

THE *PATER NOSTER* IN IRISH: REFORMATION TEXTS TO  
c.1650<sup>1</sup>

1. INTRODUCTION

The practical realism of Elizabeth I's decision to allow the use of Irish as a means of promoting the Reformation in Ireland probably evoked a rather cool response in some quarters. Certainly the long delay in publishing the New Testament in Irish, a project initiated in the 1560s and not realised until 1602–3,<sup>2</sup> shows no great evidence of enthusiasm. Nevertheless as steps were taken to implement this policy, for example by appointing ministers and bishops competent in Irish, it must have appeared to many that it was no longer impolitic to be known to support or encourage proselytising through Irish, and so we find Sir William Herbert 'patting himself on the back'<sup>3</sup> for his efforts in this regard as he writes from Castleisland, Co. Kerry, to the Lord High Treasurer of England, Lord Burghley, on 30 April 1587:

Touching the estate of religion in these parts, here is neither public prayers in any church nor private prayers that any of them doth understand, whereby it seemeth God is altogether unserved. I have taken order that public prayers shall be said in their own tongue, and that they shall assemble themselves at their churches on the Sundays. I have caused the Lord's Prayer and the Ten Commandments, and the Articles of the Belief, to be translated into Irish, and this day the ministers of these parts repair unto me to have it in writing. They have undertaken to instruct their parishioners in it. I find them very tractable and willing to learn the truth. I hope to do some good therein with them.<sup>4</sup>

And again in the first of three tracts which he sent to Burghley in 1588 he says:

. . . I have been careful in those parts wherein I am, to have them taught the truth in their natural tongue, to have the Lord's Prayer, the Articles of the Creed, the Ten Commandments, translated into the Irish tongue; [and have instituted] public prayers in that language, with the administration of the sacraments and other ecclesiastical rites, which in a strange tongue could be to them but altogether unprofitable. . . .<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup>For the pre-Reformation period see *Celtica* 21 (1990) 470–88.

<sup>2</sup>See N. Williams, *I bprionta i leabhar* (Baile Átha Cliath 1986) 21–2, 29–31.

<sup>3</sup>The phrase is Brian Ó Cuív's: *Irish dialects and Irish-speaking districts* (Dublin 1951) 14.

<sup>4</sup>*Calendar of the state papers relating to Ireland of the reign of Elizabeth, 1586–8*, 331. See Williams, *I bprionta i leabhar*, 26.

<sup>5</sup>*Calendar of state papers, Ireland, Elizabeth, 1586–8*, 533. On the authorship of this tract see *ibid.*, 538–9.

Herbert's translation of the *Pater*, the Ten Commandments and the Articles of Belief (i.e. the Apostles' Creed) has not survived, to my knowledge, and it was in any case otiose, for Irish versions of the *Pater* were already in existence and all these items which he had translated had appeared in print in Irish in two Reformation texts published over the preceding twenty years, Seon Carsuel's *Foirm na n-Urrnuidheadh* (Edinburgh 1567) and Seán Ó Cearnaigh's *Aibidil Gaoidheilge agus caiticiosma* (Dublin 1571). It is, however, possible that Herbert may have been unaware of the existence of these two books and that copies of them were not available in Kerry in 1587. Carsuel had certainly intended his book to be read and used, not only in Scotland, but also in Ireland,<sup>6</sup> and it is clear that it was known here.<sup>7</sup> It is unlikely, however, that a large edition was printed,<sup>8</sup> and there is no evidence that any further editions appeared, so that it is improbable that many copies made their way to any part of Ireland, even to places much less remote than Castleisland. Ó Cearnaigh's book also can have had only a very limited circulation, since it was published in an edition of only two hundred copies<sup>9</sup> and does not appear to have been reprinted.

This implies that neither Carsuel's nor Ó Cearnaigh's version of the *Pater* had any great impact on popular practice in Ireland, particularly when it is remembered that they would have been used only by the Protestant minority of the Irish-speaking population, while the Catholic majority continued to recite the prayer in Latin. These versions are nevertheless important as being the third and fourth oldest surviving Irish versions, and the only published Irish versions of the sixteenth century. There are aspects of them, too, which are of intrinsic interest in that, on the one hand, they seem to provide evidence for the continued survival of the older versions and for the existence of still other versions, and, on the other hand, suggest that they themselves, or versions like them, formed the basis for the two early seventeenth-century Reformation versions, namely, that of the Gospel of St Luke in the 1602–3 New Testament, and that of the Gospel of St Matthew, which in turn is repeated with some variations in Uilliam Ó Domhnaill's *Leabhar na nUrnaighththeadh gComhchoidchiond* (Dublin 1608), in William Bedell's *Aibghitir .i. teagasg chéudtosughadh an Chríostaidhe* (Dublin 1631) and in Gofraidh Mac Domhnaill's *An teagasg Críostuidhe* (Dublin 1652).

<sup>6</sup>See R. L. Thomson (ed.), *Foirm na n-Urrnuidheadh* (Edinburgh 1970) lxxii, 10–13.

<sup>7</sup>See T. de Bhaldraithe, 'Leabhar Charswell in Éirinn', *Éigse* 9 (1958) 61–7.

<sup>8</sup>N. Williams, *I bprionta i leabhar*, 20, suggests that it is unlikely that more than five hundred copies were printed.

<sup>9</sup>*ibid.*, 22.

2. CARSUEL'S *FOIRM NA n-URRNUIDHEADH*

Seon Carsuel's *Foirm na n-Urrnuidheadh* (FU)<sup>10</sup> is a translation of the *Book of Common Order* (BCO) of the Church of Scotland. The prose text of the *Pater* occurs twice,<sup>11</sup> the version being the same in both cases, apart from two misprints in the first and the absence of the opening address in the second.<sup>12</sup> I give the text here as edited by R. L. Thomson at lines 1132–9, having, however, corrected the two misprints and having broken the text into petitions for ease of reference:

- 1 Ar n-Athair-ne atá ar neamh, go ma beandaighthe th'ainm;
- 2 go dtí do ríge;
- 3 go ma dēnta do thoil a dtalmhuin mar atá ar neamh;
- 4 tabhair dhúinn aniu ar n-arān laitheamhail;
- 5 agas maith dhúinn ar bfiacha, amhail mhaithmaoid-ne dār  
bfēicheamhnuibh;
- 6 agas nā lēig a mbuaidhreadh sind,
- 7 acht saor sind ó olc;  
óir is leat-sa an ríge, an neart, agas an ghlōir, tré bhioth síor.  
Bíodh amhluidh.

The most significant innovation in this version is the use of the optative subjunctive in place of the imperative of the earlier versions in the first three petitions. I am unable to establish whether this innovation is Carsuel's own, or whether in this regard he made use of an existing translation: at all events it subsequently became the norm, though not precisely in the same form in the first and third petitions, where the periphrastic copula with verbal adjective was replaced by the autonomous verb. I would suggest that Carsuel's construction was an attempt to provide a close rendering of a Scottish English version of the *Pater*, the implication being that he himself may have been responsible, if not for the introduction of the optative, then at least for the form it takes in the first and third petitions of his version.

Carsuel claimed to have translated BCO from Latin and English.<sup>13</sup> However, since no Latin version existed of that work in the form translated by him, either his claim was based on a misunderstanding which could have led him to believe that, in translating the English, he was translating a Latin original at one remove, or his reference to Latin 'was

<sup>10</sup>The first modern edition was that of Thomas McLauchlan (Edinburgh 1873); references here, however, are to Thomson's edition: see above.

<sup>11</sup>Lines 1132–9 and 1574–80. A verse rendering, 'An Phaidear a meadarthacht dhána', occurs at lines 3905–3933.

