BOOK REVIEWS


This work is a literary and folkloristic study of two wooing-tales, the Irish Tochmarc Emire and the Welsh Culhwch ac Olwen. Tochmarc Emire (TE) belongs to the Ulster Cycle, and tells of Cú Chulainn’s wooing of Emer, and of his initiatory journey to the land of Scáthach. Culhwch ac Olwen (CO) is the oldest Arthurian tale in Welsh, but Arthur’s role in it does not correspond to that of Cú Chulainn in TE: the wooer in CO is Arthur’s maternal cousin Culhwch, and Arthur’s own position is comparable to that in TE of Cú Chulainn’s maternal uncle, Conchobor. The tales have often been compared, and with good reason: as Dr Edel observes (p. 1), they are both tales of the wooing of a bride, which, in depicting the tasks which must be accomplished by the wooer, deploy themes which in both literatures occur also independently as heroic feats. They were considered together at some length by Alwyn and Brinley Rees in Celtic heritage (1961), but they have never received such detailed treatment as that which is accorded them here.

In an Introduction (pp. 1-34), Dr Edel gives an account of the cultural context within which the tales were composed and transmitted, and provides summaries of the two tales. The body of the work is divided into three parts, dealing successively with ‘Märchenaspekte’ (pp. 36-92), ‘epische Aspekte’ (pp. 93-206), and ‘Gelehrte Aspekte’ (208-52). The first of these is concerned with reflexes of international popular tales, the second with items from the traditional literature and lore of Ireland and Wales, and especially with the personages who figure in TE and CO, and the third with the presence in the two tales of items which reflect the organised learning of Ireland and Wales. These sections share a common format: a short introduction, a study, first of TE, then of CO, and a brief statement of the conclusions drawn. The general conclusions are brought together in an epilogue (pp. 253-8). The ‘Texttradition’ of each tale is the subject of an appendix, and the work concludes with notes, an extensive bibliography, a list of abbreviations and an index.

Neither TE nor CO has received a great deal of scholarly or critical attention, and indeed neither of them is available in a satisfactory edition. Insofar as they have been studied, it has been mainly, as Dr Edel
points out, from the folkloristic point on view. These two tales are more than usually amenable to this kind of analysis. As long ago as 1862, J. F. Campbell said of CO, 'When I first read this Welsh story, it was like a confused dream, made up of fragments from all that I had read and collected during the last two years', while Baudisch began his article on TE with the observation that 'it is well-known that Irish sagas abound in motives which are still current in modern folk tales'. Baudisch's article on TE (Ériu ix. 98-108) has held the field since its appearance in 1923. The Welsh tale has fared better. Jackson's classic study, The international popular tale and early Welsh tradition (1961), attends inter alia to CO, and the folkloristic approach is exploited at length in the lively account of CO given by Gwyn Jones in Kings, beasts and heroes (1972).

Dr Edel takes due account of the folkloristic work which has been done on the two tales, but she does this 'um den Weg für die Untersuchung ihrer episch-heroischen und intellektuellen Aspekte ... frei zu machen' (p. 36). The germ of this threefold approach is doubtless to be found in Rachel Bromwich's treatment of CO, in terms of folktale, native Arthurian Tradition, and the love of catalogue and enumeration, on pp. 106ff. of her chapter on 'The character of early Welsh tradition' (H. M. Chadwick and others, Studies in early British history, 1954).

In discussing the 'Märchenaspekte' of TE, Dr Edel takes Baudisch's analysis as her point of departure, and she considers the relationship between TE and the relevant tale-types in Aarne-Thompson. Her conclusion is that the relationship is superficial, and that it pertains only to portions of the tale. She argues that it is its complexity which most strongly distinguishes TE from the folktale, and she faults Baudisch for his failure sufficiently to distinguish between individual motifs and motif-strings. Turning to CO, she discusses in some detail the motifs concerning the Jealous Stepmother with which the story begins, and goes on to consider the main part of the tale which has as its framework the story of how the hero won a Giant's daughter, which is essentially of the type classified by A-T as 513A ('Six go through the World'). One of her main aims here is to disentangle those elements in the tale which belong to folktale, and those which have their origin in native Arthurian tradition.

Dr Edel concludes her study of the 'Märchenaspekte' of CO with an unexceptionable 'working hypothesis': 'CO ist eine Rahmenerzählung mit einer Reihe von ursprünglich selbständigen Arthurabenteuern, die der britischen episch-heroischen Tradition entstammen' (p. 92). The use of 'ursprünglich' is in order here, but the same cannot be said of the disquieting proliferation of claims in this book that certain items are 'secondary' or 'interpolated' or 'late', claims which often seem to be based on intuition, and to be made without due regard to method. As an example, I shall take Dr Edel's treatment (p. 77) of Gwalchmai, who is one of the
Arthurian warriors who accompany Culhwch on his quest for Olwen.

In ‘Six go through the World’, the hero is accompanied by a number of men with extraordinary powers, and they help him in performing the tasks which devolve upon him as suitor. In CO, Culhwch is accompanied by six men who have been assigned to him by Arthur, but only four of whom eventually assist him in accomplishing the tasks which have been laid upon him by Olwen’s father, Ysbaddaden. The other two companions are Cyndylyg the Guide, and Gwalchmai son of Gwyar, of whom we are told that ‘he never came home without the quest he had gone to seek. He was the best of walkers and the best of riders. He was Arthur’s nephew – his sister’s son – and Culhwch’s cousin’. Dr Edel considers Gwalchmai to be ‘a later addition’: she says that he is a mere name in CO, and that he has no function in the tale. Presumably, then, what we are being asked to believe is that in an earlier version of the story, Culhwch set off with four companions. (The argument for regarding Gwalchmai as a late addition would hold also for Cyndylyg, although Dr Edel is silent on this point). But of course even this attenuated list will not give us a perfect match with those who actually help Culhwch in his quest. Should we also consider as ‘later’ everything in the achievement of Culhwch’s quest which is not attributed to the four companions with whom he originally set out? And should we likewise regard as ‘later’ everything in the list of tasks imposed by Ysbaddaden, which is not fulfilled in the tale? In fact, the list of tasks, only some of which are later adverted to, provides an analogy for the list of companions, only four of whom are later active in Culhwch’s interest. The fact that Gwalchmai and Cyndylyg are not shown to have helped Culhwch in his quest does not establish them as later additions to the list of companions.

It is not quite accurate to say, as Dr Edel does, that Gwalchmai is no more than a name in the story. As the best of walkers and the best of riders, and as one who never came home without the quest he had gone to seek, he is eminently qualified to take a place among the list of helpers assigned to Culhwch. The other item of information given about Gwalchmai is that he is a sister’s son of Arthur’s, and that cannot be disregarded in the context of a tale in which relationship through the mother is so prominent: Arthur and Culhwch are maternal cousins; Custennin’s wife is their maternal aunt, and so her son Goreu, the one who finally kills Ysbaddaden, is a maternal cousin of Arthur’s and of Culhwch’s. The relationship of Arthur, Culhwch and Goreu is deemed ‘secondary’ by Dr Edel (p. 75). The unanswered question is, secondary to what? To a different relationship? To no relationship at all? It may be that Dr Edel has been influenced here by the painstaking investigation of this matter which was carried out by Rachel Bromwich in Trioedd Ynys Prydein (1961, pp. 365ff.), but she does not cite Bromwich in this
connection, and, as distinct from Bromwich, Dr Edel seems to be implying that the maternal relationship among these personages is secondary within the context of CO, which is tantamount to positing an earlier narrative in which this relationship did not exist. No useful purpose is served by intuitive speculation of this kind. The fact is that relationship through the mother is a component of the social code of CO, as is the more dimly discernible dynastic dimension to which Dr Edel draws attention. The emphasis placed in CO on relationship through the mother is enhanced by Arthur's inclusion of his sister's son Gwalchmai among Culhwch's helpful companions.

(It may be added that Dr Edel suggests in a note (p. 290, n. 35) that the prominence in later Arthurian literature of Gwalchmai, under the name Gauvains/Gawain, may be due to his having been Arthur's sister's son.)

In the second section of her book, Dr Edel discusses such topics as the nature of Cú Chulainn's relationship with Emer, the companions who set out with Cú Chulainn on his initiatory journey to the land of Scáthach, and the personages whom he encounters along the way; she goes on to deal with the main personages of CO, and the accomplishment of the tasks set by Ysbaddaden. She draws on a range of Irish and Welsh texts for purposes of comparison.

Comparison with Irish material is established practice in the criticism of early Welsh narrative, and it has proved illuminating on occasion. Dr Edel's essays in comparison, however, are not always successful. Here one may cite her discussion (pp. 200f.) of the witch Gorddu, whose slaying, demanded by Ysbaddaden, is the last of the tasks to be accomplished on Culhwch's behalf. The Welsh word which is translated 'witch' here is gwiddon, and Dr Edel claims that 'in einem exakteren Sinn bezeichnet das Wort in der frühen Periode dämonische Frauengestalten von der Art, wie sie auch die irische Literatur kennt'. No authority is adduced in support of this assertion; the word seems to be wider in meaning than 'witch' (see GPC, s.v.), but Dr Edel's bald statement requires some discussion or reference to sources. All that she offers is the claim that a 'Relikt' is to be found in the role in Peredur of the witches of Caer Loyw. Notwithstanding obvious differences, she says 'die ursprüngliche Verwandtschaft mit Cú Chulainns Lehrzeit bei Scáthach (ist) unverkennbar' (p. 201). Dr Edel is not the first to compare the witches of Caer Loyw with Scáthach, but she places far too much weight on the comparison when she says, 'Anscheinend hat das keltische Britannien noch im elften Jahrhundert (und danach?) gewisse Erinnerungen an die kriegerischen Frauengestalten und Ziehmütter der frühen episch-heroisichen Tradition'. She then goes on to say, 'Gorddu gehört in CO wohl ebenfalls zu jenen Mächten, die der herrscher bezwingen muss'. It
is this latter observation which has to do with the actual function of Gorddu in CO, where she is slain by Arthur. There is sleight of hand in the use of ‘ebenfalls’ here, since the discussion of ‘the more exact’ meaning of gwiddon ‘in the early period’ has not been shown to be relevant to CO. The proposition regarding the ‘memories’ of eleventh-century ‘Celtic Britain’ is thus not only extremely dubious but entirely gratuitous as well.

The Irish too are to be credited with prodigious feats of memory, at least if we are to accept the extraordinary notion (pp. 118f) that in going to the land of Scáthach, Cú Chulainn may in fact have been going north of the Alps to the homeland of the Celts – ‘die Vorstellung, die Reise hätte nicht in eine beliebige Ferne geführt, sondern zu einer Art von Matres-Gestalten im alten Stammland’ (p. 118). Dr Edel finds this idea attractive, but, to be fair, she does concede that it must remain unproven.

There is a tendency in this work to generalise about ‘Celtic tradition’, ‘Celtic epic’, and so on, and this calls for some comment. ‘Celtic’ is less cumbersome than ‘Irish and Welsh’, but its use is of course more than a matter of stylistic convenience. To describe something that is common to Irish and Welsh as ‘Celtic’ is to imply genetic relationship, and there are indeed many items in the narrative literatures of Ireland and Wales which can be shown to have been independently inherited from the period of Common Celtic. The term should nevertheless be used with caution, and in scholarly work it should be restricted to items where a genetic relationship can be clearly shown, or reasonably assumed, to exist. I shall have occasion presently to quote her observation that ‘die keltische Epik ist in ihrem Kern lehrhaft’. Leaving aside any question about the use of ‘Epik’ here, it can be accepted that certain Irish and Welsh tales are in some sense didactic, and the likelihood is that this feature is inherited from the period of Common Celtic. Dr Edel’s appeals to Celticity come quite unstuck on occasion, however, as in her notion that the Celts were particularly pre-occupied with couples or pairs (‘In der keltischen Überlieferung lässt sich eine typologische Vorliebe für Paare erkennen’, p. 96). This observation is at best banal, at worst misleading, and in either case carries no explanatory value in relation to the existence in Irish and Welsh of wooing-tales. Cú Chulainn’s wooing and winning of Emer is, as Dr Edel rightly observes, part of his heroic biography; as that is so, it may be added that it was unnecessary on Dr Edel’s part to enter upon a tortuous search for an explanation of the hostility shown to Cú Chulainn by Forgall Monach, as it would be expected in the heroic biography that the bride’s father would implacably oppose the hero’s suit.

The importance of swine in CO has often been noted. Patrick Ford,
for example, has said of the tale that 'its unusual opening and its central episode assure us that it carries on traditions associated with a Celtic swine divinity' (*The Mabinogi and other medieval Welsh tales*, 1977, 16). Dr Edel also adverts to the Celtic preoccupation with swine: nothing in this book is more astounding than her comparison of the position of swine among the Celts with that of wolves among the Germans ('In der keltischen Vorstellungswelt nimmt das Schwein nämlich etwa denselben Platz ein wie der Wolf in der germanischen', p. 149). Comment is superfluous, but perhaps one might ask, if Celtic swine are to be compared with Germanic wolves, with what can we compare Celtic (and especially Irish) wolves (and hounds)?

The third section of the book is devoted to learned aspects of the two tales. After a general consideration (208-11) of traditional learning in Ireland, and, to a lesser extent, in Wales, Dr Edel discusses the wooing dialogue between Cú Chulainn and Emer, together with Cú Chulainn's subsequent explication (to his charioteer) of his own contribution to it (212-42), and the catalogues in CO of Arthur's warriors and Ysbaddaden's Tasks (243-52). In the general discussion, she mentions certain features of the style and content of the tales, which she considers representative of traditional learning - such features as allusions to other tales, references to discrepant traditions, quotations of celebrated lines of verse, items of legal language, and word-play of one kind and another, especially that entailing etymological speculation. This kind of thing she is inclined to attribute to the *filid* (p. 208), and when she speaks of such learning as 'einheimisch', she is contrasting it with monastic learning (p. 210). It may perhaps be conceded that her argument that traditional learning has its origin in verbal magic is none the less interesting for being altogether speculative. But there must be grave doubt about the division of labour implied in her discussion. There is no good reason why the relevant allusions, references, quotations, and speculations could not have emanated from the ecclesiastical schools which bear primary responsibility for the state of the texts as we actually have them. That is not, of course, to say that some, at least, of the matter in question was not received into the monastic schools by oral transmission. In any case, Dr Edel is doubtless correct in seeing in these learned elements a reflection of the role in society of the literati and of the function of their work: as she puts it, 'die keltische Epik ist in ihrem Kern lehrhaft'.

If traditional learning was a necessary part of the equipment of the authors of Irish and Welsh tales, it was also required of the fully rounded hero. A case in point, as Dr Edel remarks, is the erudition displayed by Cú Chulainn in his dialogue with Emer, and especially in the detailed explication which he gives to his charioteer of his own contribution to
that dialogue. She reminds us that, in the Boyhood Deeds, Cú Chulainn learned the important names of Ulster. This knowledge he puts to good use in his riddling references to these places in his dialogue with Emer.

Dr. Edel considers the affinities of TE with a number of Irish texts, from two early items known to have been contained in Cín Dromma Snechta to the Early Modern Irish Foglaim Con Culainn (pp. 10-13; see also relevant entries in the index). This is a subject of great complexity and requires a good deal of further investigation. (See now James Carney in Proceedings of the sixth international congress of Celtic studies (1983), p. 118.) Dr Edel rightly rejects (p. 12) Thurneyssen’s notion that once the early sagas were written out they formed the exclusive basis of later versions and adaptations. She refers, apparently with approval, to Gerard Murphy’s unfortunate comparison of the relationship of medieval Irish manuscripts to living storytelling with that of the modern museum to living material culture, but for her own part she takes a more balanced view, and envisages mutual influence between the oral and written traditions. Two of her propositions in this regard stand in need of demonstration. She holds, first, that certain descriptive passages in TE, which also appear in similar, and sometimes almost identical form in other tales, are not, as Thurneyssen believed, to be put down to borrowing, but rather that they are more or less stereotypical traditional elements which the storyteller could use at will in his performances (‘die der Erzähler bei seinen Darbietungen nach Belieben verwenden konnte’, p. 12). Secondly, and this is implicit in the wording just quoted, she attributes these ‘traditional’ elements, with others (motifs, ‘Motivformeln’, dialogues and rhetorical passages, p. 2), to oral storytelling. This attribution seems to me to be less unlikely a priori than that, which we have already discussed, of Cú Chulainn’s learned allusions to extra-ecclesiastical savants. But while the origin in oral tradition of certain motifs and motif-strings is well established, the orality of early Irish descriptions, dialogues and rhetorical passages still requires to be proved.

Thurneyssen’s attitude to the relationship among texts within the written tradition inevitably informed his reconstruction of the manuscript history of TE. He saw three recensions, where Meyer had seen only two. In Appendix I, Dr Edel gives it as her view that it is unnecessary to posit a third recension (p. 265). It has been the general view that the short recension is older than the other(s) but Dr Edel holds that the short recension is not much closer to the original state of the saga than the longer (p. 263). Judgment on these thorny questions is best suspended, pending a thorough examination of the linguistic evidence. (See now Gearóid Mac Eoin, The dating of Middle Irish texts (1983), pp. 122f.)

While this book is an analysis of the content of the tales with which
it deals, the language of the texts is occasionally discussed; but the discussion is for the most part superficial and unhelpful. Her suggestion (p. 122) that *mildemal* is in origin a compound of *mil* and *demal* is plausible; the word was probably analysed in this way by the person who was responsible for the variant *mildemon*. But no reason is given (p. 111) for rejecting Thurneysen’s translation of *genas* as ‘Keuscheit’ and substituting ‘Zurückhaltung’. The discussion of *ailges* (p. 114) should at least take account of the entry (s.v. *áilges*) in *DIL*. As an example of the level of the linguistic discussion in this book, I shall take the treatment of a sentence in the description in TE of Conchobor’s house in Emain Macha. The text says that all the men of Ulster would fit into it when drinking (*Nó tháit tseil gáil fer nUlad oc ól isind réithig sin, LU 10129f*), and what follows is: 7 *ní bíd nech dhí him comchéfhaid álaili*. Meyer translated, ‘and no man of them would touch the other’ (*The archaeological review* 1, p. 69); this has become ‘and yet no man of them would crowd the other’ in Cross and Slover (*Ancient Irish tales* (1936), p. 154). Dr Edel, however, takes it to mean that at the evening drinking-feast, everyone was entertained and fed according to his individual taste (*‘Beim abendlichen Trinkgelage wird ein jeder nach seinem persönlichen Geschmack bewirtet und unterhalten’*, p. 99). She explains that, since *comchéfhaid* is a calque on Latin *consensus*, the literal meaning is, ‘Niemand von ihnen war in Übereinstimmung mit dem andern’, but holds that the allusion can only be to the abundance of the feast, since ‘the second possibility’, a bellicose interpretation, is ruled out by the context. But the exclusion of bellicosity does not mean that our only remaining option is Dr Edel’s interpretation, which is at some remove from any known use of *comchéfhaid*. In *DIL* (C 363 2ff.), examples of *i comchéfhaid* are cited with the meanings ‘with the approval of’, ‘in the company of’, ‘present at’. The second of these would fit our example, which can be taken to mean that none of the warriors was (excessively) in the company of another, which would be an extension of the notion, already expressed in the sentence, that there was room in the house for all of them, and is well conveyed in the translation by Cross and Slover.

The main criticism of this book must be that so many assertions are made without due consideration of the evidence. The overall structure of the book cannot be faulted, nor can the considerable industry with which that structure has been fleshed out, but it would have been better to focus on a smaller number of topics, and to give them adequate treatment. The book could have done with some editing: there is a good deal of repetition, and the discussion of A-T 461 (pp. 38ff.) could have been drastically foreshortened. But while it is not without its deficiencies in selectivity and (more seriously) in method, we may nevertheless hope that this book will purvey knowledge and understanding of the two important
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tales with which it deals, that it will stimulate further scholarly work on
them, and that it may even hasten the day when both of them will be
available in scholarly editions.

TOMÁS Ó CATHASAIGH

University College Dublin

IMMRAM BRAIN: BRAN’S JOURNEY TO THE LAND OF THE
WOMEN. (Buchreihe der Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie, Band
xi + 510 pp. DM 164.

Imram Brain was first edited, with translation and notes, by Kuno
Meyer in The Voyage of Bran Son of Febal, vol. i (London 1895). The
second edition, consisting of an introduction, text, notes and variae
lectiones, but without a translation was that by A. G. Van Hamel in
Imramana, Mediaeval and Modern Irish Series X (Dublin 1941). Extracts
from the text appear in various anthologies, notably an edition of the
second long poem by Gerard Murphy in Early Irish Lyrics (Oxford 1956)
92-100.

Meyer’s edition, the only one up to now with a translation of the
complete text, was a great achievement, but left various difficulties
unresolved. With the progress made in our knowledge of Early Irish
since 1895 one would reasonably expect a new edition to be a major
improvement on that of Meyer’s. It is the unfortunate duty of this
reviewer to have to report that the present work by Séamus Mac
Mathúna (henceforth M) does not meet this expectation.

