OBSERVATIONS ON THE CITATIONS IN IGT V

The citations in the Early Modern Irish tract on faults known as IGT V form the subject of this paper, which consists of four parts.¹ The first part includes a brief account of the tract and its manuscript transmission, the second deals with the nature and provenance of the citations, the third with textual and editorial concerns. The final part treats of the subject matter of the citations.

PART I

Manuscript transmission

IGT V was being prepared in a diplomatic edition without commentary or translation by Osborn Bergin at the time of his death in 1950. It was published posthumously in 1955 in Ériu 17, having been seen through the press by Eleanor Knott.² Bergin’s edition presented the text of National Library of Ireland manuscript G 3 [G] which originally formed a single volume with G 2. Kenneth Nicholls has suggested that writing took place between 1328 and 1350 on the basis of the genealogies in G 2.³ The manuscript was written mainly by Æthamh Ó Cianán who is identified in his obit of 1373 as ‘a master of History’ who ‘died as a canon in Lisgoole’ (Adam h. Qianan sai senchusa do ecc a Lis Gabail ina chananach).⁴ He wrote the manuscript for his own use and, at one point at least, was copying from an exemplar written by, or belonging to, his master, Seaán Mór Ó Dubhagán.⁵ Ó Dubhagán was a learned historian and ollamh of Uí Mhaine who is known as the author of a

¹I wish to express my thanks to Pádraig A. Breatnach and the Celtica peer-reviewer for helpful comments on this article. References are to IGT V and translations are by the present writer unless otherwise indicated. Arabic numerals in brackets after a paragraph number are used to denote distinct citations within a single paragraph, e.g. §86 (3); roman numerals are used when it is necessary to refer to different versions of the same citation, e.g. §105 (ii). Text is cited from Bergin’s edition of the tract as a matter of convenience, but macrons have been supplied and other modifications made where required for present purposes.
²See Ériu 17, 259 n. 1 and 293.
³Nicholls 2000, 158, cf. also idem 1983, 445 n. 1 and Henry and Marsh-Micheli 1987, 793–4. See also the accounts of the manuscript by Ní Shéaghdha 1967, 12–28, who had suggested 1344 as a probable date of writing (ibid., 13), and Carney 1969.
⁴AC s.a. 1373.4; cf. also AU, AFM s.a. For other scribal work which has been identified as that of Ó Cianán, see Carney 1969, 123 n. 1 (RIA 23 O 4 (no. 471), pp. 1–5 with scribal signature on p. 5) and Macalister 1938, p. xii (RIA 23 E 29 (no. 1134), pp. 1–16; D III 1 (no. 671), ff. 7–9), citing Best as the source of the identification; cf. also RIA Cat. Fasc. 16, 2063. Of these D iii 1 and 23 E 29, 1–16 ‘must have originally belonged to the same MS’ according to RIA Cat. Fasc. 25, 3092; see also Macalister 1932. For other material in G 2–3 not in Ó Cianán’s hand, see Ní Shéaghdha 1967, 13 and Carney 1969, 122 n. 2, 126.
⁵See scribal notes at G 2, ff. 11v, 15r, 27v, 35v, 36r; G 3, ff. 52r, 78r; G 2, 8r.
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topographical poem on Ireland and a metrical glossary, among other works.\textsuperscript{6} He died in 1372.\textsuperscript{7} As he predeceased his student by only a year, the suggestion has been made that Ó Cianán may have been writing \textit{G} while attending Ó Dubhagáin’s school.\textsuperscript{8}

The manuscript is a miscellany of metrical, grammatical, genealogical, historical, legal and other material. James Carney noted that it represents ‘the earliest surviving compilation of traditional material after the Book of Leinster, and antedates considerably the Books of Lecan, Ballymote, Uí Maine, etc.’\textsuperscript{9} It has the further distinction of being the oldest manuscript to contain technical literature emanating from the classical bardic schools, and predates the sources for the other tracts by some two centuries. In the course of the present writer’s work to prepare a new edition of \textit{IGT V}, it has been possible to identify two additional manuscript witnesses which were not known to Bergin and which have hitherto gone unnoticed in any discussion of the tract. The manuscripts in question are Royal Irish Academy 23 N 12 (no. 488) [\textit{N}] and Maynooth M 49 [\textit{M}].\textsuperscript{10} \textit{N} was penned by Micheál Ó Longáin around the year 1763 and preserves the first twenty-three paragraphs of the tract. It can be identified as representing an independent witness to \textit{IGT V} derived from a common archetype with \textit{G}. \textit{M} was written primarily by Micheál Óg Ó Longáin between 1818 and 1820 and is a copy of \textit{N}, its exemplar or a faithful intermediary copy.\textsuperscript{11} The present study takes \textit{G} as its primary focus as it alone preserves the bulk of the citations. References to \textit{N} are included where appropriate.

\textit{IGT V}

The tract deals with a wide range of faults, a large portion of which is metrical. In addition, it contains material related to grammatical anomalies, stylistic concerns and factual error. A total of thirty-seven faults is introduced (or fifty-two if we include various sub-types of certain faults).\textsuperscript{12} Of these, nineteen (or twenty-one) are not in fact metrical, so that the title ‘Metrical Faults’,


\textsuperscript{7}\textit{AC} s.a. 1372.3 (\textit{Seaan Mor h. Dubacan sai re senchas γ ollam h. Mane do ecc in hoc anno ‘Seaan Mor O Dubacain, a master-historian and ollav of the Uí Maine, died this year.’); cf. also \textit{AU}, \textit{AFM} s.a.

\textsuperscript{8}See Carney 1969, 123, 128 and Henry and Marsh-Micheli 1987, 793.

\textsuperscript{9}Carney 1969, 123.

\textsuperscript{10}See accounts of these manuscripts in \textit{RIA Cat.} Fasc. 11, 1313–25 and Ó Fiannachta 1965, 95–7. A copy in TCD 1289 (H.1.15) has no independent value, see \textit{Ériu} 17, 259 n. 1 and Ní Shéaghdha 1967, 15.

\textsuperscript{11}A preliminary version of the points made here regarding the copies in \textit{N} and \textit{M} was delivered at the conference ‘Grammatica and the Celtic vernaculars in the medieval world’ at the University of Oxford on 13 April 2013 and will appear in print in due course. Further discussion of the matter lies outside the scope of the present study.

\textsuperscript{12}Three faults mentioned in §1 are absent from the manuscript texts and are not included in these figures. Note also that a small number of faults could perhaps be classified as belonging to more than one type.
under which the tract was edited, may perhaps be generally appropriate but is not entirely apt.

The text is a model one, the main purpose of which is to convey rules for the correct composition of verse by exemplifying what should not be done. In addition to the faults, a handful of passages are concerned with demonstrating exceptions, and it may also be noted that the correct structure of thirty metres is exemplified. It would appear that the structure of other metres, for which corrected versions are not supplied, was to be extrapolated by disregarding faults exemplified in them. This was not the main concern of the tract, however, as is clearly stated: "Ní fuilmid ag leanmain seanaisdeadh in dāna uile acht ag tiachtain tar na loc[h]taibh 'I am not pursuing all of the old metres of poetry but rather am dealing with the faults'.

Presentation

The teaching in IGT V is by examples, to borrow an observation made by Bergin. The general practice and manner of presentation adopted in the tract is that there is commonly a single quotation for each fault. More often than not, this takes the form of a couplet (almost invariably a closing couplet) rather than a complete verse (there are, respectively, 109 couplets and 45 complete verses). Verses are by and large reserved for faults which occur in, or involve, the opening couplet, or are intended to illustrate correct metrical structure.

The citations are also routinely accompanied by a generally concise explanation in prose. This practice may be demonstrated by examining a passage of text.

§§47–53, 76–8, 111–16, 152 (1), (2) give exceptions and §§88–92 give the correct metrical structure of five metres. The correct structure of the other metres is illustrated as an ancillary to the introduction of corrected versions of faulty citations or of exceptions to faults. Instances of certain metres (such as ranaigncheacht) in which a fault known as cláen creite is exemplified require separate discussion.

§87. It may be noted, however, that the faulty and corrected versions in §61 consist of two distinct citations.

§87, cf. also §92.

Bergin 1938, 12.

Faults are exemplified by more than a single citation in §15 (N) and within a paragraph in the edition in §§23, 95, 97, 109–10, 128, 135, 150–2 (§§128 and 152 should, however, be divided into several paragraphs). Some faults are exemplified in a variety of different metres (§§34–5, 37–46, 79–83, 55–71, 74, 85–6, 100–5) and additional material related to certain faults is cited in separate paragraphs in the edition (e.g. §§26; 110–13; 129, 134, 137).

Verses occur in §§15, 22, 23 (1), 47–53, 55–60, 61 (2), 62–71, 74, 85, 86 (1), (3), (4), 88–91 (1), 92, 99, 135 (2), 142 (printed as prose, but I tentatively suggest that it contains a corruptly transmitted verse), 143 (two verses), 151 (2); in addition, a citation consisting of two verses is preserved solely in N (§15). For an instance of an opening couplet, see §61 (1).

Exceptions to this pattern are found in §§61 (1), 91 (2) (couplets); 85, 135 (2) (quatrain). This might be explicable in §92 (2) in that the couplet represents an additional example presented after a complete quatrain (§91 (1)), but this explanation does not apply to §§61 (1), 135 (2) where the situation is reversed in that the additional examples are quatrains.

