CORA Cork Open Research Archive
Cartlann Taighde Oscailte Chorcaí

Title	Aspects of Bardic poetry in the thirteenth century
Authors	Ó Macháin, Pádraig
Publication date	2015
Original Citation	Ó Machain, P. (2015) 'Aspects of Bardic poetry in the thirteenth century' in Breatnach, C. and Ní Úrdail, M. (ed.) Aon don Éigse: essays marking Osborn Bergin's centenary lecture on Bardic poetry (1912). Dublin: Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies, pp. 91-125
Type of publication	Book chapter
Link to publisher's version	https://books.dias.ie/index.php?main_page=product_info&products_id=383
Rights	©Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies 2015
Download date	2026-11-06 06:42:01
Item downloaded from	https://hdl.handle.net/10468/4816

UCC
University College Cork, Ireland
Coláiste na hOllscoile Corcaigh

Aspects of bardic poetry in the thirteenth century

Pádraig Ó Macháin

One of the noteworthy characteristics of Osborn Bergin, and of many other scholars of his generation, is the different ways in which he and they engaged with the Irish language, particularly in the years before the foundation of the State. He was far from being a one-dimensional scholar. As we know, Bergin first comes to attention not just in the area of scholarship but also as a language activist, as a founding member of Craobh na Laoi of Conradh na Gaeilge, one of the more rebellious branches in the heady days of that organisation at the end of the nineteenth century and the beginning of the twentieth.[1] His activities on behalf of the language continued into his more mature period, after he had been appointed to University College Dublin in 1909. In the year that his public lecture on bardic poetry was delivered (1912) Bergin was engaged in academic projects such as co-editing the *Miscellany presented to Kuno Meyer*, where difficulties with his co-editor, Carl Marstrander, proved trying;[2] but he also found time in July to teach phonetics at Coláiste na Mumhan in Béal Átha an Ghaorthaidh,[3] and to give a lecture to the West Muskerry Teachers' Association on the subject of simplified spelling, which had not found favour with Conradh na Gaeilge.[4] This support and service that he gave to the language and literary endeavours in his native county is symbolized by the publication of the lecture, which we are commemorating here, in the *Journal of the Ivernian Society*,

[1]Traolach Ó Ríordáin, *Conradh na Gaeilge i gCorcaigh 1894-1910* (Dublin 2000) 30-31, 73-4.

[2]Archive of the School of Celtic Studies, Bergin Correspondence: Carl Marstrander to Bergin, Kristiania, 11 June 1912; Kuno Meyer to Bergin, Charlottenburg, 10 July 1912.

[3]*Claidheamh Soluis* 22 June 1912.

[4]The inaugural lecture of An Cuman um Letiriú Shímplí (The Society for the Simplification of the Spelling of Irish), delivered by Bergin in November 1910, and published in 1911, remains the clearest exposition of the society's motivations and aims: Osborn Bergin, *Irish spelling: a lecture* (Dublin 1911).

the organ of a Cork literary society that had Bergin's friend an tAthair Peadar Ua Laoghaire as its president and as a regular contributor to its journal, which was published from Cork City Hall.

Bergin was also a member of the Dublin literary intelligentsia, centred on people such as W. B. Yeats and George Russell. It is that context, removed from the strictly scholarly one that we usually associate with his name, in which Bergin's lecture on bardic poetry was delivered. This highlights the general nature of the lecture, as does the use of mainly texts in translation to illustrate the talk, appropriate, one imagines, for a lecture given to the Irish National Literary Association, which had been founded by Yeats and Hyde twenty years earlier. The fact that most of the lengthy quotations in the lecture (with the exception of that from the Clanrickarde *Memoirs*) are drawn from Bergin's own editions – some that had been recently published, some still to be published – underlines the extent to which he was a pioneer in this field, and also the extent to which the discipline was still very much in its infancy. That fact, combined with the general nature of the lecture itself, means that while there is a great amount of information in it, there is no concentration at any point in the talk on any particular poet or on any particular period during which bardic poetry was practised.

The thirteenth century, for instance, does not rate much mention in the lecture, yet is was a period that set the tone for the following three and a half centuries of bardic production, the outstanding feature of which was the big poem of praise or lamentation, of the type that Bergin may have had in mind when he made the observation in the lecture about transcribing bardic poems from manuscripts and wishing 'before reaching the fortieth or fiftieth quatrain, that the poet had had enough restraint and good taste to stop at the twentieth'.[5] It was the period in which some of the most renowned poets of the bardic era operated: Giolla Brighde, Muireadhach Albanach, and of course Donnchadh Mór Ó Dálaigh, who figures prominently as an author of much of the religious poetry reliably attributed to the era, and whose poetry accounts for roughly twenty-five per cent of all bardic poetry that is extant from the thirteenth century. At this period the great families of Í Bhriain, Í Dhomhnaill, and Í Chonchubhair Chonnacht dominate the patronage statistics of the surviving poetry. The one factor that skews those statistics is of course the survival of the Mág Shamhradháin *duanaire*, a manuscript that is important in so many ways to our understanding of bardic poetry at this period.[6]

[5]Osborn Bergin, 'Bardic poetry', reprinted in David Greene and Fergus Kelly (ed.), *Irish bardic poetry: texts and translations, together with an introductory lecture by Osborn Bergin* (Dublin 1970) 3-22: 12.

[6]National Library of Ireland MS G 1200; Lambert McKenna, *The Book of Magauran. Leabhar Méig Shamhradháin* (Dublin 1947).

The Book of Magauran is one of the earliest surviving post-Norman Irish manuscripts. It is also our earliest Gaelic manuscript exclusively devoted to poetry in Irish, and our earliest collection of bardic verse. Written by a number of different scribes, one of whom was Ruaidhrí Ó Cianáin (d. 1387) who wrote for Tomás Mág Shamhradháin (d. 1343) of Teallach nEachach (in present-day Co. Cavan), this manuscript contains an amount of bardic verse from the thirteenth century, accounting for at least a third of its contents. The Book of Magauran establishes, defines, and anticipates trends and modalities with regard to the composition and recording of bardic verse. Although surviving instances of the bardic *duanaire* date predominantly from the second half of the sixteenth century and later, this manuscript reminds us that the practice of creating such books had a venerable ancestry. It also reminds us of the changing fortunes of once prominent families, for if this *duanaire* is to be considered a status-symbol in the way that the later books certainly are, then it must be admitted that the status of the Clann Shamhradháin diminished spectacularly after the fourteenth century.

With regard to layout, the Book of Magauran continues the practice in evidence in the Book of Leinster, almost 200 years earlier, of the two-column presentation of poetry, where each quatrain begins on a new line, with the initial prominently displayed and coloured in its own ruled space to the left of the column, and where the text is written continuously, punctuation at line-end being optional. The larger dimensions of the pages in the Book of Leinster frequently allow the scribes to fit a quatrain into two column lines, whereas the relatively narrower page of the Mág Shamhradháin manuscript means that there is a more irregular aspect to the quatrains, and frequent use of the *ceann fo eite*. This is in contrast to the single column approach of later *duanaireadha*.[7]

General features in the Book of Magauran that we find repeated throughout the bardic period include the statistics that it furnishes with regard to metres of the poems in the collection. The primacy of *deibhidhe* as the favoured metre of the poets, followed in second place by *rannaigheacht mhór*, is in evidence here, where thirteen of the thirty-three poems in the *duanaire* are in *deibhidhe* and eight in *rannaigheacht mhór*, accounting between them for just

[7]For some discussion of the layout of later *duanaireadha* see articles by the present writer: 'Three poems by Fearghal Óg Mac an Bhaird, with remarks on the *duanaire* of Domhnall Mac Suibhne', *Celtica* 27 (2013) 38-54; 'Two Nugent manuscripts: the Nugent Duanaire and Queen Elizabeth's Primer', *Ríocht na Midhe: Records of Meath Archaeological and Historical Society* 23 (2012) 121-42; 'An introduction to the Book of the O'Conor Don', in Pádraig Ó Macháin (ed.), *The Book of the O'Conor Don: essays on an Irish manuscript* (DIAS 2010) 1-31.

under two thirds of the poems.[8] Another feature is that of authorship. Here in particular we see borne out Bergin's implied distinction – again in the lecture that we are commemorating – about one of the differences between prose and poetry in Irish tradition being that 'prose is common property'[9] and that its authorship is generally unknown; whereas the authorship of poetry is, more often than not, fairly precisely specified. Of the thirty-three poems in the Mág Shamhradháin manuscript, twenty-eight have ascriptions.

***

The place of praise-poetry in the *seanchas*-laden poetic tradition of the centuries before the thirteenth has given rise to debates as to the role of the *fili* and the reason for the general absence of praise-poetry from the written tradition of that time. While it has been obvious that praise-poetry existed in the earlier tradition, locating much more than fugitive examples – such as those assembled by Proinsias Mac Cana[10] – has proved a difficult task. Not only is it clear that such poetry existed, however, but it is equally clear that the themes and motifs of later *dán díreach* were all to be found, in one form or another, in the older literature. To take but one example: the basic principle of reward for *dán díreach* was predicated on the patron's generosity, the latter quality in turn being dependent on his success in battle. This contrast between the patron's toughness and softness, between the comfort and civility of the castle and the hardship of battle, is articulated by Fearghal Óg Mac an Bhaird is his short poem to Brian Ó Ruairc towards the end of the sixteenth century:

> Brian Ó Ruairc mo rogha leannán
> lór a bhuga ag bronnadh séad;
> 's is lór a chruas i gcrú chaoilshleagh,
> an cnú do chnuas Ghaoidheal nGréag.[11]

[8]See Brian Ó Cuív, 'Some developments in Irish metrics', *Éigse* 12/4 (1968) 273-90; and Pádraig A. Breatnach, 'The metres of citations in the Irish Grammatical Tracts', *Éigse* 32 (2000) 7-22.

[9]Bergin, 'Bardic poetry', 5.

[10]Proinsias Mac Cana, 'Praise poetry in Ireland before the Normans', *Ériu* 54 (2004) 11-40.