Part One of the book begins with a description of the individual MSS
in which Imram Brain is contained, followed by a discussion of the
relationship between the MSS (p. 12ff.). There are two major shortcom-
ings here. Firstly, the version in The Yellow Book of Lecan (L) deviates
to a very great degree from those in the other MSS, but this deviation
is not sufficiently brought out by M (pp. 12-15). Secondly, when M uses
variations such as radarc vs. rodarc (p. 17), cech vs. cach (p. 19),
echtraie/echtrai vs. echtra (p. 20), etc. as evidence for the relationship
between the MSS, he fails to distinguish between variants which can arise
independently in the course of transmission and truly diagnostic
variants. There is simply not enough real evidence presented in support
of M’s arguments, and any future editor will have to examine the matter
again.

The core of this book is, of course, the edition itself. The duty of an
editor is to provide an acceptable text, with an accurate translation, and
notes which discuss difficulties in the text and take into account any
relevant material which will help towards the understanding of the text. Regrettably, the present work does not meet the requirements of scholarship on any of these counts, as the following will show.

§1.

The initial of *Febail* should be lenited (following a dative singular) as in one of the MSS (L).

The translation of the last three lines is most peculiar. Supply lenition in *fetatar*, and translate: ‘when the palace was full of kings; what they could not discover (was) where the woman came from, since the ramparts had been closed’.

It is difficult to see the point of the comments (p. 120) on the banal phrase *for lár in taige* (translated ‘in the middle of the house’), which include the information that ‘The phrase *for lár in rígh(a)jige* finds a parallel in Welsh *ar llaw mordei* “on the floor of the big house (palace)” ’; does M mean to imply that there is something peculiarly Celtic about the floor/middle of a house?

One wonders what the relevance of the ‘note’ on *ríghtech* (p. 122) is.

§2.

-cúalai (line 7; similarly 16) is not OIr.; the correct form -cúalae should be restored. Since there is such variation in the treatment of final unstressed short vowels in the MSS, chance agreement between two or more MSS is of no value in determining the original form.

In lines 15-16 take *and* as proleptic, the neuter pronoun in *arron-chuíalai* as referring to *in caeaint rand-so* (see Thurneysen, Grammar §421), and the *ro*-forms of the verbs as expressing possibility, and translate: ‘She sang these fifty verses to Bran when the host could hear them, and they could all see the woman’.

I, for one, can make no sense of the paragraph at the top of p. 123 in the Notes; it might have helped (but not much) if we were told who the ‘certain grammarians’ are.

The second paragraph on p. 126 is irrelevant, based as it is on an incorrect analysis of the sentence there cited; *occus nád accai* depends on *in tan*, and is not conjoined with *ciid*.

In the note on *asse* on p. 127 one might have been told why one should ‘See *Ériu* xxv (1974), 281-2, 284’. (pp. 281-2 in fact contain a note on the etymology of *asse* by Eric Hamp, but I can see nothing of relevance on p. 284).

The wording of the first paragraph of the note on line 14 (p. 127) is sloppy to the point of incomprehensibility. What exactly does ‘since *etach* was followed by *o* originally’ mean?

The note on *Braun* (p. 128) reflects extraordinary confusion on the part of M. That in line 3 ‘we have the whole name *do Bran mac Febail*’ does not alter the fact that *do* takes the dative! Further on in this note M states ‘Thurneysen, *GOI* §80 (b) (c) says that we are evidently dealing with a vowel here for which the Irish script did not have an unambiguous symbol’. When one looks up the Grammar, however, one finds that the relevant statement by Thurneysen is in §80 (c), and refers to ‘certain other words’ (not covered by §80 (a) and (b)), but most certainly not to the form in question here. M’s immediately following sentence ‘We are also dealing with free variation, the pronunciation being dependent primarily on the consonantal environment’ is a sloppy rendition of the final sentence of §80 (b) of the Grammar; sloppy in that M refuses to distinguish where Thurneysen does, and especially in the addition of the adjective ‘free’. At the end of the note we are told to ‘See Greene, *Ériu* xxvii (1976), 26-45’. These pages con-
tain a substantial article on the diphthongs of Old Irish; which particular part of it would M have us consult?

§3.
As the translation 'its like surpasses the known ones' makes no sense, it must be wrong.
In the note on Emain (p. 129) M says that this name 'could, however, be a cover-name in this opening stanza for the monastery of Ard Macha'. This is repeated on pp. 295-6, but in neither place is the slightest whit of evidence given in support of this assertion.

§4.
In the note on fil (p. 134) M states 'The use of fil here appears to be Mid. Ir.', whereas in a note on a similar use of fil in line 169 (p. 184) it is said to be found in both archaic texts and Middle Irish.
In the note on etar (pp. 134-5) M says 'If this is an old compound, however, one would expect lenition'. Quite the opposite! – as etar always ended in a consonant it is the forms with lenited c which are later analogical formations.
The notes on friss' tolbgel tonnat (pp. 135-7) contribute nothing to our understanding of this line or of anything else. M's translation 'against the little white-sided wave' ignores the fact that a diminutive tonnat would be feminine in Olr. In the footnote on p. 136, M says of the form dosnai 'unstressed a often written as ai in Middle Irish . . .'. Is it not one of the first things a student of Old Irish learns that deuterotonic verbs are stressed on the second syllable?
Reading the corrupt cethrar in line 24 (following three of the MSS) is perversive, especially when the correct form cethor (which Meyer restores) is found in one of the MSS. In the notes (p. 137) M says 'The reading of RTL looks formally like the personal form of the numeral "four", .i. cethrar'. Is it or is it not? The examples cited by M of personal numerals + noun are not relevant as (i) all the nouns are animate, and (ii) they are all in the genitive plural. I know of one comparable instance from Middle Irish where the noun is not animate, viz. Atch i chœicir ndairn ghro ndocht, Metrical Dindshenchas III, 110.9, but here the noun is also in the genitive plural, as one might expect. M's cethrar followed by the nominative plural cossa is impossible.

§5.
In a note (p. 139) on what he prints as consna M takes it as '3 sg. pres. prototonic of con-sni' (he incorrectly states that 'the same suggestion is made independently in Contrib. C sub con-sni'), and proposes reading consnai. Did it not strike M that a prototonic form in this position is impossible? The forms in the MSS (consna in all except for H which has consnai) point to a compound consná of snáid, conjunct -sná, later also -sná. The line can be translated 'coracle sails together with chariot'; cf. §§33ff.

§6.
The note on tria bithu gnóe (p. 141) leads nowhere in particular. The sequence 'Not so in §42 fil fid fo mess i-mbi gnóe where it must be read as a monosyllable. It rhymes with disyllabic noe' is a not untypical instance of the juxtaposition of mutually contradictory statements found so often in this book.
Meyer translates tria bithu bátha in the third line as 'through the world's age'. M substitutes 'ages' for 'age' and in the Notes (p. 142) says 'See Contrib.B col. 44 for further instances of báith'. When one follows up this reference one finds
two words, one meaning ‘death’ and the other meaning ‘sea’. Nowhere, however, do we find either a justification for the translation or any real discussion of the problems involved here.

§8.

M ignores *sreth* in his translation of the third line.

In the note on mothégnatha (p. 143) the inconvenient fact that we should expect *-gnátha* rather than *-gnatha* is passed over in silence. What, by the way, is the relevance of the comment ‘Note that the final syllables are unstressed in both instances: *datha: mothégnatha/datha: éthatha*’ at the end of the note?

§9.

For *ecoíniud* read *ecoíniud*.

M has brought us no closer to an understanding of the second line. The translation ‘in the land of the well-known citadel’ requires that *etargnath* be in the genitive, which it clearly is not.

In the note on the third line (p. 144) M says ‘*nach guth garc* is quite in order; given the omission of *guth* in the other MSS., their use of *nach* is not problematic’; can this really mean that it would be problematic if *guth* were not omitted?

§10.

In the first line M reads *cen dubai*, and in the Notes (p. 145) refers to his ‘Linguistic Analysis’ where it is shown that *dubae* was neuter in OIr. Why then restore the incorrect form (found in only one of the MSS)?

What M prints as *indgas* in the second line is admittedly ‘poorly attested’ (Notes, p. 146), but from the rhyme here with *bás*, and from the spelling *íngás* in LU 3304, we can at least know that the vowel in the second syllable was long. If M is taking this as a derivative of *int(d) + gai*, he should say so and attempt to explain the formation.

The translation of the last two lines is poor English, and inaccurate. Read ‘that is what distinguishes Emnæs; anything as wonderful as it is unlikely’.

§11.

The difficulties in the last line are not seriously tackled. We find *frithid* in the text, but *frithit* in the Notes; which is it? The statement in the Notes (p. 149) that ‘This construction is on a par with the equative in -idir, *frithit* being probably a derivative of *frís-suíd* “is equivalent to” ’ just will not do.

§12.

In his note on *má ad-cetha* (p. 150) M overlooks the fact that the 2sg. past subjunctive is distinguished from the 2pl. in that the former ends in -a whereas the latter ends in -e.

In the third line M reads *do-snig*, but in the notes (p. 151) suggests reading *dos-nig* ‘with 3 sg. f. infix anticipating *toinn*’. Do-nig, however, is used of washing someone or something, but not in the sense of ‘the sea washing against the shore’, which one presumes is what M had in mind here.

§13.

In the note on *cani-étatha* (p. 152) M says ‘Were Meyer’s *étath* correct the é could be explained as the preposition *ess* “out of” . . . The long é in TL would fall under the rule of secondary lengthening, cf. *étrocht* “shining” for earlier
etrocht, GOI §834 A (a)’. When one consults the Grammar, one finds that Thurneysen actually says of this form ‘later étrocht, probably with secondary lengthening’; there is certainly no ‘rule’ as such.

In the fourth line M restores óol fino cen ingrindi, based on MSS T and L. All the other MSS point to ool fino óengrindi ‘drinking wine with unique pleasantness(?)’ which with disyllabic ool is surely the original reading. In the Notes (p. 153) M goes on to suggest reading ‘cétingrindi or co n-ingrindi’ for which there is no MS evidence at all! The note on this line ends with the mysterious ‘See n. 46 above on indgas’.

§15.

In the note on graig (p. 153) M refers to his ‘Linguistic Analysis’, where he is troubled by the lack of nasalisation after this word. He might also have noted that it is followed twice in this verse by aile, not n-aill. Admittedly, DIL s.v. graig takes it as originally neuter (as does Thurneysen, Grammar §301), but there is not a single form there cited which supports this assumption. It is certainly not neuter in the text here.

In the third line M reads olaill, found only in the most deviant MS, L. The other MSS have ualann/-nd/-nt, except for T which has ualainn. This leads to the comment in the Notes (p. 154) ‘The vowel in the second syllable appears to have been -ai-: T and L agree on this!’. The line is translated ‘another stud over the back of the others’, and in the Notes olaill is taken ‘to be the demonstrative pronoun aile, aill with double stem used substantively’. What case does M imagine this to be? Aill is confined to the nominative and accusative singular neuter, his translation calls for a genitive plural, but in the Notes he talks of an emendation to ‘olaill, g.sg. of aile, aill’, which has no MS support at all. There is no suggestion made as to why aill should have become olaill. The other MSS point to ualann tar ais ‘excellence across back’, a chevile referring to the colour of the horses; for the meaning of ualann see M. O Daly (ed.) Cath Maige Mucrama (Dublin 1975) 119.

§17.

In the first line M reads tar muir glan ‘based on agreement of RTL’ (Notes, p. 155), although the other three MSS have the expected nasalisation of glan. M thereby implies that the archetype had glan, and that nglan is a later alteration (independently in the three MSS which have it!). Surely the opposite is the case?

In the second line M reads don tír don-aídbri imram and translates ‘to the land to which they apply their rowing’, the plural pronoun referring to the host of the first line. It is hard to see how this translation can be justified; the note on p. 156 is certainly of no help. There M states: ‘A noted feature of our text, referred to earlier, is the absence of the rel. part. (s)a n- in prep. rel. clauses’. I have been unable to find any earlier reference to this strange phenomenon. Is M perhaps thinking of the reduction of forms such as frisá, lasá to frí, lasí referred to by Thurneysen, Grammar §492? If so, it is of no relevance to the form in question here, as there is no comparable reduction in the case of dia. In the following sentence M curiously refers to the relative particle as ‘the participle’. The note is rounded off with the statement that ‘do-aídbri appears to be a mixture of ad-firi and do-aídbir, cf. Contrib. under relevant entries, and GOI §525 (c) note’. M cannot have it both ways; his attempts to see here some kind of prepositional relative clause would preclude reading a compound do-aídbri. The nasalisation in do-n-aídbri indicates an object antecedent; translate ‘to the land
which rowing reveals’, i.e. which can only be reached by a sea-voyage.

In the third line M reads imrat, taking it in the body of the Notes (p. 156) to be a prototonic form, while stating in a footnote ‘It could also be deut. im-rat.’ It most certainly cannot be a prototonic form in this position. The deuterotonic form is im-rát.

When, at the top of p. 157, M says ‘a case can be made for disyllabic lêur also . . .’ he does not seem to realise that this would destroy the rhyme with céul.

In the translation of the last line for ‘from which arises a hundred songs’ read ‘from which arise a hundred songs’ (similarly on p. 287).

§18.

In the first line M prints dond tslóg in spite of the fact that all the MSS have donts-

In reading nád-bí tròg in the second line, rather than nádbi tròg, M ignores the elementary distinction between the copula and the substantive verb. This error is repeated on p. 345, and the form is entered in the Glossary under atá (p. 216).

Confusion as to the correct use of prototonic verbal forms is again apparent in M’s treatment of the third line. He prints tormaig céol (translating ‘music swells’), and in the Notes (p. 158) refers us to the ‘Linguistic Analysis’ where the verb is explained as the prototonic form of do-formaig. Even if a prototonic form were permissible in this position one would surely expect tórmaig. In fact, however, we have to do here with an entirely separate verb. The readings of the MSS (tormaid / tormaidh / torm- / tormaig / tormuigh) all point to the simple verb tormaid ‘resounds’, which suits the context admirably.

§19.

In the fourth line M prints immus-timchella. This form is found only in L; E has immutimmcel, while all the other MSS point to the perfect immus-timerchell ‘has encircled it’, which is surely the lectio difficillior.

Two of the MSS (L and H) have the expected nasalisation of glan; read muir nglan and compare my comments on §17 above.

§21.

If, following Meyer, we read cach ágí at the end of the third line, we would then have a verse in a form of deibide n-imrinn. M’s comments on the metre (p. 160) are of little help, especially as he confuses internal rhyme with aicill.

§22.

In the fourth line foa-feid counts as three syllables, and clearly consists of the preposition fo + relative particle aN + the conjunct form of feidid. It is surprising, then, to find at the end of the note on this line (p. 162) the comment that ‘fo-feid is poorly attested, there being only one further (doubtful) ex. noted in RIAD sub fo-feid’, but, as we shall see, this is not the only instance of M’s failure to distinguish between preposition + relative particle + verb, on the one hand, and pretonic preverb + the stressed part of a compound verb, on the other.

§24.

In the third line M prints mbruig mbrecht, lióg óas ma(i)sse mind, and translates ‘a varicoloured land more beautiful than a diadem of beauty’, adding in a footnote: ‘lit. a stone above a diadem of beauty’. It is difficult to see by what means the translation of liög as ‘stone’ was arrived at. In the Notes (p. 165) M
seems to be thinking of *lia*. This is a hiatus word in OIr., and has c in the oblique cases. The metre, however, requires a monosyllable, and M's translation a nominative singular. Read *mruig marechtlig. das maissi mind* 'a land of variegated hue, a diadem surpassing fineness', taking -líc as genitive singular of *líc*, and *das maissi mind as = mind ós maissi*.

§26.

In the note on *forclethaib* in the second line (p. 167) M says: 'I take *forclethaib* to be dat. pl. of an otherwise unattested *forcleeth* < *for* (int. prefix) and *cleeth* f. a 'house-post, stake, pole'. Meyer's translation 'lofty place' seems to presuppose *for + cléithe* 'roof-tree, ridge-pole', which should make dat. pl. *forcléithib*. Why should Meyer's translation presuppose such an analysis any more than M's 'high places'? In fact, M's comments on Meyer's translation are no more than a re-wording of what is to be found in *DIL* s.v. *forcleeth*. Meyer translates the first two lines as 'A great birth will come after ages, that will not be in a lofty place', while M has 'A great birth will come after ages which will not be in high places'. Meyer's explanation of these lines as 'alluding probably to the lowly birth of Christ' (footnote 2 on p. 14 of his edition), followed by M (p. 167) seems most unlikely. It makes far better sense to take *forclethaib* as dative plural of *forcleeth* 'concealing, hiding', and translate 'A great person, who will not be in concealment, will come after ages'.

Instead of regular *rinn ocus airdrinn* in the second couplet we have *cèle* corresponding to *ilmile*. In any attempt to account for this, we should at least expect familiarity with the basics of Irish metrics. In the Notes (p. 168) M calls this 'an example of perfect consonance, in which the stressed vowels agree in quantity and the final vowels are the same'. He omits to mention that the consonating words must be of the same syllabic length. In spite of M's statement to the contrary, the *i* of *ilmile* is not stressed! He goes on to say 'Consonants after stressed vowels do not necessarily have to be of the same colouring to give perfect consonance, cf. *Fél. ProL. 27 trógsa: rígsa*'. As, however, the -g of the genitive singular of *rí* is broad, the consonants in this instance are in fact of the same quality. When we are told 'For a similar example to our own, cf. *Fél. Epil 232 do-ríme: féile* there is no mention of the fact that *dorime* is a variant found in one of the three MSS printed in parallel columns in Stokes' first edition of *Féileire Óengusso*, and that in the second edition Stokes prints *dorímiub*. The MSS offer a choice between restoring *do-rímiub* 'I will number', *do-rímiom* 'we will number', or *do-rímiu* 'I number', none of which makes consonance with *féile*. M should have confined himself to noting the rhyme here as irregular *rinn ocus airdrinn*.

§27.

In the third line M reads *dos-roirbe talam ocus muir*. Not only is *dos-roirbe* found only in L, all the other MSS pointing to is *aí*, but the line as M prints it contains one syllable too many.

§28.

As a translation of the third line, *glainfíd sluágu tre linn nglan*, M offers the ludicrous 'He will purify hosts by means of a holy pool'. The form of the following adjective shows that we have here the neuter *linn* 'liquid' (which clearly makes better sense) rather than the feminine *linn* 'pool'.
§29.
The last two lines, étsed Bran de betho bró / a ndi ecnu ad-féat dó, seem pretty straightforward, although the translation ‘let Bran listen from the crowd of the world what of wisdom I relate to him’ could be bettered. In the note (p. 171) on ad-féat, however, the paragraph beginning ‘That the form is 1 sg. pres. is supported by the characteristic way Jesus introduces precepts in the New Testament . . .’ is breath-takingly irrelevant.

§30.
In the second line M reads nachid-throíthad. The infixed pronoun is second person singular, so one should restore -t (admittedly found in only one of the MSS) rather than -d. As it is preceded by a dental, the initial dental of the verbal form is not lenited, either in OIr. or in any of the MSS.

Tír na mBan in the fourth line is translated ‘the Land of the Women’; read ‘the Land of Women’.

§31.
For what M prints as a nnád-fetatar in the first line, compare my comments on §1. above.

M’s protestations (Notes, p.173) cannot alter the fact that leblaing is formally preterite, not perfect. He goes on to say of the reading of R: ‘The scribe of R, however, takes leblaing to be 3 sg. pret. and tries to change the text accordingly. He reads di lám ina mná nó Brain . . . he fails however to change the second part of the phrase to co mboi for láim Brain’. These comments are completely misguided; no Brain is simply a correction of ina mna, nó being the standard way of introducing a correction (the scribe obviously strayed to ina mna later on in the sentence, and then realised his error). What is most remarkable in all of this, however, is the real confusion shown by M himself in rendering the text in lines 130-1 as di lám inna mná co mboi for láim Brain instead of di láim Brain co mboi for láim inna mná.

§32.
a lín (lines 133-4) is translated ‘their number’, and in the Notes (p. 174) we are told to ‘leg. llín’, in spite of the fact that the pronoun is clearly singular.

In line 139 M reads boí fair, and translates the passage ‘and said that it was upon him to go to Ireland after long ages’, which looks most peculiar. Fair is found only in L; all the other MSS point to airiu. Reading boí airiu one can translate ‘it was in store for him’ (compare the meaning of the compound verb ar-tá), which at least makes sense.

In the note on forid-mbiad (p. 175) M calls it a ‘nasaling relative clause’. There is no relative nasalisation here. If there were it would appear as forind-mbiad – the m belongs to the infixed pronoun! In any case a nasalising relative clause would be most surprising here as the preceding ed is a subject antecedent.

§33.
In the note on caine amrae M proposes emending to amrai, comparing it with the phrases amrae fiadat, and amrae n-amrae. The constructions are not however comparable; in the latter we have a neuter singular adjective followed by the genitive singular of a noun (for this construction see also E. Lewy, Celtica iii, 323), whereas caine is a noun. Why could M not have been satisfied with the straightforward construction of noun followed by adjective?
§34.