There are no prose explanations in §§58, 62–3, 68–9, 81, 88–91, 144, 150–1. To judge by the surrounding passages, there is a possibility that the prose may have been omitted in error in §§58, 62–3, 68–9, 81. It may also be noted that there are some passages which do not contain quotations. These are (i) in connection with the preceding or following passages in which quotations occur (§§72–3, 96, 114–16), and/or (ii) represent prose commentary with examples of lexical (or, in one instance, genealogical) items and/or syntagmatic units (§§98, 126, 130–4,
In the following instance the name of the fault is introduced as a heading. This is followed by a citation which exemplifies that fault and is accompanied by some explanation:

Éguaim amail a-tā
Is imda abhall fólum
ō nach marand Conch[h]obhur
Marann ar mhuin agus Conch[h]obhur ar coll agus ēnfhidh teagaid is ēguaim.21

‘Absence of alliteration is thus:
Is imda abhall fólum
ō nach marand Conchobhur
“Many an apple tree is bare since Conchobhur lives no more”
Marann ("lives") begins with m and Conchobhur begins with c and since they do not begin with the same letter there is an absence of alliteration.’

It may be observed that a line or more illustrating a corrected version of the relevant fault is provided in just over a third of passages in the tract.22 Furthermore, corrections to only the word or part of a line relevant to the fault are provided in other instances.23 The correction may result in a metrically or linguistically unsound text and, in such instances, it would seem that the intention is to remedy the fault under discussion only, not to present a fully correct version. With a small number of exceptions, the passages in which correction would result in an unsound text correspond to those in which only part of a line is given.24 This appears to reflect a general, but not invariable, desire to avoid presenting unsound corrected citations.

Approach

The purpose of the citations is, as has been said, to exemplify what should not be done when composing verse.25 On the whole, this negative approach is in contradistinction to citations in the other tracts which are concerned with demonstrating correct usage. Quotations illustrative of incorrect usage

138–9, 141, etc.; cf. also §125 which comprises mainly prose and examples of syntagmatic units), or (iii) consist of introductory lists (§§1, 33, 36, 54, 75, 84, 87).

23§6. Lenition of f has been supplied silently.
24§§13, 23 (1), 25, 27, 37, 56–7, 59–61 (see n. 14 on §61), 64–7, 70–1, 79, 82, 93, 95 (1), 97 (1), 99, 100–5, 108, 118–23, 128 (1), 135 (1) (2), 136, 149 (1). In many of these the entire citation is repeated; however, only part of the initial citation is given as a corrected version in §§13, 23 (1), 27, 99, 102–3, 108, 118–23, 128 (1), 135 (1) (2), 136, 149 (1). In some instances listed here and in the following notes, corrections have been corruptly transmitted.

25§§12, 16–21, 23 (2), 24, 26, 95 (2), 97 (2), 124–5, 128 (2) (4), 129, 137, 140, 148, 149 (2) (3) (4), 152 (3) (3i) (3ii); cf. also §130. §149 (5) in which most, but not all of the couplet is given in the corrected version, should probably be included here as it takes in only the parts relevant to the fault.

26Exceptions are §§13, 23 (1), 25, 37, 82, 97 (1), 120, 122–3, 135 (1) (2), 136, 149 (1). Emendations might be proposed in two or three instances. See further discussion of §97 below.

27With the exceptions noted above (n. 13).
do occur in other tracts, however, as do, occasionally, citations which are employed to demonstrate correct usage but which are faulty for other reasons unrelated to the usage being demonstrated.\textsuperscript{26} While such instances are very much in the minority there, they represent a point of contact with $IGT$ V, if only a small one.\textsuperscript{27} It might also be suggested that there may have been an additional pedagogical purpose to instances in which corrected versions of citations are supplied in that the differences between the two versions may have been intended to demonstrate how a sentiment might be redrafted in a more metrically or linguistically acceptable form.\textsuperscript{28}

Instruction with an eye to faults may also have served to prepare the student for dealing with texts in manuscript. Here an awareness of errors, combined with other necessary linguistic and metrical knowledge, could be thought to equip him to identify the underlying or ‘deep-structure’ text, for example in cases of unmetrical variant forms written in place of the ones required by the metre.\textsuperscript{29} It could also be thought to provide training towards recognising textual corruptions which might arise through the vagaries of textual transmission. A possible instance of such training put into practice is attested in a scribal note written by Míchél Ó Cléirigh in which he comments on the poor state of the exemplar from which he had copied a metrical life of St Caimin of Inis Cealtra in 1629. There two faults proscribed in $IGT$ V §§11–14 (roghiorra and rofad) are mentioned:

... & ge gur sgriobas amhail fuaras ataim admálach móran da bfuil ann so γ i n-áitibh ele do bheith go roshalach brionach go roghiorra i ceethramhnaib γ go rofad i ceethramhnaibh ele agus go neimceill do bheith i romoran ele.

‘Although I have written (it) as I have found (it), I admit a great deal of what is here and in other places is very corrupt, false, too short in some lines, too long in others, and in all too much else there is incoherence.’\textsuperscript{30}

The suggestion that a reader might be expected to spot corruptions is perhaps supported by scribal comments such as the following in the hand of Risdeard Ó Conchubhair from the late sixteenth century (1590):

gach ionad ina nderrnus dermad agus gach ionad ina nderrnus aíinhios nach do bhriigh chumardhachta na dermuid do ronus.

\textsuperscript{26}E.g. $IGT$ II 758, 1737, 2111.
\textsuperscript{27}Ó Cuív 1994, 403 records that 80 out of 1000 citations in $IGT$ III are faulty.
\textsuperscript{28}Compare $GGBM$ 3479–500 where suggestions are made on how to order certain elements within a line in order to avoid a fault of alliteration ($gnúis gharbh$).
\textsuperscript{29}For a study of such matters in the context of a seventeenth-century manuscript, see Ó Riain 2010a. See further below (n. 108).
\textsuperscript{30}Cited from Bibliothèque royale de Belgique MS 2324–40, f. 273v in Breatnach 2013, 164 n. 10 on which the above is based; cf. Plummer 1926, 31 n. 5. For discussion of elements of this note, see Breatnach 2013, 164, 167.
Iarruim ar sgothuibh na fsealmac do sgríobh a hionnshamhui
so do lánoibair no chuirese roimh a dhéanamh ag a fúil
fios gach neithe do chuirfeadh buaidh do sgríobhneoir do veith a
riachtánus gach uili cunganta mo chertuguad gan sgannail agus
veith ar mo lethsgél do ghnath.

‘wherever I made an omission or displayed ignorance, that it is
not because of abridgement that the omissions which I have com-
mitted occurred. I ask of the best scholars who have transcribed
such a long work as this, or who propose to do so, and who know
everything which might confuse a scribe rather in need of assis-
tance, to correct me and not to be scandalized (recte without con-
demnation (?)), and always to stand for my defence.’

The pedagogical approach of exemplifying faults is also encountered in
the Middle Irish period in the tract known as the Trefolio which was pub-
lished by George Calder in 1917. The list of faults found in the Old Irish law
text Bretha Nemed Dédenach, from which the Trefolio is said to have been
extracted, suggests that such teaching may have been a feature of the earlier
period. A comparable practice formed a key element of the medieval Latin
grammatical tradition, as in Book III of Donatus’s Ars maior. However, the
faults are presented alongside separate treatments of compensatory features
and of the virtues of speech (virtutes) in the Trefolio and in the Latin tradition
respectively.

**Part II**

**Nature of the citations**

No authorial attributions are given in IGT V, as is also generally the case
in most copies of the other tracts. In contrast to those tracts, no work had
been undertaken to attempt to identify the sources of the citations in IGT V

---

31Walsh 1933, 136 (text), 138 (translation); cf. ibid. 140 and 151 (n. 48, 52) where Walsh
explains that he has deleted agus before aínfhios; this might be allowed to stand, however. It is
not inconceivable that this passage also envisages a reader who has some prior knowledge of
the text in question. See also scribal notes in Ó Fiannachta 1969, 27, Hennessy and Kelly 1875,
68–9 n. 7 (cf. Plummer 1926, 31) and Dillon, Mooney and de Brún 1969, 69 (§8) and see Simms
further Blair 2007 on corrections in early modern printed works.

32Calder 1917, 258–69 (ll. 5056–415). There is also a poem on the faults in the Trefolio, ibid.
150–64. For discussions of the Trefolio, see Bretnach 1989, 21–3; 1996, 66–7; 2015, 65–6, and
Hollo 1996.

33Gwynn 1942, 43 (= CHI 1132.13–15); for Bretha Nemed Dédenach, see Bretnach 2005,
184–8, and for the connection between the list and the Trefolio, see Bretnach 1989, 21 and
Smith 1994, 133 q. 58.

34See Baratain and Desbordes 1986; cf. also Kelly 1991, 52, 155.

35The remedies in the Trefolio are termed scéith and gnúise in a poem in Calder 1917, 150
(ll. 1966 etc.).

36For attributions in copies used in published editions of the tracts, see Bretnach 2004,
51–60 (asterisked names), and on attributions in the copy of IGT III in TCD 1319/2/7 (H.2.17),
see ibid., 49–50; cf. also BST 8b.46, 12a.30, 14a.30, 21a.30, 72b.10.
prior to 2008. The lack of identified citations, taken in conjunction with their faulty nature, had led some scholars to suggest that the citations in the tract may not be genuine. This was expressed by Brian Ó Cuív as follows: ‘We may wonder about … many … of the metrical citations throughout this tract, whether they were composed ad hoc by the commentator as part of his didactic technique.’ This suggestion is not, of course, capable of proof. It may, however, be called into question by the identification of the sources of some of the citations. This work is ongoing and, to date, the present writer has identified the sources of three citations while a further three may be identified as shared with other tracts. These are as follows:

(1) §88: A Mhuire a mháthair ar nAthar q. 1 (RIA 23 E 29 (no. 1134), p. 119.27).
(2) §90: Mac súd ar sliochd fhionn Mhanannán q. 9 (NLS 72.1.37, 97.13; Quiggin 1937, 37).
(3) §105: Gach éan mar a adhbha v. 37cd (RIA B iv 2 (no. 1080), 95.z; DDána no. 98).
(4) §90cd: IGT II 1561.
(5) §97 (1): BST 67a.26/TCD 1314/3 (H.2.12 no. 17).§

37See Ó Riaín 2008a, 215 where the sources of two citations (nos. 1 and 3 below) are identified. (It may be noted that in the latter article, pace McManus 2008, 181 n. 1, a distinction is clearly made between Rudimenta grammaticae Hibernicae and the grammatical tracts as indicated in the opening sentences of the article where it is stated that citations in the former text have ‘also’ been included.)