[11]Eleanor Knott, *An introduction to Irish syllabic poetry of the period 1200-1600 with selections, notes and glossary* (2nd edition, Cork 1934) 23: read 'an chnú' in the fourth line (Brian Ó Cuív, 'Roinnt leasaithe téacs', *Éigse* 15/1 (1973) 13-21: 16). Fearghal Óg expresses an identical sentiment in a poem to Fiachaidh mac Aodha Í Bhroin: 'croidhe as buga ag díol draoitheadh / lámh as cruaidhe a ttaobh tachair' (Seán Mac Airt, *Leabhar Branach: the Book of the O'Byrnes* (Dublin 1944) lines 2514-5).

Brian Ó Ruairc, my choice lover, sufficient his softness in the bestowal of jewels, and sufficient is his toughness in a bivouac of slender spears, the [superlative] nut from the cluster of the Gaoidhil of Greece.

In expressing this truism, the poet was merely repeating a principle that is found as early as the Middle-Irish text, 'Timna Chathaír Máir':

fosadh flaith fri fidchellacht
ós ráthaibh ós ro-maighibh
aicnid rígh ós ro-chathaib . . .

A quiet prince while playing chess
above ramparts and great plains;
the (warlike) temper of a king over great battles . . .[12]

The question of the role of the *fili* with respect to praise-poetry has been satisfactorily resolved by Liam Breatnach, who has shown, from an examination of the legal sources, that the practice of such poetry constituted one of the *fili*'s functions.[13] On the second question, that of the scarcity of praise-poetry surviving from the early period, Breatnach views the non-survival of written examples in the context of the poor survival rate of much of Irish written tradition from the medieval period, as opposed to the almost exclusively oral practice of praise-poetry advocated by Mac Cana as a solution to the question.[14]

As an observation on the matter of textual tradition, it may be stated that the evidence of post-Norman times suggests that, despite the poets' expertise in a broad selection of disciplines such as *seanchas* and storytelling, *dán díreach* was a specialist activity, comparable to other specialisations such as law or medicine, and there is no reason to believe that this was not also the case in the pre-bardic era. If the evidence of the thirteenth century points to the west of the country, and north Connacht in particular, as the cradle of later bardic civilisation (see below), it must be admitted that even in the great manuscripts of the late 14th and early 15th centuries that emanate from this area, bardic verse, if found at all, is very rare: the Book of Uí Mhaine is the only one that could be said to contain a significant quantity of *dán díreach*,

[12]Myles Dillon, *Lebor na Cert: the Book of Rights* (London 1962) 156-7.
[13]Liam Breatnach, 'Satire, praise and the early Irish poet', *Ériu* 56 (2006) 63-84.
[14]Ibid., 81-2; Mac Cana, 'Praise poetry', 35.

which still hardly amounts to more than ten poems. It may be that the relative accessibility to the modern reader of the products of the bardic poets, as opposed to those of the lawyers or the doctors or, indeed, the historians, has led to a misconception as to the availability of bardic poetry in late medieval manuscripts.

As with the few surviving twelfth-century Gaelic manuscripts, it is in fact the work of the *senchaidh* that tends to dominate the contents of much of the compendia-type manuscripts of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, while medical manuscripts account for roughly a quarter of all surviving books from the vellum period. Specialist *duanaireadha* such as the family poem-books of Mág Shamhradháin (fourteenth century, mentioned above) and De Róiste (fifteenth century), and the poet's *duanaire* of Tadhg Óg Ó hUiginn (d. 1448), now part of the Yellow Book of Lecan, tend to skew the picture of the popularity of *dán díreach* in pre-sixteenth century manuscripts. For, with one or two exceptions,[15] the bardic anthology – as opposed to the family or the poet's *duanaire* – is a sixteenth-century patrons' phenomenon. It can be said to have been pioneered by the MacGregors in the Book of the Dean of Lismore (a manuscript with strong north Connacht associations), and by Maghnus Ó Domhnaill in what is now Bodleian MS Rawlinson B 514, and continued by similar enquiring and enlightened patrons such as the Nugents (NLI MS G 992), before reaching its apogee in the early seventeenth century under the patronage of Somhairle Mac Domhnaill in the Book of the O'Conor Don. It is no surprise to discover that of the hundred or so *dán díreach* poems that survive from the thirteenth century,[16] the earliest copies of twenty-eight of them are found in one or other of these anthologies. Excluding the poems in the Mág Shamhradháin manuscript, only eighteen poems from the thirteenth century are found in manuscripts of a date earlier than the sixteenth century; the remainder are found in manuscripts of the later paper tradition, including some preserved exclusively by the Ó Longáin scribal family.[17]

***

[15]For example British Library MS Additional 19,995, a manuscript of the fifteenth century 'written upon mere refuse disconnected strips and remnants of different sizes' (Standish Hayes O'Grady and Robin Flower, *Catalogue of Irish manuscripts in the British Museum* I-III (London 1926, 1953) I, 328), which contains seven bardic poems, five of which belong to the thirteenth century.

[16]Figure derived from the Bardic Poetry Database developed by Dr Katharine Simms (bardic.celt.dias.ie).

[17]Meidhbhín Ní Úrdail, 'Two poems attributed to Muireadhach Albanach Ó Dálaigh', *Ériu* 53 (2003) 19-52: 23-4.

In his important paper on developments in Irish metrics, mentioned already, the late Brian Ó Cuív – who is surely worthy of mention at a colloquium dedicated to Bergin and bardic poetry – provided evidence for the evolutionary development towards full *dán díreach* in an investigation of poetry surviving from the eighth century onwards:

> An examination of the extant verse shows that *dán díreach* came as the culmination of a process of development which extended over many centuries and which was of especial relevance to the compositions of professional poets.[18]

On the basis of this evidence, Ó Cuív suggested a date in the mid- to late twelfth century for the formal reformation of the language and metrics and the consolidation of *dán díreach*:

> My interpretation of the evidence is that some time towards the end of the [twelfth] century an influential body of [poets] produced the linguistic foundations of classical Modern Irish and at the same time agreed to impose the discipline of *dán díreach* – one might be tempted to call it a prosodic straitjacket – on their profession.[19]

The logistics for the meeting of this 'influential body of poets', on the scale that Ó Cuív seems to have had in mind, would not necessarily have been complex. The possible parallel with the many synods and assemblies that took place throughout the twelfth century, as part of the accelerating movement of church reform, has been suggested by Mac Cana,[20] and such synods could have provided a ready template for a congress of poets, if not indeed a venue. It could be argued, for example, that there may be more than coincidence in the proliferation of synods under Ruaidhrí Ó Conchubhair[21] and the date of

[18]Ó Cuív, 'Some developments in Irish metrics', 275.

[19]Ibid., 290; see also Brian Ó Cuív, 'Linguistic terminology in the medieval Irish bardic tracts', *Transactions of the Philological Society* 64 (1965) 141-64: 143.

[20]Mac Cana, 'Praise poetry in Ireland before the Normans', 13.

[21]For these and other assemblies see, for example, Aubrey Gwynn, *The twelfth century reform* (Dublin 1968); Marie Therese Flanagan, *The transformation of the Irish Church in the twelfth century* (Woodbridge 2010).

the poem that Ó Cuív suggested as the earliest surviving poem in *dán díreach*, that addressed to Raghnall King of Man.[22]

Í Chonchubhair sponsorship might also have been appropriate for a poetic colloquium of the kind envisaged by Ó Cuív, given the national ascendancy of that sept at the time, and given also that when, after the twelfth century, the power centres had contracted from national and provincial to the territories of what became the late-medieval lordships, pre-eminent among the patrons of *dán díreach* in the thirteenth century were the Í Chonchubhair. This suggests the west of the country as a probable general locus for the codification of bardic verse. Taking into account the prominence of poets of Connacht such as the Í Uiginn, not just as composers of poetry but also as teachers as evidenced by the renown of the school of Ceall Chluana,[23] it may not be out of place to suggest the context of the overlordship of the Í Chonchubhair for the origins of the reformed poetry. It is worth recalling that Gerard Murphy dated 'the last poem of the learned *seanchus* type' to the reign of Ruaidhrí Ó Conchubhair and one of the earliest *dán díreach* poems to that of his brother, Cathal Croibhdhearg.[24]

As we look at the emergence of *dán díreach* in the thirteenth century, fully developed and metrically accomplished, comparison with the appearance of accentual verse in the late sixteenth century and early seventeenth century, in similar circumstances of social and religious upheaval, seems apt. As with the *amhrán* metres employed by Tadhg Dall Ó hUiginn, Seathrún Céitinn and Pádraigín Haicéad at that time, it is difficult to conceive that the poetry composed by Muireadhach Albanach Ó Dálaigh and by Giolla Brighde Mac Con Midhe in the first half of the thirteenth did not have antecedents in the preceding century, albeit largely, but by no means entirely concealed from us now. One might also be justified in asking if the emergence of a relative profusion of praise-poems and elegies in *dán díreach* at this time occluded less mainstream bardic activity, or put an end to what we might call bardic thinking in the matter of grammar and poetics. It is one of the purposes of the present paper to refer to some texts that are suggestive of such activity in the thirteenth century.

The contemporary literary context for the codification of the poetic language was that of the well-known redefinition and rewriting of matter

[22]'Some developments in Irish metrics', 290; Brian Ó Cuív, 'A poem in praise of Raghnall, King of Man', *Éigse* 8/4 (1956-57) 283-301.

[23]Eleanor Knott (ed.), *The bardic poems of Tadhg Dall Ó hUiginn (1550-1591)* I-II (London 1922, 1926) I, xxii-xxiii; cf. Lambert McKenna, *Bardic syntactical tracts* (Dublin 1944) viii.

[24]Gerard Murphy, 'Bards and filidh', *Éigse* 2/3 (1940) 200-07: 206.

such as *dindsheanchas* and *fianaigheacht*, which continued in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries through the creation of original works in subject-areas such as law and *seanchas* as expressed in the works of Giolla na Naomh Mac Aodhagáin and Seaán Mór Ó Dubhagáin. The effect of the codification of the poetry was to be profound. It confirmed the professional poets in the supreme and refined skill, *dán díreach*, through which they could demonstrate the elitism of their art, and in which they could articulate the suitability for Tara of every magnate up and down a country that had once again become fragmented.[25] It also served to further distinguish them from the *seanchaidh*, whose work, as already observed, tends to dominate the native secular content of manuscript tradition from the twelfth to at least the sixteenth century, and whose *laidshenchas* and *dindshenchas* are prominent in both the Book of Leinster and Rawlinson B 502, which manuscripts are roughly contemporary with Ó Cuív's suggested date for the codification of *dán díreach*.