Towards the end of the note on *immut* (p. 178) M says ‘Both *imadh* (*iomadh*) and *imad* (*iomad*) occur in Early Mod. Ir. . . . In Mod. Ir. *iomad* is dominant except in the phrase *iomat*. This latter form, however, represents earlier *iomhda*, not *iomadh*; see T. F. O’Rahilly, *Irish Dialects Past and Present* (Dublin 1932) 270.

§35.

M translates *lín tonn tibrid* of the second line as ‘many waves breaking’, presumably following Murphy’s ‘many breaking (?) waves’. In the Notes (p. 179) he says ‘*tibrid* can be read as 3 sg. pres. rel. of *tibr(a)id* “breaks, gushes against, over”’. While admitting that *tibr(a)id* is not otherwise instanced*, he fails to notice that even if such a verb existed the relevant form would be *tibras*. The form in question is surely an attributive genitive singular of *tibre*, an abstract noun formed from the stem found in the verb *tibid*. The verb, the noun (see *DIL* s.v. *tipri* for another example), and the derived adjective *tibreach* are all instanced in use with *tonn*. One could also translate ‘many smiling waves’.

§36.

M translates the second line *sellu roisc ro-siri Bran* as ‘as far as Bran has stretched the glances of his eye’, following Meyer’s ‘as far as Bran has stretched his glance’. Murphy, on the other hand, translates ‘throughout the prospects over which Bran can roam with his eye’. It is difficult to see how either of these translations relates to the original text; M’s note (p. 180) is certainly no help. The line is best taken as an elaboration on the first line ‘Sea-horses glisten in summer’; supply a dash before *sellu* and translate: ‘- the prospect (lit. ‘viewings of eye’) which Bran can range over’, i.e. that is all that Bran is able to see.

§37.

In spite of the fact that *fairge* is a feminine *iā*-stem M reads *Lí na fairci* in the first line.

In the third line M reads *ros-sert*, taking this to contain ‘the 3 pl. infix anticipating the objects *bulide* and *glass*’ (Notes, p. 182). The -*s*-, however, is found only in L, the other MSS having either *ro* or *ra*. M goes on to say: ‘Murphy, *EIL* 295 sub *sernaid* “spreads out”, suggests reading *ro-sert* (for *ra-sert* of B). I don’t know why!’ No doubt Murphy was thinking of the common substitution in later MSS of *ra* for OIr *ro*, so common that it is hardly worth mentioning.

§38.

M translates for *n-aicci-siu* of the second line as ‘on which you look’, and enters *aicci* in the Glossary (p. 215) under *ad-ci* ‘sees’. In fact the form belongs to the verb *for-aicci*, the nasalisation being due to the object antecedent; translate ‘which you survey’.

In the fourth line *cen imarbat* is translated ‘without mutual slaying’; Meyer has ‘without mutual slaughter’, while Murphy has ‘without mutual slaying (?)’. The note on this (p. 183) is truly extraordinary. M takes *imarbat* ‘to be acc. sg. of m. or n. form of the usual f. *a*-stem *immurbáig* “strife, contention, rivalry”’. This is followed by various irrelevant comments, including the statement that ‘It is significant that *immurbáig* is not instanced in the OI glosses’. Significant for what?, one may ask. In all of this, however, there is no attempt to explain why on earth M imagines there should be (i) a change of gender, (ii) a shortening of
á to á, and (iii) a change of -g to -th. In fact, of course, immáríg and immárbad are entirely separate words, the latter clearly being a compound of bath ‘death’.

§39.

In the first line M reads Cé ad-chetha, and in the Notes (p. 184) gives the MS variants as: ‘ceacteatha H: cetch(h)eth RBES ce adcheter L’, adding the comment ‘ad-cheth, 3 sg. past subj. of ad-ci, cannot be accepted as there would be only 6 syllables in the line’. Indeed, if this were the reading of RBES, but according to M’s transcription of the MSS (p. 95) they have in fact cetc(h)eth-. Meyer (p. 21, n.1) expands the suspension-stroke as -a, but it seems better to expand as -er, and restore ad-cether, 2sg. present subjunctive, which fits well with the 2sg. present indicative in the fourth line.

§43.

The note (p. 190) on cen esbad takes up five lines without tackling the problem either of (i) if it is a form of esbad, why the final consonant is broad, or of (ii) the irregular rhyme with órdath. The reader is left wondering why ‘The reading of L forbaídhe: ordaidh is perhaps significant’.

§44.

Following Meyer, Fil dún of the first line is translated ‘We are’. Murphy, on the other hand, clearly realised this is impossible, and translated ‘there is a fort’. In the Notes (p. 190), in spite of saying ‘I take this to mean “we are” rather than “there is a fort”’, M goes on to give instances of the fact that attá + do ‘may indicate possession in OL’. It may indeed, and Fil dún should accordingly be translated ‘We have it (viz. the wood)’. This will entail following Murphy’s translation of uire as ‘of freshness’ rather than Meyer’s ‘of earth’. M simply says with regard to the two possible translations (Notes, p. 190): ‘I take the ambiguity to be deliberate’.

In the fourth line for ‘the sin has not reached us’ read ‘sin has not reached us’.

§45.

In the third line M reads sech recht ‘in disregard of the Law’, following L, whereas all the other MSS point to cenae, which is in fact what is translated.

The fourth line co-mbu haithbe nádh bué is translated ‘so that there came about ebbing which was not original’, which looks like a blend of Meyer’s ‘so that there came decay which was not original’ and Murphy’s ‘and brought about wretched (?) ebbing’. There are certain difficulties with this translation which M ignores: (i) bué means ‘native’ hence ‘person with legal connections’, and not ‘original’, (ii) the copula form co-mbu is translated as if it were the substantive (iii) the sequence of tenses in the line as printed (preterite combu followed by present nádh) is very odd. They can be avoided by reading combu haithbe nádbu é ‘so that what was not woe was decay’. The rhyme of é (DIL s.v. 5é) with ché means the whole quatrain is in deibide nguillnech.

§46.

In the note (p. 192) on bithaittreb of the fourth line M is troubled by the slender -itr-, but refers us to instances of ‘the old spelling attreb in Corpus 3.14, 4.40’. These are in fact not instances of the noun, but rather of the deuterotonic 3sg. preterite verb.
§50.

In the fourth line M reads *fer cain i corp criad-glain* ‘a fair man in a chalk-white body’. This leaves us with the feminine form of the adjective (fixed by rhyme with *ngair*) qualifying a masculine noun! Reading *criad glain* as two separate words will not do either, as *cré* is feminine and would take *glaine* in the genitive. Read *i corpchrí adglain* ‘in very pure bodily form’, taking *corpchrí* as a compound of *corp* ‘body’ + *cri* ‘body, flesh, form’ (compare *hi colla cri* ‘in carnal shape’ cited in *DIL* s.v. *cri*), and *adglain* as containing intensive ad-. *DIL* gives one example which shows *cri* to be feminine; to this can be added *Crist conic mo chrí nachum thair tríst tré LL 39038 (Bórama) where it is referred to by the feminine *tré* (*sche*). -*glain* is supported by S and L, while the other MSS point to -*gil* (no doubt corrupt). When M says in the Notes (p. 95) ‘Carney is correct in emending Meyer’s *cain* to *cain* as this gives us internal *aicill* rhyme between the final of c and a word in the interior of d’, he seems to have forgotten that Carney’s interpretation of the quatrains depends on taking it as a type of *rannaigecht*. Even M’s reading gives us a quatrains in *deibide*, a metre in which *aicill* would be most unusual.

§52.

In the second line of the text we find *tretel*, but in the Notes (p. 198) ‘*dretel*: sic L alliterating with *dagthire*’.

Meyer takes *riith ecni* in the third line as a cheville, translating ‘a course of wisdom’, whereas Murphy translates ‘in the course of his wisdom’, followed by M with ‘in the course of his knowledge’. The fact that there is nothing in the original to correspond to ‘his’ seems to have escaped M’s attention; Meyer’s interpretation is clearly superior.

§54.

With reference to *arcait* at the end of the first line, M asks the question ‘*leg. aircit?’* in the footnotes to the text (p. 42). The answer is most definitely no, as this would destroy the rhyme with *carpait*!

The second line *i mruig i n-agtar carpait* is translated by Meyer as ‘in the land where chariots are driven’, by Murphy as ‘in a territory in which chariots are driven’ and by M as ‘in the land in which chariots are driven’. In the context here of a contrast between land and sea in general, the reference to a particular land in the translation cannot be right. Take *i n-agtar carpait* as a non-restrictive relative clause and translate: ‘on land, where chariots are driven’.

For *ecne* in the third line read *éce* (the error is repeated in the Glossary, p. 221), and for *findbán* in the fourth read *findbán* (the preceding word *ela* is feminine!).

§55.

M takes *imréin* of the fourth line to be a prepositionless dative (Notes, p. 200) with no mention of the inconvenient fact that *rian* is a masculine *o*-stem.

§59.

There is no discussion of the difficult second line in the Notes (p. 205). No progress is made by taking *friss-seill* as ‘3 sg. pres.’ of *friss-sella* (Glossary, p. 223) which is itself 3 sg. present indicative!

§60.

In the fourth line M reads *ricfe* ‘you will reach’, following Meyer. Murphy,
however, is clearly correct in reading a sg. form ‘he shall reach’, in agreement with the sg. *imrad Bran* of the first line.

§61.

When M translates *Luidi Bran óad úrom* (line 255) as ‘Bran, then, went from him’, one can only ask: from whom? Take *óad* as used adverbially and translate ‘Bran then went off’.

In line 258 *Ad-aígtis treftecha gàire* is translated ‘They began letting gusts of laughter’. The meaning ‘begins’ for *ad-aíg*, however, only applies when it contains a reflexive infixed pronoun, and is followed by *oc* + a verbal noun, as is patent clear from DIL s.v. *ad-aig* (h). Translate simply ‘They gave forth gusts of laughter’; the translation of *ad-aícht* in line 260, and of *ad-aíged* in line 264 should be similarly corrected.

§62.

In the note (p. 210) on *in sná(i)the inna certle* (lines 272-3) we find the following: ‘The double article construction . . . is well-documented in Old and Mid. Irish and I have noted further examples in the later periods of the language, including Modern Irish story-telling. I dealt with this matter in detail some years ago in my paper The Article in Irish (unpubl. MS., University of Ulster, 1975)’. This is nothing less than an insult to the reader.

In line 275 M reads *Ar-ránc imdai cecho lábamna(a)e* and ‘They found a couch for every couple there’, translating the clearly singular verb as plural. Read *Ar-ránc imdae cecho lábamnae* and, taking the verb as intransitive (as Meyer does) and *imdae* as the subject, and translate ‘There happened to be a couch for every couple there’.

§63.

In line 280 *Atáigh*, with its -*gh* looks most out of place. Why not simply restore to *Ad-ídich*?

The above comments represent only a selection of the criticisms which can be made of this edition, but we must now move on to consider the rest of the book.

Part Two begins with an essay on the Otherworld Journey (pp. 238ff.) in other literatures (Greek, Persian, Scandinavian, etc.), followed by a discussion of the Irish *echtra* (pp. 248ff.) and *immrama* (pp. 275ff.). M’s preoccupation in all of this can be seen in the questions he poses on p. 275: ‘This brings us to the vexed question of the *genre* to which *Bran* actually belongs. Is it an *echtrae* or is it an *immram*? Is it an *echtrae* with *immram* elements or is it an *immram* with *echtrae* elements?’, and answers on p. 280: ‘*Bran* is, in the form in which we possess it, a hybrid which contains both *immram* and *echtrae* elements’. The reader would have been better served with some attempt at an interpretation of the text itself. Instead of this we get in the section headed ‘The Structure and Content of “Immram Brain”’ (pp. 286ff.) a summary of the text, followed by ‘A structuralist approach’ (pp. 290ff.) which M himself refers to as ‘this admittedly rather unscientific use of
Propp's functions' (p. 293). M gives up any attempt at a coherent analysis with the words 'There are, moreover, inconsistencies, disunities and duplications in the tale and one is left with the overall impression that it is structurally embryonic and unbalanced' (pp. 293-4). Speaking of the introductory prose (bottom of p. 294) he says 'This use of the "so-called" flashback technique is common in oral literature and gives the impression that the author/redactor is recording and recreating materials which already existed in either oral or written form or in both', but in the middle of the following page he says 'I agree with Mac Cana that the initial prose constitutes fresh composition'. This sort of inconsistency is barely credible. The fruitless attempts to chop up the text culminate in absurdity at the end of this section. On p. 295 M introduces 'the theory which I shall now advance, namely, that §§3-25 form the nucleus around which the remainder of the tale is built'. Only about a page intervenes between this and the following statement at the bottom of p. 296: 'It is possible that the author of the nucleus is also the author of both the Christian stanzas in the first poem and of the Manannán poem; the possibility that these latter were composed by a near contemporary, however, should not be discounted'.

Part Three begins with a section on metre (pp. 299ff.). On p. 299 M gives us his statistics for 'deibide scailte' and 'deibide guilhnech' quatrains and couplets. The meaning of these terms is discussed by Gerard Murphy, Early Irish Metrics (Dublin 1961) 29: 'Scailte ('scattered') is used in all four tracts with deibide metres apparently to indicate that there is no link between the first couplet of the quatrain and the second. Deibide scailte is probably named mainly in contrast to deibide n-imrinn, in which all the lines are linked by some type of end-rime; deibide nguilhnech is distinguished from both by another principle of distinction (the difference between fully stressed rimes and rinn and airdrinn rimes)'. It is clear from the metrical analysis of the individual quatrains in the Notes, however, that M for some unknown reason uses deibide scailte to indicate quatrains or couplets which contain rinn and airdrinn. It is also clear from the Notes that the statistics on p. 299 are wrong. On p. 165 the analysis of §25 is 7, 7, 7, 7, with the comment 'The first couplet is in Deibide Scailte, the second in Deibide guilhnech ndialtach'. The word at the end of the second line, however, is aniar, which is stressed on the second syllable; this means that the line must be counted as ending in a monosyllable! Similarly on p. 176 imma-reid at the end of the fourth line of §33 is counted as a trisyllabic ending, and on p. 181 ime-rai at the end of the second line of §37 is also counted as a trisyllabic ending. (For §§45 and 50, see my comments above). Faced with such disregard of the basics of metrics, one does not approach the rest of M's comments on metrics with much confidence. These include
a chapter entitled ‘The origins of Deibide’ (pp. 302ff.), which adds nothing new, and a chapter on *Fidrad Freccomail* (308ff.), which does not discuss properly how consistently this feature is found in *Imram Brain*. In the middle of the latter (p. 311) we find an extraordinary statement regarding alliteration of *f* and *f* ‘No exx. The Bran poems support Carney’s contention that there is as yet insufficient evidence for this alliterative link’. This section is rounded off with a chapter entitled ‘On dating early Irish poetry in general and IB in particular’ (pp. 314ff.) ending with the hardly very specific ‘I conclude from the metrical evidence that the poems of IB were composed between c. 700-950 A.D.’.

This is followed by a section entitled ‘Linguistic Analysis’ (pp. 321ff.). The quality of the analysis here is no better than in the notes to the text; many of the errors found there are repeated here (often with greater elaboration) and new ones are added. I confine myself in the following to a selection of the more egregious ones.

In general M attaches an unwarranted importance to the representation of final unstressed short vowels in the MSS; rhyming examples provide the only reliable evidence for the date of the language of the original.

On p. 336 M confidently states ‘As is to be expected the demonstrative particle isin is not nasalized after art + N’. As *i* is stressed one would surely expect nasalisation in OIr.!

The list of examples under the heading ‘Prepositional Relative Clauses’ (pp. 346-7) is an extraordinary farrago. Admittedly some of the examples belong under this heading, but we also find examples which consist of a compound verb with object antecedent in a nasalising or leniting relative clause, viz. *don tór don-aídbri imram* 74 (see my comments above on §17), *is mag scothach imma-réid* 146, *geldod mora imme-raí* 160, and *a mmutr find for-n-aicci-stu* 164 (see my comments above on §38), one example which consists of a compound verb with subject antecedent in a leniting relative clause, viz. *is ed forid-mbíd* 141 (M has a different misanalysis of this in the Notes; see my comments above on §32), and two examples which consist of a non-relative verb preceded by a prepositional phrase in periphrasis with the copula, viz. *(Is la suthaini sine) / do-snig arcab i tíre* 94, and *is iar mbarr fedo ro-sná* 179. Can these last two really have been included because of the prepositions *la* and *iar* in the preceding phrases?

On p. 347 we are told ‘The rel. form in -e occurs in *RBH* (-ie) 64.286: *cia do-(-)luidé*. Is M not aware that relative -e is found only with simple verbs in OIr.? The form in question has nothing to do with the relative, but is simply a later form of *do-lui* on the analogy of *luid: luidi*, the -i in the latter being in origin the suffixed pronoun 3 sg. neuter. The error is repeated on p. 408.
On p. 368 M says 'To reconstruct original coictea here may be wrong as the consonant cluster ct often resists palatalisation. RIA Contr. C, Fasc. II, col. 292. offer no examples of the form coictea other than our form from IB which is based on van Hamel's edition. None of the MSS, in fact, have the -ea termination'. M might have noted that the erroneous form coictea (which he suggests reading, at the bottom of p. 37) originated in Meyer's edition. He speaks of ct resisting palatalisation, but refers us in the footnote to the above to discussions of the consonant cluster /xt/ where no vowel ever intervened between the /x/ and the /t/. In coicta, however, the -ct- represents /gd/ brought together by syncope. As the syncopated vowel was o (see Thurneysen, Grammar §392) there can be no question of (nor is there the slightest bit of evidence for) a form coictea.

The first paragraph of the section on 'nd> nn' (pp. 391-2) is remarkable. It begins with 'The change of nd to nn had taken place in certain positions by the beginning of the eighth century . . . In other positions, and generally over the board, the change appears to have been accomplished by the time the Calendar of Oengus was composed . . .' and ends with 'To compound the difficulty nn was confused with nd (and written for it) from as early as the eighth century also'.

The discussion of the date (pp. 411ff.) begins 'Kuno Meyer believed IB to have been originally 'written down' in the seventh century' to which is appended the bizarre footnote 'VB i, Introduction xvi. I shall tacitly assume that 'written down' = 'composed' although Meyer was probably reckoning with an earlier oral tale'.

This whole discussion is vitiated by the attempts to chop up the text into discrete sections, which we have met with previously. On p. 417 M cannot make up his mind whether to date the prose to the ninth or to the tenth century, and on p. 418 he tells us 'Indeed, my considered view is that, in the form in which we possess them, the poems and prose of IB are not earlier than the ninth century'.

Appendix I (pp. 421-69) titled 'Cin Dromma Snechtai: a Reappraisal' is a typically muddled piece of work, in which no real case is made for M's proposed tenth-century date for CDS. A single example will suffice to illustrate the level of argumentation: 'The Laed Genealogies agree with Mael Muru with regard to the sharing of the kingship except that in this case the Goidels share with the Cruithin. This appears to be a much more realistic account of the early adventures of the Goidels in Ireland than that contained in the other versions and may represent a reasonably accurate record of the historical situation' (pp. 444-5).

Appendix II consists of a transcript of the Mongán stories from the RIA MS 23 N 10, and Appendix III of a transcript of the poem beginning Fil and grian glinne hAi from the Stockholm MS Vitterhet Engelsk II.
Appendix IV is titled ‘Orthography of Harl. 5280 (H)’. The work ends with a ‘Select Bibliography’ and various indexes.

It has been a tedious task to review this overlong book. But I cannot finish without some reference to the eccentric variety of English in which M’s opinions are presented to us. Some oddities are probably typing errors, such as: ‘promentory’ (p. 235.8), ‘explicitely’ (p. 294.9), or ‘Heildensaga’ (p. 448.23), but others are more serious. Thus we find ‘advanced typescripts’ (p. 131 n.1), ‘consonants’ (for ‘consonance’, p. 168.22), ‘critic’ (for ‘critique’, p. 131.29), ‘terrestrial’ (pp. 280.29, 281.12, 282.8), ‘vica versa’ (pp. 163.7, 333.19), etc. Proper names do not fare any better; my own name and that of Professor R. A. Breathnach are consistently misspelt ‘Breathnach’ (e.g. in the Bibliography, p. 486, or p. 124.32), Howard Meroney appears as ‘Meryon’ (p. 167.20), and Mark Scowcroft throughout as ‘Snowcroft’ (e.g. in the Bibliography, p.492, or p. 437 n.31). Finally there are the peculiar turns of phrase, such as ‘over the board’ (for ‘across the board’, pp. 334.3, 391.23), ‘near the head of Firth’ (196.1), ‘Suprascr. i under m?’ (p. 78 n.1), ‘the indecl. demonstrat. deictic part.’ (p. 193.22), etc. The strangest of all, however, is ‘analogous buildings’ (p. 141.12), in a rendering of §61 of Pokorny’s Altirishe Grammatik (Berlin 1969), where the German has Analogiebildungen (‘analogical formations’).