38Ó Cuív 1994, 398, cf. also Breathnach 2000, 11. Compare Bergin 1938, 11 commenting on the tracts in general (‘Apart from couplets marked “faulty” we may take it that the examples they contain are excerpted from the works of various poets who were recognised as masters of their craft’) and Dillon 1927, 332 on the examples in BST (‘some made up by him [i.e. the author of the tract], some quoted from the bardic poetry’). Some of the citations referred to by Bergin have since been identified as being composed by masters, and faulty citations in the other tracts are now generally regarded as genuine.

39It might also be pointed out that the introductory lists of information a student should know in IGT I §2 include instances of ‘many faults’ (lochta iomdh). Examples of some of these, and of the various other aspects of learning, are said to be by authorities in poetry (ó ughdaruibh γ ó shaoithibh an dána). The relevant text is cited in full in n. 52 below.

40The implications of these identifications, when taken in conjunction with other factors, for dating the tract to some time between the second half of the thirteenth century and the first half of the fourteenth will be discussed in a future publication. Two of the shared citations here listed (nos. 4, 5) were identified by McKenna (BST pp. 223–4; 67a.26 n.) and McManus 1996, 170 respectively.

41The first line of this poem is reproduced here as it is given in GGBM 2723.

42TCD 1314/3 (H.2.12 no. 17) is a single sheet in three folds with unnumbered columns. It contains a fragment of a grammatical tract which can be identified as belonging to the BST tradition. It was unknown to McKenna, but is mentioned in Armstrong 1985, 264, where, however, its affiliations are not commented upon. For §97, see further n. 60 below.

43For further discussion of these citations, see pp. 8–9, 11–12 and Part III below.
In addition, one citation (§144) is said to be taken from a piece which began Éri Inis Éreamhōn, while two others (§§32, 145) are drawn from a poem beginning Tāngadar teachta in tsamhraidh. Neither of these is extant to the present writer’s knowledge.

Two of the citations for which sources have been identified are introduced to illustrate the correct structure of the relevant metres (nos. 1 and 2 above). However, the third provides an insight into the method employed by the author of the tract. There are two versions of the couplet in question in IGT V. They are presented in (a) and (b) below alongside (c) the text of the source poem from RIA B iv 2 and (d) Lambert McKenna’s edition of the couplet based on that manuscript:

(a) IGT V §105 (i):
[...] Murc[h]adh Mumhan
nach tubhthar ‘s ra tubadh
(b) IGT V §105 (ii):
Is e sin [sic] Murchadh Muman
nach tubhthar do thomhadh
(c) RIA B iv 2, 95:
seisiumh Murcadh Mumhan,
nach tomhtar do tomadh
(d) DDána no. 98 v. 37cd:
sei-sean Murcadh Mumhan
nach tomthar [leg. tubhthar]
do thomadh

Setting aside for a moment textual difficulties to which we will return below, the following observations may be made. The first version (a) introduces the fault known as rudhrach uaitne. This arises because Mumhan and tubadh, the final words of lines c and d (highlighted in bold) rhyme when they should in fact consonate. The second version of the couplet in the tract (b) is presented as a correction of the first. Here the fault is no longer present as the finals of lines c and d consonate, as required, owing to the replacement of (‘s ra) tubhadh by (do) thomhadh in line d. A third version of the couplet (c) is found in a complete copy of a poem preserved in RIA B iv 2 which was written by Michél Ó Cléirigh.

The identification of the source of this citation allows us to ascertain that the modus operandi of the author of IGT V in this case was to adapt a correct version of a pre-existing couplet by deliberately altering it in order to introduce the fault he wished to illustrate. A matter of interest

---

44Bergin misread tamhraidh as damhraidh in §145 (cf. Ériu 17, 290 n. 8). Both citations in question illustrate faults related to metrical closure (dúnadh); since they are drawn from a poem with the same first line, at least one must represent the final couplet of a supplementary quatrain (see further discussion in n. 143 below). For remarks on drawing citations from the same poem, see Bretnach 2000, 14.

45The term ‘author’ is employed here as a matter of convenience. Compare Bergin’s remarks (1938, 11) on the blending of ‘the work of the original “person” or author’ with the work of later copyists ‘who were also editors’.

46 Bergin read ‘thomadh’ for ‘thomhadh’.

47The fault is dealt with in §§100–5; cf. also §§87, 99 and p. 19 below.

48On the manuscript, see RIA Cat. Fasc. 24, 3021–9 and Bretnach 2013, 131–2. In addition, it may be noted that another copy of the poem in RIA 23 N 28 (no. 137) breaks off incomplete at v. 36. A copy of v. 8 is written on f. [i]r of the Book of Ballymote, RIA 23 P 12 (no. 536), on which see RIA Cat. Fasc. 13, 1616, 1619. A further copy in British Library, Egerton 111 has no independent value.

49This is pointed out in Ó Riaín 2008a, 215 n. 4.
regarding the alteration is that it extends to the sense of the citation. McKenna rendered the couplet as ‘he is as Murchadh of Mumha / who can not be threatened with any danger’. The second line of the adapted version (a above) may be rendered ‘who cannot be reproached and (yet) who was reproached’. The aim was clearly to present a meaningful couplet and not merely gibberish which would serve to exemplify the fault. This may have arisen partly from a desire for clarity and intelligibility and partly from a concern to ensure the memorability of examples.

The method of altering a source text in order to introduce a fault is also encountered in one demonstrable instance in the Middle Irish tract on faults and correctives known as the Trefoch. The passage from the Trefoch is worth citing here as a parallel to the above example from IGT V. The versions below are from Calder’s edition of the Trefoch which presents the text of the Book of Leinster [LL] and TCD 1337 (H.3.18) [H]. (Differences between the versions are indicated in the translation by the relevant siglum.)

\[LL\]
Can ecenelus
Tanic sund de muntir Dé
Ní fhetar císi rún,
Bud messu dúin oldás di.

\[H\]
Cen ecenelus i. na dertar
Tainic sund do muintir De
Clereach gelban, glan a li,
Bad meassu dun oldas di.
Observations on the Citations in IGT V

[ ] his appearance, I do not know if it is a counsel which was worse for me than for her [sic].

The fault arises here from the use of the third singular feminine prepositional pronoun *dí* to refer to the masculine noun *cléreach* ‘cleric’ (*H*) or *cléirchén* ‘little cleric’ (*LL*). The source of the citation is preserved in another manuscript written by Míchél Ó Cléirigh, namely Bibliothèque royale de Belgique, Brussels MS 5100–4. It forms part of a short poem beginning *Disert mBreccain sunt istleiph* which is ascribed to Saint Mo Ling and was published by Stokes in volume two of *Anecdota from Irish manuscripts*.

Tainic sunt do muintir Dé, cailech gelbhan glan a lli,
nochan fettar ciasa run, fa mesa dún ina dí.\(^{55}\)

‘A bright, fair veiled woman of the people of God came here, clear her appearance, I do not know if it is a counsel which was worse for me than for her.’

I take it that the quatrain refers to the temptation that might arise for either party owing to the presence of a member of the opposite sex.\(^{56}\) It will be clear, then, from this version that the feminine noun *caillech* has been replaced by masculine *cléreach*/*cléirchén* in the *Trefocal* in order to introduce the grammatical incongruity.\(^{57}\)

The practice of altering citations may not be confined to tracts on faults alone. There are occasional instances in the other Classical Irish tracts where it is conceivable that an example has been altered to demonstrate a grammatical point. One such instance is found in *IGT I* §117:

\[
\text{Teach san ród bhláith bhileachbhothach}
\]
\[
do sháith an t-óg eineichbhreachach lochtach
\]
\[
bhileachrothach cóir
\]

‘The youth of honourable judgements built a house in the smooth, tree- and hut-covered [bhileachbhothach] road incorrect; adorned with trees (recte with beautiful trees) [bhileachrothach] correct.’\(^{58}\)

\(^{55}\)*Stokes 1908, 39 no. 22 q. 4 (Brussels MS 5100–4, 65). The text agrees more closely with the *H* copy of the *Trefocal* than with that found in *LL*.

\(^{56}\)*Compare, perhaps, the following quatrain from the Rule of Ailbe of Emly: *Ní raib féinid ná banseal / sind loccán i mbíat, / is amnas, is andiarraid / int ordan frisgníat* ‘Warrior [recte layman (?)] or woman, there should not be in the place in which they dwell; it is harsh, it is fierce, the order they serve’, O’Neill 1907, 104, 105 q. 37a, 113 (n.).

\(^{57}\)*IGT V contains material related to the incorrect use of grammatical gender in §§29, 30 (see also §§118, 119 and n. 148 below). Note further the term *Innsgne a n-ionad a chéile* ‘One innsgne put for another’ in a seventeenth-century poem edited by McKenna 1951, 219 q. 18a which may denote the same anomaly, although *innsgne* has other grammatical meanings as well (for which, see *BST* pp. 260–1).

\(^{58}\)*The translation is taken from Mac Cárthaigh 2014, 127; arguably ‘(road) abounding in’ or ‘lined with trees and huts’ would be a better rendering of *bhileachbhothach*. The same couplet is cited in *BST* 207.12–13 with the variant *bhfód* for *ród*. For other passages in which alternative
The fault arises through the use of an adjective ending in –ach as the first element in a compound word (bileachbhothach). This is remedied by the substitution of another compound consisting of the noun bile and the adjective crothach. One suspects that one version of the first line may be an alteration of the other in the same manner witnessed in IGT V and the Trefocal. Alteration of quotations in various contexts and types of text is a practice which is also attested, for example, in the Greek and Latin traditions and has been suggested in the case of the Old Icelandic grammatical treatises. It would, of course, be imprudent to identify with certainty a consistent working method in IGT V on the basis of a single citation. Nevertheless, the identification of the altered citation in that text, combined with the parallel practice in the Trefocal, and possibly also in the other tracts, should give pause for thought, and the benefit of the doubt must be given to regarding the citations as authentic in the first instance.

