.

10. The language of prayer is often marked by conservatism and does not necessarily reflect contemporary linguistic usage.

11. A copyist, even one who is normally faithful to his original, may experience great difficulty, either unconsciously or consciously, in transcribing accurately a version of the *Pater* which does not correspond to the one with which he is familiar.

12. Vernacular versions of the *Pater*, being translated, are likely to show interference with the target language on the part of the source language, particularly when the translation is less than sensitive.

13. New translations of the *Pater* into Irish are unlikely to have been free of influence from earlier versions in Irish.

Many of these factors are relevant to all translations of the *Pater*. Some others may or may not be; and it has not always proved possible in what follows to establish which, if any, of them should be taken into account in the discussion of the various Irish versions of the prayer.

2. LATIN VERSUS VERNACULAR

The evidence which suggests that Irish lay people, ignorant of Latin, recited the familiar prayers, including the *Pater*, in Latin, is fairly abundant. In any case, apart from Germany, where the official use of vernacular forms was encouraged in the fifteenth century by Cardinal Nicholas of Cues,² the *Pater* was recited in Latin by the people of all of western Europe down to the time of the Reformation, and the practice survived in many countries even after the sixteenth century. In England, however, Henry VIII after the break with Rome set out to extirpate this practice. From 1536 onwards in injunctions issued in the name of the king the clergy were directed to teach the *Pater* to the people in English. In *The manuell of prayers or the prymer in Englyshe*, compiled in 1539 by Bishop Hilsey under instructions from Thomas Cromwell, an official English version of the *Pater*, *Credo* and *Ave Maria* was published, and in the 1541 edition of this *Primer* all unofficial English versions were banned by the following ordinance:

²See H. Thurston, *Familiar prayers: their origin and history* (London 1953) 31.

. . . His Grace [the King] perceiving now the great diversity of the translations, hath willed them all to be taken up and in stead of them hath caused an uniform translation of the said *Pater Noster*, *Ave*, Creed . . . to be set forth . . . willing all his loving subjects to learn and use the same. And he straightly commandeth every parson, vicar, and curate to read and teach the same to their parishioners, and that no man imprint or set forth any other translation upon pain of His Highness' displeasure.³

Finally in 1545 the royal *Primer* was published to which was prefixed the following:

Henry VIII by the grace of God. . . . To all and singular our subjects as well Archbishops . . . priests and all others of the clergy, as also all estates and degrees of the lay fee and teachers of youth within any our realms, dominions and countries, greeting.

Among the manifold business and most weighty affairs appertaining to our regal authority and office, We, much tendering the youth of our realms, whose good education and virtuous bringing up redoundeth most highly to the honour and praise of Almighty God, for divers good considerations and specially for that the youth by divers persons are taught the *Pater Noster*, the *Ave Maria*, Creed and Ten Commandments all in Latin and not in English, by means whereof the same are not brought up in the knowledge of their faith, duty and obedience, wherein no Christian person ought to be ignorant; and for that our people and subjects which have no understanding in the Latin tongue and yet have the knowledge of reading may pray in their vulgar tongue which is to them best known, that by the mean thereof they should be the more provoked to true devotion and the better set their hearts upon those things that they pray for; and finally for avoiding the diversity of primer books that are now abroad, whereof are almost innumerable sorts, which minister occasion of contentions and vain disputations rather than to edify; and to have one order of all such books throughout all our dominions both to be taught unto children and also to be used for ordinary prayers of all our people not learned in the Latin tongue, have set forth this Primer, or book of prayers, in English to be frequented and used in and throughout all places of our said realms and dominions as well of the elder people as also of the youth for their common and ordinary prayers; willing, commanding and straightly charging that for the better bringing up of youth in the knowledge of their duty towards God, their Prince and all other in their degree, every schoolmaster and bringer up of young beginners in learning, next after their A.B.C. now by us also set forth, do teach this Primer or book of ordinary prayers unto them in English.⁴

³For this modernised version, see *ibid.*, 33.

⁴For this modernised version, see *ibid.*, 31–2.

Penalties, including heavy fines and even imprisonment, were to be imposed on those who used, or even kept, the older service books or *Primers*.⁵

This stern decree must have had a profound influence on the clergy and people of England, particularly when we remember that Henry set up a Church which was 'Catholic without the Pope', and that for the rest of his reign ordinary worshippers continued to receive as before the old sacraments and attend the Latin Mass,⁶ and that these new *Primers* were in no sense anti-Catholic. Thus the habit of saying the familiar prayers in English became established and was so entrenched by the time that Queen Mary came to power that, though the Latin liturgy was restored, no serious attempt seems to have been made to reintroduce among lay people the practice of saying the *Pater* etc. in Latin.

Henry VIII's attempt to extend the religious reform to Ireland was largely ineffectual. The Act of Supremacy was indeed passed in 1537 by the 'Reformation Parliament', but, while many bishops took the oath of Supremacy, 'it seems certain that the whole policy of a Reformation enforced from England was opposed by the vast majority of Irishmen'.⁷ The change could in any case have had little effect in Ireland, for along with it went the policy of anglicisation, and since bishops and priests were expected to use, and preach in, English, their teaching and sermons could have had little impact on a predominantly Irish-speaking populace. No serious effort to impose the reform on Ireland was made under Edward VI: the first prayer-book of his reign, that of 1549, was a Catholic one, and was sent over to be printed in Dublin; but the second (1552), which was Protestant, was not. The Acts of Supremacy and Uniformity of the beginning of Elizabeth I's reign (1559) made the Church of England and of Ireland both schismatic and heretical in the eyes of Rome. Irish Catholics' opposition to the reform could not now be placated, so that when Elizabeth gave permission to use Irish as a means of furthering Protestantism, it was too late for such a move to have any great impact. Thus for Irish Catholics, Latin as the language of worship and prayer, both public and private, was not replaced by Irish; indeed as the counter-Reformation gained momentum the use of Latin would be seen as a badge of Catholicity, and the possibility of its being abandoned would have become unthinkable.

Teabóid Gállduf (Theobald Stapleton) saw the disadvantage of the use of Latin in private prayer. When he published his *Catechismus seu Doctrina Christiana* at Brussels in 1639 he had already spent twelve

⁵The text is quoted (from *Statutes at Large*, 1549, V, 342-3) in H. Littlehales, *Pages in facsimile from a layman's prayer-book in English about 1400 A.D.* (London 1890) viii.