Liam Breathnach

Trinity College, Dublin


The book under review is dedicated to Heinrich Wagner. This is not surprising since the entire discussion throughout the book is based on the large body of phonetic material contained in Wagner’s Linguistic Atlas and Survey of Irish Dialects (1958-68). The book on the whole complements O’Rahilly’s work in Irish Dialects Past and Present (1932) and provides a framework for the description of the major dialect groupings within Ulster Irish. Chapter 1 outlines briefly the historical background of Ulster Irish dialects and dialect relationships in general and goes on to discuss the study of dialect geography. Chapter 2 gives a general overview of the treatment of unstressed long vowels in such endings as ‘-án’, ‘-óg’, ‘-úr’ and ‘-ín’. In each of chapters 3-8 various phonetic realisations are examined in detail, in order to provide a systematic outline to the structure of dialect differentiation within Ulster. Chapter 9 deals with the distribution of certain lexical items while chapter 10 traces the study of Ulster dialects before and after O’Rahilly and concludes with a dis-
cussion on O’Rahilly’s views on dialect interrelationship and linguistic change.

One must agree with the author that the replies in the Atlas are random samples of language use which show a clear lack of linguistic bias. Although these data show a high degree of internal consistency, they nevertheless only present us with preliminary materials for the purposes of major dialect differentiation. Given the elicitation techniques used in the Atlas (one individual informant for each area) linguistic differentiation must be along geographical lines rather than on sociolinguistic grounds. The author’s remarks, however, that ‘In the Irish sociolinguistic situation, it is very doubtful if there exists among native speakers any major instances of language differentiation on social grounds, given the social composition of the Gaeltacht areas.’ (p. 16), can hardly be sustained, if one considers the kind of language used in public speaking, in the school domain, in storytelling, the language of religion and the various registers used on Raìdiò na Gaeltachta. Language differentiation in those domains can be either phonological, lexical or grammatical or along all three parameters.

The treatment of unstressed long vowels shows clearly that within Ulster we have three main dialectal areas: South Donegal and Cavan where the vowels are half-long/long, from Fanad eastwards where the vowels tend to be short or reduced to [ə], and the rest of Donegal where the vowels are generally short but tend to half-long in some cases. In trying to account for this variation the degrees of stress found in noninitial syllables in such words as *braddán, fuinneogáí* and in phrases of the type *braddán mór* etc. is discussed in some detail.

The views of Quiggin, Ó Seartaigh and Sommerfelt differ in a number of important details concerning the stressing of non-initial syllables. In order to standardise the various transcriptions, the author in the book under review proposes the following marking conventions: 1 = Primary Stress. Three degrees of secondary stress as follows: 2 = Secondary stress in disyllabic words (*fuinneog*); 2+ = Stronger secondary stress in trisyllabic words (the second syllable of *fuinneogáí*); 2- = a weaker secondary stress in trisyllabic words (the last syllable of *ogánach*). 3 = Tertiary stress (unstressed syllable) such as the second syllable in *capall, amadán* etc. In this way the stress pattern of *fuinneog* is [1 2] and of *fuinneogáí* [1 2+ 2-], and the length of the vowel in the second syllable is predictable from the stress pattern. Any syllable having stress [2] will have a short vowel generally, while those with stress pattern [2+] are likely to have a half-long/long vowel in most of the Donegal dialect points covered in the Atlas.

While I agree that attributing stress patterns 2+, 2 and 2- to certain non-initial syllables does predict the distribution of vowel length in such syllables, nevertheless, some unanswered questions still remain. They pertain in particular to the great variation in the data given in Table 2.6 on page 47 with regard to points 73, 74, 76 and 86 in particular. The data from point 76, for example, shows that the vowel in such endings as
‘-eog’ in fuinneog, fuinneog mhór and fuinneogai may be short, halflong or long. That is to say, the vowel is short in fuinneog, half-long in fuinneog mhór agus fully long in fuinneogai. While the variation for the other points is not as extreme, nevertheless it also calls for comment, as for example the length difference at point 86 in fuinneog and fuinneog mhór type words, from short to fully long.

The second question that must be asked is what exactly is a ‘secondary stressed’ syllable and how does it relate to primary stressed and unstressed syllables within the dialect. It seems to me that we have secondary stress on the second element of the following compounds: seanbhoc, seanbhrog, sean-dán, An Chorrmhín (placename). The vowels of bróg, dán and min are intrinsically long and are reduced to halflong in such compounds. One may compare the length in bróg, bróga, seanbhróga and will notice that they all differ in length. The ‘ó’ in bróga is not quite as long as the ‘ó’ in bróg, but is longer than the vowel ‘ó’ in seanbhróga which in turn is longer than the vowel in oie, soc etc. One could, therefore, distinguish four degrees of length in such words within most of the main dialectal areas of Donegal. In such cases one must define clearly what one means by halflong or long vowel.

Anyone familiar with Donegal Irish will notice that seanbhrog and fuinneog have very different stress systems. The ‘ó’ is better preserved in seanbhrog than it is in fuinneog, mainly I would argue because it receives secondary stress and is never reduced to a short vowel. If we compare the pronunciation of ‘min’ as in phrase cisor mhín[k'i:'r 'v'i:n'] with the pronunciation of the second element of the placename An Chorrmhín [ə'kəɾəv,i:n'], we notice that min with primary stress has a long [iː] and when it receives secondary stress as in An Chorrmhín, it is half-long [iː]. They in turn may be compared to the short /i/ in ‘min’.

It would seem, therefore, that the notion of ‘secondary stress’ has to be redefined and the preservation of ‘length’ in non-initial syllables as in the words bradán and fuinneog must be attributed to some other cause. Speech rhythm, syllabification and overall word length within the dialect may prove more fruitful grounds in the search for this explanation.

The author suggests that the reason why certain vowels are affected by qualitative weakening more than others may lie in the relative functional loads carried by the segments involved, as indicated by the frequency of use. With regard to the distinction between ‘inner’ and ‘outer’ areas in Ulster (those dialects which maintain halflong/long /i:/ and /u:/ in cailin and galún and those which reduce them to a neutral vowel /ə/), the author disagrees with O’Rahilly’s comment on the same issue and says the picture is much more complicated and that dialects do not fall rigidly into either category. The distribution of the various allophones of /a(ː)/ are given on maps 3.1 – 3.4 (pp.66-7). Short /a/ before a palatalised environment shows fronted allophones in most of Donegal as compared to the rest of Ulster which has [ə] generally. The long /aː/ shows similar fronting with North and North West Donegal being the most innovative area here with raised [ɛː] variants being very
common before palatalised consonants. While agreeing that preceding labial consonants in general offset any tendency towards fronting of short /a/, nevertheless I can’t agree that a following labial consonant or a preceding non-labial can not also exercise similar influence.

The Atlas does not cover in sufficient detail the 20 mile stretch whose centre point is Cnoc Fola and within which lies many of the answers to questions about the effect of preceding and following consonants. In general many subdialects within that area have different vowel realisations in such pairs as – cailín : cailleach; bearrach : bearradóir; bean : beanna etc., namely [ê] versus [a]. That each differs from ach and that eala, eallach and allas all have different initial vowels in the same subdialects may reveal more about what really happened historically than the Atlas materials.

In discussing the distribution of the realisation of ‘ea’ within Ulster and especially Donegal the above mentioned area holds the key to the historical developments of /e/ within Donegal. At the Southern end of this area one compares fear [f’ar] with fearr [f’ê:r] whereas on the Gweedore/Cloughaneely border one finds the reverse [f’ê:r] and fear [f’a:r]. These facts do not fit in very well with the statements made on pp. 80-2, where only the contrasts /f’ê:r/ : /f’ar/ and /f’a:r/ : /f’ar/ are pronounced possible. While I agree with the author that underlying /a/ was raised to [ê] in certain cases as in ainm, faire, madadh etc., I do not agree with him that all instances of historical /e/ have been lowered to [a] and some subsequently raised. In many subdialects we get /ê/ in dearmad and doras but [a] or [â] in dara. The historical /ô/ of doras still preserved in doirse was obviously lowered to [a] and than raised to [ê]. The original vowel /a/, however, was preserved in dara, cara, tar etc. In the same subdialects dearmad has [a:], darna [a] with no fronting and raising as in cár, lár etc.

In chapter 4 the possible underlying forms for the ‘óg’ ending in the singular and plural are discussed. This poses certain problems for the author which have not been very satisfactorily resolved. It would seem from figure 4.1 (p. 103) that different underlying forms are envisaged for both singular and plural in many instances, (e.g. a short vowel /ô/ or /a/ in the singular and a long vowel /ô:/ or /a:/ in the plural).

In the next paragraph, however, we are told this would not be necessary if we were setting up synchronic grammars for individual dialects. In such cases one underlying form would be sufficient for each subdialect. It is only if we wish to compare the phonological grammars of various dialects either synchronically or from the standpoint of diachronic derivations that we need to look at all the possible endings. Since only vowels that have been shortened from /ô:/ to [ô] can lower to [a], then the puzzling question arises as to why we get long [a:] in many subdialects, in plurals like fuinneogáich which have only short [a] in the singular fuinneog. One possible explanation for this we are told on p. 104 is that the vowels in the singular and plural forms have to be identical in quality. In other dialects long or half-long vowels in words like
fuinneogáí are attributed to secondary stress [2+]. There must be some (simpler?) explanation for all this other than the complicated barrage of rules and subrules given on pp. 101-4. I would suggest that maintaining half-long/long vowels in fuinneogáí and the lowering of [ɔ] to [a] can not be attributed to secondary stress as shown by the maintenance of half-long [ɔ] and short [ɔ] in seanbhróg [ˈfan,wrɔːɡ] and seanbhoc [ˈfan,woːk], respectively. In the plural seanbhróga, the ‘ó’ is generally longer than in the singular seanbhróg and this would tie in with the length distinction in fuinneog/fuinneogáí but shows clearly that stress is not the overriding factor since seanbhróg and seanbhróga have identical stress patterns (ignoring the final ‘a’).

The discussion of the high back vowels is precise, clearcut and to the point. Ulster it would seem is divided into four distinct zones. The change of [ua] to [ua] to [ia] is also common in much of the subdialects of Gweedore, unfortunately not covered by the Atlas. The author’s reason for /guːh/ and /daːh/ as underlying realisations for guth and dath respectively, is not altogether clear. If such underlying long vowels have any reality then one would expect alternations of the type [uː]/[u] to appear in the phonetic realisations of such words. No evidence, however, has been produced to support this argument.

The voiceless velar fricative /x/ is discussed in some detail in chapter 6. The historical background is sketched and the synchronic distribution of the various allophones of /x/ are shown clearly by means of tables and maps. In summary /x/ is weakening towards [ɔ] to [h] to zero. The initial weakening tends to happen intervocally or at the end of unstressed syllables as in leapacha and cladach. The /x/ is strongest at the end of stressed syllables such as ach, teach etc. The strongest realisations are in Rathlin Island and in Glangevlin in Co. Cavan. As one moves from South Donegal towards the North West the [h] allophones of /x/ begin to increase and indeed the [h] in often lost and disappears altogether in the dialects of North and North East Donegal. The change of /x/ to /r/ common in Tyrone Irish and on Tory Island is discussed and a very revealing and convincing explanation given for this change in phonetics terms via the teachings of Uldall 1958. Again it would have been interesting and informative to have data from various dialects within the Gweedore area where this change is quite widespread.

The affrication of the palatalised dental stops seems to have occurred in peripheral areas – East Ulster, South Donegal, Arranmore and Tory Island – the rest of Donegal showing fairly conservative realisations of /tʰ/ and /dʰ/. This is an expected phonetic development and is attributed by the author to the slow release of the laminal articulated palatalised stops. He disagrees with Wagner who attributed the change in South Donegal to maintenance of strongly articulated geminata consonants in that area. However, as Ó Dochartaigh points out, this affrication is widespread in North Mayo dialects which show no trace of gemination.

With regard to the realisation of palatalised /r’/ East Donegal generally with Tyrone and Omeath show that the contrast between
palatalised and velarised ‘r’ is being lost or has been lost in favour of the latter. The norm for most of Donegal would seem to be [r'] with three areas showing a preference for a strongly palatalised [r’'], a preference found in many subdialects of the North West not covered by the Atlas points.

Chapter 8 discusses some isolated phonetic changes many of which have been dealt with in more detail in papers published elsewhere by the author. They include devoicing of final stops, loss of intervocalic ‘h’, the ‘f’ of the Future ending, deletion of final /ο/, the comparative form ‘nios’ and the shortening of original stressed long vowels in polysyllables. Chapter 9 deals with some lexical isoglosses and their distribution as well as the relationship between the dialects of Rathlin, Gleann Gaibhleann and the Irish of the rest of Ulster.

Most of chapter 10 is spent on identifying and clarifying O’Rahilly’s views on, and his basic orientation towards, dialect differentiation. The author shows that O’Rahilly had a somewhat biased view of the linguistic materials from Ulster, Scotland and the Isle of Man. This is shown clearly by the use of such words as ‘extraordinary’ (:119) and ‘peculiar’ (:145) when describing Scottish Gaelic and Manx. In dealing with developments within Munster Irish no such emotive terminology is used. Instead he refers to the ‘interesting extension of the Munster tá sé duita isteach . . .’ (:235). His view was that ‘Southern Irish was of native growth . . .’ (:263) while Ulster Irish had ‘acquired its distinctive features as a result of the partial assimilation of the pre-existing Northern Irish to the Gaelic spoken in Scotland some centuries ago, . . .’ (:261). The author tries to grapple with O’Rahilly’s use of the term ‘influence’ and concludes that O’Rahilly ideas can be traced back to the ideas of Darwin who saw change as the result of intergroup struggles. In linguistic behaviour terms the competing societies were identified with dominant and less dominant dialect groups within a language. O’Rahilly had a militaristic and territorial view of dialect expansion and contact, which is clearly shown by his description of Connacht Irish waiting to be overrun by the other two major dialects Ulster and Munster. Foreign invasions were also called upon to explain major dialectal changes – the Anglo Normans in the case of Munster stress. There is much else of interest in this chapter which is well organised and clearly argued and presented.

Since all the data and maps given in Ó Dochartaigh’s book are based entirely on the Atlas data, and because of the geographical distribution of the Atlas points, certain important gaps remain. The large stretch not represented in the Atlas was the meeting place of various subdialects, those of East Donegal from the East and those from Mid Donegal from the South. Those divisions are still clearly represented by the subdialects from Gort An Choirce to Croithli a distance of 20 miles or more. Most of this area was uninhabited 400 years ago and in 1659 had approximately 200 souls. Now 8,000 people inhabit the area. It is imperative that the dialects of this area be surveyed in detail in the next 10-15 years.
BOOK REVIEWS

This book, however, has been well worthwhile and presents the reader with a vast amount of data synthesised and presented in very readable form. It has placed Ulster Irish Dialectology study on a new par and has opened new avenues and set new objectives for future research. Some of the discussion in the book is very technical and loaded with linguistic jargon and may form an unnecessary barrier for the ordinary reader. Perhaps the author might consider issuing a much shorter and less technical edition of his book with maps. Such a publication would be well received by all those interested and familiar with Ulster Irish and with Irish dialects in general.

DONALL P. Ó BAOILL

Instituít Teangeolaithe Éireann
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CERDDI GAELEG CYFOES. JOHN STODDART. Gwasg Prifysgol Cymru, 1986. xi + 161 pp. £3.95 (sterling).

This attractively produced volume will be greatly welcomed by that (still fairly substantial) minority who take an interest in Welsh poetry. The author’s main purpose is to give Welsh readers a broad idea of the subjects exercising the minds of one ‘group’ of modern Gaelic poets, and to show how those subjects are handled by them, both from the standpoint of content and, as far as is possible, form. He is well aware that very few Welsh people (even among those of us who have followed Welsh or Celtic university courses) know anything at all about Gaelic poetry - not even the names of its principal exponents (Hugh MacDiarmid, because his main medium was English, is a possible exception). It was therefore a wise decision to include an introduction, which is rather modestly described as a ‘glance of the development of contemporary Gaelic poetry’. The present-day writers of Gaelic poetry are said to fall into one of two groups: the traditional (whose work is conservative from the standpoint of form and motivation) and the modern (products of higher education whose attitudes to structure and topic are more venturesome). The first type - the ‘village’ poets - is becoming more and more scarce, for the simple reason that Gaelic society itself has changed so fundamentally during the present century. Their ‘social’ poetry is no longer a necessary element of village life and activity. Mainly for that reason, it is the latter group, and more especially, ‘the five most prominent and most important’ among them, Sorley MacLean, George Campbell Hay, Derick Thomson, Ian Crichton Smith and Donald MacAulay, that is featured in this anthology. A brief biographical note
on each is appended to the text.

The topics favoured by the poets are briefly discussed in the Introduction. In this respect, one aspect which will immediately strike those familiar with the work of present-day Welsh scholar-poets, is the less dominant role that political nationalism seems to play. Indeed John Stoddart at one point asks the question, 'How Gaelic in reality is a great deal of this poetry?' His answer is that foreign (particularly English) influences are unavoidable in these mass-media days. Nevertheless it is the Gael who speaks, feels and hears in these verses, and it is his temperament and personality that interprets the situations and ideas, even if the background is as removed as 'Algeria or India, Turkey or Tibet'.

The reviewer would not wish to end these remarks with anything that might be interpreted as carping. But would it not have enhanced the value of the work if the Gaelic original had been printed side by side with these commendable Welsh translations? A more solid insight into metre, rhyme, consonance and other aspects of form would then have been possible for the Welsh reader.

T. Arwyn Watkins

University College, Dublin


The articles and reviews in volumes 14 and 15 of this, the most important of present-day Welsh literary periodicals, are, in accordance with policy, all written in Welsh medium. They are also, as always, of a very high standard. Discussions related to the Arthurian legend figure prominently: Vol. 14: 'Rhai sylwadau ar Peredur a pherthynas y chwedd Gymraeg à Perceval Chrétien' (Doris Edel), 'Darogan yr Olew Bendigaid: Chwedd o'r bymthegfed ganrif (Ceridwen Lloyd-Morgan), 'Darogan yr Olew Bendigaid a Hysdori yr Olew Bendigaid' (R. Wallis Evans); Vol. 15: Y dartun o Arthur (A. O. H. Jarman), 'Un o ffynonellau Cymreig Chrétien de Troyes, Laudune de Lauduc, merch Laudunet' (Brian Woledge), 'Gerallt Gymro a Siôn o Gernyw fel cyfieithwyr proffwydoliaethau Myrddin' (Michael J. Curley), and 'The Legend of Arthur in the Middle Ages; Arthurian Studies vii' (a review by Ceridwen Lloyd-Morgan). Another well-represented field is that of the social and political aspects of 'Beirdd yr Uchelwyr', Vol. 14: 'Canrif olaf y Cywyddwyr' (D. J. Bowen), 'Gwaith Lewys Môn' (a review by Rachel Bromwich); Vol. 15: 'Hanfodion undod gwladwriaethol, cyfraith a
threfn yng Nghymru cyfnod y Tuduriaid: Tystiolaeth Beirdd yr Uchelwyr' (J. Gwynfor Jones). Caerwyn Williams contributes an article in Vol. 14 on the history of Y Traethodydd (in its time a highly influential periodical in Welsh literary, social and religious life, and still appearing regularly), and another in Vol. 15 on the early development of our most famous novelist, Daniel Owen (it is in some ways a pity that so many scholarly footnotes constantly draw one's attention from the very readable text). Other leading articles are, Vol. 14: 'Tri mewn llenyddiaeth' (R. M. Jones); Vol. 15: a review of the poetry of that somewhat uninspired period, 1801-25, by Glyn M. Ashton, and an article on the sparse classical influences on modern Welsh poetry by T. G. F. Powell. Also in the latter volume is a brief note of reminiscences by Brian Woledge. It refers to some of his early contacts with Celtic scholars. The following account of Vendryes's Middle Welsh class (attended usually by three or four students) throws some interesting light on the central interests of early scholars of Celtic:

Vendryes wore his scholarship lightly, and the atmosphere was friendly and informal. I can still see him entering with an armful of books, saying 'I've just received these to review.' He was clearly much at home with Welsh and he spent a great deal of time on syntax and etymology; comparisons between Celtic and other Indo-European language groups were frequent. Not much attention was paid to literary topics, and though we read 'Geraint fab Erbin', very little can I remember being said about Chrétien de Troyes or the Mabinogionfrage. Esthetic topics were not entirely absent: Vendryes noted in relation to the word esmwyth: 'Voilà un bien joli mot'. I asked him whether there was a connection between it and the English word smooth; he pondered for a while and then answered that there was not.

To return briefly to the 'Matter of Britain'. Since no reference is made to it in any of the articles appearing in these two volumes, it would be well to call Arthurian scholars' attention to Petrus Gerardus Korrel's successful PhD thesis (presented to the National University of Ireland, September 1982): 'The characterization of Arthur, Modred and Guinevere in the Early Welsh and the chronicle tradition, and in the Middle English Romances dealing with the death of Arthur'. Its scope is wide, its arguments lucid and perceptive, and its conclusions, particularly in respect of the portrait of Arthur, novel, imaginative and stimulating (while being at the same time admittedly controversial).