<sup>12</sup>The misprints are *go mo* for *go ma* (line 1132) in the first petition, and *dod* for *do* (line 1133) in the second. The lack of the opening address, *Ar n-Athair-ne atá ar neamh*, in the second occurrence of the prayer (line 1574) is due to the fact that here the *Pater* forms part of a very long prayer which opens with the address *A Dhē uile-chumhachtaigh agas a Athair neamhdha* (line 1425) followed by the address *a Thighearna* at several points subsequently.

<sup>13</sup>Thomson, *Foirm na n-Urrnuidheadh*, 1.

intended to dispose his Highland readers to a more sympathetic attitude towards the book and its contents than if its origin were entirely Lowland and English'.<sup>14</sup> R. L. Thomson considers it 'likely . . . that his translation was . . . entirely or predominantly based on the English of BCO'.<sup>15</sup> It would appear that the English text of the *Pater* was not given in BCO at the point corresponding to FU lines 1132–9,<sup>16</sup> but it was given at the point corresponding to FU lines 1574–80 as follows:

- 1 . . . So that thy Name may be sanctified:
  - 2 Thy Kingdom come:
  - 3 Thy Will be done in earth as it is in heaven:
  - 4 Give us this day our daily bread:
  - 5 And forgive us our detts even as we forgive our detters:
  - 6 And lead us not into tentation,
  - 7 but deliver us from evil:
- for thine is the Kingdome, and the power, and the glorie for ever and ever. Amen.<sup>17</sup>

It is likely that the normal form of the first petition, freed from the context in which it occurs here, was 'Our Father which arte in heaven, sanctified be thy Name'.<sup>18</sup> Carsuel's version provides a perfectly good translation of the first three petitions of this rather standard English *Pater* and indeed of the complete text. Nevertheless, since other aspects of his version would seem to suggest that he knew of Irish versions similar to those of LB–EG and *Liber Flavus*, one might ask why he abandoned their imperatives in favour of the optative subjunctive forms of his first three petitions.

<sup>14</sup>*ibid.*, lxviii

<sup>15</sup>*ibid.*

<sup>16</sup>I have not seen a copy of the original BCO (Edinburgh 1564). G. W. Sprott, *The Book of Common Order of the Church of Scotland* (Edinburgh and London 1901), which reproduces Andrew Hart's large edition of 1611, and Thomas McLauchlan, (note 10 above), which gives the English text from David Laing's edition of the *Works of John Knox* (1846–64), both lack the *Pater* at this point apart from the opening address, *Our Father which arte in heaven*.

<sup>17</sup>The text is that given in McLauchlan, 97. Apart from orthography and punctuation, that given in Sprott, 102, is identical with it, with the single exception that it has *on earth* in the third petition.

<sup>18</sup>The complete text would then be the same in all important respects as that in *The myrrour of the Chyrche* printed in London in 1521 by Wynkyn de Worde: 'Our Fader that art in Heven, sanctified be thi Name; thy Kyngdome come to us, thy wyl be done in erth as in Heven, our dayly brede gyve us to day and forgyve us our detts as we forgyve our dettis [? dettoris], and lede us not into temptacion, but delyver [us] from evil. Amen'. See H. Thurston, *Familiar prayers: their origin and history* (London 1953) 25.

Works such as John Gau's *The richt vay to the kingdom of Heuine* (1533)<sup>19</sup> and John Hamilton's *Catechism* (1552)<sup>20</sup> attest to the existence of a specifically Scottish version of the *Pater* in English,<sup>21</sup> both in the reformist and in the Catholic tradition.<sup>22</sup> Gau's version is as follows:

- 1 Our fader thow quhilk is in ye heuine / thy nayme mot be hallowit /
  - 2 thy kingdome mot cum (to vsz)
  - 3 thy wil mot be dwne in ye zeird as it is in the heuine
  - 4 giff wsz this day our dailie breid /
  - 5 and forgiff wsz our dettis as we forgiff our dettours /
  - 6 and leid vsz noht in temptatioun
  - 7 bot deliuer us fra ewil
- Amen.<sup>23</sup>

The use of *mot* in the first three petitions is an example of what is the most frequently recorded use of this verb in Scottish English, namely, in principal clauses 'in expression of a wish, supplication, request, proposal or suggestion'.<sup>24</sup> The inversion of word-order in such asseverative phrases as these petitions is normal.<sup>25</sup> The employment of this auxiliary serves to form a clearly optative subjunctive in contradistinction

<sup>19</sup>A. F. Mitchell (ed.), *The richt vay to the kingdom of Heuine* (Scottish Text Society XII, Edinburgh and London 1888 for 1886-7). Gau's reformist work, published at Malmö in Denmark, is a translation of the Danish treatise of Christiær Pedersen, *Den rette vey till Hiemmerigis Rige* (Antwerp 1531).

<sup>20</sup>T. G. Law (ed.), *The catechism of John Hamilton* (Oxford 1884). Hamilton, who was Archbishop of St Andrews, Primate of Scotland and Legatus Natus of the Holy See, was a prime figure in the effort to sustain the Catholic system up to the establishment of Protestantism in Scotland in 1560.

<sup>21</sup>Their choice of this version seems to have been quite deliberate: as his commentaries on the *Pater* (Law, *The catechism of John Hamilton*, 248-9, 249-70) show, Hamilton at least was conversant with other standard versions.

<sup>22</sup>Following the Catholic practice Hamilton gives the Latin text of the *Pater* both before the prayer itself in English and also phrase by phrase in both of his commentaries.

<sup>23</sup>Mitchell, *The richt vay to the kingdom of Heuine*, 82. The text is repeated on pp. 85-96 with the single change (apart from slight orthographical variations) that *fulfillit* replaces *dwne* in the third petition. Though Hamilton's *Catechism* was much nearer in time to Carsuel than Gau's work, I have thought it preferable to give Gau's version of the *Pater* in the text of this essay since Gau was a forerunner of Carsuel in the reformed tradition and therefore much more likely than Hamilton to have provided Carsuel with a model. But Hamilton's version is identical in all relevant points with Gau's and reads: 'O our Father quhilk is in Hevinnis. Thy name mot be hallowit. Thy kyngdome mot cum. Thy wyll mot be done in erd, as it is in hevin. Geve us this day, our daylie breid. And forgyff us our dettis as we forgyfe our dettours. And lede us nocht in temptatioun. Bot delyver us fra evyl. Sa be it' (Law, *The catechism of John Hamilton*, 249).

<sup>24</sup>A. J. Aitken (ed.), *A dictionary of the older Scottish tongue from the twelfth century to the end of the seventeenth . . . M-N* (Chicago and London 1973) s.v. *Mot, Mote, Moit*, 2b.

<sup>25</sup>Among the examples of this quoted *ibid.*, 2b (5), are 'Thy nayme mot be hallowit', referring to Gau and Hamilton; and 'In hell comdampnyt mot he be!', referring to Barb[our, 1375].

to what, in a recent grammar of English, has been called the formulaic subjunctive,<sup>26</sup> which occurs in the standard English form of these first three petitions, *sanctified or hallowed be thy name, thy kingdom come, thy will be done*. Since, like the imperative, these formulaic subjunctives are realised by the base form of the verb, they may quite easily be felt and understood to be imperatives, with which the Irish imperatives of the first three petitions of the LB-EG and *Liber Flavus* versions could be seen to correspond. On the other hand the optative subjunctive of Carsuel's first three petitions, and in particular the periphrastic *go ma beandaighthe* and *go ma dēnta* of the first and third, would seem to be an attempt to translate as closely as possible the optatives of the Scottish English version represented by Gau and Hamilton.

As to the remainder of Carsuel's *Pater*, there is nothing to choose between the BCO version and that of Gau and Hamilton, which might have influenced his translation one way or another, apart from the fact that BCO has the final doxology,<sup>27</sup> Carsuel's version of which may be the first in Irish and certainly is the oldest surviving published version in Irish.