This is not necessarily to suggest that the same method was adopted in each case, and there are passages which point to the possibility that the author’s methods may have varied. One such instance exemplifies the fault known as imarcaithiadh (‘redundancy’). The fault in question is one of style and arises when a prepositional pronoun is employed with reference to a noun which is itself preceded by the corresponding simple preposition (as in Ni t[h]ibur mo demheas / do na mn[aibh cf[h]eleas mo ch[r]’I will not give my scissors to them / to the women who hide my comb’). The couplet which illustrates (either correct or faulty) versions of parts of, or entire, citations are given in an individual tract, see IGT I §§42, 76, 83, 91, 113, 133, 135; IGT II 69, 118, 246, 701–2, 756, 784, 887/2042 (discussed by Carney 1945, 118 l. 745 n.), 938/2067, 1061, 1457, 1515–16, 1739, 1749, 1758, 1805, 1887, 1920, 1933, 2003, 2071, 2119; IGT III 20–1, 24, 88–9, 92, 106, 107, 125–6, 154, 198–9, 218, 226, 272, 342, 362, 414, 506, 609, 688, 740–1, 768–9, 901–3, 956, 1011, 1018; BST (reurrence of citations in other copies not noted) 187.6–7, 192.30–2, 195.8–9, 10–11, 196.3–4/228.24–5, 197.17–18, 198.1–2, 6–7, 199.9–10, 22–3, 31–2, 201.5–7, 15–16, 19–20, 203.4, 23–4, 25–7, 204.20–1, 205.2–3, 6–7, 206.13–14, 18–19, 20–1, 208.9–10, 26–7, 211.9–10, 214.24–5, 215.13–14, 219.10–11, 14–15, 220.4–5, 223.4–5, 224.8–9, 226.5–6, 14–15/242.16–17, 16–17/242.18–19, 21–2, 31–2, 227.6–7, 21–2, 230.3–4, 231.16–17, 237.3–4, 239.20–1, 241.6–8, 9–10, 15–16, 242.11–12, 45b.21–2, 66a.6–7, 67a.33–4, 69b.27–8, 70a.6–7, 71b.10–11, 12–13, 72b.9.

§97 (1); see further n. 99 below. The fault is discussed by McManus 2005, 163–5 where it is incorrectly classified as ‘metrical’ and given in the form imarcaithiadh (with normalised spelling and a silent, unnecessary emendation to a variant form of the noun imarcaithiadh). It may also be observed that the supposed example of the fault given by McManus on p. 164 (second citation) is irrelevant as it involves the repetition of two simple prepositions (san, i), the first combined with the definite article. Such repetition is not faulted. See O’Rahilly 1941, 271 (§29) on repetition of the simple preposition with multiple referents (as in the example in question) where it is described as ‘a general rule’; cf. also BST 206.7–8. Giolla Brighde Ó hEodhasa may regard as optional the repetition of a simple preposition and corresponding prepositional pronoun with the same referent, as also the repetition of the simple preposition applied to nouns which refer to the same item or individual, see GGBM 1952–64; it is not entirely clear from the context, however, whether he is referring specifically to poetry or if the comments might apply to prose or, perhaps, speech (compare, for example, the contrast of verse and speech at GGBM 1682–9). Note also that McManus 2005, 164 states that the fault ‘always involves the preposition and conjugated preposition occurring one immediately after the other’; it is not clear if this interpretation...
the fault is introduced and twice redrafted (the second time only one line is given). The first redraft removes the simple preposition (do), but this results (i) in a noun in the dative plural (mnáibh) without a preceding preposition and (ii) a hypometric line (na mnáibh ceileas mo chír). The second redrafting involves the elimination of the prepositional pronoun (dáibh) with substitution of nocho for ni to make up the syllable count: Nocho tibhur mo dhemeas.

However, this results in a line without alliteration which ends in a disyllable and has no rhyming counterpart for mnáibh. It is then remarked that the couplet is faulty regardless of what measures are taken to improve it. This is an interesting example of apparent ‘failed’ or ‘aborted’ correction, but it should be pointed out that both redrafts are stylistically, though not metrically or linguistically, acceptable, thus conforming to the principle that the intention is to remedy the fault under discussion and not necessarily to present a fully correct version. If this example has not been adapted from a correct couplet, it need not necessarily be regarded as ad hoc, if we allow for the prospect of genuine faulty citations being employed in certain instances, as is the case in other tracts.

A variation on the above possibility is that citations which are introduced to illustrate imperfect rhyme (faulty from the point of view of dán direach) could represent genuine extracts from poems in brúilingeacht ( §§4, 5). This is comparable to the other tracts in which brúilingeacht citations are also found on occasion. Further citations are in ógláchas. This is not as surprising as might perhaps appear at first glance. The citations represent a type of deibhidhe which is associated in the tract with chroniclers (seanchaidhe). Looser forms of this metre are associated with this class of professional scholar, as has been observed by Pádraig Breatnach: ‘perhaps the most abundant evidence of the continuation of the freer form of deibhidhe in the period of classical Irish is found in association with practitioners of seanchas. In fact the strict form of

is the same as that presented here, that is that the preposition and corresponding prepositional pronoun are applied to the same noun.

See p. 4 above.

See n. 38 above. McManus 2005, 164 cites two examples of the fault in which the preposition and prepositional pronoun occur in separate couplets and suggests on the basis of those two examples that the usage may be permitted, where the preposition and prepositional pronoun are found in separate couplets. In one of his two examples (involving repetition of uaidh and ó chraobh with reference to the same individual), it should have been pointed out that there is a variant reading in the earliest copy of the relevant section of the poem in the Book of the Dean of Lismore, namely lé for ó (as edited by Ross 1939, 182 l. 2324). Ross also offers a different interpretation of the final line in which craobh is taken as having a different referent to uaidh. While it might be argued that the reading of the Book of the Dean of Lismore may be less likely, it is important to note the divergence and to take the full textual picture into consideration.

See also §§28, 38 (cited on p. 21 below), 117. For citations in brúilingeacht in other tracts, see, for example, BST 192, 30–2, IGT II 2060, IGT III 700 and IBP 154.

§§86 (3) and (4). A handful of citations which require separate treatment are omitted here and in the previous note, see n. 13 above and 67 below.

Called deibhidhe bais re tóin. Compare Ó Cuív 1989, 54 who remarks on the similarity of §§86 (4) and the examples in MV III §3 (McLaughlin 2008, 134 §1; see also Breatnach 2014, 17–19) and MV I §49, II §71 (EIM 68, §72).
deibhidhe characteristic of dán direach is not normally employed by many later chroniclers.  

The discussion so far has identified a practice of alteration and allowed for the possibility of authentic faulty citations. We might also allow for further possibilities which may be mentioned in brief. One would be that the citations could have been drawn from or modelled on examples from a period pre-dating the codification of the metrical and linguistic norms of Classical Irish; another is that they represent adaptations of contemporary examples in ógláchas, that is to say, poems in which non-classical or faulty features might occur. However, whether the author of IGT V modelled examples on such poems or whether he took them from existing, separate poems, themselves modelled on earlier or contemporary examples, is something of a moot point.

These suggestions need not be mutually exclusive and do not necessarily rule out the presence of ad hoc compositions in the tract. Pádraig Ó Macháin has drawn attention to some of the citations concerned with the use of infixed pronouns as possibly reflecting such a practice, presumably given a certain similarity between four of the relevant citations, particularly in the final lines, e.g. cia ras buail na bachlaigh ‘who struck them, the churls?’; cia rad buail a bachlaigh ‘who struck you, O churl?’ It might also be noted that commentary on the use of the infixed pronouns in IGT V suggests that one way of introducing such grammatical constructions was in an interrogative phrase. Accordingly, such citations may well represent ad hoc compositions. However, it is not unthinkable that they represent one or more genuine citations which were reworked or, perhaps, extracted from a mnemonic poem on the various forms of the pronouns. Thus, while it is conceivable that such citations were composed ad hoc, there are alternative possibilities, as is, perhaps, inevitable when one enters the realm of speculation. As a practice of alteration can be demonstrated in one instance, alternative suggestions are, in any case, vitiated by the circumstance that we cannot know whether or not other citations have been altered or, if so, to what extent. The object of the foregoing has been to engage with previous commentary concerning the nature of the citations in IGT V and to press the case for a more nuanced approach. The hope is that further citations may yet be identified and that they may allow for a refinement of our perception of the methodology or methodologies employed by the author of the tract. In the long run, however, it seems likely that the majority of citations in the tract will remain unidentified. This situation is to a certain

---

66Breatnach 2000, 20. He goes on to note a change in this situation from the sixteenth century.
67Compare n. 65 above and see Breatnach 1997a, 1–63 on the use and adaptation of literary models. Clancy (2000, 88) has stated that some of the citations are drawn from pre-classical sources (‘seeming to date from the three centuries before its compilation’). I hope to deal with this matter in the context of a study of the metres of the citations in a separate publication.
68§§122 (MS bachlaidh), 124 (MS bachlaidh) and §§123, 125 (cf. also §§127, 128). See Ó Macháin 2015, 106.
69§§118, 126 (cia ros marbh ‘who killed her?’); see also §125.
70Infixed pronouns are treated of in two such compositions preserved in G: A aos dána, is aithnidh damh (ed. Ó Riaín 2008b) and Ca med focal féigthar lend (NLI G 3, ff. 75r9–76vaz) (an edition of this text is in preparation).
Observations On the Citations in IGT

extent analogous with that of the other tracts, although the scale is undeniably different. It may be useful to place these remarks in perspective by noting that of a total of around 3,500 citations (excluding recurring examples) in IGT I–IV and BST, only about 13% have been identified. These figures compare with 18% of citations in the Trefocal, although some others have attributions. In the case of MV I and III, however, the citations represent a significant proportion of surviving Early Irish verse. (As a point of wider comparison, it may be worth mentioning a similar situation with regard to the Old Icelandic Third grammatical treatise where almost three quarters of citations are not known from other sources, a third of which are anonymous.) It should also be borne in mind that the number of surviving poems from the classical period which date to the fourteenth century or earlier is considerably less than the body of poetry which has been preserved from subsequent centuries. This reduces the prospects for identifying source poems in the case of IGT V. To assess this situation in the context of the other tracts once again, an extremely rough approximation suggests that somewhere in the region of a third of identified citations are from pre-fourteenth-century compositions, but this represents only about 4–5% of the total number.