University College, Dublin

T. Arwyn Watkins

This work is based on three present-day dictionaries Y Geiriadur Mawr, Y Geiriadur Cymraeg Cyfoes and Geiriadur Prifysgol Cymru (the last-named presumably only with reference to the catch-word which had been reached by 1984 or 1985). ‘Obsolete words’ (the author must have had to depend on the opinion of the lexicographers concerned in respect of these) and ‘recent loans from English’ have been disregarded. Dr Zimmer suggests in his foreword that the work will be useful to Welsh poets, and the reviewer agrees – particularly to those working within the severe constrictions of Welsh strict-metre poetry. But the phonologist and the morphologist will readily find a mine of information on such features as the phonotactic or suffixational possibilities and restrictions of Welsh. It is well to remind oneself, however, that in respect of ‘productiveness’ it is to the literary language alone that the information refers. The colloquial language handles things very differently. Thus the noun-forming suffix -(i)æth looks very productive (more than 600 words in which it occurs as a final morpheme are listed). But most of these words would not be even in the passive vocabulary of the vast majority of Welsh speakers, and they would certainly not be able to produce neologisms from the suffix. Or again, if one bases one’s conclusions on this dictionary the verb-noun suffix -u seems just as widespread as its allomorph -io (there are in fact more -u words than -io words listed). In colloquial Welsh (and of course in the dialogue component of modern novels, plays etc.) the situation is very different. Almost every verb borrowing from English in recent times has been assimilated to the -io (or its regional variant -o) group of verb-nouns. Providing that these and other limitations are borne in mind the dictionary will supply a useful addition to the ‘tools’ available to the Welsh linguist and litterateur.

T. ARWYN WATKINS

University College, Dublin


The approach in this volume is (at least as far as Welsh hagiology is concerned) unusual and refreshing. Elissa Henken is a folklorist and discusses the topic from that standpoint:
My purpose . . . in examining these [hagiographical] materials, in all the genres and periods in which they appear, is to discover what the people thought, how they viewed their world, and how the saints served them as heroes, as symbols of what was or could be, and as expressions of their needs as individuals and as a people. (p.1)

The question of what the saint ‘really’ did — as contrasted to what the stories say he did — does not concern her. Consequently the hagiologist’s usual ‘tools’ — place-name analysis, church records, geographical distribution of associated foundations etc. — are not fundamental to her study.

The criteria for the inclusion of a saint’s name in the work are (i) that his main area of activity should have been Wales (the Cornish-born Pedrog is thus included, but the Welsh-born Patrick — since his major area of activity was Ireland — is not), (ii) that the saint’s lore must have been preserved by the Welsh (for this purpose Brittany and Cornwall are included in the term ‘Welsh’), (iii) that there must be some evidence of a narrative tradition (just a genealogical reference or church dedication is not enough). The final result is forty-six chapters devoted to individual saints and three chapters on ‘Relationships and Associations’ (i.e. between the saints and each other), ‘Enlli’ (i.e. Bardsey Island, which is a traditional locational link between saints — 20,000 of them are purported to have been buried there), and ‘Arthur and Maelgwn’ (the two tyrants who, because of their historical and folk tale fame, provided excellent foils for the saints’ successful battles against secular authority).

The amount of story material available varies substantially from one saint to another. At one extreme the chapter on Dewi takes up 42 pages, and on the other Deiniol has less than a page.

The introduction deals concisely with the author’s principal sources of information. These are the prose ‘lives’ in Welsh and Latin, the poetry of the Gogynfeirdd (Early Middle Welsh) and the Cywyddwyr (late Middle and Early Modern Welsh), the work of historians and antiquarians, and finally modern folk-lore collections. In respect of the latter, Dr Henken admits the difficulty of evaluating an informant’s information. Very little truly oral lore concerning the saints has survived in Wales. The author herself seems to have had very little opportunity to do field research, but even if she had, it is very doubtful if any ‘new’ lore would have come to light. It is significant that even in relation to St David, her informants ‘. . . admitted that what they did know had been learned in school lessons . . .’, and in casual conversation half of those questioned about the best-known of his traditions (the ground rising under his feet) remember only ‘something about David’s standing on a handkerchief . . .’. The experience of the Welsh Folk Museum researchers suggests that almost nothing seems to have survived the Methodist
(and subsequent) revivals.

The format of the book is attractive, the handling of the material competent, and the content very readable. As a non-folklorist the reviewer would have liked to have learned more about how ‘true’ oral lore is distinguished from material motivated by political, religious and other considerations. Future researchers will find the ‘Text Code’ (where all relevant sources are listed under individual saints’ names) most useful. Equally valuable is the ‘Index of Saints’ Traditions’ (again individually listed with cross references to the text). There is also a bibliography of works cited. The book can be commended to both the professional hagiologist and the intelligent general reader. The price does, however, seem a little high.

T. ARWYN WATKINS

University College, Dublin

JOHN MORRIS-JONES. ALLEN JAMES. University of Wales Press on behalf of the Welsh Arts Council, 1987. 89 pp. £3.50 (sterling).

This little volume in the ‘Writers of Wales’ series gives an interesting account of the career of a scholar who contributed an immense amount to the development of Welsh learning in the closing decades of the nineteenth century and first three of the twentieth. It brings us through his schooldays in Bangor and Brecon and the awakening in him of an interest in Welsh literature which, during his early years in Oxford, led him to abandon the study of mathematics and turn to an academic career in Welsh. Morris-Jones’s appointment as lecturer in Welsh in Bangor in 1889 was followed by the establishment there of a Chair which he occupied from 1894 until his death in 1929.

Mr. James discusses Morris-Jones’s contribution to the establishment of modern Welsh orthography and to the improvement of literary standards, as well as his importance as a teacher, as the author of such fundamental works as A Welsh Grammar, Historical and Comparative (1913) and Cerdd Dafod (1925), and as editor of the periodical Y Beirniad. There is also an assessment of Morris-Jones’s own poetic compositions.

Somewhat surprisingly a photograph included as a frontispiece has the caption ‘John Morris-Jones 1864-1919’ and on p. 26 ‘Sir Henry Sweet’ is named as author of ‘Spoken North Welsh’ published in the Trans. Phil. Soc. 1882-4.

BRIAN Ó CUÍV
BÁS CEARBHAILL AGUS FARBHLAIDHE. SIOBHÁN NÍ LAIOIRE a chuir in earag. An Clóchomhar Tta., 1986. 97 lgh. £5 (crua), £3 (bog).

Téacs ón 15ú nó ón 16ú haois é seo a bhfuil roinnt oibre déanta cheana air, go háirithe eagrán dioplamaídeach den LS ar a bhfuil an t-eagrán seo bunaithe le Paul Walsh (Iriseabhar Mhuighe Nuadhad 1928) agus aistriúchán déanta air ag J. E. Doan (The Romance of Cearbhall and Fearbhlaíde, Dolmen Press 1985). ‘Téacs soileir soléite’ a d'oir don eagarthóir seo a chur ar fáil a bheadh oiriúnach do litéitheoirí na Nua-Ghaeilge. Chuige sin tá normaldú déanta ar litriú an téacs. Ba dheacair scéal níos ãéir ná é seo a aímsiú ina chomhair, mar, murab ionann agus Scéalta Rómánsacha eile, tá stil ghonta scríbhneoireachta ann a thainneodh le léitheoirí an lae inniu.

Sa réamhrá fairsing (25 lgh) tá cur síos ar thraidisiúin na LSÍ, tugtar faoi dháta cumhtha an scéil a beachtú, riantar tagairtí don scéal i sothair eile, déantar teanga an téacs a chioradh agus múnear na prion-sabail eagarthóireachta. Tá dán nach bhfuil sa LS is luaithe (ar a bhfuil an t-eagrán seo bunaithe) agus leagan eile den scéal ó LS de chuid an ochtú haois déag sna hAgusí findsí.

Tháinig an leabhar seo i gcló an-luath i ndiaidh don taighde a bheith déanta. Ba é an deithneas chun cló cailleach bhascatha an tsaothair. Mar atá, tá an leabhar lomblán de dhearmaid agus de mhurcraíneas. Is trua gur scaoil an t-eagarthóir chun na clóidóirí é gan breis uaine a bheith aici ar é a cheartú.

Sa chioradh gramadúil tá roinnt mhaith dearmad, idir dhearmaid chló agus eile: lch 27, nil aon sampla de innisidh ar l. 331, (leg. 177); ar -te agus ní ar -e a chroichochnonn an sampla den fhoirm chéasta san Aim-sir Ghnáthchaite; lch 28, nil foirmeacha céasta iad sin a chroichochnonn ar -feas; in ionad coinmillach leg. coinmillach; ní Gnáthláitheach an fhóirm bhf hjadh ach Modh Coinn.; lch 29, nil foirm an bhriathair in rodhbha sa 2ú uatha ach sa 3ú uatha le forainm inmhéánach 2ú uatha, ní 2ú uatha Modh Ordaiteach biodh ach 3ú uatha; ní Foshuiteach Láithreach gurabhfhj (l. 32) ach Preitiríteach le bri an Mhodha Choinn.; ní 3ú uatha ach 2ú uatha Modh Ord. abair; ní Foshuiteach Caite bheartaoi ach Modh Coinn.; lch 30, nil sampla de go dtiobhradh ar l. 401 ach ar 378, agus ní Foshuiteach Caite é ach Modh Coinn.; scoileadh nod chun an fhoirm go bhfacadh a fháil sa 3ú uatha, b'thearr go bhfacaidh; ní rann-ghabháil fheidireachta ro cíthe ach céasta Gnáthchaite; lch 31, ar an gcomhthéacs is dealraithi dá ndearntaoi le Foshuiteach Láithreach; ní bhaineann an fhoirm targha leis an nbriathar tigíom; lch 33, ni faoi ag ba cheart don fhoirm oraibh a bheith; lch 34, ní foirm ársa taosga; nil an forainm inmhéánach iomarach sa sampla rodhbha l. 518. Nuair nach
gcuirtear séiníthi ar chonsan tosaigh in iúl go rialta sa LS ní fheadar an fiú a lán an t-eolas i dtaoibh séimhiú ar lorg na réamhfhoical lgh 31-2.

Dealraíonn sé gur deacra cló faoi deara rointn mhaith de na dearmaid sa roinn ar an modh eagarthóireachta: Ioch 35 ‘(c) p/’pp láir agus deiridh’, leg. p/’ph; ní ceart an sampla ‘tarcce > targha a bheith faoi ‘(g) cc láir agus deiridh > g’ nuair nach g atá ann ach gh; ‘(h) bh tosaigh > bhff’, leg. bh tosaigh > bhf. Ó dhéantar ea nó eí de e roimh chonsan de ghnáth bheadh súil againn le nóta ar an bhfoirm adhbhért. ‘e, é > ei, éí roimh chonsan caol’, ff. le > léi l. 212. Déantar a den u agus o i sioillai neamhaiceanta de ghnáth ach b’fhéidir go dtéitear thar fóir i gcás an chomhfhocal amhulchach a ndéantar amhalchach (l. 50) de (= gan féasóg, > ulcha; amhulchach in FGB).

Mar leis an t-eac Féin éirionn le haidhm an eagarthóra sa mhéid go bhfuil sé soiléir agus níor cheart go mbainfeadh sé starrán as éinne a mbeadh Nua-Ghaeilge Mhoch léite cheana aige. Ina theannta sin cearrtaitear léamh Phoibh Bhreatnaigh in áiteanna, m.sh. neascharad > n-eascharad l. 18, (neascharad 1928), cualaidh > gcualaidh l. 98, (cualaidh 1928).

Ina choinne sin ní clóitear rómhaith leis na prionsabail a leagadh sios lgh 34-36. Lasmuigh de na hathruite a luaitear déantar a lán eile gan forrmeacha ón LS a thabhaitt, m.sh. b láir > bh, m.sh. ilbeardadh > ilbheardadh l. 7, ionbadh > ionhbadh (sic) l. 16; c > ch, m.sh. clochaíbh > clóchaíbh l. 53, d deiridh > dh, m.sh. leasughadh > leasughadh l. 27, leigeadh > leigeadh l. 54, maighneadh > m’aighneadh l. 57; df tosaigh > d’fh, m.sh. dfearoibh > d’fhearaibh l. 15; m láir > mh, m.sh. coimioimlan > coimioimlán (sic) l. 5, commor > commhór l. 11, diomaoin > diomhaoin l. 13.

Uaireanta déantar séimhiú easnaimh a sholáthar le tagaírt don LS m.sh. siorgradh > siorgrádh l. 10, do fhleisg doilbhthe draoidhechto > do fhleisg doilbhthe dhraoidheachta l. 153-4; uaireanta eile ní dhéantar, m.sh. meanma maith > meanma maith l. 82, san baile > san baile l. 97. Uaireanta tarlaíonn séimhiú go héagóirach nó gan gátar sa téacs gan é a bheith sa LS, m.sh. coimeagad > choimeagad l. 53 (ag tagait do cruít bain.), (t)aidhmilleadh > (t-)aídmhilleadh 60, 69 (ff. O’Rahilly, T. F., ‘Varia II’ (6, ‘The prefix ad-‘), Celtica i. 337-41), carraghail > carraghail, eimdis > éimdhíth l. 346, aithímhíthi > aithéimhíth l. 346.

Déantar noda a scaoileadh go héagórhach ar uairibh, m.sh. ro fhagasa > ro fhasga l. 64 (ro fhagaisbh 1928), 2noideacht > dá n-oideas l. 108 (da noideacht l. 1928), cl > cloch l. 218 (cloich 1928), ionbhas > ionhbadh l. 16 (ionbaidh 1928), ionph > ionhbadh l. 94 (ionphaid 1928), mhann > mh’annam l. 56 (manmain 1928) – nílim cinnti an ann nó as don phonc

1 ea a thugaim anseo mar a mbionn e ard sa LS, ach amháin nuair a leanann i é.
ar an litir thosaigh, uatha > uathadh 1. 353 (uathaibh 1928).

Mar aadmhaitear sa réamhrá cuirtear isteach sinte fada os íseal. Tá an obair seo crúinn don chuid is mó, ach cuirtear síneadh éagóirach in áiteanna leis gan é a bheith sa LS m.sh. adúbhramh l. 97, tígh l. 272, cródh l. 299, róidheithneach l. 361, bhruigh l. 419, móchaír l. 292, croinn-fháilgheach l. 440. Fágtar focal gan síneadh fada leis: lógh) (‘logh’) l. 182, néamhann (‘neamhann’) l. 233, 235, cúinneadha (‘cúinneadh’) l. 274, déarghadh (‘deargadh’) l. 296, urdhálta (‘urdhalta’) l. 362, áirghe (‘airghe’) l. 475, fochtais (‘fochtais’) l. 493, 524, agus theasdáil (‘theasdail’) l. 501.

Ní léitear an LS sa cheart ó am go chéile, m.sh. sidhein > sídhsin l. 4, corcora > corca l. 51, corcora > corca l. 222 (a os cionn an c sa LS), hfaictear > hfaicear l. 57, truaighneimhieile > truaighneimhile l. 71, tigh > t’í l. 99, chloich > cloich l. 218, a’núigh > ainmnighdeal l. 111, taighiuire > taighire l. 166, shlaíneas > sháineas l. 210 (shlainigeas 1928). Fágtar i ar lár i ndiaidh Fhathbhalaidh l. 130.

Tá lochtaanna éagsúla eile ar an eagrán seo. Déantar i de a go héagórach: An ro bhadhas (ní léir dom an an ann nó as do phoche an tséimhite) > In ro bhádhas l. 49, A mbaoi > I mbaoi l. 98. Seo é an cónas a a bhfuil a bhunús san alt neodhrach. Ff. an séú Ionráil a DIL. Nior mhiste é seo a lua i measc na samplaí den ársaíocht Icht 34, comh maith le go gcuailaidh p. 98 a bhfeidhm i bpriomhchialáis na habairte ina dhiaidh (Ff. O’Rahilly, C., ‘Three Notes on Irish Syntax’, Celtica viii. 155-66). Ba cheart comhfhocal a dhéanamh le céad- i nGaeilge na tréimhse seo ach déantar focal ar leith de (l. 40), in ainneoin a bhfuil sa LS. Nuair a thugtar léamh ón LS ag bun leathanaigh is gnáth go cuirtear macraíos os cionn guta fhada a bhfuil a fhad ceitelte sa LS, ach ní i gcónaí a dhéantar seo. Cé go gcuirtear in iúl sa réamhrá go ndéantar st, sc de sd, sg tagaimid ar na samplaí seo: feasda l. 83, fhleisg l. 53, tuarasbháil l. 79, taoseadh l. 462, theasdail l. 501.

Tá na haistriúcháin ar na dátha gan locht don chuid is mó ach is féidir iad a leasú anois agus arís: l. 218 b’fhéarr ‘poisonous’ ná ‘heavenly’ ar an gcomhtheach; d’fhéadfaí l. 417-9 a léamh mar seo: ‘it is bad that my friend Cearbhhall has found – while I am marriageable – that the sound of a wedding feast is in his mansion’; l. 430 leg. ‘the neck of my harp’; l. 431 ‘dear the blood that is on it’; l. 439 ‘from which ivory was carved by the goldsmith’; l. 470 ‘and did you kill my swan’; l. 479 ‘cowherd’. Dán díreach is ea Fuaras chloich ach fuaras i l. 225 a leasú go dtí uaras.

Ní thugtar san fhoclóir focail ó na dátha agus tá focail sa phhrsé féin ar lár nár mhiste a bheithe ann, m.sh éarnróimh l. 94, foscadh l. 158, fhoilhrann (–dh- DIL) l. 84, partlann (–taing DIL) l. 101, teagar l. 107, tigheadhas l. 107. Déanann an foclóir buanú ar fhoirmeacha éagórachá ón téacs. Tá sé pháirt éagsúla de na briathra mar cheannfhocal sa bhfoclóir

Ar na heasaimh ar inneacs na ndaoine agus na n-áiteanna tá Corcamruadh, Connacht (gin.), Connachtachtaigh, Eorpa (gin.), agus Séamas mhac Turcaill. Tagraíonn umhreacha san inneacs seo do leathanach seachas do línte, cé nach gcuirtear sin in iúl.

Dhein an t-eagarthóir éagóir uirthi féin nuair a thug si uaidh an t-ábhair agus an crot seo air. Ba mhaith an cuimhneamh di eagrán cearrtaite a chur ar fáil.

SÉAN UA SÚILLEABHÁIN

Institiúid Ard-Léinn Bhaile Átha Cliath.
RAIFTEARÁI: AMHRÁIN AGUS DÁNTA. CÍRÁN Ó COIGLIGH a chuir in eagair. An Clóchomhar Tta., 1987, vii + 253 lgh. IR£8 (crua), IR£5 (bog).

Tá dán agus leathchéad leis an bhfile cluíteach ó Chill Liadáin in atheagar anseo, mar aon le cur síos ar a shaol agus ar a shaothar. Tugtar cur síos ar an aighneas idir Raiftearáí agus Marcas Ó Callanáin sa réamhrá, agus dhá dhán de chuid Mharcais sna haguisní, An Ciníneach agus An Scíolladh, mar aon le ceol roimnt de na hamhráin a bailiúdó ó bheirt deartar ó Chreachmhaoil. Ar na pointí is suimíula sa réamhrá tá gur chleacht Raiftearáí aortha i bhfoirg fianacht agus a cheapadh. B’fhéidir go dtéitear thar fóir nuair a mhaítear gan fianaise a thabhait gur nós fior-shenada í seo agus gur ansin atá bunús na cuminchta marfai a shamlaití leis an aoir. Arís is dócha gur beag filiocht a chum Raiftearáí roimh chasadh an náoiú haois déag agus is ar éigean is féidir a rá ‘go raibh na P’éindlíthe fós i bhfeidhm’ (Ich 5).

Pléann Raiftearáí leis na téamaí ar gnáth le filí na tréimhse sin trácht orthu. B’fhéidir gurb iad na hamhráin mholtá is lú a mbeadh éileamh orthu ag léitheoirí an lae inniu de dheasca an file a bheith róthugtha do na liostaí, ach sna hamhráin sin fainn bionn línte bréatha agus is deacair línte áirite i gCill Liadáin a shárú. Tá blúirí maith leis sna dáanta cráifeacha, a leithéid seo:

Braon de do ghrásta, déan mar dhéirce,
ar pheacach bocht a raibh déithe céile air,
mar bhí ar Phól an t-aspal naofa,
a chaith tús a shaol ar thí thu a shéanadh. (Ich 67).

Tugann na dáanta polaitiúla agus Seanchas na Sceiche léargas dúinn ar an deighilt a bhí idir Caitlicigh agus Protastúnaigh le linn na haimsire sin, go háirithe ar an reitric a bhí ar siúl mar gheall ar Anraí VIII:

Thug sé cúl do Dhia agus sheán sé a chéad bhean
agus thóg sé a inion féin mar mhnaoi is mar chéile, ... nár bhf oic an dlí a bhí ag an té sin
a chuair a inion is a bhean chun bás in éineacht. (Ich 146).