Evidence of at least a gentle rivalry between the two learned classes is to hand in a text that is thought to be the earliest to reflect the results of the reform of the language, the tract on metrical faults now known as *IGT* V.[26] One of the faults mentioned in this tract is entitled 'Claen Seanchais' (§98), which we might translate as 'perversion of tradition'. This is explained as an error in assignment of genealogical affinity: aligning someone from Leath Cuinn with the Dál gCais, for instance, or a Munster king with Niall or Conn, where no relationship is demonstrable. The author then adds:

> agus is e sin locht is mo lingthear agon aes dana, oir ni legid rand maith ar sloindeadh dibh sin uatho agus a[s] senchaidh is mo agras.
>
> *and that is a fault that poets most often avoid, since they do not allow to utter from them a good quatrain containing one of those [false] names, and it is the historian to whom it most applies*[27]

There are some other interesting points inherent in this earliest of what Bergin termed the Irish Grammatical Tracts. Outside of the poetry surviving from

[25]Ó Cuív saw the significance of the codification of the language in the wider terms of its 'immense importance in the subsequent confrontation between native and alien cultures': 'A medieval exercise in language planning: Classical Early Modern Irish', in Konrad Koerner (ed.), *Progress in linguistic historiography* (Amsterdam 1980) 23-34: 25.

[26]Osborn Bergin (edited posthumously by Eleanor Knott), 'V. Metrical faults', *Ériu* 17 (1955) 259-93.

[27]Literally 'who it [*sc.* the fault] most accuses'. The metre 'Deibhidhe bhas re tóin' has earlier (§86) been stated to be a *seanchaidh*'s metre, for which passage see Brian Ó Cuív, 'An ornamental device in Irish verse', *Éigse* 23 (1989) 45-56: 53-4.

this period, this metrical tract is one of the best indicators of the rise of *dán díreach*. The tract is contained in the second part of Ádhamh Ó Cianáin's manuscript, NLI MS G 2-3, (G 3) ff. 53-72v, and occurs as part of an eclectic collection of poetic teaching in the manuscript that is representative of poetic thought and theory over many centuries. The collection comprises texts such as *Uraicecht Becc*, a version of *Mittelirische Verslehren* II, eleventh-century material deriving from Priscian,[28] and a variety of poems on metrical matters. Ó Cianáin wrote the manuscript for his own use ('ro sgribh in leabharsa do fen' (ff. 11v, 35v))[29] – seemingly the first recorded instance of such a statement in Irish manuscript tradition – and, typical of such a personal anthology, the poetic material is presented in no discernible order, but is flanked by other matter of interest to a *seanchaidh*: genealogies, traditional lore, wisdom texts, etc. Ó Cianáin's presentation of poetry is generally as in the Book of Magauran, but without the colouring of the initials, and, apart from the *ceann fo eite*, with negligible punctuation.[30]

An Augustinian canon, Ádhamh Ó Cianáin was continuing the ecclesiastical connection with the production of Irish manuscripts, and the contents of his manuscript reflect that continuity also, much of it deriving from pre-Norman sources, as was the case with later manuscripts such as the Leabhar Breac or the Liber Flavus Fergusiorum.[31] In the matter of presentation, this continuity extends to the prognosticatory material in G 2, f. 50, where the presentation of the Kalends on which this material is based, with large decorated 'Kl-' at the start of each paragraph, is imitative of monastic annalistic practice. Also by way of continuation from the pre-Norman manuscripts, G 2-3 contains little by way of bardic praise-poetry in the scribal hand, the nearest being the filler-item on G 3 f. 25r, the lament for Maoileachlainn Mór (†1022) beginning *Dunta in teach ataid na righ*;[32] on the verso of this leaf is a copy of Giolla Brighde Mac Con Midhe's poem beginning *Ceathrur is f[h]éili fuair Flann* which is a non-scribal addition in the later, single-column style. Named authors for the poetry copied by

[28]David Greene, 'A Middle Irish poem on Latin nouns', *Celtica* 2 (1952-54) 278-96.

[29]Further: 'Agus Adhamh O Cianan ro sgribh do fen in lebarsa' (f. 15r); one item of *dindsheanchas* he records as having copied from the book of his great teacher, Seaán Mór Ó Dubhagáin (f. 8r).

[30]So also the genealogical poem written by him in RIA MS 471 (23 O 4), pp. 1-5.

[31]For an overview see Máire Herbert, 'Medieval collections of ecclesiastical and devotional materials: *Leabhar Breac*, *Liber Flavus Fergusiorum* and the Book of Fenagh', in Bernadette Cunningham and Siobhán Fitzpatrick (ed.), *Treasures of the Royal Irish Academy Library* (Dublin 2009) 33-43.

[32]James Carney, 'The Ó Cianáin miscellany', *Ériu* 21 (1969) 122-47: 142-7.

Ó Cianáin are those of the pre-*dán díreach* era of the eleventh and twelfth centuries, such as (eleventh century) Giolla Caoimhghin and 'Fland file o Ronan .i. Fland na marbh', and (twelfth century) Giolla na Naomh úa Duinn and Giolla Modhuda [úa Caiside].

As mentioned already, much of the poetic teaching contained in this manuscript is pre-*dán díreach*. This is true of some of the teaching in metrical format also: for example the poem beginning 'Sloindfead daibh deaghaisdi indana' on the closing leaves of the manuscript, ff. 77v-78r, the subject of Liam Breatnach's paper in the present volume. Other teaching, however, is thought to represent Early Modern developments, such as the tract on the Latin alphabet edited by Anders Ahlqvist,[33] the mnemonic verse edited by Gordon Ó Riain,[34] or the poem on rhyme on ff. 76v-77v, edited by the same scholar, where authorship is ascribed in the final quatrain to Tadhg Ó hUiginn.[35]

To the era of *dán díreach* also belongs the tract on metrical faults mentioned above. The inclusion of this tract as part of the *IGT* canon has led us to associate it with the same act of linguistic, metrical and syntactical re-organisation that gave us the standardized language of *dán díreach*. This may be the case, and the prescriptive nature of the document might encourage us to that conclusion. There is also a sense, however, more so than in any of the other tracts, of *IGT* V acting as a bridge between the pre-bardic and the bardic era in that it connects more with pre-Norman times than with the material covered in *IGT* I-IV.[36] It is noteworthy that, relative to the other tracts, many of the illustrative examples in *IGT* V have defied identification as regards authorship and provenance. The possibility is that the author of this tract drew at least some of this material from the pre-bardic era, and this would go some way to accounting for this lack of identification. We may note also how, in its subject matter, the tract echoes the tenth-century tract on metrical faults known as *Trefocal*,[37] – where, incidentally, authorship of texts is generously acknowledged – and, in its list of metres, the tenth- and

[33]Anders Ahlqvist, 'An Irish text on the letters of the alphabet', in A.M. Simon-Vandenbergen (ed.), *Studies in honour of René Derolez* (Gent 1987) 3-16.

[34]Gordon Ó Riain, 'Early modern technical verse from NLI G 3', *Éigse* 36 (2008) 35-42.

[35]Gordon Ó Riain, 'Early modern technical verse from NLI G 3 (II)', *Celtica* 27 (2013) 55-78.

[36]This, of course, is not to deny the influence of the Auraicept tradition on the later bardic tracts: Ó Cuív, 'Linguistic terminology', 161-2; Anders Ahlqvist, *The early Irish Linguist* (Helsinki 1983) 20-1.

[37]Kaarina Hollo, 'Metrical irregularity in Old and Middle Irish syllabic verse', in Anders Ahlqvist *et al.* (ed.), *Celtica Helingiensia: proceedings from a symposium on Celtic Studies* (Helsinki 1996) 47-56: 50.

eleventh-century tracts published by Thurneysen under the title *Mittelirische Verslehren*,[38] though in many cases with a change in nomenclature.

It is possible therefore that, to some extent at least, we should uncouple *IGT* V from the movement that gave rise to *IGT* I-IV, and recognize that it was possible that individual learned men, operating within the tradition but not necessarily in consort with fellow poets, could have been independently considering the forms and structures of bardic verse in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, and that the tract on metrical faults might be the result of such an individual effort. It happens that in the immediate vicinity of the tract on metrical faults is material displaying an independent strand of bardic thought, specifically in the matter of conjugation.

Following the *IGT* V tract at f. 72va19 is a list of verbal nouns that fills out the remainder of the folio and is continued for a line and two characters on f. 73r, the double columns being abandoned on this folio. The list was published by Brian Ó Cuív in 1966,[39] who omitted to mention that beginning on the second line of f. 73r, immediately after the list of verbal nouns, is another list entitled 'ni dobrighaibh na persand ann seo sís' ('something of the conjugated verbal forms of the verbal noun hereinafter'), now presented below as Appendix 1. This text, which ends on 73v, concentrates exclusively on the substantive verb, listing its Early-Modern forms seriatim. Impersonal forms are arranged, naturally enough, by tense/mood, in the order of past, present, future, secondary future, imperfect, present continuous and imperative. Personal forms are arranged using a complex of ordering principles, the primary one being person and number governed by tense/mood: singular 1 past to imperative, singular 2 past to imperative, singular 3 past to imperative, plural 1 past to imperative, plural 3 past to imperative, plural 2 past to imperative. The general presentation is according to the following categorization: impersonal (*oibrichi anurrdhalta* 'non-finite verbal forms') absolute, excluding subjunctive; personal (*oibrichi urrdhalta* 'finite verbal forms')[40] absolute, excluding subjunctive; conjunct (*diultadhaich*, forms that follow the negative particle) impersonal forms; conjunct personal

[38]Whitley Stokes and Ernst Windisch (ed.), *Irische Texte* III/1 (1891) 1-182.

[39]Brian Ó Cuív, 'A fragment of bardic linguistic tradition', *Éigse* 11/4 (1966) 287-8.