71 See comments by Breatnach 2000, 14 and Bergin 1938, 11 on the situation regarding identified citations in the other tracts.

72 For identifications of the citations, see McManus 1997, de Brún 1998, Breatnach 2000, 14 n. 28, McManus 2000, 2004, 2005, 2008, 2011, Ó Riain 2007, 55 n. 7, 70 q. 4 cd n., 2008a, 2013a, 152. A figure of 466 identified citations from 184 poems is given in McManus 2011, to which may be added two citations and one poem as identified in Ó Riain 2007, 2013a loc. cit. as well as IGT III 908 (which may now be identified as q. 19cd of the poem beginning Ní fa a hinne is measda Mór, RIA 23 E 29, 124b.11–12). (A minor slip in calculation in McManus 2004 means that the figures there and in idem 2005, 2008 are one short; the figure has been resolved in idem 2011, but this is the result of a slip whereby a citation previously recognised in de Brún 1998 is identified and included for a second time).

73 See n. 53 above. Six of the total of 44 citations are found only in the incomplete copy in the Book of Uí Mhaine, thus the figure of identified citations in the LL copy is 21%. Note also that not all attributions are found in each copy.

74 See Gísli Sigurðsson 2000, 100, 111. Foote 1984, 256 suggests that the author of the Third grammatical treatise ‘was prepared to quote himself, but … appears to go much farther in his personal contribution. He illustrates his definitions with numerous verses, in which he picks up the original but expands as necessary to fill the dróttkvætt stanza.’ It has also been suggested that a large number of citations in the Fourth grammatical treatise are the work of the author of the tract or someone working under his direction, see Clunies Ross and Wellendorf 2014, pp. xlv, xlix–lii. Compare also Clunies Ross 2005, 181, 186, 203, n. 59 above and Kelly 1991, 42 n. 24, 43 n. 29, 91 for the use of their own compositions by authors of Latin tracts.

75 See remarks in Ó Macháin 2015, 96. He also notes that a quarter of extant thirteenth-century poetry is attributed to Donnchadh Mór Ó Dálaigh. This is an additional factor in reducing the chances of identifying sources since only a small proportion of citations in IGT V are religious (see discussion at pp. 25–6 below).

76 This is not, of course, to suggest that the total number does not include citations from other thirteenth-century poems which are no longer extant or which have not yet been identified. It should also be stressed that the figures presented above for the other tracts are merely intended to give a very general approximation of the situation in light of the difficulties involved in assigning a date to certain poems.
Textual quality

*IGT* V as transmitted in *G* presents a number of challenges to an editor. Some of these were formulated by Eleanor Knott in a note appended to Bergin’s edition of the tract as follows:

It has been observed that in the later Irish vellums the accuracy of the text is very often in inverse relation to the quality of the script, and this is strikingly exemplified in this manuscript text, in which the errors, repetitions, misplacements, mispunctuation, and running together of separate items make it difficult to accept it as the work of a learned scholar.\(^{77}\)

Other copies of the citations, where available, are potentially instructive in matters of textual quality and act to a certain degree as an external control. It should naturally be borne in mind that quotations, separated as they are from their source, may be more susceptible to change in the course of transmission than complete copies of poems.\(^{78}\) The citations may also preserve variant textual traditions which are no longer extant.\(^{79}\)

With this in mind, Knott’s comments may be further considered by returning to examine in detail extracts from the text which were introduced earlier. It will be convenient to reproduce those short extracts once again at this point.

(a) *IGT* V §105 (i):

 [...] Murc[h]adh Mumhan
nach tubhthar’s ra tubadh

(b) *IGT* V §105 (ii):

Is e sin [sic] Murcadh Mumhan
nach tubhar do thomhadh

(c) RIA B iv 2, 95:

sei-seiumh Murchadh Mumhan,
nach tomhar do tomadh

(d) *DDána* no. 98 v. 37 cd:

sei-sean Murchadh Mumhan
nach tomhthar [leg. tubhthar] do thomhadh

The metre of this citation is *rionnard* (6\(^2\) 6\(^2\)). However, the first line of (a) wants two syllables (the lacuna is indicated by ellipsis enclosed in square brackets). The same line in (b) is a syllable too long.\(^{80}\) (Bergin’s word division *is e sin* should probably be altered to *is esin* or *i[s] sesin* since emphatic forms of the

\(^{77}\) *Ériu* 17, 293 n.

\(^{78}\) For remarks on transmission of citations, see West 1973, 17–18, cf. also ibid. 10–11; Huygens 2000, 42–9; Reynolds and Wilson 1991, 219–21; Bäckvall 2013, 189–90; cf. also n. 59 and 74 above.

\(^{79}\) For examples, see Ó Riain 2007, 70 q. 4 cd n. and idem 2010b, 99 q. 10 cd, 105 n. Compare also the variation in §104 (*mo / na*), n. 58 above (*bhfód / ród*) and the citations discussed at pp. 16–19 below.

\(^{80}\) Bergin attempted to resolve the lacuna in (a) by supplying the hypermetric text of (b).
third singular pronouns are used extensively in this part of the source poem. The spelling of G is ambiguous, however and, although isesin is written as a unit there, it is not impossible that the text represents is é sin or if[s] sé sin as divided by Bergin.) The complete copy of the poem in RIA B iv 2 preserves the correct syllable count. The readings in IGT V and B iv 2 presumably go back to an original seisean or ‘s (s)eisean (with the shortened form of the copula). The copula (is) was either added later or the syllabic variant form was substituted for ‘s in the tradition reflected in (b). The variant form of the emphatic suffix –sean was most likely replaced by -siumh in (c). In this instance, then, B iv 2 preserves the superior text. However, the text of the second line of the couplet as transmitted in B iv 2 contains a corruption which went unnoticed by the editor in that tomthar (MS tomtar) does not rhyme with Murchadh. This is to be remedied by supplying tubhthar from IGT V which has the superior reading in this case.

Further observations on textual quality

The above observations may be supplemented by examining the remaining citations found in source poems or other texts.

(a) IGT V §88: RIA 23 E 29 (no. 1134) p. 119:

A Mhuiri a māthair ar nAthar

do tháthaich ar sochur

bí gār ndín mar as dů ar féitheamh

is tū ar sídh ‘s ar sochur

This represents the initial quatrain of an address to the Virgin Mary, a complete copy of which is preserved solely in the Book of Fermoy. The reason for introducing the citation in the tract is to exemplify the correct structure of the metre known as deachnaidh mhór (8 2 6). It may be rendered: ‘O Mary,

81 For the spelling -i- for -e-, see SnaG III §2.9. For the use of emphatic forms in the poem, compare v. 37ab (Si-se re sluaigh nGaoidheal / Gob na Sgéal sgeamh solamh ‘She [i.e. a horse] standing in front of the hosts of the Gaoidhil is as the quick-snorting “Gob na Sgéal’”, McKenna 1921, 292) and vv. 33bd, 34cd, 35ac, 36ac, 38ac, 39, 40a.

82 For ‘s, see Ni Dhomhnaill 1973, 91–2.

83 McKenna emends to -s(e)an in all instances where the manuscripts have -siumh (variously spelled), see DDána p. 503. The former (also variously spelled) occurs in vv. 33bd, 34cd, 36c, 39bd and the latter occurs in vv. 35cd, 38a, 40a in B iv 2 and in 23 N 28 (before it breaks off at v. 36). See BST p. 190 for -siumh where it is suggested that the form began to be replaced by -s(e)an from about the beginning of the fourteenth century; the evidence upon which this date has been arrived at is not presented, however. Compare the examples of -s(i)un, -sin cited from the twelfth-century Book of Leinster in SnaG III §10.2 and note that the form -s(e)an is given in IGT V §116 (seisain, sesén [leg. sesen]). This might be taken to support McKenna’s suggestion as to the date at which -s(e)an replaced -siumh. If so, the fact that IGT V has -scean rather than -siumh in the present couplet may possibly suggest that the reading (+siumh) of B iv 2 is archaising. A suggestion that the original reading was sé sin is less economical than that proposed above and less likely in light of the use of emphatic suffixes in the source poem.

84 The reading tomtar presumably came about under the influence of the final word tomadh.

85 Angular brackets enclose text which is difficult to read.

86 For an account of the manuscript, see RIA Cat. Fasc. 25, 3091–125.

87 For the form deachnaidh, see EIM 78 s.v. dechnad.
o mother of our father / who healed all strife / guard us as our protection is befitting / you are our pardon and our comfort.’ It is apparent that the copies vary only in minor orthographical points in all but the second line. There the scribe of G has inadvertently replaced the final words of that line with the penultimate and ultimate words of the quatrain. The variants do and ra in line b are also to be noted.

(b) IGT V §90: Quiggin 1937, 37 (NLS 72.1.37, 97.13):

Sāl chruiind bhog is bitharnaide
nach ob t[h]uind dā treathanmire
feacadh na bharr bhachallbhuidhe
ōs bhall leacan leathanghile

Saill wok crone is bearne
nar ob tone da trayil vir
fekka na war bayll woe
oss bak’laggin [leg. ballaggin (?)]
layin zill.