At a number of points this first printed Irish translation of the *Pater* agrees well with the two older ones. Thus Carsuel's *Ar n-Athair-ne atá ar neamh* reflects the form of this phrase in *Liber Flavus*, and there is virtual identity between the two versions of the fifth petition, Carsuel, however, having *amhail* as in LB-EG rather than *mar* of *Liber Flavus*. Again his fourth and seventh petitions are clearly modern forms of those in LB-EG, while his *ná léig . . . sind* of the sixth petition is a reflex of the earlier *\*níroléice* of LB-EG. In view of what has been said above about Carsuel's apparent attempt to reflect an English version of the first three petitions, his retention of the *léig-* form to translate English *lead*<sup>28</sup> bears strong witness to the tenacity of this particular usage in the Irish version of the sixth petition.

Carsuel's version of the *Pater* contains two further innovations: the use of *laitheamhail* in the fourth petition and of *buaidhreadh* in the sixth. The examples of *laithemail* quoted in *Dictionary of the Irish language [DIL]* are all from the seventeenth century, but its use in the sixteenth century is attested to in three translations of the *Pater*, those of Flaithrí

<sup>26</sup>R. Quirk, S. Greenbaum, G. Leech, J. Svartvik, *A comprehensive grammar of the English language* (London and New York 1985) 155, 157–8.

<sup>27</sup>On the use of the doxology, see below.

<sup>28</sup>This is what occurs in BCO, Gau and Hamilton, and is, of course, the formula which has prevailed from the middle of the sixteenth century on. As already noted, however, *let us not be led* type formulae existed in English from Anglo-Saxon times (*Celtica* 21 (1990) 485) and *lette us not be ledde into temptacyon* was the form promoted by Henry VIII (see B. Ó Cuív, 'Some versions of the sixth petition in the *Pater Noster*', *Studia Celtica* 14–15 (1979–80) 212–22, pp. 219–20; Thurston, *Familiar prayers*, 33–5).

Ó Maolchonaire (1593)<sup>29</sup> and Seán Ó Cearnaigh (1571)<sup>30</sup> and that of Carsuel, which is the earliest. Like the older *laithide*, *laithemail* (in its various spellings) seems to belong in the main to the translation literature; and just as *cechlaithi* (LB-EG) and *gach n-aon-lá* (*Liber Flavus*) reflect Latin *quotidianum*, so too the use of *laithemail* in the *Pater* could be taken to be due to an attempt to translate English *daily*. I regard it as most unlikely, however, that Carsuel was the originator of the use of this form in the *Pater*, for it is found, not only in Ó Maolchonaire and Ó Cearnaigh, but in all subsequent Irish versions of the *Pater*, and since there is little reason to suppose that Carsuel's version influenced later Catholic translators, it is to be presumed that he and they in this matter simply accepted an already established usage. Ó Maolchonaire is particularly unlikely to have had a copy of Carsuel with him in Spain where he translated the catechism in which his versions of the *Pater* occur, and the same is no doubt true of Bonabhentura Ó hEodhasa, who composed his *Teagasg Críosaíde* in Louvain in the early seventeenth century.

The use of *buaidhreadh* to translate *temptation* in the sixth petition shows a development of meaning from *molestation*, *tribulation*, which parallels that which was involved in the use in this sense of *ammus* (LB-EG) 'attempt, effort, attack', and *aimsiughadh* (*Liber Flavus*), 'aiming at, striking at, attacking', and which would obviously be facilitated by the understanding that here the underlying Greek word *πειρασμός* means 'trial, proof, test'. In this case too I would argue that, though Carsuel provides the first record of the use of this word in the *Pater*, he did not himself introduce it. First, since I have suggested that Carsuel was aware of versions of the *Pater* similar to those of LB-EG and *Liber Flavus*, and given that he was a skilled translator, I believe that it is unlikely that he would have replaced an existing word by a new one in a prayer, the clear understanding of which by the people he would have regarded as essential, if that new word were not already well sanctioned by use.<sup>31</sup> Second, Ó Maolchonaire has *buaidhreadh*, though not in the text of the *Pater* itself but when repeating the petition in the question and answer

<sup>29</sup>In his translation of de Ripalda's *Exposicion breve de la doctrina christiana* (1591), ed. B. Ó Cuív, 'Flaithri Ó Maolchonaire's catechism of Christian doctrine', *Celtica* 1/2 (1950) 161-206. On the identification of de Ripalda's work as the original translated by Ó Maolchonaire, see Ó Cuív, *Studia Celtica* 14-15 (1979-80) 212 n. 7. I am grateful to Brian Ó Cuív for letting me have a partial copy of the modern (1949) edition of de Ripalda to which he refers there. I have also used an older edition in the library of Trinity College, Dublin, namely, Edward Spencer Dodgson's 1893 edition of a Basque translation made in 1656 in which the original Spanish text is also given.

<sup>30</sup>On his *Caiticiosma*, see further below.

<sup>31</sup>Carsuel generally uses *buaidhreadh* in the sense of 'disturbance, tumult', but there is at least one other instance, apart from the *Pater*, in which he uses it to translate *temptation*, viz. 'seasamh . . . a n-adhaidh gach uile bhuaidheartha' (lines 1389-90) translating 'to withstand all tentations' (see McLauchlan, 86). *DIL* (s.v. *búaidred*) gives no instance of this use of the word.

discussion of the prayer, and in a formula which differs from Carsuel's;<sup>32</sup> and since I have already suggested that Ó Maolchonaire is likely to have been independent of Carsuel, in this case too this can only mean that both were drawing on established usage.

Apart from Ó Maolchonaire's, no Catholic version of the *Pater* has *buaidhreadh*; while on the other hand, unlike Ó Cearnaigh, the Protestant works of the first half of the seventeenth century all have *buaidhreadh*, though again in a formula different from Carsuel's in most cases, only the translation of the Gospel of St Luke 11:4 having the full petition in the form used by Carsuel. The word *buaidhreadh* was subsequently eschewed in all Irish versions of the *Pater*, both Catholic and Protestant.

In Scotland, Carsuel's version of the *Pater* was repeated with a few changes in the Gaelic version (c.1630) of John Calvin's *Catechismus Ecclesiae Genevensis* (CC)<sup>33</sup> and in *Foirceadul aithghearr* (FA), the translation made of the *Shorter catechism* in 1653.<sup>34</sup> Unlike Carsuel, who to a very large extent followed the literary language common to the learned men of Ireland and Scotland, the later translators tended to accommodate themselves more to the usage of contemporary Scottish Gaelic, so that their books are unlikely to have been used in Ireland. It is certain that what small changes they made in his version of the *Pater* had no impact here.<sup>35</sup>

<sup>32</sup>Ó Cuív, *Celtica* 1/2 (1950) 172 line 348: 'M. Créd iarús tú ag rádh dhuit "ná treoraigh sinn a mbuaidhredh"?' Apart from this instance, Ó Maolchonaire does not use *buaidhreadh* in this sense, preferring *cathughadh* in the text of the sixth petition of the *Pater* (line 286), in the answer to the question on it (line 350) and at lines 908 and 909, where it translates *tentaciones*. *Buaidhirt* (line 933) translates *turbaciones*, not *tentaciones* (pace Ó Cuív, 204 s.v.). In *Desiderius* (1616) Ó Maolchonaire often uses *cathughadh* in both singular and plural to translate *tentacion* (for references, see T. F. O'Rahilly (ed.), *Desiderius* (Dublin 1941) 288 s.v. *cathoigh*).

<sup>33</sup>Ed. R. L. Thomson, *Adtimchiol an chreidimh* (Scottish Gaelic Texts Society VII, Edinburgh 1962).