⁶See E. Curtis, *A history of Ireland* (London 1961) 165.

⁷*ibid.*

years ministering as a priest in Ireland,⁸ and this pastoral experience clearly informs his oft-quoted criticism of the practice: ‘. . . as mór an truaidh à liacht Erenach, na foil aca acht gaoilaig amhain, à cur chum na Paidri, na crée, & úrnuithe ele na Heagluise do radh à laidin ró bhrísti, & fós gan à fhios aca cred à deirid, acht à gogalluig amhail Pioraide, no caoge do chuirfeadh chum cainte; oir ma fhiathriann tú cred adura, ní fhoil do fhregara aca dhuit, acht aradh nach tuigid an ní derid’.⁹

Gállduf’s *Catechismus* is printed in parallel columns of Latin and Irish text, and thus gives the Latin version of the common prayers, including the *Pater*, as well as the Irish. But even Seán Ó Dubhlaioich (Dowley), whose stated aim in publishing his *Suim bhunudhasach an teaguisg chriosdaidhe a bpros agus a ndán* (Louvain 1663) was, as the title implies, to provide merely ‘eilemeinte nó cnamhshuim an teaguisg chriosdaidhe’,¹⁰ thought it useful, even necessary perhaps, to add an appendix to his work in which he gives in Latin ‘Elementa Catechismi’, viz. the Sign of the Cross, the Creed, *Pater*, *Ave*, the Ten Commandments, the Commandments of the Church, the Sacraments, and various other lists of items, responses of the Mass-server and Litany of Mary, all of which were presumably to be learned by heart.

Over a hundred years after Gállduf’s *Catechismus*, when Andrew Donlevy published his bilingual (Irish and English) *Teagasg Críosduidhe* (Paris 1742) he appended a verse synopsis which, as was the case with the greater part of Ó Dubhlaioich’s verse text, had been composed by Bonabhentura Ó hEodhasa and published in his *Teagasg Críosdaidhe* (Antwerp 1611). In the body of his text, however, Donlevy had given the text of the *Pater* and *Ave* in Latin before giving them in Irish (and in English). It could be argued that the evidence of a large catechism such as Donlevy’s is of no value in this matter, since it was designed to be used by the priest as a catechist’s manual and not to be read or learned by heart by the ordinary laity.¹¹ This point is certainly valid in relation to other larger catechetical works of the seventeenth century, where the fact that the Latin text of the familiar prayers is not set down in them cannot be taken as evidence that those prayers were not recited in Latin. It is, however, highly unlikely that Donlevy would have written ‘Abair í [an Phaidir] a Laidion’, ‘Abair, “Fáilte an Aingil” a Laidion’ (pp. 368,

⁸Dedicatory letter ‘Serenissimo Principi Ferdinando Hispaniarum Infanti’: ‘in ea enim Regione annis duodecim animarum munus obiui’.

⁹*ibid.*, ‘Oraid don Leagthoir’, § 28.

¹⁰Preface.

¹¹This is clearly implied by the whole drift of the ‘Forfhógra’ prefixed to Donlevy’s book and by many statements in the text, e.g. ‘Cred is éigion do dheunamh, chum Tairbhe do bhuaín as an dTeagasg Críosduidhe? . . . Air dTús, is cóir theachd dhá fhodhlum maille lé Rún gnódhughadh air; an dara Ní, Dia d’adhradh agus do ghuidhe, an tan thiugfas chum na hÁite, ionn a mbiadh an Teagasg Críosduidhe dhá mhúnadh. . . . Creud eile is cóir fós do dheunamh? Is cóir Urnaidh do dheunamh an aoinfheachd ris an tSagart, no ré fear mhúinte an Teagaisg Chriosduidhe’ (1742 ed., 4–6). See also J. Brady, ‘The Catechism in Ireland: a survey’, *Ir. Ecclesiastical Record* 83 (1955) 167–76, p. 174.

382) if he did not believe that it could reasonably be expected that the laity could respond in Latin, as in each case they are here directed to do. In this connection it is noteworthy that it would appear that it is not to be expected that the Creed would be known in Latin by ordinary folk, since no similar directive is given in its case (p. 14) nor is the text of the prayer given in Latin; and that in the case of the *Confiteor* a distinction is made between those who know Latin and those who do not:

- C. Creud iad na briathra is gnáthach leat a rádh, an tan iarras tú a bheannacht-son [an tAthair Faoisidine]?
- F. A deirim: *Benedic mihi Pater, quia peccavi*, iodhon, ‘beannaídh mé a Athair, óir do pheacaigheas’.
- C. Creud do ní tú na dhiaidh sin?
- F. A deirim an *Confiteor* a Laidion, go nuige *Mea Culpa*, más Duine mé do thuigeas Laidion; mun ab eadh, a deirim é a nGaoidhlig, gus an bhFocal-so, ‘Tré mo Choir féin’ (1742 ed., p. 288).

It seems then that Donlevy expected that all the faithful, even those ignorant of Latin, would be able to recite the *Pater* and *Ave* in Latin. On the other hand, only twenty-two years later, in 1764, Dr John O’Brien, bishop of Cloyne, insisted that the majority of Irish Catholics recited their prayers in Irish,¹² thereby implying that the era of private prayers in Latin had come to an end. However, Dr O’Brien may well have been overstating his case in support of the appeal that he was making to the Congregation of Propaganda in Rome for financial assistance in the publication of his *Focalóir Gaoidhlighe-Sax-Bhéarla*. Indeed the Rev. James Hall, in recording the impression he gained of Ireland during his visit to this country in 1807, mentions several occasions on which he heard Irish Catholics pray (privately but ostentatiously) in Latin.¹³ During the centuries following the Reformation so many different Irish versions of the *Pater*, containing so many minor variations, made their appearance, that it is clear that no standard form emerged,¹⁴ as happened, for example, in the case of English. This lends support to the view that

¹²See F. M. Jones, ‘The Congregation of Propaganda and the publication of Dr. O’Brien’s Irish dictionary, 1768’, *Ir. Ecclesiastical Record* 77 (1952) 29–37, p. 32, where Dr O’Brien’s French is translated as follows: ‘. . . the majority of the Catholics of Ireland live in the country, in villages and small towns and in general speak only the Irish language. . . . As a necessary consequence they learn their Catechism and recite their prayers in Irish. . . .’