[40]*urrdhalta* and *anurrdhalta* (*DIL* s.vv. *airdalta* and *ainirdalta*) are otherwise unfamiliar to me as grammatical terms; Dr Gordon Ó Riain informs me that they occur in another text in G 3, in the poem beginning *Ca med fhocal féaghtar lend* (ff. 75-6), an edition of which he is currently preparing. Prof. Seán Ó Coileáin suggests to me that we might translate them as 'conjugated' and 'non-conjugated'. The conventional *IGT* terms are *déanmhus neith* (the application of which term is demonstrated in n. 106 below) 'finite', and *neimhinnsgne* 'impersonal'. For other variant terminology from the same period see Ó Riain, 'Technical verse (II)', 55.

forms; subjunctive forms, with impersonal followed by personal, arranged by person and number.

This arrangement is in contrast to the presentation of the substantive verb in *IGT* III.7. Here the forms are ordered solely by tense/mood, with those perceived as correlated (future, present subjunctive; secondary future, past subjunctive; present continuous, present indicative[41]) cited together by person. The absolute and conjunct forms of each person are given together. In further contrast to the G 3 arrangement, the order of tense/mood is: future (with present subjunctive), secondary future (with past subjunctive), present continuous (with present indicative), imperfect, past, and imperative. No more than the G 3 tract, the list of forms is not comprehensive, the author being content to note the conjugational pattern and add 'In aimser sin mar sin', or, in the case of the imperative, to list the forms of the first and third person singular and to observe 'Gan d'ingnad innti acht sin'.

In a lecture delivered many years later than his talk on bardic poetry, Bergin referred to the G 3 conjugational text as follows:

> The earliest attempt known to me to explain the verbal system (Nat. Lib. Ir. MSS. 3) classifies the verb 'to be' according to the persons – 'I was, I shall be, I should be, I used to be, I am' – then the 2nd person sg., then the negative forms – a very awkward arrangement, in which the scribe often loses his place and mixes up the persons. This must have been early abandoned.[42]

It is true that Ó Cianáin does indeed lose his place while writing these forms, perhaps understandably due to the constant repetition of identical preverbs and particles. Yet this arrangement of conjugated forms is not without interest in the context of the reform and codification of the poetic language. Idiosyncrasies are numerous – the terminology for finite and non-finite forms noted above, for instance – and also the order in which the forms of the plural persons are presented: first, third and second. When scribal repetitions are removed, however, and the text is laid out by number and person but in parallel columns as in Appendix 1 below, it can be seen how this arrangement of the conjugation, only marginally more 'awkward' than that of *IGT*, might offer a plausible alternative to the manner of conjugational analysis that achieved the bardic consensus in evidence in *IGT* III.

[41]But not the imperfect and perfect/preterite, which are kept separate.

[42]Osborn Bergin, *The native Irish grammarian: the Sir John Rhŷs Memorial Lecture* (British Academy 1938, separately reprinted Chicago 1969) 11.

It is worth adding that marginal entries, in what appears to be a non-scribal though contemporary hand, preceding and following this short tract, present a more *IGT*-aligned view of the verb in that they correlate present and past subjunctive forms with those of the future and secondary future respectively,[43] while retaining the innovatory terminology for impersonal forms. Because of this correlation between future and present subjunctive, secondary future and past subjunctive, the forms can be arranged by both tense/mood and by person. The exemplary verbal noun (*pearsa*) in the first marginalium (f. 72v, lower margin) is *déanamh*, but the cited forms are now somewhat fragmentary due to the condition of the manuscript. That of the second marginalium (f. 73v lower margin) is clearer, and involves the verb *buailidh*. The forms of the future and secondary future are cited together by person, and their subjunctive derivatives are given overhead:

> Persu oibrigi seo o tig oibreaghudh ⁊ isiad seo na hoibrighi thig uadha ar a d[t]iaghaid suidhighi .i.[44]
>
> [1sg] Buailfead [*above*: dambuailer a .s.[45]] da buailfind. [*above*: dambuailind a .s.]
>
> [2sg] Buailfea [dambuailea a .s.] Da bhuailfidea [dambuailtea a .s.]
>
> [3sg] Buailfidh [dambuailea .s.] da buailfedh. [dambuaileadh a .s.]
>
> [1pl] Buailfeam [dambuaileam a .s.] Da buailfimís. [dambuailmís a s.]
>
> [2pl] Buailfidhi [*above*: dam buail[te]a] Buailfidh sibh [dambuaileadh sibh[46] .a s]
>
> [3pl] Buailfed [dambuailead .s.] Dabuailfidis [dambuaildis .a s.]

[43]Another point of alignment is the use, in the first marginalium, of *gidh cuin* (*gé cuin* in *IGT* III) to generate subjunctive forms; the second uses *dá,* which is what is used in the account of the substantive verb in Appendix 1 here.

[44]'This is a verb noun from which a conjugated form derives and these are the verbal forms that derive from it on which subjunctive forms are based.'

[45]= 'a shuidhiughadh' ('its subjunctive form').

[46]Da*m*buailea *ed*sib MS. The pattern of the paradigm is broken here in that no secondary future form is supplied, rather the analytic form of the future, 2 plural. Dr Caoimhín Breatnach suggests to me that the '⁊' in '*ed*sib' of the subjunctive form may be expuncted by what I take to be a lenition mark on the *d* of 'Buailfidh' immediately below; this would give a reading of 'da mbuailea sibh'.

‡Da oibreaghugh anurdalta ar a tead suidheaghudh ann seo.[47]

Buailfi[dhir] [da mbuailti[r]] Dabuailfidi. [dambuailtea a .s.]

If this entry on G 3 f. 73v is contemporary with the writing of the manuscript, it shows, through its alignment with *IGT*, that the short tract on the forms of the substantive verb can hardly be regarded as proto-bardic. Rather than being an example of a system that was tried and abandoned before the ultimately accepted system was arrived at, what it appears to represent is one grammarian's (or one school's) alternative way of viewing the conjugational system, one that might easily co-exist with what appears to have been the canonical teaching of *IGT* III.

It may be that we should regard the tract on metrical faults in a similar light as the conjugational text that follows it in G 3. Idiosyncrasies, early associations and continuities aside, however, there is no doubting that the metrical tract contains many examples of *dán díreach*. As a token of this, it may be of significance that *IGT* V appears to be the earliest to enunciate the *dán díreach-brúilingeacht* contradistinction, which we find again towards the end of the bardic tradition in the grammars of Ó hEódhasa and Ó hUiginn.[48] In *IGT* V the distinction is made almost casually in §117, where the use of rhymes that occur in *dán díreach*, perfect rhymes in other words, is forbidden in *brúilingeacht*. This casualness suggests that the notion of *dán díreach* may have been in existence for some time, but that what was being addressed by the reformers of the late twelfth century was a redefinition of what it entailed, and a rebranding, as it were, of this strict poetry as the summit of bardic art. Though it could be eclectic in subject matter, having the divine status of the *donum Dei*, as argued by Giolla Brighde Mac Con Midhe,[49] and could be a vital vehicle for *seanchas*, as Giolla Brighde also emphasises, the central characteristic of *dán díreach* was that in form and construction it was strict and uncompromising.

[47]'Two impersonal verbal forms here on which the subjunctive is based.'

[48]Parthalán Mac Aogáin (ed.), *Graiméir Ghaeilge na mBráthar Mionúr* (Dublin 1968) lines 2277-80, 3810-13; it is of interest that Ó hEódhasa compares *metrum* with *dán díreach* and *rithmus* with *óglách*as thus echoing a comparison made in at least one Old-Irish tract: Pádraig A. Breatnach, 'Múnlaí véarsaíocht rithimiúil na Nua-Ghaeilge', in Pádraig de Brún, Seán Ó Coileáin and Pádraig Ó Riain (ed.), *Folia Gadelica: essays presented by former students to R. A. Breatnach* (Cork 1983) 54-71: 67.

[49]Nicholas Williams (ed.), *The poems of Giolla Brighde Mac Con Midhe* (Dublin 1980) Poem XVIII (other editions referenced ibid., 339).

Thematically, the types of poetry represented in *IGT* V, insofar as one can make such deductions based on stray quatrains and half-quatrains, appear to be representative of the varieties of bardic verse with which we are familiar from subsequent centuries. These varieties comprise the usual division into religious (§§ 42, 48, 88, 122-5, 127-8, 136) and secular (*passim*) poems. Extra-*dán díreach* material is manifest, not just in the humorous samples mentioned below, but also in the single citation from what appears to be a Fianaigheacht composition in §23. Such material provides a glimpse of the broader bardic family that, in the later period also, encompassed satiric poetry and occasional verse such as the *dánta grádha*.

Some of the illustrative lines in *IGT* V have the appearance of deriving from lighter, non-encomiastic verse, possibly having even been composed *ad hoc*;[50] as perhaps in the repeated variant half-quatrains illustrative of various points concerning the use of infixed pronouns §§122-5. One might also cite humorous examples such as this:

> Ingnadh mas eadh Tadhg go trom
> is a bhean go hard etrom. (§112)[51]
>
> *It's a wonder indeed that Tadhg is heavy when his wife is tall and light.*

Or this:

> Gilla Mo Chua mo chac dhó
> dha mhac da ua da iarmho. (§128)
>
> *My shit to Giolla Mo Chua, to his son, to his grandson, to his great-grandson.*

Leaving aside possible *ad hoc* confections, we may assume that quite a number of the citations are genuine, some having possibly been deliberately tampered with to illustrate the fault in question, allowing the author subsequently to demonstrate feigned ingenuity in providing the restored or emended lines with the prefixed

[50]See for example Brian Ó Cuív, 'The concepts of "correct" and "faulty" in medieval Irish bardic tradition', in Roland Bielmar and Reinhard Stempel (ed.), *Indogermanica et Caucasica: Festschrift für Karl Horst Schmidt zum 65. Geburtstag* (Berlin and New York 1994) 395-406: 397-8.