<sup>34</sup>ibid., appendix II. No copy of the first edition being known to have survived, Thomson prints the second edition of 1659.

<sup>35</sup>Thomson, ibid., xvii, rejecting the claim that Carsuel was the translator of CC, seems to suggest that, though the version of the *Pater* in FA is similar to Carsuel's, that in the translation of CC is different from both and 'derives from Calvin's Latin'. In his edition of FU (p. 138), however, he describes this latter as 'a very similar rendering' to Carsuel's. It is in fact so, and differs from his only in an increased use of emphatic suffixes (*hainmsa*, *righese*, *thoilse*, *dhúinne* (× 2)); pl. *neamhdhaibh* for sing. *neamh* and *naomhtha* for *beandaighthe* in the first petition; *ctulaín* (i.e. *giúlain* 'bear, carry; permit') for *lraig* in the sixth; *ó n'olc* for *ó olc* in the seventh; and *rìoghacht* for *rìghe* and *gus na saoghalaibh* for *tré bhioth síor* in the doxology. The version in FA differs from Carsuel's in the following details: three extra emphatic suffixes (*hainmsa*, *rìoghachdsa*, *thoilsi*); *rìoghachd* for *rìghe* in the second petition and in the doxology; *dēntar* for *go ma dēnta* and *air dtalmhuin* for *a dtalmhuin* in the third petition; and *cumhachd* for *neart*, *gu siorraidh* for *tré bhioth síor* and *Amen* for *Bìodh amhluidh* in the doxology.

## 3. Ó CEARNAIGH'S AIBIDIL GAOIDHEILGE AGUS CAITICIOSMA

Seán Ó Cearnaigh published his *Aibidil Gaoidheilge agus caiticiosma* in 1571 in Dublin, where he was treasurer of St Patrick's Cathedral.<sup>36</sup> After the title-page, epistle to the reader and some notes on the Irish alphabet come two of the most substantial sections of the book, namely, the *Caiticiosma* itself (11–21), which consists of a translation of the catechism in the *Book of Common Prayer* (BCP) of 1559, and *Foirm Urrnaighthe* (21–40), which, among some other prayers, including a prayer for the Church militant from the Communion Service of BCP, contains morning and evening prayers and grace before and after meals taken, as Tomás de Bhaldraithe has shown,<sup>37</sup> from Carsuel's FU.

Ó Cearnaigh's version of the *Pater* occurs in the *Caiticiosma* section at pages 19–20 and is as follows:

- 1 A athair atá annsna neamhaibh naomhthar hainm.
  - 2 Tigeadh do fhlaithreamhnas.
  - 3 Bíodh do thoil mar atá ar neamh agus ar talamh.
  - 4 Tabhair dhúinn aníú ar n-arán laetheamhail fén,
  - 5 agus maith dhúinn ar bhfiacha amhail agus mhaithmidne dár bhfiach-  
aighthóiribh fén,
  - 6 agus ná treóraigh don chathughadh sind,
  - 7 achd saor sind ón olc.
- Óir is leat fén in ríoghachd an cumhachd agus an ghlóir tré bhithibh síor. Amen.<sup>38</sup>

It is clear that, though Ó Cearnaigh used other prayers from Carsuel's FU, his version of the *Pater* is, as de Bhaldraithe pointed out,<sup>39</sup> quite different from Carsuel's. A possible explanation for this is that Ó Cearnaigh may have produced his translation of the *Pater* before Carsuel's book came to hand, indeed before it was even published. In his letter to the reader, Ó Cearnaigh refers to a previous version of his Catechism which he had published in 1563.<sup>40</sup> This cannot have contained

<sup>36</sup>For an account of Ó Cearnaigh and his work see Williams, *I bprionta i leabhar*, 21–6. I have used a photostat copy of *Aibidil Gaoidheilge agus caiticiosma* which is in the Royal Irish Academy.

<sup>37</sup>*Éigse* 9 (1958) 61–3.

<sup>38</sup>This edited version is from de Bhaldraithe, 63–4. The original (with abbreviations italicised and the *punctum delens* represented by italic *h*) is as follows: 'A athair atá ann sna neamhaibh naómhthar hainm. Tigead do fhlaithreamhnas. Bíóth do thoil mar tá ar neamh agus ar talamh. Tabhair dhuinn aníú ar naran laetheamhail fén, agus maith dhuinn ar bhfiaca amhail agus mhaithmidne dár bhfiach aighthóiribh, fén. Agus ná treóraigh don chathughadh sind, achd raór [*sic*] sinnd ón olc. óir is leat fén in ríoghachd an cumhachd agus an ghlóir tré bhithibh síor. Amen'.

<sup>39</sup>*ibid.*, 63.

<sup>40</sup>'Agus ní hé amháin atá aga iarruidh ort an ceartughadh ceannsa carthanach sin do thabhairt ar an gcló: Acht cheana, ar in dtranslasion nó ar in arrthughadh do roinneasa ar in gcaiticiosma so, do chuireadh amach roimhe ar mhór an chulaidh linn 1563 d'aois an Tighearna' (p. 5). Both de Bhaldraithe (p. 65) and Williams (*I bprionta i leabhar*, 141, and see 24) read *ar mhór an chulaidh as ar mhórán chulaidh*

Carsuel's prayers, since his book did not appear until 1567, but presumably it did contain the translation of the Catechism of BCP, including the *Pater*. Having already provided a translation of the *Pater* in 1563, he must have decided to retain it in 1571, and not to reject it in favour of Carsuel's.<sup>41</sup>

Since Ó Cearnaigh's original of the text in which the *Pater* occurs, viz. the Catechism of BCP, was in English, one would perhaps assume that the English version of the *Pater* would have formed the basis for the Irish. There is no evidence that this was so; rather it would seem that this Irish version owes much to earlier Irish versions and also shows signs of the influence of a Latin (or Greek) original.

The official text of the *Pater* in English which was imposed by Henry VIII in 1541 had 'And lette us not be ledde into temptacyon' in the sixth petition, though the earlier quasi-official version of *The institution of a Christian man* (1537) had had 'And lede us not into temptation'. In the first Prayer Book of Edward VI of 1549 the earlier formula was restored, and thus was produced the text of the *Pater* in English which became standard in BCP:

- 1 Oure father whiche arte in heauen, hallowed be thy name.
- 2 Thy kyngdom come.
- 3 Thy wyll be done in earth as it is in heauen.
- 4 Geue vs this daye oure dayly bread.
- 5 And forgeue vs oure trespasses, as we forgeue them that trespasse agaynst vs.
- 6 And leade vs not into temptation.
- 7 But deliuer vs from euell. Amen.<sup>42</sup>

The phrase most suggestive of a connection between the English and Irish versions is that of the sixth petition, where *ná treoraigh* appears for the first time. The formula *ná treóraigh . . . sind* could be taken to be a literal translation of the English *leade vs not*. However, it is also true that it 'would seem to provide a reasonable equivalent of *ne nos*

[i.e. *in several garbs*], but while de Bhaldraithe suggests that this may mean that he published it in various print styles, Williams (24) offers the view that *do chuireadh amach . . . kinn* does not necessarily mean that he published the book, but that he issued it in several manuscript copies.

<sup>41</sup>This argument can also be used to explain the great differences between Ó Cearnaigh's and Carsuel's version of the Creed and the Ten Commandments noticed by de Bhaldraithe (*Éigse* 9 (1958) 64), since they also occur in the *Caiticiosma* section of Ó Cearnaigh's book.

<sup>42</sup>From V. Staley (ed.), *The first prayer book of King Edward VI* (Library of Liturgy and Ecclesiology for English Readers 33, London 1903) [21]. A photograph of this page of the original (1549) will be found in E. C. Ratcliff (ed.), *The Booke of Common Prayer: its making and revisions 1549-1661* (London 1949) pl. 22. For the text of the *Pater* in the 1559 BCP, which is the same as that produced here, see *The prayer-book of Queen Elizabeth* (The Ancient and Modern Library of Theological Literature, London 1890) 43 (Morning prayer), 119 (Catechism).