¹³*Tour through Ireland* I (London 1813) 75–6, 123, 269, 322, quoted in P. Ó Súilleabháin, ‘Leabhair urnaithe an ochtú haois déag’, *Ir. Ecclesiastical Record* 103 (1965) 299–302, pp. 301–2. It must be admitted that while Hall mentions the *Pater*, it is not absolutely clear that he heard it, or any other prayer of similar length, recited in Latin, his clearest references being to ejaculations such as ‘O Jesu, Domine, nos audi! O Maria Virgo, audi nos!’ and to a prayer which he calls ‘the evening spell’.

¹⁴The version which appears to have come nearest to being established as standard was that of Ó hEodhasa’s *Teagasg Críosaíde*, which was reproduced in very many printed and manuscript sources of the 17th, 18th and even 19th centuries.

it was commonly recited in Latin, not in Irish. Nevertheless Irish versions had been in existence long before the Reformation, just as versions existed in other European vernaculars.

In England, Anglo-Saxon versions of the *Pater* not only existed, but had the approval of no less a personage than the Venerable Bede. The concern expressed by Teabóid Gállduf, and before him by Henry VIII, for the laity who prayed uncomprehendingly in Latin had prompted Bede to write in 734 to Ecgbert, bishop of York, as follows:

In . . . praedicatione populis exhibenda, hoc prae ceteris omni instantia procurandum arbitror, ut fidem catholicam, quae apostolorum symbolo continetur, et dominicam orationem, quam sancti euangelii nos scriptura edocet, omnium, qui ad tuum regimen pertinent, memoriae radicitus infigere cures. Et quidem omnes, qui Latinam linguam lectionis usu didicerunt, etiam haec optime didicisse certissimum est; sed idiotas, hoc est, eos qui propriae tantum linguae notitiam habent, haec ipsa sua lingua discere, ac sedulo decantare facito. Quod non solum de laicis, id est, in populari adhuc uita constitutis, uerum etiam de clericis siue monachis, qui Latinae sunt linguae expertes, fieri oportet. Sic enim fit, ut caetus omnis fidelium, quomodo fidelis esse, qua se firmitate credendi contra immundorum spirituum certamina munire atque armare debeat, discat; fit, ut chorus omnis Deo supplicantium, quid maxime a diuina clementia quaeri oporteat, agnoscat. Propter quod et ipse multis saepe sacerdotibus idiotis haec utraque, et symbolum uidelicet, et dominicam orationem in linguam Anglorum translata optuli.¹⁵

Bede was anxious to insist that all the faithful have the Apostles' Creed and the *Pater* rooted deeply in their memory. This presented no great problem in the case of those who were competent in Latin (*qui Latinam linguam lectionis usu didicerunt*); but his great care was that those monoglot Anglo-Saxons (*idiotae, hoc est, ei qui propriae tantum linguae notitiam habent*), including, not only layfolk, but also clerics and monks who do not know Latin (*qui Latinae sunt linguae expertes*) and consequently cannot read, be caused to learn those prayers in their own tongue and to repeat them diligently over and over again (*sua lingua discere, ac sedulo decantare*). Indeed he has himself often (*saepe*) provided an Anglo-Saxon version of the two prayers for monoglot priests (*sacerdotibus idiotis*). This final point, as was the case with much else in Bede's letter, was to be echoed in an ordinance of the Council of Clovesho in 747.¹⁶

¹⁵C. Plummer (ed.), *Venerabilis Baedae opera historica* I (Oxford 1896) 408–9. English translation by J. E. King in *Baedae opera historica* II (Loeb Classical Library, London 1903) 454–5.

¹⁶See C. Plummer (ed.), *Venerabilis Baedae opera historica* II (Oxford 1896) 380: 'presbyteri . . . symbolum fidei ac Dominicam orationem . . . interpretari atque exponere posse propria lingua, qui nesciant, discant'.

Thus by the middle of the eighth century, Anglo-Saxon versions of the *Pater* had official sanction at least for the purpose of interpreting and explaining the Latin.¹⁷ One would feel that the same kind of approval of Irish versions would have existed in Ireland at the same time. Certainly the firm links between the British and Irish Churches might have been expected to lead to such a development, particularly in view of the fact that in the Irish Church the movement away from Latin to Irish became progressively stronger from the eighth century onwards. Though no Irish translation of the *Pater* has survived from that period, I believe that it can be shown that such a translation (or translations) had been made in the Old Irish period.

3. THE LEABHAR BREAC – EGERTON 91 VERSION

The earliest extant Irish translation of the *Pater* is found in two manuscripts which were written in the fifteenth century, *An Leabhar Breac* (LB) and British Library Egerton 91 (EG), where it forms part of a translation into Irish of a Latin homily on the prayer itself. In LB the homily is one of a group of homilies which are part of what has been described by Frederic Mac Donncha as an Irish homiliarium.¹⁸ The Irish text of the homily follows the Latin text phrase by phrase.¹⁹ In EG, however, the homily occurs (pp. 37–40) separated from the rest of the group, and the Latin text of only the prayer itself is given there, the commentary being given in Irish alone. While the copy of the Irish text given in EG has been described as being in ‘a more modern form’ than that in LB,²⁰ it is certainly not derived from LB and seems occasionally to be more faithful to the original than the copy in LB in that it contains phrases lacking in LB. At all events the text of the *Pater* in EG arguably represents an earlier version than that in LB (see below). In both cases the text of the *Pater* is given at the head of the homily (LB–A, EG–A) and phrase by phrase through the homily (LB–B, EG–B), some of the phrases being quoted more than once in the course of the commentary (LB–C, EG–C) which constitutes the homily; and in both cases the *Pater* in Irish is given phrase by phrase after the common Latin version both at the beginning of the homily and in the commentary on each phrase.

¹⁷None of those versions survives. Anglo-Saxon versions of the *Pater* occur, of course, in translations of the Gospels, but I do not regard these as necessarily relevant to the present discussion, since (a) these translations are extremely literal, one, that of the Lindisfarne Gospels, being a word for word gloss, and (b) they are not part of the prayer tradition, which has to be seen as something derived from the Gospel text tradition, but separate from it. When reference is made to the Anglo-Saxon text of Matthew 6:9b–13 the source is W. W. Skeat, *The Gospel according to St. Matthew in Anglo-Saxon, Northumbrian and Old Mercian versions . . .* (Cambridge 1887).