[51]This is the culmination of a series of such citations begun in §110 constructed around the personal names, Murchadh, Fearghal, Donnchadh and Tadhg.

formula 'agus is amhlaidh is chóir' ('and it is correct thus');[52] in one instance a correct sample, unrelated to the preceding faulty one, is adduced, prefaced by the expression 'ag seo rand cóir uirri ceana' (§61). If these are genuine examples, it is not surprising that family and tribal names are identifiable among the citations, those to Ó Conchubhair and Clann Chonchubhair being most prevalent.[53] Other references to families include the Í Néill (§§49, 66, 99, 103), Í Bhriain (§89), Í Dhomhnaill (§59),[54] Í Chatháin (§143), Í Dheaghaidh (§149), Í Dhubhda (§135) and Í Fhaoláin (§151). Just as it has been possible in the case of the earlier tracts to suggest identifications of individuals mentioned in metrical citations,[55] or to pinpont references to historical events, such as the sack of Clonmacnoise by the Sionnaigh in 1050,[56] or the battle of Móin Mhór in 1151,[57] so it is hoped that further research will help in producing similar identifications for the citations in *IGT* V. As an aid to this an index is supplied at the end of this paper (Appendix 2).

We are not entirely without indicators, however, with regard to the period of composition of *IGT* V. One such is a half-quatrain quoted in paragraph §105, in faulty and then corrected form, which Gordon Ó Riain has identified as q. 37cd of a poem composed for Maghnus Ó Conchubhair, King of Connacht, who died in 1293.[58] The poem begins *Gach éan mar a adhbha*,[59] and is discussed further below in the context of other poems addressed to the same subject. This identification is clearly of importance for the dating of the tract in question.

Another indicator is to be found among the Scottish material present in the tract. The research of Thomas Owen Clancy has produced plausible identifications in the case of some of this material.[60] The presence of such

[52]For example §§25, 27, 37, 56-7, 59-60, 64-7, 70-1, 79, 82, 93, 97, 99-105, 108, 118-25, 128, 135-6, 149. Variants of this expression are: 'agus is edh ba choir ann' §25; 'agus is amhlaidh is coir in leathrand ele' (§99), 'agus is i in choir' (§123), 'agus is amlaidh budh coir' (§128).

[53]§§13, 39, 76 (Clann Chréidhe), 77, 80, 82, 120.

[54]The most popular forename is Domhnall (see Appendix 2 below), and some of these references might be expected to refer to the Í Dhomhnaill.

[55]Donncha Ó hAodha, 'The first Middle Irish metrical tract', in Hildegard L.C. Tristram (ed.), *Metrik und Medienwechsel: Metrics and media* (Tübingen 1991) 207-44: 226-41.

[56]Caitilín Ní Maol-Chróin's proposal ('Macalla as Cluain-Mhac-Nóis A.D. 1050', *Galvia* 1 (1954) 15-17) referred to in Gerard Murphy, *Early Irish metrics* (Dublin 1961) 71.

[57]John V. Kelleher, 'The Battle of Móin Mhór, 1151', *Celtica* 20 (1988) 11-27.

[58]Gordon Ó Riain, 'Some identifications of citations in the grammatical tracts', *Éigse* 36 (2008) 215-16: 215. A citation from this poem in the declensional tract (*IGT* II) is identified in Damian McManus, 'The Irish grammatical and syntactical tracts: a concordance of duplicated and identified citations', *Ériu* 48 (1997) 83-101: 95.

[59]Láimhbheartach Mac Cionnaith (ed.), *Dioghluim Dána* (Dublin 1938) Poem 98; L. McKenna, 'Poem to Maghnus Ó Conchobhair', *Irish Monthly* 49 (1921) 288-92.

[60]Thomas Owen Clancy, 'A Gaelic polemic quatrain from the reign of Alexander I, ca. 1113', *Scottish Gaelic Studies* 20 (2000) 88-96.

content is not surprising when we consider that two of the major poets of the early thirteenth century — Muireadhach Ó Dálaigh and Giolla Brighde (surname uncertain)[61] — attracted the sobriquet 'Albanach': ample evidence that the interaction between *dán díreach* poets of the two nations was well under way by the thirteenth century.

Scottish subjects are referred to in a relatively significant number of citations in *IGT* V. These include references to Connacht being raided from Mull (§81), to the death of an unidentified Donnchadh being reported in Ireland and in Scotland (§85), and possible references to Lennox (§70) and Arran (§101). Two further Scottish references are equally intriguing, as Dr Clancy suggests that they may refer to datable historic events or personalities. One of these citations invokes two Scottish royal Christian names in referring to a son of Malcolm, a *mac ríogh*, acting to the poet's detriment in respect of one Alexander:

> Olc a ndearna mac Mael Colaim
> ar cosaid re hAlaxandair
> do-ní le gach mac righ romhaind
> foghail ar farasAlbain. (§57)
>
> *The son of Mael Colaim acted badly in complaining us to Alaxandair; with every king's son before us he preys on ancient Scotland.*

This has been interpreted by Dr Clancy as referring to David son of Malcom and brother of Alexander I of Scotland. Clancy dates the quatrain to *c.* 1113.

The second citation is still more enigmatic:

> A meic Ruaidri a ri na n-oilen
> is ur gruadh
> alainn do chul tar do choler
> duid is dual. (§56)
>
> *Mac Ruaidhrí, king of the isles, fresh of face, comely is your hair [flowing] over your collar, it is natural for you.*[62]

[61]Gerard Murphy, 'Two Irish poems written from the Mediterranean in the thirteenth century', *Éigse* 7/2 (1953) 71-9; Brian Ó Cuív, 'A poem for Cathal Croibhdhearg Ó Conchubhair', *Éigse* 13/3 (1970) 195-202.

[62]Translation of this and preceding quatrain is by the present writer. Translations also appear in Thomas Owen Clancy (ed.), *The triumph tree: Scotland's earliest poetry* (Edinburgh 1998) 184,

The reference to a son of Ruaidhrí, or indeed to a Mac Ruaidhrí, being a 'king of the islands', is tantalisingly suggestive of the short-lived Clann Ruaidhrí, whose eponym was a grandson of Somerled, Rí Innse Gall (d. 1164), and some of whom supplied *gallóglaigh* to the Í Chonchubhair.[63] Between the early thirteenth century and the middle of the fourteenth, when the clan were terminally eclipsed by their cousins the Clann Domhnaill, the Clann Ruaidhrí, it appears, vied successfully on more than one occasion for the title once held by Somerled.[64] If we can discount the possibility that these citations from *Gach éan mar a adhbha* and from the Scottish material might be later additions – and they do not appear as such in G 3[65] – it may be that we have here confirmation of a thirteenth-century date, or even an early fourteenth-century one, for the compilation of *IGT* V.

***

Another reason for the difficulty in identifying citations in *IGT* V may be the amount of them that are drawn from non-mainstream or non-dominant bardic metres. This contrasts with the poetry surviving from the time the tract may have been composed. Among the hundred or so poems in *dán díreach* that survive from the thirteenth century, 56 per cent are in *deibhidhe*, 18.5 per cent are in *séadna* and 16.5 per cent in *rannaigheacht* metres.[66] In *IGT* V, however, while *deibhidhe* (47%), *rannaigheacht* (13.5%) and *séadna* (12%) are still prominent, others such as *deachnadh* and *casbhairdne* metres feature at 7 and 3.5 per cent respectively, and short-line metres (of six syllables or less) together amount to 17 per cent of the total.

That the relatively high proportion of short metres in the tract was not merely an academic inheritance or a continuation from earlier poetic teaching is shown by a sequence of nine poems that has not featured in previous discussion of thirteenth-century Irish poetry. They are addressed to Maghnus Ó Conchubhair, King of Connacht, who died in 1293. The poems in this

309; the 'mac Ruaidhrí' referred to in another citation (§59), however, *pace* Clancy ('Polemic quatrain', 88) appears to refer to an Irish subject.

[63]W. D. H. Sellar, 'MacDonald and MacRuairi Pedigrees in MS 1467', *West Highland Notes & Queries* First Series, 28 (1986) 3-15: 4.

[64]K. A. Steer and J. W. Bannerman, *Late medieval monumental sculpture in the West Highlands* (Edinburgh 1977) 202-4.

[65]It should be observed however that sections of the text in G 3 display corruption (Bergin, 'Metrical faults', 259 n. 1), a token perhaps of an active textual tradition prior to Ó Cianáin's copy that in theory might permit of the accrual of citations to a canonical text.

[66]See n. 16 above.

sequence, of which I have recently presented a preliminary edition,[67] all have short-line metres. They are constructed with lines of two syllables ('aisdi is lughu sa dan' in the words of *IGT* V, §92), three, four, five and six, and one poem in a metre that combines alternating lines of six and five syllables. These poems are all in *dán díreach*, and with the exception of the last mentioned, can all be referred to named metres in *IGT* V, as follows:

Poem 1 (6 qq.) $4^3 + 4^3$: 'creitgearr' or 'rathnua gearr' (*IGT* V.71)

Poem 2 (5 qq.) $3^2 + 3^2$: 'uirmeadhach bheag' (*IGT* V.70)

Poem 3 (5 qq.) $2^1 + 21$: 'mael caem' (*IGT* V.92)

Poem 4 fragmentary

Poem 5 (11 qq.) $4^1 + 4^1$: 'deoch fhileadh mhóir' (*IGT* V.68)

Poem 6 (8 qq.) $4^2 + 4^2$: 'deoch fhileadh bhig' (*IGT* V.67)

Poem 7 (11 qq.) $6^3 + 6^3$: 'rathnua mhór' (*IGT* V.66)[68]

Poem 8 (7 qq.) $5^3 + 5^3$: 'rathnua' (*IGT* V.65)

Poem 9 (10 qq., incomplete?) $6^3 + 5^2$: 'aí fhreisligi for dechnad'[69]

This collection demonstrates that the inclusion of so much detail on short-line metres in *IGT* V was far from being an antiquarian or backward-looking exercise. On the evidence of this sequence, such metres, although rare in the bardic era, were far from extinct by the end of the thirteenth century, and could be invoked by poets employing full *dán díreach*.