*inducas* of the Latin Vulgate and μή εισενέγκης ἡμᾶς of the Greek',<sup>43</sup> and since other aspects of Ó Cearnaigh's version seem to reflect a Latin or Greek, rather than an English, original, on balance I prefer to take it that the same is true of this form of the sixth petition also. As we shall see, there is clear evidence that Ó Cearnaigh's version of the *Pater* is not an original translation but owes much to earlier Irish versions, in particular to the LB-EG tradition. It would seem that he was not the first to use the verb *treoraigh* in this formula either, for it also occurs in Ó Maolchonaire's discussion of the *Pater*,<sup>44</sup> and, since I believe that it is unlikely that Ó Maolchonaire was influenced by Ó Cearnaigh any more than by Carsuel, I regard it as most probable that both adopted an existing translation. It is, of course, also possible, that both chanced on the same verb independently of each other; but, given that the range of options is not unduly limited, the likelihood of this having happened can be discounted.

Ó Cearnaigh's version of the third petition is meaningless, the word-order of the second part of the formula, *mar atá ar neamh agus ar talamh*, being clearly due to a slavish attempt to provide a word for word rendering of the Latin *sicut in caelo et in terra* or of the Greek ὡς ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς, and owing nothing to English *in earth as it is in heauen*. So too in the first petition *neamhaibh* reflects the plural of Latin *caelis* and Greek τοῖς οὐρανοῖς rather than the English singular *heauen*; and *fiacha* and *fiachaighthóiribh* of the fifth petition translate Latin *debita* and *debitoribus*, Greek ὀφειλήματα and ὀφειλέταις, rather than *trespasses* and *them that trespassed against us* of BCP. In these latter instances, however, it must be admitted that there is every reason to believe that these forms are derived from earlier Irish versions of the *Pater*, for plural *nimib* is well represented in the LB-EG texts, and *fiachu*, *fechemnaib* etc. are found in the three earlier versions to the exclusion of anything else.<sup>45</sup> Indeed Ó Cearnaigh's version is remarkably faithful to the oldest Irish version of LB-EG. His first two petitions, as

<sup>43</sup>Ó Cuív, *Studia Celtica* 14–15 (1979–80) 215.

<sup>44</sup>Ó Cuív, *Celtica* 1/2 (1950) 172 line 348. The original Spanish has nothing to suggest the use of *treoraigh*.

<sup>45</sup>Many earlier English versions of the *Pater*, including that of the Scottish BCO as we have seen, had *debts* and *debtors* here (e.g. *The kalender of shepherdes*, London 1506). This continued to be true of translations of the Biblical text (e.g. Wiclif (1380), Cranmer (1539), Geneva (1557), Rheims (1582), Authorised (1611); see Samuel Bagster (publ.), *The English hexapla* (London n.d.), at Matthew 6:12) and of the BCO version. However, *trespasses* and *trespassers* are found in some versions of the prayer printed early in the sixteenth century (e.g. *Mirrore of Oure Lady* (1530); Tyndale's translation (1534) of Matthew 6:12; see Bagster, *The English hexapla*) and, with the change of *trespassers* to *them that trespass against us*, constitute the formula which was adopted in the version of the *Pater* which appears in the quasi-official *The institution of a Christian man* (1537), in the official Henrician version (1541) and in the BCP from 1549 on. Both *debt* and *trespass* (in the broader sense of *transgression*, *offence*, *sin*) are valid translations of the underlying Aramaic word, which covered the full semantic range involved in the two words in English (see A. Durand, J. Huby, J. J. Heenan, *The word of salvation* I (Milwaukee 1957) 108).

well as the first part of the third and fourth, and also the fifth and seventh petitions are simply modern versions of the earlier formulae, with *flaitheamhnas* replacing the related *flaithius*, *maith-* (as in the *Liber Flavus* version) replacing *log-*, *fiachaighthóiribh* replacing the related *féchemnaib*, and *ón olc* replacing *ó cech ulc*.<sup>46</sup> The retention of *A athair* and *insna nimib* (LB-1B, EG-1B; *hi nimib* LB-1A) in the first petition is striking, since these had been replaced by *Ar nAthairne* and *ar nimh* (*neamh*) in *Liber Flavus* and *Carsuel*. But the retention of *Bíd do thol* in the third petition is of particular significance, for though on the one hand *Bíd* had been replaced by *Déantar* in *Liber Flavus* and by *go ma dēnta* in *Carsuel*, on the other hand it is found in Ó Maolchonaire,<sup>47</sup> which, for the same reason as in the case of *treoraigh*, I would argue is due to both Ó Cearnaigh and Ó Maolchonaire adopting independently an existing formula, in this instance that of the LB-EG tradition.

Ó Cearnaigh's translation of *tentatio* in the sixth petition is *cathughadh*, which is not found in any earlier version of the *Pater*. However, the extension of meaning from 'fighting, battling' to 'temptation' had taken place at least as early as the fifteenth century,<sup>48</sup> and the word was certainly firmly established as bearing this sense by the early seventeenth century.<sup>49</sup> It is unlikely that Ó Cearnaigh was the first to use it in the *Pater*, for Ó Maolchonaire has it, not only in the main text of the prayer,<sup>50</sup> but also in the answer to the question on the sixth petition, even though the word does not occur in the question, in which, quite confusingly, a version of the petition is quoted which is very different from that of the text of the prayer.<sup>51</sup> Once again I would argue that both Ó Cearnaigh and Ó Maolchonaire took this word from an existing translation.

The predominant feature of Ó Cearnaigh's version then is the number of its formulae which appear to derive ultimately from the LB-EG tradition: indeed its principal importance lies in the evidence it provides

<sup>46</sup> *Ón olc*: not only is this stylistically valid, it is also supported by the Greek ἀπὸ τοῦ πονηροῦ and by modern scholarship, e.g. *The Jerusalem Bible* (1966), which gives *from the evil one* as its primary reading.

<sup>47</sup> Ó Cuív, *Celtica* 1/2 (1950) 171 line 283, and see 172 line 329. The Spanish has *hágase* (*hacer*, to do).

<sup>48</sup> See C. Ó Maonaigh (ed.), *Smaointe Beatha Chríost* (Baile Átha Cliath 1944) lines 1308-1310: 'De ieiunio et temptacionibus Domini . . . treigenus in Tigherna, ocus in cathughadh do cuireadh air'. The first example quoted in *DIL* s.v. *cathugud* (c) is not relevant, for *cathugud* [*n*]a *colla* there translates *belló carnis*; and the dating of the second example, that from *Dioghlaím dána*, 53.10, cannot be established since the attribution of the poem in question to Donnchadh Mór Ó Dálaigh is in doubt: see L. Mac Cionnaith, *Dioghlaím dána* (Baile Átha Cliath 1938) 624. The instances from *Smaointe Beatha Chríost* (1430 × 1461) and Ó Cearnaigh are not given in *DIL*.

<sup>49</sup> For Ó Maolchonaire's use of it in his *Catechism* (1593) and in *Desiderius* (1616), see note 32 above. For Bonabhentura Ó hEodhasa (1611), see F. Mac Raghnaill (ed.), *An teagasg Críosaíde* (Baile Átha Cliath 1976) 108 s.v. *cathoghadh*.

<sup>50</sup> *Celtica* 1/2 (1950) 171 line 286.