¹⁸‘Medieval Irish homilies’, in M. McNamara (ed.), *Biblical studies: the medieval Irish contribution* (Dublin 1976) 59–71, pp. 67–8.

¹⁹Both have been edited (and the Irish translated into English) in R. Atkinson, *The passions and the homilies from Leabhar Breac [PH]* (Dublin 1887) 259–66, 503–6; English translation, 495–503.

²⁰See R. Flower, *Catalogue of Irish manuscripts in the British Museum II* (London 1926) 440.

This close juxtaposition of the Latin and Irish texts of the *Pater* is rather obscured by Atkinson's presentation of the text of the homily in *Passions and homilies*.

LEABHAR BREAC TEXT

A

- [1] A athair fil hi nimib, noemthar thainm.
 [2] Toet do flaithius.
 [3] Bid do toil i talmain amal ata in nim.
 [4] Tabhair dún indíu ar sásad cech laithi.
 [5] Ocus log dun ar fiachu amal log-maitne diar fhéchemnaib.
 [6] Ocus nirlecea sind in amus ndo-fulachtai.
 [7] Acht ronsóer ó cech ulc. Ropfír.

B

- [1] (A athair) . . . (Isna nimib atái). . . noemthar thainm.
 [2] Toet do fhlaithius.
 [3] Bíd do thol hi talmain amal ata in nim.
 [4] Tabair dún indíu ar sásad cech-lathide.
 [5] Ocus log dún ar fhiachu amal log-maitne dar fechemnaib.
 [6] Ocus nacharléic in amus.
 [7] Acht déna ar soeraad ó cech ulc. Ropfír

EGERTON 91 TEXT

A

- [1] A athair fil in nim noemtar hainm.
 [2] Taet do fhlaitheas.
 [3] Bid do thoil i talmain amal ata in nim.
 [4] Tabhair duinn indiu ar sasadh cachlaiti
 [5] Ocus dilgidh duinn ar fhiacha amal dilgidmitne diar feichemnaibh.
 [6] Occus niroleice in ammus.
 [7] Acht ronsaer o ulc. Robfír.

B

- [1] (A athair . . . atái) . . . (Isna nimib atai). . . Naemthar hainm
 [2] Taet do fhlaitus.
 [3] Bid do thoil i talmain amal ata in nim.
 [4] Tabair duinn indíu ar sassadh cechlaithide.
 [5] Ocus dlighid duinn ar fiacha amal dilgimit diar feichemnaibh.
 [6] Ocus nacharleic in amus
 [7] Ach den ar saeradh o ulc. Robfír.

The translation of the homily in the form in which it occurs in LB dates from at least as early as 1050, it would appear.²¹ I would suggest, however, that the translator²² of the homily did not attempt to provide a new translation of the *Pater*, but used an earlier version or versions. There are a number of features of the language of this version of the prayer which are Middle Irish. The 1st pl. present absolute ending *-m(a)it* (*logmaitne* LB-5A, B, C; *dilgidmit* EG-5A; *dilgimít* EG-5B; *dlegmait* EG-5C) displaced Old Irish *-mi* and became the normal ending in the tenth century.²³ The use of the *ar n-* form of the 1st pl. infixed pronoun in *nacharléic* etc. (LB-6B; EG-6B) is also a Middle Irish feature, as is the use of the 1st pl. independent object pronoun *sind* (LB-6A) and *índ* (LB-6C), and the use of *ro-* to infix the object pronoun in imperative *ronsóer* etc. (LB-7A, C; EG-7A, C). *Noemthar* of the first petition would have been *noíbthar* in Old Irish.

On the other hand many other features of the language are perfectly good Old Irish: *fil* (LB-1A, EG-1A) as direct relative which was replaced by *atá* in Middle Irish (see *Is tú ata*, LB-1C = *PH* 7891-2); the imperatives *táet*, *bíd*, *tabair* of the second, third and fourth petitions, as well as *rop* of the final *Amen*; the 2nd sing. jussive subjunctive *níroleice* (EG-6A, C) and 2nd sing. imperative *nach-léic* etc. (LB-6B,C; EG-6B,C); the use of *amal* with the independent verb (see Thurneysen, *Grammar* § 505); and nominal forms, such as *nim* (EG-1A; LB-3A, B; EG-3A, B), *tol* (LB-3B), *talmain*, *laithi*, *fiachu*, *féchemnaib*, *ammus* (EG-6A), *ulc*. Many of these features, of course, survived in Middle Irish, some even in Modern Irish. There is no inherent impossibility in the supposition that a Middle Irish translator of the *Pater* could choose to use all of these forms. On balance, however, it seems to me more probable that this collection of Old Irish features represents elements of an Old Irish translation (or translations) of the *Pater* which survived in the version (or versions) used by the translator of this homily.

A further piece of evidence which may point to the existence of an Old Irish version of the *Pater* may be the use of *cechlaithide* etc. (LB-4B, C; EG-4B, C). The adjective *laithide* (daily) does not require the addition of *cech-* (see *Thesaurus* I, 455, where *la[i]thidi* glosses (Ml. 133b 15) *diurno*): no doubt the *cech-* was added to form a calque on

²¹ Assuming that it is to be included among those which Kenneth Jackson would regard as 'perhaps a century older than c.1150': see 'The date of the Tripartite Life of St. Patrick', *Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie* 41 (1986) 5-45, p. 10; see also his remark that some of the early homilies in LB 'are very early, and must be categorised as "early Middle Irish"', in 'The historical grammar of Irish: some actualities and some desiderata', in G. Mac Eoin et al. (ed.), *Proceedings of the Sixth International Congress of Celtic Studies* (Dublin 1983) 1-18, p. 7.

²² Mac Donncha, in *Biblical studies*, 67-8, put forward the view that the translator of this homily (and others in LB) was also the author, and that he was Mael Ísu Ó Brolcháin. This identification, which is referred to by Brian Ó Cuív (Ó Cuív, 212 n. 3) is rejected as unproven by Kenneth Jackson, 'The date of the Tripartite Life of St. Patrick', *ZCP* 41 (1986) 9-12.