Is léir ar theirce na dtagairtí do na Lísí agus ar a laghad eolas a thugtar ar an modh eagardhóireachta gur ar an ngnáthléitheoir atá an t-eagrán seo dírithe seachas ar an scoláire. Í dteann na litriú a aithrí déantaí sárú ar ghrámadach agus foirmeacha na Lísí os isel in ainneoin a ndeirtear ina thaobh seo ar Ich ix, m.sh. a oileadh 1, 14 < do h-oileadh, h-oileadh; shórt éin 1, 28 < eun, éun. Tá an t-ainmneach ar
lorg sórt ag teacht le húsáid an lae inniu i gConamara. Cuirtear foirm an Chaighdeáin Oifigiúil, bánta (1, 34) in ionad báinte, bainti na LSÍ, agus bráca (1, 33) in áit pracá. Athraithear an logainm in 1, 11, go ndéantar Abhainn Œ Gearnáigh de Amhainn Mhac Cearna, Abhuin Mhá g-Cearna na LSÍ. Ní chun feabhas gach athrú ar an litriú achar oiread, m.sh. brancaí (1, 32) < Brandy, brandidh. Ní heol dom go mbíonn d leathan san fhocal seo choichne nuair a bhíonn í sa dara siolla.

Pé locht a gheobhaidh litéitheoirí acadúla ar a leithéid seo níl aon amhras ná go mbeidh fáilte ag pobal na Gaeilge roimh eagrán soléide de shaothar an fhile seo a bhfuil éileamh mór go fóill ar a dhéantús breis agus céad caoga bliain i ndiaidh a bháis.

Seán Ua Súilleabáin

Institiúid Ard-Léinn Bhaile Átha Cliath

SÉADNA. PEADAR Ua LAOGHAIRE. In eagar ag Liam Mac Mathúna. Carbad, Baile Átha Cliath, 1987. lviii + 267 lch. IR£8 (crua), IR£4.50 (bog).

Seolann an leabhar seo ar ais sinn go tús na hathbhoechana agus tús na nuallitrioichte. Cé nach bhfuil éinne a bhfuil léamh na Gaeilge aige ná gur airigh teacht thr Séadna tá leathchéad bliain ann ó foilsfodh an leabhar go hiomlán, rud a fhágann gurb é seo an chéad eagrán iomlán sa chló rómhánach agus i lítriú an lae inniu. Saothar litriochtta, blúire dáir stair agus foinse bhará Ghaeilge is ea an leabhar seo agus ní baol ná go bhfuil na fáithí geala roimh an eagrán úr seo.

Tá cur síos crocnúil ar stair an leabhair agus mínitear an modh eagarthóireachta sa réamhrá faising a chlúaidh, geall leis, trí fichid leathanach. D’éagair an Piarsach, a bhí ar an léirmheastóir ba ghearr-chúisi llena linn, ar fhoilsíú an leabhair: 'Here at last is literature', ach toisc go bhfuil Séadna bunaithe ar an scéilín béaloideas AT 303, Gabha a Fhaigheann an Ceannsmach ar an Diabhal, níor léir do dhaoine eile go raibh clochaúl duit a ar an mbunábhar, agus litriocht déanta de. Tá liosta faising leabhar agus alt ag deireadh an réamhrá don té ar mian leis an chonspóid i dtaobh tíuntais liteartha Séadna a leanúint nó breis eolaíse a fháil.

Tá an t-eagrán seo bunaithe ar an gcéad eagrán iomlán den leabhar, 1904, ach cuirtear foirmeacha i gcead a bhfuil in eagráin eile chun an cearr aimsiú.

Tá deacra faoi leith ag baint le heagarthóireacht ar ábhar leis an Athair Peadar, mar a mhínteer sa réamhrá. Scríobhainn mirialta neamhspleachta a bhí ann, agus d'admhaigh sé féin go dteastódh eagarthóir uaidh a rachadh ina dhiaidh ag cur isteach na sémhité mar
nach dtabharfadh sé féin faoi deara go bráth iad a bheith ar lár. Tá bráca faoi leith ag baint le li triú an lae inniu a chur i bhfeidhm ar scríobh sé, mar, cé go mbiodh Caint na ndaoine mar phort aige, ghlac sé don chuid ba mhó leis an li triú stairiúil agus is deacair an uairibh a dhéanamh amach cé acu a bhí rud sa chanúint aige nó an amhlaidh a bhí li triú stairiúil nó sanasaíocht bhreíge a chur amú. Más é li triú an Chaidheadáin Oifigiúil a úsáideart san eagrán seo ní mór an cur isteach a dhéantar ar na foirmeacha a chleacht an t-údar. Fágtar foirméacha canúnacha ar nós abhar (ábal), ciscéim (coiscéim), finneog (fuinneog), glaciás (glícneas), olmhu (olmhu), sord (sórt), tirl, Fágtar, leis, foirméacha a d'úsáideadh an tAthair Peadar agus é ag scríobh nár bhain lena chanúint féin: tarrang, (/tərəŋ/ i Múscraí), nach (copail), (/næːx/ i Múscraí), mé, thú, tú nuair nach ainmnithe briathar iad, (/mˈeː/, /mˈiː/, /huː/, /tuː/ i Múscraí). Fágtar foirméacha briathar a chleachtadh an t-údar ach an li triú a thabhaith chun dáta nuair is gá, m.sh. druididh, ná liúfair, ceist iom < ceistighean. Leásaitear li triú eagrán 1904 ar chuma thuiscionach nuair is gá, m.sh. ní fhéadhar ’en tsaoil < ní fhéadhar an tsaoighal, ndeaghaigh < ndeachaideach, ndéigh, ndeighidh. Cuirtear li triú an Chaidheadáin i bhfeidhm nuair is féidir sin a dhéanamh gan cur isteach ar foirméacha ná ar fhuaímní Ghaelge an údair.

Éiríonn leis an eagarthóir prós an Athair Peadar a chur i li triú an lae inniu gan stil an údair a chrapadh. Tugtar don léitheoir an athuair an cumasc idir Ghaeilge Múscraí, áRSAOCHT, agus crunneas gramadai a colleadh nuair a tugadh cead a gcinn do lucht an Chaidheadáin Oifigiúil. Biodh a bhfuilchas sin ar thuiscint Liam Mhic Mhathúna. Tá an tAthair Peadar ina steallbheatha arís.

Uaireanta téitear iarrachtíonn tar fóir leis an gcáisheadánú, ábach, m.sh. seirfeán (ích 32) < seibhthean, uafásach < wathbháscach (/sˈerˈʃan/, /wəˈhə:sax/ sa chanúint1), leis an dtua (ích 172) < leis an dtuagh (ff. ‘buile don tuaig’, Scéal Aith3, 37), caoithiúil (ích 192) x caothamhail, banlámh (ích 161) < beann láma (<ba:nˈlːaː/); thráilíodh sé go raibh an túschoigsiú, caol ag an Athair Peadar, ach is í é is dóthiú gur bréaghasnaíochtaí faoi deara dó an b a scriobh caol), tiníleach (ích 211, 212) < teinˈəoːle. Úsáideart an foírm teinˈəoːleach beagán níos déanaí in eagrán 1904 < tinaoilach an chéad chur amach, i.e. sa Cork Weekly Examiner. Is fearr a thagann leagan an Cork Weekly Examiner leis an ngnideach is gnátháil ag an bhfocal sa chanúint seo, /tˈiːnˈiːlax/4.

1 Ó Cuív, B., The Irish of West Muskerry (1944) §376, §371. IWM feasta.
3 Ó Cuív, B. (eag.), Cnóasach Focal ó Bhaille Bhuíre 1947), sub banná. Cnóasach feasta.
Déantar bhfaighfar de bhfaghfar, rud nach mbeims ag súil leis toisc go mbionn an f leathan i gcónaí sa bhriathar saor, aimsir fháistíneach i Múscrai agus go scriobhtar -fear agus -far caol agus leathan in áiteanna eile san eagrán seo, m.sh. gcrochfar, bhfeicfar. Uaireanta eile bít a ró-umhail don chéad eagrán, m.sh. tríthibh < tríthibh (lgh 118), tríthibh < tríthibh (lgh 4, 205), tu < tu (lgh 73), tú, thú < tú, thú i ngach cáis eile. Glaicaim leis gur dearmaid chló faoi deara na heisceachtaí seo sna seanaegráin. Ba neamhghá, dar liom, u a choimeád sa bhfocal fuíoch (lgh 181) < fuigheach (faíoch i bhfoclaír Néill Uí Dhónaill), ach tá feidhm leis an u sa rá am' chuis (\'am xus\') > im chois (lgh 23), 'na cuis > ina cois (lgh 166). Déantar aothó (lgh 40), leagan na canúna', de aoitheó eagrán 1904, ach faighimid aoitheo ar lgh 149, 150. Nó raibh an chuma a scriobhadh an t-údar na forainmneacha réamhfhoaclacha a bhaíneann le chun le moladh, ach ní fhéadfadh a bheith ag súil leis gur i bhfeabhas a rachadh an scéal gan síneadh fada a úsáid.

Níor mhiste 'Séadna', An Músgraigheach, ii (Foghmhar, 1943), 7-9, iii (Nodlaig, 1943), 7-8, a chur leis an liosta léithioireachta. Is é atá ann roinnt den eolas a bhreac Mícheál Ó Briain sios ó chainteoirí a mBaile Bhuirne ar an gcóip de Séadna a luaitear ar lch liii.

SEÁN UA SÚILLEABHÁIN

**Institiúid Ard-Léinn Bhaile Átha Cliath**

---

1 *IWM* §374.
2 *Cnósaigh* 286.
3 *IWM* §410. Bhí /e:hu:/ ag cainteoirí eile de réir nóta le Mícheál Ó Briain.
FOIRISIÚN FOCAL AS GAILLIMH. TOMÁS DE BHALDRAITHE.
Acadamh Rioga na hÉireann, Baile Átha Cliath. 1986. v + 240 pp. IR£18.90.

CNUASACH FOCAL Ó UÍBH RÁTHACH. CAOILFHIONN NIC PHÁIDIN.

I ndeireadh an chéid seo caite agus amhrán ag Raifteirí a chur i láthair ag de híde in Abhráin Diadha Chuige Connacht do thagair sé do na ‘sgoilte (mí)-náisiúnta’ a cuireadh ar bun sa bhliain 1831 agus don diobháil a dhícheadh, diobháil a d’fhág an t-aos óg i ndúthaigh Raifteirí ‘chomh sgríosta sin ann a n-inntleacht, nach bhfuil acht 600 no 700 d’fhoclóireachtaí ar a mbéalaíb i n-áit 4,000 no 6,000 do bhí ag a n-aithreachaibh, i riocht nach bhfuil iontai aonais acht mar bheidh pástidhe gan chéill i gcompraid de n-a n-aithreachaibh-móra’ (op. cit. I, 258-60). Níl aon amhras, is doigh liom, ná go bhfuil móran focal a d’imigh as úsáid ins na Gaeltachtaí ar fuaid na hÉireann de réir mar a bhí an Béarla á leathnú. Ach is fior, leis, gur thúinig stór móir focal slán anuas go dtí ar linn féin. Agus chomh maith leis sin táthar fós ag cur le saibhreas na teangan tré fhocail nua a chumadh agus tré fhocail iasachta a ghabhacht isteach in. Mar chruthú air sin ní gá dul thar an réamhrá den chéad cheann den dá leabhar is déanaí sa tsraith ‘Deascán Focloíreacht’ atá tagtha inár dtreó, is é sin an Foirisiún Focal, mar a bhfuil focail chomh nua-chumtha san ná fuilid le fáil sa bhFocloír Gaeilge-Béarla (1977), e.g. sictheangeolaí, sochtheangeolaí agus stíleolaí. Focal iad san gur léir dúinn a mbri, biodh, gur dócha go mbeimis i bhfad ón gceart dá mbeimis ag brath ar FGB i gcomhair soiléirithe ar an gcéad cheann acu, mar níl le fáil ann mar eolais ar réimhir sic-ach ‘sic’-, pref. Dry, desiccated.’ Is í an fhóirm síce- a thugann FGB le haghaidh Psych(o).

Is maith an léiriú ar stór focal na beo chainte an dá leabhar so, go háirithe nuair a chuimhnímid ar an dteora a chur a n-údair leis an abhar a chuireadar iontu:

(1) ‘Níl i gcló anseo ach fuilteach beag den chnuasach iomlán a baillidh ó áit go chéile i gContae na Gaillimhe ón mbliain 1939 i leith, an fuilteach a d’fhan tar éis an mhórchuid de a chur isteach in FGB.’ (Foirisiún p. iii).

(2) ‘Is é atá sa chnuasach:
   1. Focal nach bhfuil mar cheann fhocail nó mar mhalaítrí aitheanta in Foclóir Gaeilge-Béarla . . .
   2. Iasachtaí ón mBéarla nach bhfuil in FGB a ndearnadh Gaelú
foirmé orthu agus iasachtaí a bhfuil brí leo nach bhfuil sa Bhéarla.
3. Ainmnéacha flora agus fauna, bidís in FGB nó ná biodh . . .
4. Focail atá in FGB ach a bhfuil brí leo nó struchtúr comhréire agus nach bhfuil in FGB, nó a bhfuil sainréime séille agu nach léir ó iontrál FGB.’ (Úibh Ráthach p. iii).

Ó gharbh-mheastachán atá déanta agam dinim amach go bhfuil ós cionn 7,000 ceannfhocal sa bhFoirisiún agus idir 2,000 agus 3,000 sa Chnuasach. Dála na n-imleabhar eile a foilsiodh sa tsraith seo, is do réir a chéile a bainfear lántairbhe as an dá leabhar so. Níl fúm anso ach tracht a dhéanamh ar bheagán nithe atá tabhartha fé ndearadh agam iontu.

Roint mhaith des na ceannfhocail atá sa bhFoirisiún gheofar in FGB iad chomh maith. De ghnáth i gcás na bhfocal san is amhlaidh a bhionn brí difriúil á thabhaithe chun solais nó leagan cainte á thabhairt a léiríonn malaírt úsáide – agus úsáid mheafarach a chur san áireamh. De bhreis ar na focail sin tá glac mhaith d’fhocail ná faghfar mar cheannfhocail in FGB. Cuid acu san is foirméacha malaírta id d’fhocail atá in FGB, ach móran eile níl éiní ag freagairt dóibh ann.

Is féidir cuid dá bhfocail ráite agam thusa a léiriú as an gcéad leathanach den Fhoirisiún mar a bhfuil sé cheannfhocal ar fhichid. Sé cinn déag diobh san atá in FGB agus deich gcinn ná fuil. Is féidir na focail atá in FGB a roint i ndá chuid: (1) focail go bhfuil leaganachta cainte á soláthar in a gcomhair, agus (2) focail go bhfuil malaírt brí leo á thabhairt. Somplaí: (1) Ag abairt faoistín (s.v. abairt); Rud a chur abhaile chuig duine (s.v. abhaile); Ni fhaca mise é sin, ach go n-airínn caint air (s.v. ach); Sin é an lá a ndeacha sé san ádh (s.v. adh); adharc a chur ar dhuiine (s.v. adharc); (2) ábalta: 1. Cliste, glic . . . 2. Láidir; ábalta (agus ábaltaiocht ná fuil in FGB): Glicceas, clisteach; acmhainn: Cumas fulaingthe. I gcás an fhocail deireannaigh seo léiríonn an litriú foighraiochta /aku:N’/ ná luioinn an fuaimniú le gnáththriall na canúna.

Ar no focail ná fuil in FGB tá:- ábhars: Spraoi, cleasaiocht; abhcóireacht: Achrann cainte; abhlaithe: Socharthu chun feirge nó achrainn; aclái (aímnfhocal): Lúthchleasai; ad ad: Agall bagartha ar pháiste; adhair: Adhall, soidhreach; adhalta: san abairt Tá sí adhalta = tá an madra fireann faighe aicí; adhúineach: Aduain, ag mothú ‘aisteach’, neamhchleachtach ar an tímeallacht.

Focal eile ar an gcéad leathanach ná fuil in FGB isea achrae: 1. Páirc mhór réidh . . . 2. Log. Talamh réidh oírthir na Gaillimhe. Is dócha gur sompla litriú n an fhocail seo dá bhfuil ráite ag an Ollamh de Bhaldraithe san abairt seo sa Réamhrá: ‘Cumadhf litriú, de réir an ghnáthchórais, a léiríonn fuaimniú an fhocail nach bhfreagraionn don thoradh rialta sin.’
Tá an forás Achadh Réidh > Acharah > a:xre: luaite aige in _The Irish of Cois Fhairrge_, Co. Galway (ICF) §499. Ba dhóigh liom gur chabhair don leitheoir é dá mbeadh tagaírt don fhóras san sa bhFoiristiuin. Bheadh a leithéid ar aon bhonn le nótáis sanasaíochta etc. atá in áiteanna eile, mar shompla fés na focail aibeartha, bádóireacht, baidheancani, báinín, bolstaic, bruimistiúin. Forás neamhrialta eile atá luaite in ICF is ea eamha > /u:/ in deamhan d’ú: N (§529). Tá sompla den fhóras san le fiscint anso sa bhfocal luinn = Leamhan (a itheann éadach). An fhoirm den fhocal san atá ag Corcaigh, /lo:n/, freagraíonn si d’fhoirmeacha ar nós leomhan(n), leóghan, atá le fiscint i scríbhinni sa NuaGhæilge Mhoch, agus dá mbeadh a leithéid sa chaint sa Ghaeilimh roimis seo is é is doichí go dtúrfaidh sé /l’u:n/ do réir an fhóras atá léirithe in ICF §387. Níl aon amhras ná go bhfuil abhar breá staideir curtha ar fáil don fhoclóirí agus don channáin sa leabhar so ag an Ollamh de Bhaldraithe. Mar a dúirt sé féin ‘Fionnoscailt é an diolaim bheag seo ar shaibhreas is ar bhriomhairreacht na cainte beo.’

An Cnuasach Focal ó Úbhair Ráthach tá sé bunaithe ar bhreis is cheithre mhile leathanach d’abhar bhéaloidis a bhailigh Tadhg Ó Mur-chú (1961) ó mhór-sheisear seanchaithe, cuigeach acu ó Pharáiste na Dromad, duine ó Pharáiste Chill Chroíchán, agus duine ó Pharáiste Chill Fhionáin, i gcaitheamh tréimhse deich mbliana fichead anuas go dtí 1957. Is d’aonghnu, do réir dealraimh, a dhírigh an t-údar ar na paróistí sin thar Pharáiste Bhaile an Scéilg.

Tá cúram ar leithligh déanta ag an nDochtúir Nic Pháidín d’aíinmeacha flora agus fauna sa méid go bhfuil treoir dóibh bailithe le chéile i dtrí innéacs i ndeireadh an leabhar. Ní neach a bhfuil de théarmaí anso ná fuil in FGB. Cuirim i gcás, as an ocht déarmaí is trí scór atá i liosta na Gaeilge fén dteideal ‘Flora’ tá beagnach a leacht ná fuil in FGB. Téarmaí a bhaineann leis an bhfharraige, agus go mór-mhóir leis an bhfeimeann, is ea roint mhaith acu: biogarla lice, corach, corramhilséog, haingears, miobháin (meadbhán), meais, meigeall an ghabhairín, múr caol, múr dearg, múr dubh, rabhach, sáirdí, sleabhchán, straidhp, agus stropán (tropán). Maidir leis an bhfocal meadbhán, tá fionaise ar é a bheith sa Ghaeilge nuair a cumadadh Acallam an Senórach ach is fénineachfhocal miobhán a chuairt an t-údar a bhfuil an bhfharraigh aici, agus crostagaír ó meadbhán; ní léirtear duinn cad é an fáth a bhi aici leis an socru san. Ar na téarmaí féin dteideal ‘Flora’ atá in FGB a chog bhfuil malairt bhrí luaite leo sa Chnuasach tá aitean go bhfuil ‘Heather’ chomh maith le ‘Gorse’ curtha síos mar bhri dhó.

Mórchuid des na focail nua atá sa Chnuasach is focail ón iasacht iad, cuirim i gcás airclo (iol. airclos): ‘Bád seol de dhéanstús ar leith a thagadh ón Inbhear Mór’ (agus cosúil leis sin sceiri (iol. sceirios): ‘Bád seol de chineal áirithe’); beaic: ‘Fear taca i dtroid’; beairicéalta: ‘Daingnithe’;

Biodh go bhfuil an t-ábhar uirthi d’fhocail ná fuil in FGB, braithim gur lionmhaires sa Chnuasach focail a fhreagraíonn ar dhuine nó ar dhuine eile d’fhocail atá in FGB. Cuirim i gcás an focal barrais is ionann é, do réir dearlaimh, agus bairis atá in FGB. Agus an focal barrthuisle atá ar an leathanach chéanna (p. 10), ní fhicim aon difríocht ó thaobh céile idir é agus ‘barrthuisle . . . Stumble’ atá in FGB; b’fhéidir gur mar gheall ar an ngutha tacair atá a léiriú sa litriú téacsba barrthuisle atá an focal curtha sa Chnuasach. Dob fhuirist somplaí eile a lua.

An chéad iontráil sa Chnuasach tugann sí duinn sompla do mheascán dá-theangach ag fear a saolaíodh céad bliain agus fiche ó shin: ní aithneodh sé á from b, agus ní aithneodh sé aon litir. Sa tríú hiontráil (s.v. abair) tá an méid seo: ‘Á rá ná, biodh is.’ Thugaidís do landlordí agus d’agáin é a rá ná turfáidís don sagart bocht é.’ Ach más ionann brí do á rá ná agus bióch is, is deocair brí a bhaint as an abairt solaoide.