<sup>51</sup> *ibid.*, 172 lines 347-50.

for the strong survival of that version well into the second half of the sixteenth century. Other details, including the use of *laetheamhail*,<sup>52</sup> *treoraigh* and *cathughadh*, seem to represent borrowings from a more recent version or versions, while the infelicity of *mar atá ar neamh agus ar talamh* is simply due to imitation of the word-order of the Latin or Greek original. I have not been able to ascertain whether Ó Cearnaigh himself was responsible for modernising the LB-EG version and for adopting those other alterations, or whether he simply used a version in which those changes had been made.

It is strange that Ó Cearnaigh should have added the final doxology to the *Pater*, since it does not occur in the BCP of 1559, nor in any other edition of it before the seventeenth century.<sup>53</sup> The doxology was used in the liturgy of the early Christian Church, whence it was imported into manuscript copies of St Matthew's Gospel to be subsequently retained in some printed Greek, Latin and vernacular editions of the New Testament. It is possible that Ó Cearnaigh, on the basis of the Scriptural evidence available to him and of common practice, believed that the doxology was an integral part of the *Pater*, and so added it to his translation, even though it did not appear in BCP. If he did so in 1571, he may have been influenced by BCO mediated by Carsuel, though his translation of the doxology is clearly different from Carsuel's. On the other hand if he did so in 1563, then his is the first version of the doxology in Irish for which evidence exists.<sup>54</sup>

<sup>52</sup>See my earlier comments.

<sup>53</sup>As we have seen (above) it was used in BCO from the beginning; it was introduced into the Scottish BCP in 1637 and became general from the 1662 revision of BCP on; see F. C. Cross (ed.), *The Oxford dictionary of the Christian Church* 2nd ed. revised (Oxford 1983) 836.

<sup>54</sup>(a) It is noteworthy that whereas in the second petition *kingdom* (Βασιλεία, *regnum*) is translated by *flaitheamhnas*, in the doxology it is translated by *ríoghacht*. I take this to mean that the translation of the doxology was separate from that of the prayer itself, and perhaps that the translation of the prayer was influenced by one model, as already suggested, while the translation of the doxology may have been influenced by a different model or by none.

(b) The use of the dat. pl. of *bith* both here and at p. 40 in the phrase *tré bhithibh síor* (*for ever*) is interesting, for though the preposition *tre* may be followed by the dative, use of the accusative is general, particularly in this phrase *tré bithu sír* (see *DIL* s.v. *sír*, and O'Rahilly, *Desiderius*, 284–5 s.v. *bioth*). Though the plural is later frequently replaced by the singular *tré bith sír*, *tré bhioth s(h)íor*, and though *Irish grammatical tracts* II (declension) (ed. O. Bergin, supplement to *Ériu* 8–10 (1916–28)) § 71 states that *bith* has no plural ('bith (acht gan illradh aige)'), the plural *tré bhiotha síor* survived strongly into the modern period (see *DIL* s.v. *sír*; O'Rahilly, *Desiderius*, 285 s.v. *bioth*; see further Mac Raghnaill, *An teagasg Críosaíochta*, line 1627), and some instances in seventeenth-century texts of northern provenance show palatal *-th-* (see P. Ó Súilleabháin (ed.), *Beatha San Froinsias* (Baile Átha Cliath 1957) line 3213 *tré bhithe síor*; A. Ó Fachtna (ed.), *Parrthas an anma* (Baile Átha Cliath 1953) line 5961 *tré bhithe*, as well as line 6157 *tré bhioth síor*).

4. Ó DOMHNAILL'S *TIOMNA NUADH*

The Gospels contain two accounts of Christ's teaching his disciples to pray the *Pater*, namely, Matthew 6:9–13 and Luke 11:2–4. The text of the prayer given in Matthew is the one which has traditionally been used in recitation of the prayer, while in critical editions of the Gospels Luke's version differs from it in the wording of the fourth and fifth petitions and in the omission of part of the first petition and all of the third and seventh.<sup>55</sup> In many manuscript copies of the Gospels, however, the 'deficiencies' in Luke are made good in wording which follows that of Matthew, with the result that the two versions differ from one another only in the wording of the fourth and fifth petitions (and in the fact that the doxology does not occur in Luke). It is this 'restored' version of the *Pater* which is found in Luke in the *Textus receptus* of the Greek New Testament, and which is translated in Uilliam Ó Domhnaill's *Tiomna Nuadh*. There are thus two versions of the *Pater* in the *Tiomna Nuadh*, both of which merit consideration.

It seems that the project to have the New Testament translated into Irish was initiated early in the reign of Elizabeth I. At all events by December 1567 the Government was expressing disappointment that no progress had been made and was threatening to reclaim the money provided to have a font of type made for that purpose.<sup>56</sup> Twenty years later in 1587 the English Privy Council were reported to believe that the New Testament had been translated and that the manuscript was in the hands of the printer;<sup>57</sup> but it would appear that that belief was not well founded, for, in the preface *Do chum an léughthóra* which Uilliam Ó Domhnaill prefixed to his *Tiomna Nuadh* in 1602, he states that five years previously, in 1597, only the four Gospels had been translated, and only the Gospels of Matthew and Mark and the first five chapters of Luke had been printed.

Those initially engaged in the enterprise were Seán Ó Cearnaigh (author of *Aibidil Gaoidheilge agus caiticiosma*, who died in 1587), Nicolás Bhailis (bishop of Ossory, 1577–85) and Fearganainm Ó Domhnalláin (archbishop of Tuam, 1595–1609). Apparently after the deaths of Bhailis and Ó Cearnaigh, Uilliam Ó Domhnaill became involved in it, together with Maoilín Óg Mac Bruaideadha, and then after 1597 it fell to Ó Domhnaill, assisted by Domhnall Óg Ó hUiginn, to complete the work of translating and printing the *Tiomna Nuadh*. Ó Domhnaill's brief report in his *Epistle dedicatorie* is complemented by the account which he gives of the work in the preface:

<sup>55</sup> *The Jerusalem Bible* (1966) translates Luke 11:2–4 as follows: Father, may your name be held holy, your kingdom come; give us each day our daily bread, and forgive us our sins, for we ourselves forgive each one who is in debt to us. And do not put us to the test.

<sup>56</sup> See Williams, *I bprionta i leabhar*, 21–2.

<sup>57</sup> *ibid.*, 29–30.

Yet blessed be the memorie of such as haue giuen the first attempt to enterprise this worke, namely Maister Nicholas Walsh that famous Bishoppe and Martyr, Maister John Kearny, and Nehemias Donellan now Archbishop of Tuame: whose godly indeuours were notwithstanding vntimely cut off in Gods secret iudgement, and the waight of the burden cast vpon my weake shoulders. . . .<sup>58</sup>

Bíodh gu bhfuadar daoine diagha, foirfe, foghlomtha lór saothair dhá taobh roimhe so: mar atá Seán Ó Cearnuidh . . . agus Nicolás Bhailis . . . maille ré Fearganainm Ó nDomhnalláin . . . noch dho ghabh saothar mór air féin maille riomsa agus ré Maoilín Óg Mhac Bhruaideadha, duine iúlmhar sa teanguidh Ghaoidheilge, sa gColáisde nuadh láimh ré Baile Átha Cliath, áit 'nar chríochnuighemar maille re na chur a gcló Ghaoidheilge . . . agus an seiseadh caibidil do thsoisgéul Lūcāis, agus an chuid eile dhon tsoisgéul sin, agus soisgéul Eóin, sgríobhtha ré láimh gan chur a gcló an tan sin, ná fós gu ceann cúig mbliadhan 'na dhiaigh, nó gu dtáinic dhíomsa tré thoil Dé, maille ré cunnamh Domhnuill Óig Í Uiginn, (air ar chuir mé ualach na coda eile dho sgríobhadh do réir óghuim agus chirt na G(h)aoidheilge,) críoch dho chur uirthé. . . .<sup>59</sup>

It is not surprising, given that the work extended over so many years and that so many people had a hand in it, that the translation is far from being all of a piece. Ó Domhnaill insisted in his *Epistle dedicatorie* that his source language was 'the original Greeke, vnto which I tyed my selfe, as of dutie I ought'.<sup>60</sup> There is no reason to doubt the truth of this statement, for he himself and Ó Cearnaigh, Bhailis and Ó Domhnalláin had received a university education and would have been competent in Greek. Nevertheless Nicholas Williams has shown that the translation was at times influenced by the Latin of the Vulgate and the English of the Geneva Bible also,<sup>61</sup> and the translation of the two versions of the *Pater* was influenced by still other factors.