This represents q. 9 of the poem beginning Mac sūd ar sliochd fisiónMhannáin which is preserved in the Book of the Dean of Lismore. The citation exemplifies the correct structure of the metre known as ceanntrom casbairdne (84 84). It may be rendered: ‘A round, soft heel which is truly most severe [and] which does not avoid any wave however furious; [there is] a curling in his fair, ringleted hair above a broad and bright cheek (?)’. There is relatively little variation between the copies, except that the text of G is superior to that of the Book of the Dean of Lismore in line a where bhog (wok) and chruiind (crone) have been inverted. The second couplet of this quatrain is also cited in IGT II 1561 to illustrate the dative singular of the noun ball as follows: Feacadh gud (v.ll. guth, ga) bharr bachallbhuidhe (v.l. mbachall mbuidhe), Ϗs bhall leacan leathanghile. The difference is again relatively slight with the

---

88Bergin and Knott respectively suggested reading dochur and ndochur for sochur in line b, Ériu 17, 276 n. 1, but surprisingly so as it does not supply the necessary alliteration.

89Compare remarks on the variation ro/do in prose texts in Jackson 1938 p. xxiv; see also SnaG III §11.4, GGBM 1236–8 and Carney 1969, 127 on replacement of ro by do in G.

Quiggin 1937, 87 in a note on line d adverts to a reading ballaggin in a transcription made by Walter Macleod as ‘probable’. On Macleod’s transcription, see ibid. p. vii.

90The structure of this metre is illustrated by q. 1 of this poem in GGBM 2723–6 (cf. n. 41 above).

91For ball leacan (‘lit. place of cheek’), compare, perhaps, Mag. no. 9 q. 9c n-a donnballaibh a dreach réidh ‘her smooth bright-flushing face’; alternatively, it might be rendered as ‘spot on (of) a cheek’ referring, perhaps, to a birthmark or mole. With the contrast between the adjectives bog ‘soft’ and arnaidh ‘severe, harsh’, compare a similar contrast between bog ‘soft’ and cruaidh ‘hard’ in McGeown and Murphy 1953, 83 q. 15: Bog a chroidhe ag díol gach dáimhe, / Donnchadh Cairbreach an chúil tais; / cruaidh a chroidhe ag corcradh loinne, / bile fotghlan chloinne Caíis ‘Soft is the heart of Donnchadh Cairbreach of the fresh hair when he rewards every poetic band; hard is the heart of the bright-haired champion of Clann Chais when empurpling a blade’; see also discussion of such a contrast in Knott 1922, p. li and Ó Macháin 2015, 94–5.

92Notice must also be taken of the reading trayil vir. The first element (treathal- ?) would not appear to supply a viable alternative, however, and the l may be an error.
exception of the preposition _ag_ in place of _i_ and variation in second and third singular possessive pronouns in _gud_ and _ga_.

(c) _IGT_ V §109:

nō go faicea _féin_ crō Cuind
'na c[h]lō _fo-dhēn_ a Domnuill

_NÓ_ go ngabha _féin_ cró Cuinn
_na clō_ _bhu-dhéin_ a Dhomnuill.

This citation demonstrates that the rhyme of _féin_ with a variant form _fodhén/_ _bhu-dhéin_ is impermissible as it represents an instance of a word rhyming with itself, that is an instance of the fault known as _caiche_ (‘tautologous rhyme’; _lit._ ‘blindness’). Apart from minor orthographical variation, there is significant divergence between the copies in the first line with _faicea_ in one and _ngabha_ in the other, both second singular present subjunctive forms. The version in _IGT_ V may be rendered ‘until you yourself may see Conn’s enclosure (_sc._ Ireland) / in its true (_lit._ own) form, o Domhnall’. The version in _BST_ was translated by McKenna as ‘Till thou, O Domhnall, findest Conn’s Steading in its old state.’ However, a more accurate rendering of the first line of that version would be ‘until you may seize Conn’s enclosure’. The version in _IGT_ V is at least on an equal footing with that in _BST_ and may, in fact, have better claims on sense as the couplet would appear to refer to the restoration of Ireland to its proper state, presumably as a result of its union with the rightful ruler. Thus, in as far as such matters can be judged in a couplet which occurs out of context, a reference to ‘seizing’ Ireland in a restored state may be less appropriate than ‘seeing’ her in such a condition as the restoration could be expected to take place after the union with Domhnall. If the reading of _BST_ is the _lectio facilior_, it may have arisen by association with the common theme of a patron seizing Ireland.

(d) _IGT_ V §97:

_Nī_, _t[h]ibhur mo demheas dáibh /
d_o_ _na_, _mnaibh cheileas an c(h)ír_.

_BST_ 67a.26:

_Ní_ _t(h)ibhar mo dheimheas daibh._
_do_ _na_, _mnaibh cheileas an c(h)ír_.

H.2.12 no. 17:99

_ní_, _tibrainn_ mo demhes daibh.
do _na_, _mnaibh_ celes _an cir_.

---

94The reading _guth_ presumably goes back to a reading _gud_. However, the copy which contains this reading also has nasalisation in _mbachall_ _mbuidhe_. This, and the apparent treatment of the compound as two separate words, might suggest a more substantial reinterpretation unless _mb_– in _mbuidhe_ is an error which arose under the influence of the same letter combination in _mbachall_.

95Bergin prints crō with upper-case c.

96The citation in _BST_ is found only in the copy in RIA 24 P 8 (752). It is introduced to illustrate the point made in _BST_ 232.6 where the rhyme is faulted (the rhyme is also faulted in _BST_ 14a.17).

97_BST_ p. 185.

98On this common theme, see Bretnach 1953.

99On this copy, see n. 42. The citation is followed by ‘.c.’ in H.2.12 which I regard as an instance of polar error for ‘.l.’ on the basis of _BST_ 67a.26 and the passage in _IGT_ V. For a discussion of polar errors, see Timpanaro 1985, 147–54 and Briggs 1983.
The only significant variation between the citations is that H.2.12 has the conditional for the future and that IGT V has the possessive pronoun mo where the other two have the article.¹⁰⁰

Comparison of the text of additional citations corroborates the observations made earlier. That is to say, shared citations bear witness to varying degrees of corruption in G (as in citation a), but they also show that that manuscript may vary from other copies only in details (as in citation d) or may preserve a superior reading (as in citation b and possibly also citation c). The corruptions, which might arise in any text in the course of transmission, are hardly grave enough to be in line with Knott’s characterisation of the scribe’s work as ‘difficult to accept … as the work of a learned scholar’; but this observation is not intended to dismiss the significant difficulties encountered in G which prompted Knott to make the comment.

**Editorial concerns**

Comparison between copies of citations is pertinent when considering those for which sources are not known to be extant. Not all are entirely sound, for reasons unrelated to the faults which they were intended to exemplify. Such instances pose particular editorial challenges given that the vast majority of citations in the tract are faulty by design. The question presenting itself is whether or not there is justification for rectifying, where possible, any additional or secondary deficiencies present in citations which may be assumed to have arisen in the course of transmission of the tract.¹⁰¹ This problem should be viewed in light of the primary pedagogical purpose of IGT V which is to demonstrate the correct composition of verse by showing what should be avoided.¹⁰² A case in point occurs in a passage which presents an instance of a fault known as rudhrach uaitne.¹⁰³

> **Eich ì òigNèll ar ōud Garbhlaich**
> **fòidbèm do bhean a talmain**

> ‘The steeds of the descendant of young Niall throughout Garbhlaich kicked sods (lit. struck a sod-blow) from the earth’.¹⁰⁴

¹⁰⁰For comparable variation between the article and a possessive pronoun, see n. 79 above and Ó Riaín 2010b, 98 q. 6a, 101 q. 20c.

¹⁰¹Compare the few emendations or suggestions for emendations to citations in Bergin’s edition (some of them proposed by Knott) in §§40, 60, 79, 88, 93, 95, 105, 120, 122, 136, 140, 143, 144, 149, 150. It may be noted that unmetrical variants occur in some copies of other tracts also e.g. IGT III 493 (n. 15), 499 (n. 26), while emendation is necessary in other instances e.g. IGT I §17 (leg. tèid [ifín]. ìu. a n-iodhadh as); IGT II 334 (leg. méd, mar); IGT III 354 (leg. Samradhán). With regard to the hitherto unresolved crux in IGT I §17, note that ifín, the name of the five digraphs and trigraphs which begin with the letter t, namely io iu ia iai iui, usually precedes the individual graphs which begin with the letter t, namely io in ia iai iai, usually precedes the individual graphs as, for example, in Ó Riaín 2013b, 62 vv. 16cde, 18a. Individual graphs do also occur without the graph name on occasion, e.g. BST 236.15. The graph name is clearly required in the line in question, however, as it supplies the two missing syllables.

¹⁰²See p. 3 above.

¹⁰³This fault was encountered earlier in a different metre, see discussion at p. 8 above.

¹⁰⁴§103. Alternatively, ì in the first line might be capitalised and taken as forming the title Ó (òig)Nèill.
The fault is exemplified here by the final words of lines c and d (Garbhlaigh and talmhain, highlighted in bold). As in the previous instance of the fault, the problem is that the words rhyme instead of consonating. This is resolved in the tract by replacing one place-name (Garbhlaigh) with another (Murbhaigh) and reading: Eich ì òigNéll ar [f]ud Murbaich ‘The steeds of the descendant of young Niall throughout Murbhach’.

This results in a sound text by virtue of making the required consonance as opposed to rhyme. The corrected version consists solely of this line, but several problems are left untouched. The metre of the citation is deachnaidh mhór (8' 6'). However, the second line (fōidbēm do bhean a talmhain) is hypermetric and lacks alliteration as it stands. In addition, (f)ud in the first line has no rhyming counterpart in the second line. Accordingly it contains three serious faults over and above the one being exemplified, namely rofad, éguaim and anocht. However, all of these may be remedied by reading tug in place of do bhean. The corruption is explicable on the grounds that the phrases beanaidh bèim and do-bheir bèim may be viewed as roughly synonymous in the context. Substitution of one synonym for another may occur in the course of transmission and disturb the metre without affecting the sense of a text.