The poems are found uniquely in two adjacent folios (possibly a bifolium) of Advocates MS 72.1.25 (ff. 21-2) a vellum manuscript of otherwise devotional content, contained within vellum wrappers on which mainly medical material was written.[70] The acephalous text of 'Sdair Fiarfaidhi San Selm' with which

[67]'Maghnus Ó Conchubhair, Rí Connacht (1288-1293): blogh dá dhuanaire', in Seán Ó Coileáin, Liam P. Ó Murchú and Pádraigín Riggs (ed.), *Séimhfhear suairc: aistí in ómós don Ollamh Breandán Ó Conchúir* (An Daingean 2013) 679-704.

[68]The end word in q. 2c in this poem should probably be emended from *talmhaidhe* to *tolmhaidhe*.

[69]Murphy, *Early Irish metrics*, §55.

[70]See the description by Ronald Black that accompanies the digital images of this manuscript on ISOS (www.isos.dias.ie). Ff. 21-2, in addition to being badly stained, have also suffered damage by having been cut away in places, so that there is some loss of text, particularly in the case of the fourth poem, which is the merest fragment of fifteen words or parts of words, rendering it impossible for the text to be restored. Where damage to the vellum impinges on the other poems, however, it has been possible, in most cases, to restore the text or to suggest readings.

72.1.25 proper begins, provides a *terminus a quo* for the manuscript in that this text is thought to be of fourteenth-century date.[71] Indeed, if Edward Gwynn was correct in his suggestion – which appears to be a long shot – that the Seaán Ó Conchubhair mentioned in the manuscript sources as the translator of this text was he of the Clann Mhuircheartaigh who was killed in battle in 1391, this would prove an extraordinarily coincidental link with the poems discussed here.[72] Given its exclusively pre-fifteenth-century content, it is not unlikely that Advocates 72.1.25 may be dated to the fifteenth century. If so, together with British Library MS Additional 19,995, it is among the earliest sources for the poetry of Giolla Brighde Mac Con Midhe, as two poems ascribed to him directly precede the sequence of poems being discussed here, at ff. 18r and 19v.[73]

It is noteworthy, furthermore, that the manner in which the poetry is presented in Advocates MS 72.1.25 contrasts with the earliest presentation of bardic verse, that in the Mág Shamhradháin manuscript, and with that of verse in Ó Cianáin's G 2-3, as well as in other manuscripts. In 72.1.25 the poems (including those by Giolla Brighde) are written continuously in single column across the page, with end-of-line punctuation, and the division between verses indicated only by the initial of the verse being in majuscule. Decoration is confined to two rudimentary initials (ff. 8v and 18r), and there is no colouring. Comparison with Additional 19,995, where layout is mixed, suggests that continuous writing could be a space- and vellum-saving procedure.

The subject of these poems, Maghnus (mac Conchubhair) Ó Conchubhair, is said to have banished his brother and predecessor as King of Connacht, Cathal mac Conchubhair Ruaidh, in 1288, and ruled for five and a half years from then until his death in 1293. In these poems, however, he is referred to as both *mac ríogh* and *ríoghdhamhna*,[74] and also, on two occasions, as *mac*

[71]R.A.Q. Skerrett, 'Fiarfaidhi San Anselmuis', *Celtica* 7 (1966) 163-87.

[72]Edward Gwynn, 'The manuscript known as the Liber Flavus Fergusiorum', *PRIA* 26 (1906-7) 15-41: 15. However, the suggestion by Gwynn (ibid., p. 16) that the 'maghnuis meic mathgamna' mentioned in the Liber Flavus II (RIA 23 O 48 (b)), f. 14vb34-5 was also of the Í Chonchubhair is negated by his designation there as 'adbur ridh oirgiall'. Robin Flower (*The Irish tradition* (Oxford 1947) 126-7) gives the date of Seaán Ó Conchubhair's death as 1405; cf. *BMus. Cat.* II, 532-3. See Nollaig Ó Muraíle, 'Athchuairt ar lámhscríbhinní Chonnacht' in Ruairí Ó hUiginn (ed.) *Oidhreacht na lámhscríbhinní* Léachtaí Cholm Cille 34 (Maynooth 2004) 28-104: 55-6.

[73]Williams, *Poems of Giolla Brighde Mac Con Midhe*, Poems XX and XXI.

[74]The terms are not identical: see Katharine Simms, *From kings to warlords: the changing political structure of Gaelic Ireland in the later Middle Ages* (Woodbridge and Wolfeboro 1987) 53-4, 57-8.

Í Chonchubhair, indicating that the poems date from earlier than 1288. This designation 'mac Í Chonchubhair' possibly reflects fluidity, if not uncertainty, in the Connacht succession, as it is contrary to other historical evidence that has suggested that Maghnus's brother, Cathal, was the first of this branch to be Ó Conchubhair (and King of Connacht) and that their father did not hold that title.[75] The branch in question was the Clann Mhuircheartaigh, about whom Katharine Simms has published a definitive account.[76] The eponymous Muircheartach (Muimhneach) was a brother of Cathal Croibhdhearg, and grandfather of the Maghnus Ó Conchubhair of the poems discussed here. The Clann Mhuircheartaigh were remarkable in that they appear to have led a nomadic existence – having been banished to Roscommon from their patrimony in north Mayo in the 1270s – but yet they succeeded in providing five Kings of Connacht between 1280 and 1343. Rather like the Clann Shamhradháin, the Clann Mhuircheartaigh slip into obscurity during the 15th century.

This nine-poem sequence, then, in so much as it refers to a future King of Connacht, and is datable roughly to the third quarter of the thirteenth century, is located in the period immediately following the reformation of the poetic language, and is located also in the region of Connacht where, as suggested above, it is possible that the reformation was effected.

As an example of the type of poem in this collection we may look at the second poem in the sequence:[77]

1 Mian Maghnuis
a mholadh:
linn leabhur
Chinn Chorudh.

2 Sruth Sionna,
slat Gháilli,
fear fíri,
geal ngáire.

[75]See, for instance, the genealogical table in F.J. Byrne *et al.* (ed.), *A new history of Ireland* IX (Oxford 1989) 158.

[76]Katharine Simms, 'A lost tribe – the Clan Murtagh O'Conors', *Journal of the Galway Archaeological Society* 53 (2001) 1-22.

[77]Ó Coileáin *et al.*, *Séimhfhear suairc*, 688.

3 Bha chonair
Chuinn cheólaigh
grádh Gaoidhil,
lán leómhain.

4 Fraoch fíochdha,
laoch Luachru,
sgath sgiamhtha,
cath Cruachna.

5 Barr báighi
clann Chréidhi:
uaill fhíri
is chruaidh céimi.

1. Maghnus's desire is to be praised: the slender pool of Ceann Coradh. 2. Current of the Sionna, hero of Gáille, righteous man, bright of laughter. 3. Throughout the path of melodious Conn [he is] the darling of [every] Gaoidheal, leonine perfection. 4. Furious rage, hero of Luachair, beautiful flower, battalion of Cruacha. 5. A martial acme [is] the progeny of Créidh: righteous pride that is severe in action.

The poem occupies three lines on the manuscript page, and is fairly typical of the collection as a whole. The metre is $3^2 + 3^2$, called *anair* in the early metrical tracts (number 40 in Murphy's *Early Irish metrics*) and *uirmheadhach bheag* in *IGT* V. There is end rhyme between *b* and *d*. There is internal rhyme in *cd* and also in *ab* in quatrains 4 and 5 where the linking alliteration between the opening two lines of quatrains 1-3 is absent.[78] Assonance is regular between *bcd* and is also present in line *a* of quatrains 4 and 5.

The short-line metres and the relative brevity of the poems – a feature that goes against the general trend of bardic verse, and one that would have gladdened the heart of Osborn Bergin – give the verses in the collection an epigrammatic quality. This stand-alone quality of many of the verses is, of course, in accordance with many verses from the more mainstream poetry,

[78]Note also the cross-line elision in q. 5d.

and underlines the nature of individual quatrains as the building-blocks of bardic verse. We may cite this example from the first poem:

> Dán deaghdhuine
> deoch dhaghbhlasa:
> cuirn choimhdheasa
> muirn Mhaghnusa.[79]
>
> *A good person's poem is a good-tasting drink: Maghnus's feast [consists of] equally pleasant goblets.*

A similar example comes from the third poem. As noted above, it is in what the author of *IGT* V considered the shortest metre in *dán*, and the metre is called 'ábacht rannaigechta' ('a mockery of *rannaigheacht*' or perhaps 'jocular *rannaigheacht*') in *Mittelirische Verslehren*.[80] This is a very neatly constructed verse with two *aicill* rhymes, two end rhymes and alliteration in every line.

> Maith mhór,
> clódh cealg,
> cosg creach,
> dreach dhearg.[81]
>
> *Great good, averting plots, preventing raids, red countenance.*

The themes and motifs of the longer *deibhidhe* and *rannaigheacht* poems of the *dán díreach* tradition are also to be found in this collection. Three examples may be cited here. The first is taken again from poem number 1, and articulates the common motif of the maintenance of law and order during the reign of the just king:

> Ní bheanfaidhear
> fán Bhanbhasa
> craobh choillmheasa
> ag maor Mhaghnusa.[82]

[79]Ó Coileáin *et al.*, *Séimhfhear suairc*, 687.
[80]Murphy, *Early Irish metrics*, § 41.
[81]Ó Coileáin *et al.*, *Séimhfhear suairc*, 689.
[82]Ibid., 687; note cross-line elision in *d* again here (n. 78 above).

There will not be hewn around this Banbha a bough of wood-mast because of Maghnus's steward.

The second example is taken from poem number 5, and expresses the staple theme of the patron rewarding the poets. The metre of the poem is called 'deoch fhileadh mhóir' in *IGT* V §68, and 'trian rannaigechta móire' in the earlier tracts. In the matter of internal rhymes, end rhymes, assonance and alliteration, it is altogether a perfect piece of poetry:

Budh ceann fear bhfann
an geal seang séimh,
díolfaidh gach duain
an ríoghthuir réidh,
Maghnus an mhaoin
chabhrus gach cléir.[83]

He will lead the weak, the bright slender gentle one, he will pay for every poem, the royal steady pillar, Maghnus is the wealth that helps every poet.