The version of the *Pater* in the Gospel of St Matthew is as follows:

- 1 Ar n-athairne atá ar neamh, naomhthar hainm.
- 2 Tigeadh do ríoghachd.
- 3 Déuntar do thoil ar an talamh mar atá ar neamh.
- 4 Tabhair dhūinn a niú ar n-arán léthamhail.

<sup>58</sup> *Tiomna Nuadh ar dTighearna agus ar Slánaightheora Íosa Críosa*, 1 verso; from the copy in the library of Trinity College, Dublin, shelfmark A.f.2.

<sup>59</sup> *ibid.*, *Do chum an léughthóra*. Here and elsewhere, apart from normalising the use of length accents, of punctuation and of capitals, I have not otherwise edited Ó Domhnaill's text, except as indicated by the use of brackets, of italics to mark the few contradictions and of italicised *h* to represent the *punctum delens*.

<sup>60</sup> *ibid.*, 1 verso. See also *Do chum an léughthóra*: '[An] Tiomna Nuadh . . . ar na tarruingu gu diongmhála . . . a nGaoidheilg, as an dteanguidh fhoirfe Ghréigise inar sgríobhadh hí ar tús. . .'; see further title-page.

<sup>61</sup> *I bprionta i leabhar*, 33–4

- 5 Agus maith dhúinn ar bfiacha, amhail agus mar mhaithmídne dar  
bféitheamhnuibh féin.  
6 Agus nā treoruigh do chum buaidheartha sinn,  
7 achd saor sinn ó nolc.  
Óir is leat féin an ríoghachd, agus an chumhachd, agus an ghlóir gu  
síorruighe. Amen.<sup>62</sup>

This is sufficiently similar to the version in Seán Ó Cearnaigh's *Aibidil Gaoidheilge agus caiticíosma* to suggest that Ó Cearnaigh may have been the translator, but there are obvious important differences between the two also: *Ar n-athairne* for *A athair*, *ar neamh* for *annsna neamhaibh* (first petition), *ríoghachd* for *flaitheamhnas* (second petition), *Déuntar* for *Bíodh* (third petition), *féitheamhnuibh* for *fiachaighthóiribh* (fifth petition), *do chum buaidheartha* for *don chathughadh* (sixth petition), *gu síorruighe* for *tré bhithibh síor* (doxology). It is not possible to establish whether Ó Cearnaigh himself or some other collaborator was responsible for these revisions, but the first five of them reflect a move in the direction of the tradition represented by the *Liber Flavus* text, while the use of *buaidhreadh* in the sixth petition shows awareness of a usage already seen in Carsuel and Ó Maolchonaire. Two of these changes (*Ar n-athairne* and *Déuntar*) might be seen as achieving a closer approximation to the original Greek, while one (*ar neamh*) is a move in the opposite direction. That the revision was not always skilfully done is shown by the asyntactic use of *mar atá* to refer to *Déuntar* in the second petition. This may have been due to replacing *Bíodh* by *Déuntar* and failing to notice the syntactical consequences later in the sentence,<sup>63</sup> but it is also possible that it may be the result of an attempt to translate English 'Thy will be done in earth as it is in heaven'.<sup>64</sup>

Since the first, second, third, sixth and seventh petitions of the *Pater* as it occurs in Luke in the *Textus receptus*<sup>65</sup> are identical with those in

<sup>62</sup>The Greek of the *Textus receptus* reads as follows:

[1] Πάτερ ἡμῶν ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, ἁγιασθήτω τὸ ὄνομά σου. [2] ἐλθέτω ἡ Βασιλεία σου. [3] γενηθήτω τὸ θελήμα σου, ὡς ἐν οὐρανῷ, καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς. [4] τὸν ἄρτον ἡμῶν τὸν ἐπιούσιον δος ἡμῖν σήμερον. [5] καὶ ἄφες ἡμῖν τὰ ὀφειλήματα ἡμῶν, ὡς καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀφίεμεν τοῖς ὀφειλέταις ἡμῶν. [6] καὶ μὴ εἰσενέγκῃς ἡμᾶς εἰς πειρασμόν, [7] ἀλλὰ ῥῦσαι ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τοῦ πονηροῦ. ὅτι σοῦ ἐστὶν ἡ Βασιλεία, καὶ ἡ δύναμις, καὶ ἡ δόξα, εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας. ἀμήν (Michael Lantzenberger (printer), Διαθήκης Της Καινης Ἀπαντα, Lipsiae 1594/5).

<sup>63</sup>The ultimate model would be LB-EG, 'Bíd do thol i talmain amal atá i nnim'; but Ó Cearnaigh's 'Bíodh do thoil mar atá ar neamh agus ar talamh', if it was the immediate model, required further correction because of its own awkwardness. Carsuel's 'go ma dēnta do thoil a dtalmhuin mar atá ar neamh' may not be irrelevant.

<sup>64</sup>The Geneva Bible (1557) has 'Thy will be done euen in earth, as it is in heauen'; see Bagster, *The English hexapla*.

<sup>65</sup>[1] πάτερ ἡμῶν ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, ἁγιασθήτω τὸ ὄνομά σου. [2] ἐλθέτω ἡ Βασιλεία σου. [3] γενηθήτω τὸ θελήμα σου, ὡς ἐν οὐρανῷ, καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς. [4] τὸν ἄρτον ἡμῶν τὸν ἐπιούσιον δίδου ἡμῖν το καθ' ἡμέραν. [5] καὶ ἄφες ἡμῖν τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν. καὶ γὰρ αὐτοὶ ἀφίεμεν παντὶ ὀφείλοντι ἡμῖν. [6] καὶ μὴ εἰσενέγκῃς ἡμᾶς εἰς πειρασμόν. [7] ἀλλὰ ῥῦσαι ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τοῦ πονηροῦ (Michael Lantzenberger).

Matthew, one might expect that the Irish translation of them would be the same in both instances also. This is far from being the case; indeed the two versions of the first three petitions and of the sixth show striking discrepancies. The *Pater* in Luke reads as follows:

- 1 Ó ar n-athairne atá ar neamh, gu naomhthar hainm.
- 2 Gu dtí do ríoghachd.
- 3 Gu ndéntar do thoil ar an talamh mar atá ar neamh.
- 4 Tabhair dhúinn ar n-arán laoitheamhuil gach laoi.
- 5 Agus maith dúinn ar bpeacaigh, óir maithmidni dá gach aon ar a bhfuil fiacha aguin.
- 6 Agus nā léig a mbuaidhreadh sinn.
- 7 achd saor sinn ón olc.