The case for emending in such instances is further supported by a passage for which the source has not been identified, but which is preserved in both G and N. The fault involves the use of a case of a noun which is at odds with the grammatical context (anrēm). The type of noun with which the passage reproduced below is concerned differs from the nominative singular in the accusative and dative singular. Such nouns, termed baininsge, mainly comprise á-stems and consonantal stems with the exception of all r-stems barring siúr ‘sister’. The text of G and N is presented below.

§16 (G)  
Anrēm amail a-tā  
Duarais bean ar bru na Bōinde  
do bean tū as a hōighi ī  
Duarais mhnai budh c[h]ōir ann sin  
Uair nī gabhand focul bainindsgí re  
hoibrughudh rēmī roimhe.  

N (115)  
Anreim. amail atá.  
do uaras bean ar bru boine.  
do bean tu as a hoigi i.  
do uairais mnaoi, is cóir ann sin,  
Uair nī ghabhann focal baninsscie re  
hoibrugh reime roime.  

105Garbhlaich is not given in Hogan’s Onomasticon Goedelicum, but three places in Mayo, Louth and Leitrim are listed under the name An Garbhlaich on logainm.ie (accessed 23 March 2015). The earliest attestations of each cited there are from the fifteenth (1412), sixteenth and seventeenth centuries respectively.

106§§11, 7, 6.

107Compare the phrase do-bheir bèim do in §97 (2).

108For discussion and examples of this phenomenon, see Ó Riain 2010a, 138, 140, 152, 157, 158, 160 and IBP 93. Note also that replacement of one word by a synonym is exemplified in faulty and correct versions of a citation, for example, in §§60, 67 (i) and (ii) (dáil, fedm; coisgeas, bacas).


110Bergin prints mnai and notes (Ériu 17, 262 n. 1) that the m is ‘dotted’. As lenition of the direct object is not an error, he may have intended restoring a Middle Irish orthography, although this is not done by him elsewhere.
Gordon Ó Riain

G reads d’uarais (2nd sing. past of do-gheibh), with non-classical elision of the vowel in the verbal particle do, once in the first line of the citation and again in the prose explanation.\(^\text{111}\) N reads do in both instances.\(^\text{112}\) The correct syllable count is achieved there through the absence of the article before Bóinne (gen.). This river name is found with and without the article as is clear from the entries in the *Historical dictionary of Gaelic placenames*.\(^\text{113}\) Therefore, the text of N may be identified as superior and it seems preferable to adopt it. Accordingly the first line may be read *Do-uarais bean ar brú Bóinne* and the entire passage rendered as follows:

‘Incorrect use of case is thus:

*Do-uarais bean ar brú Bóinne*

do bhean tú as a hóige i

“You found a woman on the bank of the Boyne / you deflowered her” *Do-uarais mhnaí* (”you found a woman [acc. sg.]”) would be [: is N] correct there, for a “feminine” noun does not withstand a preceding transitive verb.”\(^\text{114}\)

Instances such as these would appear to provide support for emending the text in similar cases, that is, where a secondary corruption unrelated to the fault under discussion can be identified as having arisen over the course of transmission. That situation is complicated to a certain extent, however, by a passage on the fault cláen creite in the metre séadnaidh ghairid (8\(^t\) 3\(^r\)).\(^\text{115}\) It arises there because the word which rhymes with the final of c is not in penultimate position (*labhair : bhatheis*).\(^\text{116}\)

Mo teacht [leg. sheacht] mbeannacht ar do baithis [leg. bhatheis]

labair féin rim

Lochtach sin, óir ní dleseadh focul beith edir *labhair 7 rim* 7 a-tá éguaim 7 a-tá rofadh and fós a-ráen 7 in cláen creite.\(^\text{117}\)

‘*Mo sheacht mbeannacht ar do bhatheis*

labair féin rim

---

\(^\text{111}\) For do, see *IGT* I §73.

\(^\text{112}\) The first instance (do uaras) is to be read do uarais. The manuscript reading -as for -ais presumably arose through misexpansion of the compendium -úfís, on which see Breatnach 2011, 135–6 (j) (i) and (iii).


\(^\text{114}\) It may be noted that the correction to mhnaí would leave bhean in the second line without a rhyming partner.

\(^\text{115}\) The name of the fault cláen creite is rendered as an ‘error in the framework of the stanza’ in *DIL* C 209.22–3.

\(^\text{116}\) The rhyme, which is not commented upon, is of the brúilingeacht type or imperfect, see n. 63 above.

\(^\text{117}\) §38; cf. n. 13 above.
Observations on the Citations in IGT V

“My seven blessings upon your forehead / speak to me”
That is incorrect, for there should not be a word between labhair (“speak”) and rim (“to me”) and there is an absence of alliteration and also excessive length there in addition to cláen creite.’

One may surmise that a corrected version of the final line would read labhair liom.118 What is perhaps puzzling, when considered in light of passages in which corrected versions of citations occur, is that the text is allowed to stand without a correction being proposed. This makes the case for emendation less than clear-cut and it will be apparent that each citation must be assessed on its own merits. It would seem, however, that the most sensible approach would be to allow the commentary and headings in which more than a single fault is mentioned to act as guides.119

Part IV

Subject matter
It will be appropriate at this juncture to make some general observations on the subject matter of the citations we have been examining. Citations in the grammatical and metrical tracts hold ‘an aspect of … interest … which is not widely appreciated – at least not so widely as their value is to the linguist – namely as a literary record, replete with examples of motifs and images characteristic of bardic poetry as a whole’.120 The subject matter of such citations has yet to be made the subject of comprehensive study. Pádraig Breathnach has led the way for the Classical Irish period by examining elegiac citations in IGT II and III–IV.121 For the Early Irish period, Roisin McLaughlin has edited and analysed satires and invectives which represent a high proportion of the citations in MV III, while Donncha Ó hAodha has edited the quotations from MV I, noting that almost half are panegyric in nature.122 Interpretation is naturally hampered to some extent by the fact that citations occur out of context. This caveat should be borne in mind in any discussion of their subject matter and renders parts of the examination below tentative.123 Indeed, some citations

118See DIL L 14.25–8 and AithdD. no. 34 q. 22d n. for the phrase labhraidh le. Note that this passage occurs in a section of the text which requires fuller discussion as noted above (n. 13).
119Mention is made of more than one fault in other passages, e.g. §§135, 136, 140. Compare also IGT II 1627 and 1814.
120Breathnach 2000, 20.
121Ibid. 20–1. See further n. 130 below.
122McLaughlin 2008, 104–262; Ó hAodha 1991, 222. Ó hAodha’s figure refers to the 44 citations which he identifies as belonging originally to MV I. Additional examples which are identified as later additions to that text are edited and made the subject of a separate study by the same author (2002, 232–9).
123Compare Breathnach’s comments (2000, 20–1) on assessing the subject matter of the citations in IGT II–IV and BST: ‘the degree of caution in approaching a sample drawn together on the basis of thematic or generic observation must be all the greater in view of the necessarily impressionistic nature of the undertaking, not to mention the obstacle posed by the azygous character of the citations themselves.’
cannot be firmly assigned to a particular category or genre in the absence of further information and are omitted from the discussion. In what follows, corrected versions of citations are presented where available for convenience’s sake, while such faults as occur are not generally commented on, as the concern here is with subject matter.

In all there are 152 citations in *IGT V*, one of which is found solely in *N*. The standard fare of bardic poetry is well represented with at least a third of citations readily identifiable as belonging to various types of praise poetry. An instance of eulogy was encountered earlier where the patron is made the subject of a favourable comparison with Murchadh Mumhan (‘Murchadh of Munster’), that is, the son of Brian Bóraimhe, who died in 1014. Further instances include praise of the appearance of an unidentified youth (gìolla) and a poet’s expression of affection for an Àedh who is described with standard complimentary epithets.

\[
\text{Gilla gruaidhghéal} \\
\text{gnùis m[a]r ruidhèl} \\
\text{rosg grind glan.}^{126}
\]

‘A bright-cheeked youth / a countenance like herb Robert / a sharp clear eye.’

\[
\text{Bind lemsa} \\
\text{làech Leamna} \\
\text{crèabh [h]umra} \\
\text{Àedh Emma.}^{127}
\]

‘Pleasing to me / is the warrior of Leamhain / a fragrant branch / Àedh of Eamhain.’

---

124 On Murchadh, who may also be identified as mentioned in §89 (n. 131 below), see Ní Mhaonaigh 2014, 142–4, 156–61. For the citation, see p. 8 above.

125 On such epithets, see Knott 1922, pp. lii–lvi.

126 §47. For *ruideál* (al. *r. rig*), which is noted for its red colour at certain times of the year, see *DIL* s.v. and also Dwelly 1901–11 s.v. *ruideal*, *righeal-righ*, and *righeal cuil*, *LEIA* R 52, Williams 1993, 150–2. Two instances of a tentatively suggested figurative usage in which ‘the simile … seems suggested by the hue of the warriors’ are noted in *DIL* from *Caithrēim Thoir-dhhealbhaigh*. The second of these, (2) below, might be more plausibly interpreted as referring to the colour of the bloodied bodies of the warriors, but this does not affect the interpretation of the example in *IGT V*. The examples cited in *DIL* read as follows: (1) *Cindfid re [a] cois . bud céim d’ár ndin / cland Cuilén cruaid . na ruidhél rígh* ‘Hard at his heel Clancullen comes to shelter us: a prince’s guard [sic; recte ‘Hardy Clann Chuilën like herb Robert will advance alongside him, it will be a feat for our protection’]’ (O’Grady 1929, I 97, II 148) and (2) *Fiche deithnebar do’n droing . is trí deithnebair derbaim … mar rudhél do’n droing ar dath . do cloind Cuilén gu créachtach* ‘Twenty tens of them, and three tens more I certify … right well raddled all were they [sic; recte ‘the band was like herb Robert in colour’], were wounded of Clancullen’ (O’Grady 1929, I 123, II 153).