Is é aidhm a bhí ag an nDochtúir Nic Pháidín leis an gChnuasach ná stór focal na cainte sa réigiún a roghnaigh sí a léiriú. D’ainnín sí go raibh focail aici go gceolfeadh an litriú cóirithe a bhí á úsáid aici form na beohaínta diobh agus do chuair sí litriú foghraióchta de bhreis leo san. Is maith ab féidir é sin a dhéanamh, ach is é an trua é, is dóigh liom, go raibh sí pas spáráilach sa ghnó san.

BRIAN Ó CUÍV


The unique source of the five poems contained in this volume is a manuscript which is now in the British Library and which was probably written early in the sixteenth century in the vicinity of Cashel in Tipperary for a Hiberno-Norman patron, possibly a member of the Cantwell family. The group of poems is unusual in so far as four out of the five have Hiberno-Normans as their subjects – a Cantwell, a Purcell, a Hackett and a Butler – the sole exception being an elegy for Tadhg O’Carroll of Rathenny who had close ties with the Butlers of Ormond. Anne O’Sullivan published an edition of the Cantwell poem in 1962 in Elíge x, and prior to her death in 1984 she had done a considerable amount of editorial work on the other four poems. As the material was intended for publication by the Irish Texts Society Professor Pádraig Ó Riain, who is a member of the Council of the Society, took on the task of completing the edition. As he says in the ‘Foreword’: ‘This involved
the re-collation of each poem with a photocopy of the manuscript and the revision, where necessary, of the preambles, translations and notes to the poems. It also involved the preparation of indices and an appendix to the poems. The indices are of 'Personal Names', 'Place- and Tribal Names', 'Townland, Parish and Other Minor names in English' and 'Other Elements of Place-Names'. The appendix consists of four maps on which are shown locations named in the 'battle-rolls' in Poems I-IV.

In the 'Introduction' there is an account of the British Library manuscript under headings 'provenance', 'structure', 'scribes', 'origin' and 'contents'. This is followed by discussion of that part of the contents published here under headings 'the main poet' – it is suggested here that four of the five poems had a common author – 'the poems', 'the apologue' and 'the caithreim or battle-roll'. The last section of the 'Introduction' sets out the 'manner of editing'. Here we read that 'editorial interference is limited to the maintenance of rhyme, where possible, and to the correction of non-historical usage.' Five main types of editorial correction, including the marking of lenition, are listed, and instances are cited of scribal usage which is let stand. Since the edited text is a modified form of the scribal text, provision of manuscript readings in the critical apparatus on each page is welcome. So, too, is the discussion in the notes of various linguistic and metrical matters. The text of each of the five poems is preceded by a short but informative historical introduction. Further historical details will be found at appropriate places in the textual notes.

In these five poems we have 952 lines of verse composed in north Munster a little over midway through the period of currency of classical Early Modern Irish and transcribed only slightly later. Scribal disregard for metrical requirements, such as those for rime and alliteration, is a common feature of Irish manuscripts and this one is no exception. Allowing, therefore, for the likelihood that the original texts have suffered some corruption in the course of transmission, we may conclude that the main poet adhered for the most part to the metrical and grammatical norms of bardic verse. Defects are more frequent in the fifth poem.

While most of the faulty scribal readings affecting metrical features have been replaced in the edited text, there is still room for some possible emendations. For instance, in a note on the line Ar dhíth Fidhaird fuair roimhe (153 = I, 39 a) we read 'Lenition of Fidhaird after the dative dhíth would remove the required alliteration with fuair.' But use of the permitted variant uair (IGT iii §22) would allow normal lenition. In a comment on the couplet Puirselaigh do ghrádh an Ghoill-si; / tuismhemhaidh mál toirsi trím (231-2 = II, 16 c-d) we find 'The restored tuismhemhaidh (MS tuismheamis) is an otherwise unattested form of the
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singular 3 present indicative (?) of *tuismhim* ‘I cause, bring forth, produce.’ In fact we might expect *Puirséalaigh* rather than *Puirselaigh* from *Puirséal*, and so the original verbal form rimeing with this is likely to have been *tuismhéabhadh*, the regular fut. sg. 3 of *tuismhim*, for which see *IGT* iii §68. In 543-4 (= III, 24 c-d) the one internal rime would have been improved by replacing MS *tnúth* with *tnúdh* (: *súil*). On a few occasions an editorial emendation has introduced a metrical fault. Thus in 503-4 (= III, 14 d) scribe *comhurtha*, which gives perfect deibhidhe rime with *urchra*, has been replaced by *comhurtha*. In 783 (= IV, 25 c), where pres. pl. 3 *dhlighid* (: *Philib*) is required metrically and makes good sense, the printed text has *dhlighidh*, the lenition of the final *d*, putting the verb in the singular, being editorial.

At the beginning of the notes to each poem the metre is identified and its normal features are listed. We are told that for *deibhidhe* these include ‘two internal rhymes in cd’ (pp. 97, 108, 115, 119) and that for *séadna* ‘. . . the final word of *c* rhymes with the stressed word preceding the final of *d*. Also, there are two internal rhymes in cd’ (p. 100). As a follow-up to these observations we find on eight occasions attention called to breaches of the supposed rules. It may not be out of place to consider how the rule is breached. In one instance (539-40) the only internal stressed word in *d* makes perfect rime with a word in *c* which is positionally correct. In another (291-2) the editor seems to have been misled by the scribal spelling of the word *grend* (in *d*), for which we might read *grenn*, into thinking that it did not make perfect rime with *gerr* (in *c*). In all other instances either there is a single imperfect *cd* rime (as in 907-8), or a second *cd* rime is imperfect (as in 219-20), or words occur in *d* which are not matched by rimes words in *c* (as in 543-4, 863-4, 867-8, 951-2).

As regards the required number of internal rhymes in final couplets in *dán direach*, rules similar to those cited above are to be found in Eleanor Knott’s *Irish Syllabic Poetry* (pp. 16, 19). It is my belief, however, that what was required was that every accented word in *d*, apart from the final word, should make full rime, either *comhardadh slán or aicill* according to position or metre, with some word in *c* and that the rime words in *c* should not be separated by a non-riming accented word. This belief is based on the usage of good poets and on illustrations given in the Irish bardic tracts, and it is in line with observations made by Michael A. O’Brien in *Ériu* xiv. 159.

Some other items in the text and notes might be the subject of comment, but I shall confine myself to one. In the second poem (II, §§24-37) there is an apologue based on the Arthurian tale of the Quest of the Holy Grail in which we find this quatrain (§32):
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Ní thug sidh agus sé ar suidhe
Sir Galafas, nár mheth móid,
mar do-chuaidh sa Cathaír Báeghlaigh,
tathair don sdualadh fháebhraigh óig.

This is translated: 'As Sir Galahad, whose temper was not weak, went to the Seat Perilous, it did not thrust at him, nor did it renounce the keen young hero.' In the notes we find: 'sidh “thrust” is taken to be a shortened form of sidhe.' Another possible explanation is that sidh is scribal for the pronominal form sidhe and that we should read sidhe 'gus sé (MS sidh 7e), taking sidhe as the subject of the verb thug, anticipating an unexpressed subject which can be inferred from the third line: 'When Sir Galahad . . . went to the Seat Perilous and had sat down it (sc. 'the Seat') did not give reproach to the keen young hero.' It is worth noting, perhaps, that the use of the pronoun sidhe in the prose text Lorgaireacht an tSoidhigh Naomhtha is commented on by Sheila Falconer in her edition (p. lxi).

Editing Irish verse is a challenging task and there can be no one who has engaged in it who has not occasionally overlooked some detail - whether in grammar, metrics or interpretation. Whatever minor shortcomings of this sort may be found in Poems on Marcher Lords are more than compensated for by the care with which most of the editorial work on this interesting body of poems has been carried out.

BRIAN Ó CUÍV

LÁRCHANÚINT DON GHAEILGE. Tuarascáil Taighde. DÓNALL P. Ó BAOİLL. Institiúid Teangeolaíochta Éireann: The Linguistics Institute of Ireland. 72 pp.

LÁRCHANÚINT DON GHAEILGE. Téip Léirithe agus Lámhleabhar Téipe. DÓNALL P. Ó BAOİLL (eagarthóir).


Mar a léirithe sa bhrollach don ‘Tuarascáil Taighde’ tá an t-abhar so curtha ar fáil chun soláthar a dhéanamh ar dhaoine a mbeidh úsáid acu á baint as an Foclóir Póca a d’fhóilsigh An Gúm sa bhliain 1986. Nuair a bhí saothrú an Fhoclóra idir lámhaibh beartáidh go gcuirfí fogharscribhinní leis na focal ann. Is í aidhm a bhí ag an Roínn Oideachais ná gurab aon fhuaímniú amháin a chuairfí le gach focal. Bhí
an aidhm sin ag teacht le teoiric na comhchanúna go raibh tuairimí bunúsacha ina taobh nochtha ag an nDochtúir Máirtín Ó Murchú san aiste ‘Common Core and Underlying Forms’ a foillsióidh in Éiriu xxi (1969). Cuireadh coiste comhairleach ar bun chun teacht ar réiteach ar na deocrachtáí a ghaibh leis an aidhm sin a chur i gcrích, agus de thairfe bhe an taighde agus na moltaí a dineadh faoi choimirce an choiste ceapadhr íoras ar a dtugann an Dochtúir Ó Baoill ‘Lárcháinnt’.

Agus é ag trácht ar an ngá a bhí lena leithéid seo do chomhchanúint dùirt Ó Murchú: ‘... some kind of sociolinguistic programme aimed at a revitalization of language loyalty and community pride is now an urgent necessity for the Gaeltacht – the only alternative is almost certainly a total shift to English during the next generation or two. An important instrument in such a programme, by helping to counteract the fragmentation which exists to-day, would be the common possession by the regionally and dialectally separate communities of the Gaeltacht of an accepted standardized speech.’ (op. cit. 44-5). Ina shli féin ba chéim i dtreo na lárchanúna an Foclóir Gaeilge-Béarla a foilsiódh sa bhliain 1977 – céim i réimese na gramadaí agus an stór focal.

Do thacaigh ann Foclóir Póca le cur i gcrích na haidhme sa méid gur solathraíodh ann fuaimníu roghnaithe le haghaidh na bhfocal. Sa ‘Tuarascáil Taighde’ tá cur síos ar na prionsapail ar ar bunafódh na rialacha fuaimnithe a bhí mar bhon leis na fogsairscribhinní sa bhFoclóir. Tá an cur síos rointe in dtrí chaibidil déag: caibidil tionnscaimh, cheithre chaibidil ag plé le cunsai fuaim agus foineolaíochta, seacht caibidil ag plé le foirmeacha sa deilbhiocht agus lena bhfuaimníu, agus caibidil scuir ina bhfuil tabhair lèirithe ar conas mar dhreachairíonn fuaiméanna na lárchanúna don litriú chaidhdeáin.

Is toradh é an ‘Lárcháinnt’ ar scrúdú faising ar na canúintí beo, agus dá chomhartha san tá cuntas sa ‘Tuarascáil’ ní hamháin ar na leaganacha roghnaithe ach ina theanta san ar phointí sa bhfoineolaíochta a dheileann canúintí óna chéile, a dheisfríocha diafoinéimeacha, etc.

Maidir leis na téipéanna lèirithe agus na leabhraí a ghabhann leo, is mar a chéile mórchúid dá bhfuil iontu, idir shomplaí agus tráchtairacht. Cuirim i gcás tá an ráiteas so sa dá leabhrán:

The Irish examples throughout the tape are illustrated by three native speakers, one from each of the three main dialects. Each speaker shows how the core dialect can be accommodated while using his or her own dialect as a basic reference.

Is é Seán Ó Briain a labhair an tráchtairacht, agus is iad Máire Ní Ghallchóir (Cuige Uladh), Pádraig Ó Méalóid (Cuige Chonnacht) agus Christín Ní Bhric (Cuige Mumhan) an triúr cainteoirí. Tá an chaint acu
go soiléir agus an té go bhfuil cur amach aige ar chanúintí na gcainteoirí aithneoidh sé an gleicheadh atá á dhéanamh ó áit go háit don ‘core dialect’, agus aithneoidh sé chomh maith rian na bunchanúna in áiteanna.

Tá sé le tuiscint as an drácthaireacht sa ‘Tuarascáil’ agus ins na ‘Lámhleabhair’ go bhfuil glacadh i gcóras fuaimanna na ‘lárcanúná’ le foirmeacha malairte fhotharachta taobh istigh des na fóinéimí, agus tá san lèirithe go maith ar na téipéanna, mar shampla /t’/ = [t’] nó [t’s’]. Tá corr fhuaíom ar na téipéanna a bhraithim a bheith bun os cionn leis an bhfoirm atá curtha ina comhair sa chló. Cuirim i gcás deirtheas fuaim /o/ a bhíonn ar oí faoi bhéim (‘Tuarascáil’ pp. 22-3, 57). Ins na ‘Lámhleabhair’ tá oí ins na focail seo: Coincleach (2.2, 2.6), Coirp (2.2), Droim (2.E.3, 3.A.3, 3.B.3), Roinn (1.F.1) agus Troime (2.B.1), agus tá fhogharscribhinn /oí’sg/ a ‘fos’/ le hais Oifig an Phoist (4.F.2). Mara bhfuil dul amú orm is alafoín den fhoinéim /i/ atá le cios i gcás na bhfocal coincleach, coirp, droim, poist, roinn agus troime. Is gcás na habairte Oifig an Phoist ní hionann in aonchor, is dóigh liom, an guta atá sa bhfocal Oifig agus an guta atá sa bhfocal Phoist.

Tá níthe suimiúla le cios ar na téipéanna, go mórárthó ó thaobh bunchanúna (mar is dóigh liom) na gcainteoirí. Mar shampla is dóigh liom gur fuaim /s’/ (de bharr sandhi) atá le cios san abairt Níos tíne (1.F.2). Maidir leis an abairt An Fhuidneog tá sé ráite gur fuaim /n/ atá san alt ann (Lárcanúint 5.A.1) agus is dóigh liom gur mar sin atá sé ar an téip, ach in áit eile go bhfuil an abairt chéanna a rá ag an gcainteoir chéanna braithim go bhfuil an fhuaíom /n’/ aige san alt (3.A.4).

Ní hannamh sa tarna leath den ‘Tuarascáil’ cló iodáileach in ionad cló rómhánaigh agus vice versa atí go bhfuil litreacha na scribhneoireachta agus comharthaí fuaimé a lua, e.g. pp. 39, 44, 53, 54, 57. Ar p. 68 tá an abairt An tSeachtain i measc somplá d’fhocail go bhfuil s leathan mar thúshconsaiontu. Ins na ‘Lámhleabhair’ tá Fó fóill in áit Go fóill (2.C.4), agus is dóigh liom gur ab é an focal Tuirseach atá le cios ar na téipéanna atá go bhfuil Tuirse sa chló (2.E.8.2.).

Sa chéad chaibidil den ‘Tuarascáil’ tá comhairle don léitheoir ag an nDochtúir Ó Baoill: ‘Mura greideann tú gur cheart lárcanúint a bheith ann, ní bheidh tú ach ag troid le gach moladh ar gach leathanach agus b’fhéadf duit fanacht uaidh.’ Mar liom féin fearaim fáilte roimh eimní a chothóidh ceart agus crúinnneas ó thaobh fuaimní na Gaeilge – rud go bhfuil gearngha leis mar is léir ón gcaint tuathalach atá le cios againn gach lá ar an raidió agus ar an teiflis agus i gnáthchursaí cumhásáide.

Brian Ó Cuív

This volume, the seventh in the series 'Studies in Celtic History' of which David Dumville is the general editor, brings us some of the fruits of the author's many years of study and research into the structure and organisation of Gaelic society over a wide span of time. It can be said at the outset that it is noteworthy for the use which Dr. Simms has made of source material in the Irish language. She gives us an outline of this material and an assessment of its importance in the first chapter. It includes the corpus of Irish law-texts including later glosses and commentaries, annalistic compilations, historical tracts including documents setting out the rights of various ruling families, genealogical collections and, of course, bardic poetry. Readers unfamiliar with Irish bardic poetry may be surprised at its extent which Dr. Simms estimates at over two thousand poems of which about a thousand can be dated to earlier than 1566 and of which about a quarter is still unpublished. On the non-Irish side there are the Anglo-Norman administrative records, civil and ecclesiastical, state papers, political writings and so on. Dr. Simms is clear in her assessment of the difficulties which face the scholar seeking to utilise the native sources: 'In all, then, the use of Irish-language sources for the history of the chieftains of the later middle ages entails a constant battle of wits with the members of the secular learned classes who compiled those sources and inflated or garbled the facts to suit their own purposes.'

Apart from the first chapter ('The Historical Sources') and the last ('Conclusion') the discussion is presented under eight headings: 'The Political Background - 'Gaelic' and 'Anglo-Norman' Ireland', 'Inauguration-ceremonies, Titles, and the Meaning of Kingship', 'Methods of Choosing and Depositing a King - the Tánaiste, the Mac Ríogh', 'The King's Counsellors', 'The King's Administration', 'Submission and Vassalage', 'The King's Army', and 'The King's Revenues'. As well as an extensive bibliography and general index the volume has a 'Glossarial Index', an 'Index of First Lines of Poems Cited' and an 'Index of Manuscripts Cited', all of which should prove very useful to readers.

In the second chapter Dr. Simms discusses changes which took place during the middle ages in the use of the title rí and the functions of the king. Here we find mention of such matters as the destruction of sacred trees that grew at traditional inauguration sites, the move under Ruaidhri Ó Conchobhair towards 'an effective monarchy for the whole island',
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the use of foreign mercenaries, the destruction of the high-kingship by
the English, the usurpation by Anglo-Norman lords of the role of the
provincial kings, the shift of control in the church to English prelates,
hints of a pagan revival in the thirteenth century, a Gaelic resurgence,
cultural and political, in the fourteenth century, as well as a decay in the
English colony, and a new emphasis on lordship and landownership.

In the third chapter Dr. Simms outlines the sacral nature of kingship
in early Ireland and the symbols and conventions associated with it. She
cites and discusses various accounts of inauguration ceremonies and
technical terms connected therewith. Particularly interesting is her
discussion of the use of the Gaelic surname alone without a first-name
prefixed to indicate the head of a family. Other topics dealt with here
include the application to Irish rulers of the terms ‘chieftain (or ‘cap-
tain’) of his nation’ (Latin sue nacionis capitanus) and tighearna, and
changes in the relationship between the ruler and freeholders in his
territory.

The fourth chapter deals with extensive evidence on how a person
might attain kingship or lordship, with the various rights, expectations
and powers of those who in Irish sources are termed tánaiste, adhhtar
ríogh or rioghdhamhna, with the position in Irish society of the mac
ríogh or mac meic ríogh, and with questions of land-tenure arising in
relation to such persons. In the next chapter we find discussion of
assemblies at various periods – oenach, dál, airecht – of the kind of
people who constituted an airecht which could form a corporate body of
counsellors, and of evidence of meetings of councils, of consultation
between an overlord and his subjects, and so on.

Although only two royal officers – brithem and rechtaire – are named
in the Old Irish law-tracts, the reduction in the number of overkingdoms
after the ninth century led to an increasing administrative class. In the
sixth chapter Dr. Simms discusses a wide range of technical terms applied
to functionaries of the ruler – dux luchta tighe, taoiseach teaghlaign,
marasgal tighe, fear brataigh, taoiseach séd, doirscór, comhhaor, maor
each, beachadóir, feadhmannach, aos gráidh, and so on – as well as their
status and entitlements. Here we find some interesting observations on
the learned classes, on the administration of justice, and on the collection
of rents, tributes, fines and dues.

In the seventh chapter we find discussion of the mutual obligations
of lord and vassal, the importance of taking hostages, the significance
of acceptance of tuarastal (in its later sense of ‘ceremonial gift on sub-
mission’ or ‘wages for military service’), the growth of the practice of
extracting comhadha, cios cosanta or duibhchios. Here, too, we
encounter a large number of technical terms, some of which show a
semantic change over the centuries. These include aire déso, cèlsine,
comairce, enech, engnam, giall, giallinae, inarrad, onóir, soer-chéle and soer-rath. In a short section in which she discusses the significance of the phrase which appears as ‘Spend me and defend me’ in English sources of the Tudor-Stuart period Dr. Simms cites entries in AFM 1395 and AConn. 1414.19 as ‘the first traces’ of this phrase which she calls ‘a proverb’. It may be noted that in ‘Cath Maighe Léana’, which Kenneth Jackson dated to ‘the last half of the thirteenth century or the earlier part of the fourteenth’ (ML2 p. xxiv), we find the phrase is é baránta is ferr dá caithem γ dá cosnam é (op. cit. line 1425) used with reference to Conn Céitchathach.