That this version was not produced totally independently of that in Matthew is shown by the presence of the faulty *mar atá* in the third petition and also perhaps of *ón olc* in the seventh petition. On the other hand the imperatives *naomhthar*, *Tigeadh* and *Déuntar* of the first three petitions in Matthew are here replaced by the optative subjunctive forms *gu naomhthar*, *Gu dtí* and *Gu ndéntar*, while *treoraigh do chum* of the sixth petition is replaced by *léig a*. A likely model for both of these important changes is Carsuel. The version of the sixth petition here is identical with his in all details including word-order, while that of the second petition agrees with his except only for the replacement of *ríghe* by *ríoghachd*. The change from *go ma dēnta* to *go ndéntar* would provide an excellent explanation for the use of asyntactic *mar atá*, or for its retention if it was taken over from Matthew. Of course, the replacement of the periphrastic formulae by the more direct ones, and especially of *go ma beandaighthe* by *gu naomhthar*, might be considered to present a difficulty. But what is at issue is the use of the optative subjunctive rather than the imperative, not the precise realisation of the optative; and in any case it is not necessary to postulate direct influence of the text of Carsuel's *Pater* on the version in Ó Domhnaill's Gospel of St Luke, which cannot indeed be proven, but rather to envisage that influence being mediated through awareness of the tradition represented by Carsuel's text.<sup>66</sup>

Though we know that by 1597 all four Gospels had been translated into Irish, but that only up to the end of the fifth chapter of Luke's Gospel had been printed, it is still far from clear by what stages the remainder of that Gospel reached its printed form. Had the eleventh chapter of Luke, then, been translated before the deaths of Bhailis and Ó Cearnaigh, or was it translated subsequently when Ó Domhnaill and Mac Bruaideadha had begun to work with Ó Domhnalláin on the translation? What editorial freedom had Mac Bruaideadha and, subsequently

<sup>66</sup>The fluidity of that tradition may be illustrated by the fact that later on, in the Gaelic version of Calvin's Catechism (c.1630), *go ma beandaighthe* was changed to *go ma naomhtha*.

Ó hUiginn, who were employed because of their expertise in the Irish language and its orthography? It may be that what remained in manuscript after 1597 was revised before being printed in 1602, and that, when he came to the *Pater*, the reviser was influenced by a version with which he was familiar which had the optative subjunctive forms rather than the imperative in the first three petitions and *léig* rather than *treoraigh* in the sixth. If so, Domhnall Óg Ó hUiginn is more likely than Uilliam Ó Domhnaill himself to have been responsible for these changes, for when Ó Domhnaill came to translate the BCP he retained the imperatives and *treoraigh*.

Though the version of the *Pater* in the Gospel of St Luke is not directly relevant to the tradition of the *Pater* as public and private prayer, this translation in Ó Domhnaill's *Tiomna Nuadh* is important in that it indicates that a version having the optative subjunctive forms was known, and perhaps was in frequent use at least by some people, in Ireland before 1602. When a new edition of *An Tiomna Nuadh* was published in 1681, however, the optative forms were replaced by the imperative in the translation of Luke 11:2. On the other hand the version of St Matthew's Gospel was repeated, though in somewhat revised form, in the three other Reformation texts of the first half of the seventeenth century.

##### 5. OTHER TEXTS, 1608-1652

*Leabhar na nUrnaightheadh gComhchoidchiond* (LUC), Uilliam Ó Domhnaill's translation of the BCP of 1604, was printed in 1608 and published in 1609.<sup>67</sup> H. R. McAdoo, who considered it to be 'one of the monuments of Irish translation', noted that Ó Domhnaill showed 'that intuition for the *mot juste* which is the inevitable component of the first-class translator'.<sup>68</sup> It is not surprising then that in retaining, as he does, the *Tiomna Nuadh* version of the *Pater* in St Matthew's Gospel, he found it necessary to emend the translation of the third petition, replacing *atá* with *do nítheas*, thus returning to the formula found in the *Liber Flavus*.<sup>69</sup> He also introduced some minor alterations: *thainmsi* for *hainm* (first petition); *ar talmhain* for *ar an tthalm* (third petition); and the deletion of *agus mar* after *amhuil* (fifth petition) and of *do* before *chum* (sixth petition). The final doxology is, of course, omitted since it did not appear in the BCP of 1604.

In 1631 William Bedell, provost of Trinity College, Dublin (1627-9), and bishop of Kilmore (1629-42), published a thirteen-page, carelessly edited and printed, bilingual work, *Aibgitir .i. theaguisg cheudtosugheadh*

<sup>67</sup>See Williams, *I bprionta i leabhar*, 37, 35.

<sup>68</sup>'The Irish translations of the Book of Common Prayer', *Éigse 2* (1940) 250-57, pp. 253, 250.

<sup>69</sup>The *Pater* occurs on page A3 (*Trátha*) of LUC and again, with some orthographical changes on page MMm *recto* (*An caitechiosma*). I have used the copy in the library of Trinity College, Dublin, shelfmark A.6.26.

an *Chriostaidhe* [sic] or *The A.B.C. or the institution of a Christian*.<sup>70</sup> Among other items this small work contains a copy of the *Pater* (pp. 2–4), which, misprints and other mistakes and some orthographical changes aside, is the same as the version in Matthew's Gospel, including the final doxology, with the exceptions that *hainmsi* replaces *hainm* (first petition), and that *agus mar* after *amhail* (fifth petition) is deleted, as is also *do* before *chum* (sixth petition). These minor changes would seem to indicate that Bedell also had LUC to hand, since the same changes appear in it. Nevertheless he opted to retain the faulty translation of the second petition in the version in Matthew's Gospel rather than adopt the superior revised translation of LUC.

Finally in 1652 Gofraidh Mac Domhnaill published *An teagasc Críosttuidhe nó fundameint an chreidimh Críosduithe*,<sup>71</sup> which consists of a translation of William Perkins's *The Christian doctrine or the foundation of Christ's religion*. Apart from the translation, the book also contains a number of other items, including the Creed, the *Pater* and the Ten Commandments, all three of which were taken from Bedell's *Aibghitir*.<sup>72</sup> Mac Domhnaill's version of the *Pater* is the same as Bedell's, including the doxology, with the exception that he has adopted the superior LUC translation of the second petition in preference to the faulty one found in Bedell.<sup>73</sup> The orthographical evidence and that of misprints and other mistakes would suggest that Mac Domhnaill was using both Bedell and LUC simultaneously, following now one and again the other.

Four Reformation texts of the first half of the seventeenth century present, then, what is basically the same version of the *Pater*. We have seen that this version may not be fully representative of popular practice, and, in any case, the variations, trifling though some of them are, suggest that this version did not have the status of being a sole approved formula which would have become stereotyped by constant use. Nevertheless their version is not very different from that which, as I hope to show in a further article, appeared in a sequence of Catholic published

<sup>70</sup>For a description of the book and its contents see Williams, *I bprionta i leabhar*, 46–7. There are two photographic copies of the work in the National Library of Ireland, both of which I have consulted, namely, a photostat copy (p 2179) and a copy on microfilm (pos. 450).

<sup>71</sup>On the Irish and English versions of the author's name, and for a description of the book and its contents, see N. Williams, *I bprionta i leabhar*, 191 n. 12, 60–61. I have consulted a copy on microfilm (pos. 450) in the National Library of Ireland.

<sup>72</sup>Williams, 61, considers this probable. I regard it as certain: the introductory note preceding each item is the same in both, and, though Mac Domhnaill corrects some of Bedell's misprints and mistakes he retains others: e.g. in the *Pater*, a full stop between *buaidheartha* (Mac Domhnaill, *buaignheartha*) and *sínd* (sixth petition); length mark on the second syllable of *rioghácd* (Mac Domhnaill, *riogháchd*) (in the doxology).

<sup>73</sup>He even follows LUC in placing a comma after *thoil* in this petition. On the other hand he follows Bedell in having *ar an títalamh* instead of *ar talmhain* of LUC.

works of the seventeenth century, and indeed it was this Catholic version which was to appear in St Matthew's Gospel in the 1681 revision of Ó Domhnaill's *Tiomna Nuadh*. The cumulative influence of these works, both Protestant and Catholic, through their use in catechesis, must have ensured a significant role as public and private prayer for their very similar versions of the *Pater*.

CATHAL Ó HÁINLE

*Trinity College, Dublin*