²³ See Jackson, *ZCP* 41 (1986) 39.

cotidianum (a formation based on *quot* and *dies*). The form occurs as *cách lathidi* (*Thesaurus* I, 207, note *a*) glossing (Ml. 62 a 8) *diurno* in a context which, with its reference to bread which is in daily use (. . . *panis qui cum sit in us(s)u diurno* . . .) would certainly set up a resonance of the *panem cotidianum* of the *Pater* in the mind of the glossator. If this suggestion is correct, the implication of his use of *cách lathidi* would be that this form was known to him from an Irish version of the *Pater* of which he was aware.

It is not possible to determine whether the translator of the homily in LB and EG was responsible for the introduction of any or all of the Middle Irish features of this version of the *Pater*, for the conservatism of the language of prayer can ensure the survival in prayer for a very long time of obsolete features of language. Revisions of the Old Irish version(s) may have been made in the Middle Irish period before the time of our translator, and it seems to me to be quite certain that his version was later further revised. It seems reasonable to assume, however, that in phrases of the *Pater* where the version in LB agrees with that in EG, the text is that set down by the translator of the homily. The hypothesis that he drew on an earlier version or versions offers an explanation for some strange aspects of the version in LB and EG.

Seeing that the translator was placing the Latin and Irish phrases of the *Pater* in juxtaposition, it is hardly likely that he would have used *léic*- without comment if he were providing his own translation of the sixth petition, *ne nos inducas in tentationem*: it seems clear that he simply used an existing translation of another Latin rendering of this phrase, *ne patiaris nos induci in tentationem* (see Ó Cuív, 221; and further below).

Furthermore, variant forms of a number of words and phrases occur: *cech lathi* etc. (LB-4A; EG-4A), but *cechlathide* etc. (LB-4B, C; EG-4B, C); *nirlecea* (LB-6A), *nirlecea* (LB-6C), *nirleice* (EG-6A, C), but *nacharléic* etc. (LB-6B, C; EG-6B, C); *ronsóer* (LB-7A, C), *ronsaer* (EG-7A, C), *ronsaera* (EG-7C), but *déna ar soera(a)d* (LB-7B), *den ar saeradh* (EG-7B). These would again suggest that the translator of the homily was not providing his own translation of the *Pater*, nor indeed, in this case, using a single existing one, but rather that he was drawing on a number of already available versions of which he was aware, none of which was sufficiently well established in his mind by constant repetition, due perhaps to the fact that he would normally recite the *Pater* in Latin, to exclude the variants found in the others.

Some variants which do not occur in both manuscripts deserve notice also. LB-6A has the object of the verb *nirlecea* expressed by the independent pronoun *sind* (*índ* in LB-6C). The 1st pl. independent pronoun occurs frequently in *Passions and homilies*, and indeed Kenneth Jackson suggests that independent object pronouns may have existed in the last quarter of the tenth century (*ZCP* 41 (1986) 39): thus this feature may have occurred in this phrase as written by the translator of the homily,

which would provide a further contrastive variant when set over against the infixed pronoun of *nacharléic* etc. (LB-6B, C; EG-6B, C). However, expression of the object of a verb is not always required in a context where it can be clearly understood though left unexpressed. It may be unusual to leave the 1st pl. object unexpressed, but it is not expressed in EG-6A, C in the corresponding places, which I take to indicate that the independent pronoun was added later to the original text. So too, the adjective *ndofulachtai* in LB-6A is not required by the Latin, and Brian Ó Cuív's suggestion (Ó Cuív, 213 n. 4), that it was transferred from the sentence *ni ro-lécea índ i ndérchoined no i nd-amus ndofulachta na coemsam d'fulang* (PH 7961-2) in the commentary on this petition, is undoubtedly correct. However, the addition does not occur in EG-6A (*pace* Ó Cuív, *ibid.*), though the same sentence is found in the commentary in EG-6C, and again I take this to mean that the adjective was not added by the translator of the homily, but by a later copyist. In LB-7A, B *cech* is also superfluous, since it is not required by the Latin, and again I regard it as a later addition, since it does not occur in EG-7A, B. Equivalent additions occur in many versions of the *Pater* in Irish and in other vernaculars, including an eighth-century Teutonic version from Friesing (*fona allem sunton*)²⁴ and an English version of 1506 (*fro all evyll*),²⁵ and all are no doubt derived from the prayer following the *Pater* in the Mass, which begins *Libera nos, quaesumus, Domine, ab omnibus malis*. . . .

The evidence of these three additions seems to me to suggest that, at least in some respects, EG-A preserves more faithfully than LB-A the text of the *Pater* as written by the translator of the homily. If this is so, it may well be that it is more faithful in other respects also. LB-1A has plural *nimib* where EG-1A has singular *nim*.²⁶ That both singular and plural were used in this phrase is seen from its use in the Litany of the Trinity,²⁷ where *A Athair nemdai fail i nimib* occurs in Oxford MS Rawlinson B 512, while the Yellow Book of Lecan and LB copies of that Litany have the singular *nim*. The plural, whenever it is used (see *Dictionary of the Irish language* s.v. 1 *nem*), reflects the influence of the Latin plural *caeli*, as it does in the *Pater*, and indeed one copy of 'Irish grammatical tracts' II (ed. O. Bergin, *Ériu* 9-10 (1921-8) suppl.), § 206, proscribes plural forms of the word as incorrect. The singular is clearly more natural in Irish and is the form found in almost all subsequent Irish

²⁴See Thurston, *Familiar prayers*, 30-31, where, however, the word *sunton* (*sins*) is misspelled. I am grateful to Andrea Nic Thaidhg of the German department at Maynooth for the correct reading. Compare also a Paris catechism of 1574: 'de tout mal', see J.-C. Dhôtel, 'Note sur les anciennes traductions françaises du *Pater*', *La Maison Dieu* 83 (1965) 148-57, p. 151.

²⁵The edition of the *Kalender of Shepherdes* printed by R. Pynson of London. See Thurston, *Familiar prayers*, 25.

²⁶The opening address is not quoted at the head of the relevant section of the commentary in either LB or EG.