A recurring theme in the poems is that of Tara being prophesied for Maghnus. It is the sole theme in the seventh poem from which this third example is taken:

Teamhair teach Maghnusa
maighi guirm gealUisnigh;
gan fhear 'na oireasbhaidh:
a theagh an Teamhairsin.[84]

Teamhair is the house of Maghnus of the green plain of fair Uisneach; no man wants on his account: his house is that Teamhair.

Thematic repetition is accompanied by a continuity of style across the collection of poems. This is in part a function of the short lines, as the single distinguishing stylistic feature is the litany of complimentary phrases and epithets that pervades the poems from practically beginning to end. The first poem sets the scene by establishing the themes of peace and realised

[83]Ibid., 690.
[84]Ibid., 694.

prophesy, and especially by comparing Maghnus's wealth to a feast of poems (in the quatrain quoted above). The poems that follow may then be taken as exemplifying this feast, taking their cue from the opening lines of the second poem, 'Mian Maghnuis / a mholadh'. What follows is a litany of praise continuing from poem to poem and, along the way, encompassing standard topoi such as resistance to foreigners and generosity to poets, in addition to those already listed above.

This homogeneity of form, style and substance leads us to consider the nature of this collection, and the question of authorship. For not alone are the poems short and litany-laden, but not once is an author cited for any of the poems in the sequence. It may be that the cropping of the first folio has resulted in the loss of other poems, on one of which, perhaps, an ascription may have been visible; this must be a consideration, given that the two Giolla Brighde poems carry almost identical ascriptions ('Gilla bridi mac con mighi') inserted by the scribe. If there was an ascription, it is also curious that there are no *idem*-ascriptions to indicate a continuity of authorship; the type used in the two instances in the Book of Magauran is not 'an fer céadna' but rather 'Mael Pádraig Mac Naimhin fós' (Poem 22) and 'Niall Ó hUiginn fós' (Poem 26).[85] In addition it should be noted that all the poems in the sequence have *dúnadh* with the exception of the fragmentary fourth poem and the final poem, which leads us to suspect that the sequence is both acephalous and incomplete.

We can talk therefore about nine individual poems, in nine different metres, seven of the poems containing *dúnadh*, a feature that generally marks the explicit in medieval Irish poetry, more often than not, as here, reinforced by the scribal practice of emphasising the explicit by repetition of the *dúnadh*. This feature, however, can also on occasion serve to mark the end of a section rather than the end of the entire poem, sometimes even signalling a change in authorship.[86] An alternative view of the collection therefore is that of sixty-three verses, excluding the fragment, broken up into a number of components distinguished by changes in metre. Bearing in mind that Bergin remarked in his lecture on bardic poetry that 'the poets *could* have mixed up their metres . . . But they never did so',[87] the question is: have we to do with a series of self-contained, individual poems, each with a distinct metre, or a long, continuous poem made up of many distinct parts?

[85]Cf. Rawlinson B 502, f. 60r: 'Cainneach beos do righi in northainseo'.
[86]Pádraig Ó Macháin, *Téacs agus údar i bhfilíocht na scol* (Dublin 1998) 11-12.
[87]Bergin, 'Bardic poetry', 12.

Any answer to this question must take into account the third poem in the sequence:

1 Mac ríogh,
riar sluagh,
réim ríogh
díol duan.

2 Réir ghall,
barr Breagh,
flaith fial,
grian gheal.

3 Maith mhór,
clódh cealg,
cosg creach,
dreach dhearg.

4 Arm uigh,
tarbh trúigh
tréin, céim
áigh lúidh.

5 Conn cian,
biadh, brat,
folt fionn,
mionn mac.[88]

1. A king's son, maintenance of hosts, the way of a king [is] paying for poems. 2. Subduing foreigners, summit of Breagha, generous prince, bright sun. 3. Great good, averting plots, preventing raids, red countenance. 4. Pointed weapon, bull of weak [and] strong, swift deed of battle. 5. Conn of yore, food [and] clothes, fair hair, darling of youths.

This poem contains no reference whatsoever to Maghnus. Were it not for the context in which it occurs, one would be forgiven for thinking that it was a poem about some unspecified Conn, who is of course Conn Céadchathach,

[88]Ó Coileáin *et al.*, *Séimhfhear suairc*, 689; metrical peculiarities in the poem are mentioned ibid., 684-5.

a prominent figure in Maghnus's genealogy. This suggests that, rather than being distinct entities, we have to do with a sequence of linked poetic components probably by a single author, and hence the absence of any *idem*-ascriptions.

This brings us back to the question of authorship, and to possible candidates for originating this set of texts. It happens that we are not without some guidance in the matter, however, as other poems survive with connections to Maghnus Ó Conchubhair, which provide some context for the poems we have been looking at. The first that may be mentioned is a poem in the Mág Shamhradháin *duanaire* addressed to Brian Mág Shamhradháin (who died in 1298). It is the second poem in the manuscript and a long series of dedicatory quatrains at the end of the poem is concluded by one (II.56) to 'Maghnus Cruachan', whom we can take to be our Maghnus Ó Conchubhair. This poem, which begins *D'uaislibh taoiseach Banbha Brian*, is ascribed in the manuscript to Tadhg Ó hUiginn, who is associated with the poet of the same name whose death is recorded in 1315; referred to as 'saoi i ndán' ('a learned poet') by the Four Masters, and 'sai chotchend cech cerdi da mbenand re filidecht' ('a general master of all arts connected with poetry') by the Annals of Connacht.[89]

It is probable that he is also identical to Tadhg Mór Ó hUiginn, to whom later manuscripts ascribe two other poems that are of relevance here. The first is the poem already referred to above as being quoted in *IGT* V. It begins *Gach éan mar a adhbha*, and is preserved in two seventeenth-century Ó Cléirigh manuscripts.[90] It is a poem in praise of Maghnus Ó Conchubhair, presumably pre-1288 as he is not accorded his title as chief of his name. The poem deals in particular with Maghnus's martial rearing and the figure he cuts astride his horse. Of especial relevance to us here is, firstly that the poem is not in one of the dominant bardic metres, but rather in *rionnaird*, $6^2 + 6^2$; and, secondly, that it is divided in three sections, each with its own *dúnadh*.

The poem consists of forty-two quatrains in total, and is divided into three self-contained units: qq. 1-9, 10-26, 27-42. The first unit expounds on the adage in the first line, 'Gach éan mar a adhbha' – loosely, 'every bird behaves according to his breeding'[91] – leading to another adage (q. 8), 'gach macaomh mar mhúintear' ('every warrior is as he is trained'),[92] which makes

[89]*AFM* III, 504; *AC*, 240.

[90]RIA MS 137 (23 N 28) pp. 34-6 (Cúchoigcríche Ó Cléirigh); MS 1080 (B iv 2) ff. 94-5 (Míchéal Ó Cléirigh).

[91]Cf. T. F. O'Rahilly, *A miscellany of Irish proverbs* (Dublin 1922) 4-5 (§13).

[92]This quatrain is quoted on the recto of the vellum front flyleaf of the Book of Ballymote (RIA MS 536 (23 P 12) p. 1).

the connection with Maghnus, 'mac Conchobhair Charna' (q. 9), before closing with a repetition of the first line. The second section consists of an exposition of the martial education received by Maghnus, and of the hardship he endured as part of that, a commonplace topos is bardic verse, usually signalling the subject's struggle to gain the leadership of his clan. It begins and is closed with the word *Maghnus*. The third section – beginning with *Maghnus* but closing on *Mághach* in order to echo the opening line of the poem – focuses on praise of Maghnus and of his horse through comparison of him and the horse to mythical and historical predecessors, in a manner stylistically similar to the eighth poem in the sequence.[93]

The second poem ascribed to Tadhg Mór that has connections to Maghnus is one to his daughter, Fionnghuala, called in the poem 'inghean Í Chonchubhair', which dates it to the period from the beginning of Maghnus's reign in 1288 to the date of Fionnghuala's death in 1310. It survives in a single copy in a once sizeable seventeenth-century anthology of bardic poetry.[94] The poem begins *Slán fát fholcadh* and is a masterpiece of description of the beauty of a woman.[95] The poem is metrically noteworthy, being in a non-mainstream measure of $4^2 + 8^3$, which McKenna may be correct in associating with the *ollbhairdne* metre.

Unlike *Gach éan mar a adhbha*, this poem does not appear to be formally segmented, though it can be divided into a description of Fionnghuala after her bath, literally from head to toe (qq. 1-24), followed by genealogical and literary comparisons (25-8), her hospitable home (29-33), and ending with her generosity to poets (34-41):

> Dual ót athair
> a Fhionnghuala, a fholt maoithghleannach,
> bheith ag díol dámh,
> an fíon 's an dán do dhaoircheannach. (q. 35)
>
> *'Tis right for thee, thy father's daughter, o soft-tressed Fionnghuala,*
> *to be rewarding poets, to pay generously for wine and song.*[96]

[93]Ó Coileáin *et al.*, *Séimhfhear suairc*, 696.

[94]RIA MS 743 (A iv 3) pp. 648-52.

[95]Mac Cionnaith, *Dioghluim Dána*, Poem 114; L. McKenna, 'Poem to Fionnghuala, daughter of Maghnus Ó Conchobhair', *Irish Monthly* 48 (1920) 163-7. A citation from this poem in the declensional and conjugational tracts (*IGT* II and III) is identified in Damian McManus, 'The Irish grammatical and syntactical tracts: a concordance of duplicated and identified citations', *Ériu* 48 (1997) 83-101: 97.

[96]McKenna's translation (*Irish Monthly* 48 (1920) 166).

There are other prosodic features of these poems to Maghnus and his daughter – such as the occurrence of *conchlann* and in both poems, and the use of enjambment between verses in *Gach éan mar a adhbha* – that are also found in the Maghnus collection being discussed here. Taken together with the affiliation of the poet with Maghnus as evidenced in the dedicatory quatrain in the Book of Magauran, there is enough in these circumstantial details to suggest that Tadhg Ó hUiginn may also be the author of these short poems here, possibly the same Tadhg mentioned in the internal, authorial ascription of the poem on rhyme in Ádhamh Ó Cianáin's MS G 2-3 (note 35 above).