Having opened the eighth chapter with a reference to fiana, the warrior-bands of the distant past, and a brief account of king’s hostings for fighting in early medieval times, Dr. Simms goes on to deal with changes in military organisation and warfare which took place, both during the viking period from the ninth century on and in later centuries. Among these were the use of mercenaries in large numbers, the increased mobility of armies, the use of new types of weapons, and practises such as ‘coigny’ (coinnmheadh). She deals in detail with the development in the use of Scottish mercenaries known as gallóglaih and the formation of marriage alliances between members of Irish families and families of Scottish gallóglach commanders such as Clann Shuibhne. The overall picture of Gaelic Ireland in later medieval times is one in which lords used military forces to maintain a high level of absolute power.

In the ninth chapter Dr. Simms indicates the various sources of revenue available to the ruler in pre-Norman times and she also touches on ecclesiastical taxation. She deals with changes which took place after the Anglo-Norman invasion introduced a new element in the form of non-Gaelic overlords and when new sources of revenue were opened up. Income in the early period came in the form of food-rents, labour-services, hospitality, and penalties for failure to fulfil various duties, and these have their counterpart later, as do hosting and billeting with which we associate terms such as sluagheadh, congbráil, coinnmheadh and buannacht. Among terms indicative of new sources of revenue Dr. Simms mentions amhantur, defined by her as ‘signifying such of the lord’s dues as accrued to him par aventure, by chance or accident’, and briseadh cusduim ‘defrauding customs’. Towards the end of this chapter Dr. Simms touches on the question of the size of income which the different varieties of exactions represented but she does not supply much information by way of answer. However, she does give the impression that the exactions could constitute an oppressive burden on the general population.

Among the small number of errors which I have noticed in this very welcome book are the date 1244 instead of 1224 on p. 52, line 12, and
the form mallachtáin instead of mallachtan in the term meic mallachtáin on p. 120, lines 30-31.

BRIAN Ó CUÍV


On the cover and title-page of this book the words Gaelic and Verbs are on the top and bottom respectively of a grid of squares which has the words systemised and simplified on the two sides. The ‘foreword’ opens with the statement ‘Compared to that of many other languages, the Gaelic Verbal System is very orderly and logical’. In the light of this it might surprise a reader coming to the subject for the first time to find that a systematic and simplified treatment of Gaelic verbs would run to such great length, but as he works through the various chapters, of which there are twelve, he will find firstly that this ‘orderly and logical’ system has many complexities, and secondly that in the course of his detailed discussion of the forms of the verbs and of the way in which they are used and in the illustrative examples provided, the author has given a great deal of information, morphological and syntactical, about other parts of speech, all of which is designed to give the learner a grasp of the rudiments of the language.

BRIAN Ó CUÍV


Cyril Ó Céirín’s translation of Peadar Ua Laoghaire’s Mo Sgéal Féin which was first published by the Mercier Press in 1970 was incomplete in so far as whole chapters as well as parts of others were omitted and in places the sequence of passages was altered. The overall reduction in the number of pages was relatively small and can hardly have lessened substantially the cost of production. On the other hand there was a loss to the reader, for some of the sections omitted reflected interesting facets of Ua Laoghaire’s character and upbringing. It is to be regretted that for this edition, issued under the imprint of OUP, the translator has not given us the complete work. Another matter for regret is that the ‘Preface’ to the 1915 original, in which the Bishop of Raphoe, Padraic Ua Domhaíll, wrote with sympathy and understanding about Ua
Laoghaire and his work, has not been included here.

The translation itself, which is presented in twenty-six chapters compared with the thirty-two of the original, occupies about three-fifths of this little volume. This is supplemented by a fairly long introduction, explanatory notes at the end of most chapters, and an extensive 'appendix' which consists of sixteen sections including ones on 'Placenames', 'Family Names', 'The Decline of Irish in Cork', 'The National Schools', 'Maynooth and the Irish Language' and 'The Gaelic League'. Readers interested in the recent history of Ireland – social, economic and cultural – will find all this useful. Complete accuracy is difficult to attain, and those who are familiar with the various matters touched upon will find some surprising statements – such as the one on p. 154 that Osborn Bergin 'was given the freedom of Dublin with Meyer and O'Leary' in 1912.

Next year will mark the one-hundred-and-fiftieth anniversary of Peadar Ua Laoghaire's birth. Since his dream of an Ireland in which our people would be equipped with dhá arm aigne has not been achieved, we can at least be glad that this English version makes accessible to a large extent his reminiscences on his long and fruitful life.

BRIAN Ó CUÍV


In the preface to this large volume Professor MacLennan describes how the idea of holding a congress of Celtic Studies in North America was mooted by him as far back as 1975 and how such a congress was finally achieved in 1986 with a five-day meeting in Ottawa from 26-30 March. A measure of the efficiency of the organisers is the speed with which this volume of 'Proceedings' has been published.

The programme does not form part of this volume, but it is clear that some of the meetings consisted of plenary sessions while others catered for the presentation of individual communications. There appear to have been seventy-eight papers in all, and of these forty-two are published here, as well as abstracts of thirty-six more. The list of nearly two hundred members, of which only thirty came from European countries, reflects the fact that the congress was primarily for North Americans. On the other hand European members contributed thirty-five of the seventy-eight papers.

The papers published here are arranged under eight headings: I The Celts in North America (six papers), II Computers as a Research Tool
in Celtic Studies (four), III Early Celtic Linguistics (five), IV Irish (eleven), V Scottish (four), VI Welsh (seven), VII Breton (two), and VIII Modern Celtic (three). Topics discussed in the first section include the Irish language in Newfoundland from the eighteenth century to the twentieth (Cyril Byrne), the role of dissenting evangelicalism in emigration to Canada from the Scottish Highlands (Donald Meek), demographic evidence on speakers of Celtic languages in Canada (Brian McKee and John deVries), Celtic folklore in the United States (Kenneth Nilsen) and in the Cape Breton Gàidhealtachd (John Shaw). It is understandable that the growing interest in and use of computers should have produced several papers, and in the second section we have one discussing the use of computers in fairly broad terms (Andrew Hawke), and others dealing with particular areas such as Cornish orthography (K. J. George), the material in the Corpus Iuris Hibernici (Daniel Melia), and Ulster Irish (Ciarán Ó Duibhín).

In the section on 'Early Celtic Linguistics' there is a wide-ranging consideration of the Celts in relation to their origins, their expansion and their migrations in early times (D. Ellis Evans), and also papers on the Italo-Celtic hypothesis (Leszek Bedarczuk), Hispano-Celtic and Iberian (Javier de Hoz), the relationship between Brittonic and Continental Celtic (Leon Fleuriot) and the reconstruction of Proto-Celtic (Karl H. Schmidt).

The Irish section is by far the most extensive and includes papers on literature and society, including such varied topics as entertainment and kinship (James Blake, Alan Harrison, Mary A. Ludwig), hagiography (Dorothy Bray), linguistics (Noel Hamilton, Gearóid Stockman), music (Noel Hamilton, William Sayers), mythology and place-names (Proinnsias Mac Cana), textual analysis (Uaitéar Mac Gearailt) and Anglo-Irish literature (Breandán Ó hAichir). In the Scottish section there are papers on grammar (Donald MacAulay, Damien Ó Muiri), traditional family lore as illustrated in the case of the MacInneses (John MacInnes) and Fenian lays as part of the common inheritance of Ireland and Scotland (Domhnall Meek).

In the Welsh section one paper is on a linguistic topic and rather appropriately for an American congress it deals with the Welsh spoken in the Gaiman region of Argentina (Robert Owen Jones). Two lecturers concerned themselves with medieval Welsh tales, one discussing the case for multiple authorship of Pedair Keinc y Mabinogi (Sioned Davies), and the other discussing magical games and adventure in Middle Welsh romances (Ann Martin). There are four papers dealing with early or medieval Welsh poetry: one on the manuscript sources of the Goddodin (Brendan Ó Hehir); another on borrowed elements in the poetry of Dafydd ap Gwilym (Marie E. Surridge); and another on metrical aspects
of medieval Welsh verse (Kathryn A. Klar and Eve E. Sweetser). A paper which is of especial interest is that in which Geraint Gruffydd gave a detailed account of the plan adopted in 1985 by the University of Wales Centre for Advanced Welsh and Celtic Studies for the editing and eventual publication of the corpus of ‘Gogynfeirdd’ poetry. A director of a research centre who can count on having 6,600 person-days over a period of five years available for the promotion of a single project is indeed to be envied.

In the Breton section there is a short paper on names of women in early Brittany (Claude L. Evans), and a longer one touching on conflicting views on the origin of the Breton language, discussing research and publication in the field of spoken Breton, and stressing the need for further research (Jean Le Dû).

The heading ‘Modern Celtic’ for the last section is somewhat misleading. The first paper is ‘A Plea for Celtic Studies / Celtic Languages as a University Discipline (Birgit Bramsbäck). The second ‘Pan-Celticism – Past and Future’ (Lois Kuter) ranges over matters of language, politics, economics, and cultural and sporting contacts. In the final paper ‘The Decline of the Celtic Languages’ Gearóid Mac Eoin, having outlined the fortunes of the various Celtic languages in the past, holds out little hope for the survival of Irish as a community language in Connamara and he voices similar apprehension about other parts of Ireland and about Scottish Gaelic, Breton, and even Welsh. In the light of these fears considerable importance must be attached to the ‘Archive of Celtic Speech’ established in 1982 by UNESCO.

BRIAN Ó CUÍV


This volume keeps to the same format as The Welsh Law of Women (ed. Dafydd Jenkins and Morfydd E. Owen, Cardiff, University of Wales Press. 1980) and has a similarly colourful dust-jacket designed by Gifford Charles-Edwards. The first part (pp. 15-233) deals with Celtic suretyship, and starts with a most interesting and informative article by Robin Stacey on ‘The Archaic Core of Llyfr Iorwerth’. I do not like to begin this review on a sour note, but I must express reservations about the rather flippant tone of the first few pages of her article. I refer to passages such the following: ‘The image which is perhaps most
appropriate [to Medieval Welsh Law] is that of the Egyptian mummy so beloved of early Hollywood moviemakers' (p. 15, cf. p. 37 last paragraph), 'A legal passage may thus aspire to a piscine odour without actually, as it were, having had its day in the sun' (p. 16), 'the most blatant and unrepentant archaisms' (p. 17), and 'less fishlike perhaps' (p. 20). Such witticisms seem to me perfectly acceptable as attention-grabbers at the beginning of a conference lecture where many of the audience are likely to be comatose and/or not directly interested in the topic under discussion. But they should have been cut out of the version submitted for publication in Lawyers and Laymen. After all, any reader who embarks on an article with the austere title 'The Archaic Core of Llyfr Iorwerth' is almost certain to be serious. If he is not, no amount of joking reference to Egyptian mummies or fishy smells will hold him.

Having got this gripe off my chest, I must again emphasise that the substance of this article – with its valuable comparisons between early Irish and Welsh suretyship – is excellent. In the next contribution, 'Duw yn Lle Mach: Briduw yng Nghyrfrath Hywel', Huw Price discusses the practice of calling on God as a surety in early Welsh law. This is followed by 'Suretyship in the Cartulaire de Redon' in which Wendy Davies continues to exploit with skill this fascinating source of information on the legal roles of small landed peasants in 9th – early 10th century Brittany. She draws attention to the use of sureties for 'policing' purposes (pp. 80, 85), and makes the important point that early Breton suretyship is too often viewed exclusively in terms of early Irish law. In the next paper, 'The General Features of Archaic European Suretyship', D. B. Walters describes with admirable clarity the function and development of suretyship in early law.

The next section of the book (pp. 117-233) provides texts on Celtic suretyship. The manuscripts of the Welsh texts are described by Daniel Huws, with three fine reproductions from Cotton Caligula A. iii in the British Library. Then there are editions and translations of the Iorwerth text (by T. M. Charles-Edwards), the Cyfnerth text (by Morfydd E. Owen) and Latin Redaction E (by Helen Davies). Robin Stacey provides a most useful translation of the Old Irish tract on suretyship, Berradairechta, with references to Corpus Iuris Hibernici and notes on textual problems.

Part II of the book is entitled 'Law-makers and the Law' and begins with an essay on 'Legislators, Lawyers and Lawbooks' by Alan Harding. He makes some interesting general points in relation to royal involvement in legislation. In the next paper 'The Administration of Law in Medieval Wales: The Role of the Ynad Cwmwd (Judex Patrie)' R. R. Davies emphasises the difficulties in obtaining information on the administration of justice from the records of pre-1282 Wales. It is
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followed by 'The Inns of Court and Legal Doctrine' in which J. H. Baker stresses the influence of the law-schools on the way lawyers think, 'Y Llysoedd, yr Awdurdodau a'r Gymraeg: y Ddeddf Uno a Deddf yr Iaith Gymraeg' in which Judge Watkin Powell looks at the status of the Welsh language in court from the sixteenth century onwards, and 'An English Tragedy: the Academic lawyer as Jurist' in which Ian Fletcher castigates the failure of academics to interest themselves in law.

The book ends with a glossary of legal terms, a bibliography of the writings of Dafydd Jenkins 1935-1983, an index to passages of Welsh law cited and a general index.

FERGUS KELLY

Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies


The latest volume of Studia Celtica, edited as usual by Professor J. E. Caerwyn Williams, contains twelve articles as well as obituaries, Celtic bibliography covering the period 1984-1986, a list of recent theses and dissertations on Welsh studies, book reviews and an index to Volumes I-XVIII/XIX.

The longest article, which is also the first, is 'Les Têtes Coupées et le Graal' (1-42) in which Claude Sterckx starts by discussing evidence from ancient times, both textual and archaeological, of the practice common among the Celts of beheading their vanquished enemies and of drinking from the skulls. In the succeeding pages he touches on many matters related to the severing of heads, such as the efforts of kinfolk to preserve a warrior's head for burial, the challenge to the threat of decapitation familiar to us from 'Fled Bricrend' and Arthurian stories, and the association of the head with the soul. He then proceeds to discuss, in the light of textual evidence, the significance attached in the past to various other parts of the body in the process of procreation. This leads on to the final sections of his article in which he discusses Welsh and Arthurian texts, and in particular such episodes as the adventure of Percival in connection with the Grail, the wounding and beheading of Brân Bendigaid, and the significance of these in relation to the otherworld feast of Celtic tradition and the final association of the pagan elements of severed head and divine cauldron with the eucharistic chalice of Christian belief and the eucharist itself. I have noticed a few surprising errors in this article. Thus Diarmuid mac Murchadha, the twelfth-century king of Leinster, is named as 'Diarmuid mac Muircheartaigh', Fergal mac Maile Dun,
killed in the Battle of Allen in 722, is anachronistically called ‘Fearghal O’Neill’, and Cathal mac Finguine is described as ‘roi de Leinster’ (p. 7). The motif of ‘la tête coupée’, together with that of talismanic burial, also features in ‘The Blessed Heroes’ (87-109) in which G. Goetinck discusses stories and traditions about Brân, Gwrethefyr, Cadwallon and Cadwaladr, all of whom were known as ‘blessed’, and postulates a blending of ancient legend and historical tradition in the evolution by Christian writers of the story of the blessed hero who battled valiantly to save his country from defeat.

Welsh romantic tales are also the subject of ‘The “Mute Knight” and the “Knight of the Lion” ’ (110-22) in which Annalee C. Rejnon discusses the likelihood of borrowing from Chrétien de Troyes’s Yvain by a Welshman who, it is suggested, was author of Owein, Peredur and Gereint vab Erbin. Other articles on Welsh topics include ‘When Was Welsh Literature First Written Down?’ (43-66) by John T. Koch, and ‘Canu Hywel ab Owein Gwneyd’ (167-91) by Kathleen Bramley.

Irish studies are well represented. In ‘The Structure of the Blathmac Poems’ (67-77) Brian Lambkin deals with the many references to ‘keening’ which are clearly a unifying element in the poems, and in particular he uses the evidence of the poems to make deductions about the role of the keen in eighth-century Irish society and about such related matters as the time and place at which keening was carried out and the various rituals connected with it, such as hand-beating, weeping and distortion of the countenance. In support of his suggestion that Blathmac saw himself as a storyteller he cites the use by him of terms connected with professional storytelling – tochnarc, compert, longes, feis, and so on.

In ‘Animal Imagery in Longes Mac nUislenn’ (145-66) Maria Tymoczko considers the possibility that at one level the Longes is concerned with the struggle for Sovereignty, as personified in the person of Derdriu, and the subsequent end of the Ulster heroic age, with the animal imagery – the three-colour motif centred on the slaughtered calf and the raven setting the tone for the rest of the story with its tragic outcome, the heifer and bullock motif in the encounter between Derdriu and Noisíu, and the motif of the sheep between the two rams at the conclusion – to be regarded as artistic innovations. Motifs and imagery associated with animals – but in a much wider range of texts – are also the subject of Joseph Falaky Nagy’s article on ‘Otter, Salmon and Eel in Traditional Gaelic Narrative’ (123-44), while in ‘Motival Derivations in the Life of St Samthann’ (78-86) Dorothy Ann Bray discusses elements in the legends of this female saint who is recorded as having died in 739.

The last article is about the use of Irish as a spoken language in the last century. In a lecture on ‘The Gaeltacht – Past and Present’ which I delivered in Trinity College, Dublin, in March 1950 I mentioned two
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early nineteenth-century sources of information regarding the use of Irish as a vernacular. These were (i) statistical surveys of Irish counties (twenty-three out of the thirty-two) initiated by the Royal Dublin Society and published between 1801 and 1832, and (ii) A Statistical Account, or Parochial Survey of Ireland by William Shaw Mason, published in three volumes between 1814 and 1819. When publishing this lecture in 1951 I included an appendix in which I gave in summary form the information contained in these sources (Irish Dialects and Irish-speaking Districts, pp. 77-93). In ‘Aspects of the Linguistic Geography of Ireland in the Nineteenth Century’ (205-21) Breandán S. Mac Aodha presents a fuller analysis of the Shaw Mason material which he supplements with information from the RDS volumes, and he discusses some of the factors which were contributing to the decline in the use of Irish.

BRIAN Ó CUÍN


As well as acting as joint editor of this volume Heinrich Wagner contributed the opening article ‘The Celtic Invasions of Ireland and Great Britain’ (1-40). This contains a revised text of the School of Celtic Studies Statutory Lecture for 1984 in which he gave his views on such matters as the date of the Celtic migrations to the British Isles which he would put about 500 B.C., the affinities in continental Europe of these migrating Celts, and the Hamito-Semitic nature of the language of the pre-Celtic inhabitants of these islands; in an appendix extending over eighteen pages there is a detailed discussion of ‘traces of possible Celto-Germanic isoglosses on grammatical level’. A further article by Wagner, with the collaboration of Noel McGonagle, is ‘Phonetische Texte aus Dunquin, County Kerry’ (219-41) in which are several texts transcribed by Wagner in the 1940s.

The second article in the volume is the continuation of Neil McLeod’s study ‘Interpreting Early Irish Law: Status and Currency’ (41-115) in which he deals with the functions of the various grades, considers the conflicting honour-prices set out for the grades in Old Irish texts, discusses the evaluation in Ireland of the Roman ounce of silver, and provides a table of cattle and equivalent values based on four early lawtracts, together with the later glosses and commentaries. Two articles on Irish dialects are also in continuation of contributions to earlier volumes. In ‘The Irish of Rath Cairn’ (116-37) Nancy Stenson and Pádraig Ó Ciardha give an analytic discussion of the material, based on responses to the LASID questionnaire, which they published in ZCP 41. In ‘Seamus Ó Duilearga’s Antrim Notebooks – II: Language’ (138-218)
Seosamh Watson describes the phonological system, morphology and syntax of the Glens of Antrim dialect which Ó Duilearga recorded in his notebooks long ago, and he provides a lengthy index of manuscript forms. Shorter articles on Irish are Noel McGonagle’s ‘The Irregular Verb in Modern Irish, Part I: BEIR’ (311-8), Robert D. Fulk’s ‘The Historical Present in Medieval Irish Narrative’ (330-43), and Noel Hamilton’s ‘The Non-personal in Irish’ (366-73). Manx Gaelic is represented by ‘A Handbook of Late Spoken Manx: Index of Gaelic Words’ (293-310) by George Broderick.

On the Brythonic side there are two linguistic articles on Breton and one on Welsh. Lenora A. Timms contributed a long article on the phonology of Carhaisien Breton to ZCP 40. In the present volume she follows that up with ‘The Verb Morphology of Carhaisien Breton’ (242-92) which is structuralist and descriptive in approach. In ‘Les toponymes bretons “leure” et leur intérêt archéologique’ (319-29) Paul Quentel proposes a new explanation of place-names containing the element leure (leuré, etc.) which he sees as being formed from lud + ré and as designating burials. In ‘Analogic Levelling in Welsh Prepositions’ (362-5) Martin J. Ball demonstrates a paradigmatic simplification in current Welsh usage. Thematic borrowing on a literary level is the subject of Annalee C. Rejhon’s ‘The French Reception of a Celtic Motif: The Pèlerinage de Charlemagne à Jérusalem et à Constantinople’ (344-61) in which she suggests that the ‘pèlerinage’ is analogous to ‘other world’ journeys familiar to us in Welsh and Irish tradition and that the borrowing probably took place in Norman England, ‘the locus of much cultural exchange’.

As usual the volume concludes with an extensive review section.

BRIAN Ó CUÍV