²⁷In C. Plummer, *Irish litanies* (London 1925) 78-9.

versions of the *Pater*. It may be, then, that EG-1A *nim* preserves the original which was replaced by the more literal *nimib* in other versions. The possibility has to be adverted to, however, that LB-1A *nimib* is the original which was later displaced by the more natural *nim*, for the plural form is used in both LB-1C and EG-1C.

In the fifth petition the two manuscripts are at odds in relation to the verb used to translate the Latin *dimitto*. LB has *logaid* for all full verbal forms, but in the commentary whenever the verbal noun is required (eleven times in all), with one exception (*logud*, PH 7946), the one used is *dilgud* from *do-luigi*. On the other hand, EG has full verbal forms derived from *do-luigi* (including the correct 2nd sg. imperative *dilig* in the commentary [= PH 7946]) in all cases but one, *logfa* [= PH 7958], and the verbal noun *dilgud* (once *dilgud*) in all cases but one, *logadh* [= PH 7939]. Clearly the text of the prayer and the commentary have been revised in the tradition represented by one of the manuscripts, but it is not easy to decide which one. I would hazard the suggestion that *do-luigi* was the verb originally used and that EG therefore represents the non-revised version, though the forms of the verb presented by it are somewhat mangled. The use of *logaid* in the sense 'forgives' seems a later development, the verb *do-luigi* carrying this meaning in the earlier period. If, as already suggested, this version of the *Pater* contains elements derived from an Old Irish version (or versions), it is most likely that such an earlier version (or versions) would have here used *do-luigi*, which, I would suggest, was retained by the translator of our homily, but was replaced with *logaid* by a later scribe whose revision is represented by LB-5. This revision in the case of the commentary was only partial, since the verbal noun of *do-luigi* was allowed to stand in all cases but one.²⁸

I would suggest then that the A version of the *Pater* set down by the translator of the homily may have been as follows:

A Athair fil i nnim, noemthar th'ainm.
 Táet do fhlaithius.
 Bíd do thol i talmain amal atá i nnim.
 Tabair dún indiu ar sásad cech laithi.
 Ocus dílig dún ar fiachu amal dílgimit diar féchemnaib.
 Ocus níroléice in ammus.
 Acht ronsóer ó ulc. Rop fír.

When compared with other vernacular versions of the *Pater* and with some later Irish ones, this represents a very fine piece of translation, showing strikingly little interference by the source language with the

²⁸ *do-luigi* continued to be used, of course, at least in prayer. For 2nd sing. imperative *dilaig* and 2nd pl. imperative *dilguid*, see Plummer, *Irish litanies*, 2-16.

target language in the form of literalism or of distortion of syntax or word-order. With the possible exception of the use of the preposition *i* to translate *in* of *in caelis* (first petition) and *in caelo, in terra* (third petition), the Irish of this version seems perfectly natural. That this should be so in the case of the opening address *A Athair* is indeed remarkable.

All subsequent Irish versions translate the Latin possessive *noster* of this phrase, using *ar* in one construction or another. Though vocative phrases introduced by *a mo* occur in Old Irish and are therefore, in Thurneysen's phrase, 'possible at least in the early period' (*ZCP* 19 (1933) 365), and though in a few early examples the vocative particle is apparently omitted before *mo* (*ibid.*), the use of a possessive with the vocative is branded incorrect by the bardic grammarians,²⁹ and instances such as *a mo anoim, a mo anuim* are contrasted with the 'more Irish' *a anam so agam-sa, a chroídhe seo agam-sa* by T. F. O'Rahilly,³⁰ while O. J. Bergin considered *Ár nAthair* 'a solecism confined to the translation literature'.³¹ The pressure to use the possessive with the vocative construction in this phrase of the *Pater* came, not only from the felt need to provide an equivalent for Latin *noster*, but also from awareness of the many commentaries on the *Pater* which emphasised the precise force of *noster* in a way that meant that it could not easily be ignored in translation. A good summary of this kind of commentary is found in Bonabhentura Ó hEodhasa's *Teagasg Críosaíde*:

Tabhair dot aire mar dho ordaigh ar Slánaightheōir dhúinn 'A ar nAthair' do rádh tar a rádh 'A Athair', ionnas go ttuigmís gurab bráithre dá chéile sinn uile, go bhfoil d'fhiachaibh orainn grádh bráthardha do bheith againn féin ar a chéile mar atá grádh athardha ag Dia orainn, 7 nách cóir d'ēnchuid againn tarcaisne do dhénamh ar an ccuid oile ar an n-adhbhar gurab ionann uaisle dhúinn a bhfiagh-naisi Dé, ór as clann éanathar inn; 7 fós ionnas go ttuigeadh gach neach nach air féin amháin as cóir dhó guidhe, achd ar chách oile go coitcheann, an mhéid díobh bhias 'na mballaibh firinneacha ag an Eaglais.³²

Nevertheless *A Athair* is undoubtedly preferable, not only as being more natural Irish, but also as being an accurate rendering of the phrase as originally spoken in Aramaic by Jesus, whose own distinctive and intimate way of speaking with his Father was to address him simply as *abba*, as in Luke's version of the *Pater* (Lk 11:2b). Matthew's version

²⁹'Ní c[óir] tulshunnradh. . . a mbeól gharma agallmha' in RIA MS 24 P 8, p. 220: see L. McKenna, *Bardic syntactical tracts* (Dublin 1944) 27 (= O. Bergin, 'Nominative and vocative', *Ériu* 9 (1921) 92-4, p. 93).

³⁰'The vocative in Modern Irish', *Ériu* 9 (1921) 85-91, p. 88.

³¹*Ériu* 9 (1921) 94 n. 2.