***

What is generally known of the *dán díreach* tradition in the era immediately following the reformation of the poetic language is usually extrapolated from the surviving poetry of the thirteenth century, which Osborn Bergin did much to elucidate through his editions of Muireadhach Albanach's poetry in particular. It was Bergin also who edited the metrical tract from Ádhamh Ó Cianáin's manuscript, published posthumously as *IGT* V. It would appear from the internal evidence alluded to above that the composition of that tract may have been almost contemporary with the writing of MS G 2-3. As Brian Ó Cuív demonstrated, the language of *dán díreach* was drawn from that of the second half of the twelfth century, and involved 'the formal adoption of vernacular speech as the basis for a new literary standard'.[97] If the evidence of the poems to Maghnus Ó Conchubhair and of the short tract on the substantive verb is put with it, what these texts and other material in G 2-3 show is that the reformation of the language towards the end of the twelfth century did not put an end to bardic thought or theory nor constitute a huge rift with what preceded it. The tract on the substantive verb is evidence that there was more than one way in which the bardic standard might be analysed and presented; and *IGT* V demonstrates that the metrical situation continued to reflect, in albeit a stricter and more formal dress, a variety that had existed from the Old Irish period. That few poets thought to exploit that variety is probably due to a consensus concerning what metres were most appropriate to the poet's craft in the Early-Modern era. The author of the poems mentioned above, possibly Tadhg Ó hUiginn, stands out however in demonstrating that the themes and motifs of bardic verse could be as decorously expressed in alternative metres.[98]

[97]Brian Ó Cuív, 'The linguistic training of the medieval Irish poet', *Celtica* 10 (1973) 114-40: 130.

[98]I am grateful to the editors and to Dr Gordon Ó Riain for helpful comments on this paper. In its final form it has benefited greatly from the opinion of my colleague, Prof. Seán Ó Coileáin.

Appendix 1: conjugation of the substantive verb from NLI MS G 3, f. 73r2-73v15[99]

ni dobrighaibh na persand ann seo sís[100]

	[impersonal]
Past	dabas
Present	
Future	bethear
Second. fut.	dabeithea
Imperfect	dabithea
Present continuous	bithear
Verbal of necessity	as beti

Oibrichi anurrdhalta Na hoibrichi urrdhalta o so amach .i.[101]

	[1sg]	[2sg]	[3sg]
Past	dobadhus	dabhadais	dabhi
Present		atai[102]	ata[103]
Future	biad	bia	biadh[104]
Second. fut.	dobend	dobeithea	dabiadh
Imperfect	dobhind	dobithe	dabidh
Present cont.	bim[105]	bi	bidh
Imperative	bir	bi[106]	bid
	[1pl]	**[3pl]**	**[2pl]**
Past	dobhamar	dabadar	
Present	atam	ataid	

[99]The forms given below are reproduced as in the manuscript, with the omission of hair-strokes.

[100]'Something of the conjugated verbal forms of the verbal noun hereinafter.'

[101]'The impersonal verbal forms [heretofore]. The personal verbal forms henceforth, i.e.'

[102]Repetition of seven verbal forms occurs after this (f. 73r7-8).

[103]Transposed with next form (*biadh*) f. 73r10.

[104]*Recte* biaidh

[105]Followed by superscript *b* drawing attention to repetition in the next line, where a corresponding *b* occurs.

[106]The 2sg present cont. and imperative forms are distinguished in the text at this point by the following statement: '.i. dani beth and ⁊ dena beth and' ('that is: you are there [lit. 'you do being there'], and be there [lit. 'do being there']').

Future	bemid	bed	beithi
Second. fut.	do bemis	dabedis	dobiadh sibh
Imperfect	dabimis	dabidis	dobidh sibh
Present cont.	bimid	bid	bithi
Imperative	bim	bid[107]	bidh

A ndiultadhaich andso na ndiaidh[108]

	[impersonal]
Past	nirabhais[109]
Present	nifuiltear
Future	nibeathear
Second. fut.	nibhethea
Imperfect	nibhithe
Present cont.	nibithear
Part. necess.	ni bethi[110]

	[1sg]	**[2sg]**	**[3sg]**
Past	niraba[111]	nirabhadhais	niraibhi
Present	nifuilim	nifhuili[112]	nifuil
Future	nibhiu	nibhia	nibhia
Second. fut.	nibhend	nibethe	nibiad
Imperfect	nibin[113]	nibitea	ni bhidh
Present cont.	nibim	nibi	nibhi
Imperative	nabir	nabi	nabidh

	[1pl]	**[3pl]**	**[2pl]**
Past	nirabhamar		nirabhabhar
Present	nifhuilmid		nifuilti

[107]*Dabadur* and *atad* repeated here.
[108]'Their negative forms here following them.'
[109]Sic: *recte* rabhas.
[110]Sic: *recte* beti.
[111]This is 1sg past depend. of *do bhá* (not of *dobadhas* as given above in the absolute paradigm
[112]'ní-' at end of line (but hyphen missing in other instances).
[113]Sic: *recte* níbínn.

Future	nibhiam	nibhiad	nibethi
Second. fut.	nibemis	nibhedis	nibiadh sibh
Imperfect	ni bimis[114]	nibidis	nibidh sibh
Present. cont.		nibid	nibhithi
Imperative	nabim[115]	nabid	nabhidh [*sic*]

Suidhichthi nanoibricheadh.c.na and so[116]

	Present	**Past**
Impersonal	darabhtar dambethear	
1sg	daber[117] darabhur	dambend
2sg	dambeas[118] darabhais	dambethe
3sg	dambé darabh	dambeith
1pl	dambem darabum	dambemis
3pl	dambead darabad	dambedis
2pl	dambethi darabhthai	dambeth sibh

beth. persu nanoibriughudhsa anuas uili[119]

[114] 'Nibind nibhenn' repeated here.
[115] 'nirabhamar nifhuilmid' repeated here.
[116] 'Subjunctives of the same verbal forms here.'
[117] *Recte* dá mber.
[118] *Recte* dá mbeis? Cf. *IGT* III.7, n. 33.
[119] '*beth* is the verbal noun of all these verbal forms above.'

Appendix 2: index of personal names, tribal names and placenames in IGT V

Personal Names

Ádhamh 117
Alaxandair 57
Amhalghaidh 53
Aodh 15, 17, 25, (Aodh Eamhna) 70, (Aodh Almhaine) 71
Aonghus 59
Arann 101
Art 15
Bairrfhionn 49
Blad 98
Brian 15, (B. mac Bairrfhinne) 49, (Brian Máighe) 89
Cas 98
Cathal, *see* Ó Cuirín
Ceallach 15, *see also* Ó Cuilín
Cearbhall 11, 68
Cian (clann C.) 99
Coimdhe (in C.) 48, 136
Colla 98
Colmán (cineadh C.) 121
Conaire (críoch C.) 86
Conchobhar 7, 83; clann Chonchobhair 39, 77, 80, 120
Conghal Claon 25
Conn 74, 98, (cró C.) 109, 140, *see also* Leath Cuinn
Créidh (clann C.) 76
Cú [Chulainn] (Cú na Cearda) 50
Cú Maighe 143 n. 3
Cú Mara 9
Cú Uladh 22, 34
Cumhall 23
Dáire 76
Dia 122-5, 127-8, 150
Diarmaid 12
Domhnall 12, 55, (D. óg) 66, (D. Dubh) 43, 67, 80, 108, 109, 140, 149 (*bis*)
Donn 41
Donnchadh 85, 89, 110, 140
Duí (ó Duach) 98
Dúnlaing 99
Éimhear 98
Éireamhón (Inis E.) 144
Fearghal 110, 113
Giolla mo Chua 128
Giolla na Naomh 15
Íomhar 15
Laighin 86
Lí 150, *see also* Trágh Lí
Mac Ruaidhrí *see* Ruaidhrí
Manann (magh M.) 86, 101
Manannán 86
Maol Colaim (mac M. C.) 57
Maol Mheadha 128
Martain 145
Mathghamhain (mac M.) 45
Meadhbh (magh M.) 81
Mogh 98, *see also* Leath Mogha
Mongán 119
Muire (mac M.) 42, 88, 145
Muireadhach (mac M.) 41
Murchadh 6, (mac M.) 45, 89, (M. Mumhan) 105, 110
Niall 140
Niall Dubh 15
Niall (Naoighiallach) 49, 98, (clanna N.) 99
Nodlaig 151
Ó Catháin 143

Ó Conchobhair 13, 82
Ó Cuilín, Ceallach 86
Ó Cuirín, Cathal 86
Ó Daochán 37
Ó Deaghaidh 149
Ó Domhnaill 59
Ó Dubhda 135
Ó Faoláin 151
Ó Maonaigh [recte Mhanaigh? n. 2] (mac Í M.) 46
Ó Néill 103, (Brian ó Néill 49) *see also* Niall
Roach (o rRoigh) 98
Ruaidhrí (mac R.) 56, (mac R.) 59
Sadhbh (clann S.) 99
Seoán 148
Sláine 62
Soghan 149
Tadhg 14, 112
Tál 98

Place Names and Tribal Names

Alba 57, 85
Almha 71
Beannchar 128
Bóinn (brú na Bóinne) 16, 62, 106
Breagha 82, 106
Breaghmhach 148
Cabha 143
Caiseal 99
Ceanannas 59
Ceara 141, 143
Congna 152
Corann (in C.) 13
Cúl Raithin 143
Doire 102
Dubhlochlannach 91
Dún Dealga 50
Dún Luighdheach 149
Eachinis 46
Eamhain 70, 89
Eamhain na n-abhall 149
Éire 85, 144
Éireannach 128
Formaoil 18
Gall 24, 85, 109, 120
Gaoidheal 85, 109
Garbhlach 103
Leamhain 70
Leath Cuinn 98
Leath Mogha 149
Loch Cnodhbha 152
Loch Léin 152
Lochlannach *see* Dubhlochlannach
Macha 106 [= Ard Mhacha]
Máigh 89
Muaidh (clár M.) 135, 137
Muile 81
Mumha 105
Murbhach 103
Oileach (rí O.) 66
Rómhánach 91
Saxsanach 94
Sionann, (gen.) 53, (gen.) 74, (acc.) 79
Siúir 79
Taillte 106
Trágh Lí 150
Umhall 152