³²*An Teagasg Críosaíde* (ed. F. Mac Raghnaill, Baile Átha Cliath 1976) 39.

of this phrase (Mth 6:9b) shows the *Pater* having already become the public prayer of the Christian community.³³

So too the translation of *ne nos inducas in tentationem* reflects an awareness that the meaning of the original Aramaic was not accurately represented by the Latin (nor indeed by the Greek which it translates). Various interpretations of the phrase have been offered,³⁴ but the one which seems to lie behind the alternative Latin version, *ne patiaris nos induci in tentationem*, hinges on the difficulty that Hebrew and Aramaic had in expressing the notion of an agent (and particularly God who is all-powerful) allowing something to happen when he could have prevented it. Thus an agent would be said positively to do something or to cause it to happen when in fact he had simply failed to prevent it happening. Hence God is asked not to bring us into temptation and this notion is literally but incongruously translated *μηελσευέγκης* in Greek, whence *ne inducas, ne inferas*, in Latin. The incongruity was soon recognised and remarked on in sermons and commentaries on the *Pater* and the interpretation *ne patiaris nos induci* offered.³⁵ From the commentaries the phrase made its way into some early copies of the Gospel of St Matthew, including those in the Book of Armagh, the Book of Dimma, the Book of Mulling and the Rushworth Gospels, of the eighth and ninth centuries. Brian Ó Cuív mentioned the possibility that ‘some special significance is to be attached to the fact that the reading *ne patiaris nos induci in temptationem* is found in a non-Biblical context in the seventh-century “Antiphony of Bangor” (f. 19 v)’ (Ó Cuív, 221). I would like to suggest that the significance is that it provides a hint that it was precisely via the route of the prayer tradition, rather than directly, that this reading made its way from the commentaries into the Gospel texts. For Augustine in the first part of his work *De Sermone Domini in Monte*, while commenting on the *ne nos inferas* formula, makes it clear that *ne patiaris nos induci* was widely used in prayer:

Sexta petitio est, *Et ne nos inferas in tentationem*. Nonnulli codices habent, *inducas*, quod tantumdem valere arbitror; nam ex uno graeco quod dictum est, *ελσευέγκης*, utrumque translatum est.

³³See J. A. Grassi, ‘Our Father, The’ in *New Catholic encyclopedia* X (New York etc. 1967) 829–31.

³⁴*ibid.*: ‘“and lead us not into trial”. Before the final judgment, the early Church expected a great time of trial, a final terrible onslaught of the devil. . . . The Christian asks to be delivered from this test, for he knows that no human could withstand such a trial’.

³⁵I first became aware of this alternative version and recognised its relevance to Irish versions several years ago. Subsequently, I attended Peter Doyle’s lecture ‘The Latin Bible in Ireland: its origins and growth’ (published in McNamara, *Biblical Studies*, 30–45), in which he briefly discussed the matter (see p. 35). I am grateful to Dr Doyle for writing to me soon after his lecture giving a fuller account of the sources in which the feature occurs and including mention of a slight variant of the phrase, viz. *ne passus fueris induci nos*. Brian Ó Cuív refers to use of the phrase by Tertullian (c.220) and mentions that the interpretation has been traced back to Marcion (c.150): see Ó Cuív, 221 and note 2.

Multi autem precando ita dicunt, *Ne nos patiaris induci in tentationem*; exponentes videlicet quomododictum sit, *inducas*. Non enim per seipsum inducit Deus, sed induci patitur eum quem suo auxilio deseruerit, ordine oculatissimo ac meritis.³⁶

Such reflex influence by the prayer tradition on the Gospel text would explain why this reading is found only in Matthew and not in Luke, though the Greek of this petition is identical in both: the Latin prayer text of the *Pater* is taken from Matthew, not from Luke, which lacks a number of phrases, including petitions four and seven, and has some different wording.³⁷ It seems more sensible too to take it that it is directly from the prayer tradition alluded to by Augustine and represented by the Antiphony of Bangor, rather than from the Gospel text tradition represented by the Book of Armagh etc., that the Irish translation of the sixth petition in LB and EG derives.

The 'gap of several centuries' between Latin texts such as the Antiphony of Bangor (seventh century) and the Book of Armagh (AD 807), which have the *ne patiaris nos induci* reading, and the Irish text of LB and EG, showing the *léic*-forms, seems to have posed a difficulty for Brian Ó Cuív (Ó Cuív, 222). Given that the tradition of saying the familiar prayers in Latin was strong, there is, it seems to me, no reason to imagine that the *ne patiaris nos induci* form would not have survived for a long time in the prayer tradition: indeed the *Liber Flavus Fergusiorum* version of the *Pater* (see below) would seem to provide evidence of its survival at least into the Early Modern Irish period. On the other hand, I have been suggesting that the LB and EG text of the *Pater* is not a product of the Middle Irish period, but contains elements of Old Irish usage which may reflect translations made in the earlier period. It may well be that the use of *léic*- is another element of such an early translation. Brian Ó Cuív has commented on the remarkable consistency of usage in Irish in respect of this formula, in that use of the verb *léic*- has survived down to the present day (Ó Cuív, 222). Compared with the literalism of later Irish *ná fulaing dúinn (dul) agus ná fuluing (ar [d]tuitim)* (translating Spanish *no nos debes caer*), and also of the many other 'let' type formulae listed by Ó Cuív, from Anglo-Saxon *ne gelaet us gelaede* ('do not let us be led') to seventeenth-century French *ne souffrez point que nous soyons vaincus*, the formula *níroléice in ammus* has the quality of classical economy which deserved to survive.

³⁶Patrologia Latina (ed. J. P. Migne, 221 voll., Paris 1844–64) 34, col. 1282.

³⁷Similarly influence of the prayer tradition must be responsible for the reading *Pater noster* in the opening address of the prayer in Luke in Old Latin versions (and compare *Pater sancte noster* in Luke in the Book of Mulling): see P. Doyle, in *Biblical Studies*, 35.

4. THE LIBER FLAVUS VERSION

Like the LB-EG version the second oldest surviving Irish version of the *Pater* is found in a commentary on it which is preserved in another fifteenth-century manuscript, *Liber Flavus Fergusiorum* (I, ff. 35 r b – 36 r b). The editor of the commentary, Gearóid Mac Niocaill, was unable to be sure whether it was an original composition or a translation, but inclined to the view that it was the latter, though he failed to find an original on which it might be based.³⁸ The dittographs and other slips in the *Liber Flavus* copy show that the scribe was not the translator. The text of the *Pater*, which is Modern Irish, is given, like the earlier version, both at the head of commentary (A), phrase by phrase following the Latin, and again in the body of commentary (B). Apart from the fact that a few words are lacking in B, and from the addition of *c[h]uginne* in 4B (see further below) and of *ar neímh* after *ainm* in 1A (which, as Mac Niocaill pointed out, is merely a dittograph), A and B represent a single version, which I give here in ‘normalised’ Early Modern Irish spelling. I append a selection of manuscript readings; for further readings see Mac Niocaill’s edition.

- 1 Ar nAthairne^a batá ar^b nimh,^c naomhtar^d th’ainm.^e
 2 Tigeadh^a do ríge.^b
 3 Déantar do thoilse^a i dtalmhain mar do-níthe ar nimh thuas í.^a 4 Ar n-arán gach n-aon-lá^a tabhair^b dúinn anigh é.
 5 Maith dúinn ar bhfiacha mar mhaithmidne^a dar bhféicheamhnaibh.^b
 6 Ná fulaing dúinn dul i n-aimsiughadh.
 7 Acht^a caomhain^b sinn ar olc.
 Amen. ^cBíodh^d sin mar sin.^c

- 1 a: nAtharne A b-b: (A D[h]ia) neoch ata huas ar B c: neímh A d: naemtar A, naemhtar B e: ar neímh add. A
 2 a: teigeadh A, teigead B b: rígh AB, cuginne add. B
 3 a-a: lacking B
 4 a: gach aen la A, gach nae[n] la B b: tobuir AB
 5 a: maithmaidne B b: feitheamnuibh A, feitheamhnuibh B
 7 a: lacking B b: cumain A, caemain B c-c: lacking B d bith A

This version was obviously intended to provide a literal rendering of the Latin text which accompanies it, but here again, in the sixth petition it is the *ne patiaris nos induci* formula which is translated rather than the accompanying *ne nos inducas*. The imperatives of the LB-EG version have not yet been replaced by the optative with *go* in the first three petitions, as would later happen, but otherwise this version marks a clear break with the earlier one in very many details.

The strong tendency towards literalism is alone responsible for some of the changes. At all events in the case of the opening address, the commentary lays no stress on *noster* which would demand the change from *A Athair* to *Ar nAthairne*. Similarly, the addition of *c[h]uginne*

³⁸‘Gluais na Paidre’, *Éigse* 9 (1958–61) 153–8, p. 153.

in 4B seems to have been made purely in response to the need to reflect the element *ad-* of the verb in *Adveniat regnum tuum*.³⁹ In the fourth petition the object *arán* has been brought forward to the beginning of the sentence to reflect the word-order of the Latin, but the addition of the post-referential *é* at the end of the sentence leaves the term of the pronoun, *arán*, standing free, and thus saves the word-order from being unIrish in the way later versions are when the pronoun is omitted. *Ná fulaing dúinn* of the sixth petition is clearly a literal translation of *ne patiaris nos*, but the force of *induci* is lost in *dul i*, just as it was in the earlier *níroléice i* ('do not allow us to enter into').

Other changes cannot be explained in this way, and must be seen simply as dictated by a desire on the part of the translator to improve and perhaps to modernise. So *ríghe* replaces *flaithius* in petition 2, *arán* replaces *sásad* in petition 4, *maith* replaces *dilig/log* in petition 5, *aimsiughadh* replaces *ammus* in petition 6, and *caomhain ar* replaces *sóer ó* in petition 7. *Fiat* can equally well be translated by *bíd* and *déantar*, depending on the context. Here, given that the commentaries offer nothing specific in favour of either, one would feel that *déantar . . . mar do-nítheas* is preferable with *tol/toil* to *bídh . . . amal atá* in the third petition. Finally, in the fourth petition *cech laithi / cech-laithide* is replaced by the equally awkward and literal *gach n-aon-lá*. Mac Niocaill has corrected the manuscript reading *la* to *la[e]*, so that the phrase corresponds to the genitive *cech la[i]thi* etc. of LB-4A and EG-4A.⁴⁰ However, both instances in *Liber Flavus* (A and B) have *la*, so that I prefer to take it as the adverbial *gach n-aon lá*⁴¹ being used here adjectivally in petrified form.

The fact that these Irish versions of the *Pater* in LB-EG and *Liber Flavus* occur in the context of commentary means that they are provided as a method of explaining the prayer to the faithful. It is possible that they, and such earlier versions as may have existed, were no more than

³⁹Flaithrí Ó Maolchonaire has this addition also in one of his versions of the *Pater* (1593) (see B. Ó Cuív, 'Flaithrí Ó Maolchonaire's Catechism of Christian Doctrine', *Celtica* 1/2 (1950) 161-206, p. 172 line 325), as also some sixteenth-century English versions have 'to us' (e.g. Pynson's edition of *The kalender of shepherdes* (1506), 'thy royalme must come to us'; de Worde's *The myrroure of the Chyrche* (1521), 'thy Kyngdome come to us'; and Gau's *The richt way to the kingdom of Heuine* (1533), a Scots translation of a Danish work, 'thy kingdome mot cum (to usz)'); while earlier English versions have the awkward 'come to' (e.g. the St John's College, Cambridge, manuscript copy of *The Prymer*, G 24 (c.1400), edited by H. Littlehales (London and New York 1891) has both 'thi Kyngdom come to' and 'come to thi Kyngdom'), reflecting the literalism of the Anglo-Saxon glosses on the Gospels, 'to-becume' (Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, ms 140), 'cume to' (Rushworth ms).

⁴⁰Both correspond precisely to early fifteenth-century English 'oure eche daies bred' (see H. Littlehales, *The prymer* (1891) 20, and another copy of the same from British Library ms 27592, in his *Pages in facsimile . . .* (London 1890) 1). Anglo-Saxon Gospel glosses, however, have adjectival *dayghwamlice / gedaeghwamlican / daeghwaemlicu*.

⁴¹See, for example, C. O'Rahilly (ed.), *Cath Finntrágha* (Dublin 1962) 6 line 158; O. Bergin (ed.), *Trí bior-ghaoithe an bháis* (Dublin 1931) 248 lines 7894, 7901.

that, and that they were never widely used in practice. It is, however, interesting to note that between them these two versions provide all the elements, apart from some details, from which an important post-Reformation Roman Catholic version was formed. This version, which first appeared in Bonabhentura Ó hEodhasa's *Teagasg Críosaíde* and was repeated in catechisms influenced by his, and which became the basis for a widely used modern version, corresponds closely with the *Liber Flavus* version in the first five petitions, but with the LB-EG version in the last two, where the earlier *léig* and *saor* prevailed over the later *fulaing* and *caomhain*.

CATHAL Ó HÁINLE

Trinity College, Dublin