127 §70. Bergin read ‘leamsa’ for MS ‘lemsa’.
An elegiac citation was also encountered earlier which contained the common motif whereby the fertility of the land is seen as coming to an end upon the death of the rightful king. Another instance is *IGT* V §6:

Nocho gabam ar mo gol
ón lò nach marand Murc[h]odh.

‘I do not hold back my tears since the day of Murchodh’s death (lit. from the day that Murchodh does not live).’

The paucity of elegiac examples, which amount to under 1% of the whole, may be remarked upon. This figure can be compared to *IGT* II and III–IV where 121 and 72 citations respectively are drawn from elegies, according to Breatnach, representing 6 and 7% of the total in each text.

Many of the citations are more difficult to classify precisely and consist of various miscellaneous or occasional pieces, the majority of which are conventional. These include, for example, quatrains on poets and poetry, descriptions of blackbirds and natural features, an *aisling*, mnemonic verses, and so on. There are also references to heroic figures, both legendary and historical. Some are mentioned in the context of the motif of *ubi sunt*:

Dún Dealga
maith in t-inadh oireachtais
dá maradh Cú na cearda.

‘Dundalk [would be] a good assembly place if the hound of the smith (i.e. Cú Chulainn) were alive.’

One of these has been identified as belonging to the corpus of *fiannaigheacht* poetry by Pádraig Ó Macháin. It is true that the citation makes mention of Cumhall who is, in all probability, the father of Fionn. (N reads the name *Conall* but this must qualify as the *lectio facilior*.) However, the quatrain is cast in *dán direach* (despite the presence of the fault it exemplifies) and this makes it less likely that it represents an extract from a *fiannaigheacht* poem as this type of verse is, as far as I am aware, always in *óglaich*. It may be

---

128 For the citation, see n. 21 above. For the motif, see McManus 2006, 63–7.
129 To these might be added the examples of the motif of *ubi sunt* mentioned below (n. 132).
130 Breatnach 2000, 21. The total number of citations (excluding recurring citations) runs to 2039 in *IGT* II and 990 in *IGT* III–IV, ibid. 16.
131 §§23 (1), 25, 50, 86 (2), 89, 119 (Cumhall; Conghal Cláen; Cú Chulainn; Manannán; Brian Bóraimhe and his sons, Donnchadh and Murchadh; Mongán); cf. also n. 124 above. It should be borne in mind here that there are a number of instances where only a Christian name is given in a citation; it cannot be determined if these might be the names of such heroic figures without further context to act as a guide.
132 §§50, 89.
133 §§50.
134 §§23 (1); Ó Macháin 2015, 106.
135 See Ní Dhomhnaill 1975, 44 (§85).
more plausible, then, to suggest that the quatrain might have been drawn from an apologue which formed part of a bardic poem. Another citation mentions the seventh-century king Conghal Cláen in addition to an Áedh:

Nochor t[h]oit re Congal Cláen
dá láech mar Áedh roghlan riam.137

‘Two warriors like truly pure Áedh / never fell at the hands of Conghal Cláen.’

The idea would seem to be that the Áedh in question was, in his own right, superior to any two warriors combined who fell at the hands of Conghal.138 The latter was said to have slain large numbers of warriors as, for example, in the following couplet: *cia dorochair Congal caech / mor laech adrochair da rind* ‘Though Congal Caech has fallen, / many a hero has fallen by the point of his spear.’139 The citation in *IGT V* also serves to illustrate some of the difficulties involved where a personal name occurs without further context to indicate identity.140 In the present instance, although Conghal is said to have slain one hundred men named Áedh, none of the main characters in the sagas related to him bears this name.141 For this reason, it seems likelier that the fallen Áedh of the citation is being favourably compared to earlier warriors, rather than his being a contemporary of Conghal’s.

Other types of poetry are more sparsely attested. Citations of a religious nature amount to less than 1%. Religious items include a verse on creation and a couplet on charity given for the sake of Mary and Saint Martin.

Cēdobair in C[h]oim[d]headh
cruthughudh clāir nime
ga[n] nī roime riamh
do c[h]um fairge is aër
do dhealbh t[h]almhain toirthigh
edir thoir is tiar.142

‘The first work of the Lord / [was] the creation of the plain of Heaven / without anything beforehand / he created the seas and the air / he fashioned the bountiful earth / both in the east and in the west.’

---

136 Compare, for example, the citation in *IGT III* 468 which is taken from such an apologue, as identified in Ó Ríain 2008a, 216; for apalogues which draw on *fiannaighacht* material, see Ó Caithnia 1984, 74–8.
137 §25 (this version of the couplet substitutes *thoit* for *thaeth*, which is faulted).
139 Marstrander 1911, 244 ll. 207–8, 245. See also O’Donovan 1842, 286–92.
140 See n. 131 above.
141 O’Donovan 1842, 288.
142 §48 (MS coingheadh; toirrthigh).
Dearc uaim dá gach duine duibh
ar Muiri agus ar Mártaín.\footnote{143}

‘Alms from me to each one of you for the sake of Mary and Martin.’

There is also a small body of uncomplimentary or condemnatory citations which includes instances of satire and invective. One appears to represent a threat of satire arising over a lack of generosity on the commemorand’s part:

Ní cainfidhearg Cú Mara
da fagha bů du-bera.\footnote{144}

‘Cú Mara will not be condemned should he find cows which he may give.’

Another comments on the revolting taste of a salmon.

Maigri glas ón muir a-muigh
ar nach fuil ach[t] blas bualtaigh.\footnote{145}

‘A silver salmon from the sea which tastes only of dung.’

The final instance of this category to be cited here insults a Giolla Mo Chua and his descendants.

Gilla Mo Chua mo chac dhó
dhā mhac dá ua dá iarmhō.\footnote{146}

‘Gilla Mo Chua, confound him (lit. my excrement for him), his son, his grandson [and] his great-grandson.’

An additional small cluster of citations in which mention is made of women may be identified within, and overlapping with some of, the categories outlined above. These include instances of praise and satire such as:

A ingean óg í vind
ó inbear na cræebh

\footnote{143§145. This example may be drawn from a supplementary quatrains (see n. 44 above); this suggestion is strengthened by the fact that supplementary quatrains are often dedicated to saints, see Breatnach 1993, 59, 62 and Ó Háinle 1991, 88. On Martin of Tours (who is most likely referred to here) in Irish tradition see Herbert 2002 and Gwynn 1966. The vowel length in the name is discussed by Ó Mainnín (2009, 118 n. 10), who remarks on the variability and uncertainty of the form of the name. I have no rhyming examples from dán díreach; however, the only diagnostic example to hand suggests that the vowel is long; it is found in a scholion on Félire Óengusa, see Stokes 1905, 212 (Patraic : Martain [leg. -á-]).}

\footnote{144§9. See also n. 65 above.}

\footnote{146§10.}

\footnote{148§128 (4).}
Further instances refer to women in the context of lamenting. A very small number of these citations have to do with violence or sexual relations:

\[\text{Ni maith ar labair i lliagh}
\text{faghail ar siair Domnaill duibh.}\]

‘What her physician pronounced is not good, / an attack on Domnall’s sister by you.’

\[\text{Beag nachar meath sind re seal …}
\text{c\'a neach ras mill ar maighdean.}\]

‘I almost wasted away for a time … / who has despoiled her, my maiden?’

A parallel for such material is found in Latin schooltexts, as has been discussed by Marjorie Curry Woods, who notes that ‘sexual imagery is omnipresent in the texts used to teach Latin to medieval boys, and rape is a common narrative vehicle in these texts.’ Citations such as these, and the satirical ones discussed above, may also involve considerations of memorability in light of
the recommendation by many writers on memory to use graphic or dynamic examples, as is discussed by Mary Carruthers in her study of memory in medieval culture:

Memorative images should be of moderate size, but that is their only moderate feature. Because the memory retains distinctly only what is extraordinary, wonderful, and intensely charged with emotion, the images should be of extremes – of ugliness or beauty, ridicule or nobility, of laughter or weeping, of worthiness or salaciousness. Bloody figures, or monstrosities, or figures brilliantly but abnormally colored should be used, and they should be engaged in activity of a sort that is extremely vigorous.154

While these considerations may have influenced the selection of material in some instances, it must be acknowledged that at least the specifically sensational examples represent only a small proportion of the whole.155 The assortment of subjects encountered in the citations in IGT V might, then, perhaps be compared to the situation which Douglas Kelly has described for the roughly contemporary Latin arts of poetry and prose as follows:

The traditional Horatian precept miscuit utile dulci has its application in the illustrations the treatises use to support and enliven their instruction. Weight or seriousness is offered by the examples from moral, philosophical, and religious contexts, lightness or frivolity by those from farcical, amorous, even scatological or vulgar subjects that some of the authors indulge in.156

Such variety is ‘precisely what might alternately edify or entertain teen-age schoolboys and hold their attention’.157

CONCLUSION

IGT V is the oldest of the tracts in terms of the earliest manuscript in which it survives and this fact alone assigns to it an intrinsic interest and singular importance in the Classical Irish grammatical and metrical tradition. In spite

155The citations which belong to this genre have attracted some attention, but there is a danger that the entertaining nature of some has led to overemphasis being placed on their relatively slim presence in the tract, as in McManus 1996, 170 where it is also stated that the occurrence of examples of ‘non-official’ poetry arises from the fact that IGT V is concerned with faults. It is not made clear, however, why such citations must be faulty nor does McManus address the fact that a large proportion of citations do not belong to this category. It should also be taken into account that comparable ‘non-official’ citations are found on occasion in the other tracts.
156Kelly 1991, 106.
157Ibid., 91–2; see also ibid. 147.
of its importance, it is fair to say that it is the most neglected of all the grammatical and metrical tracts. The observations here presented are a first step towards redressing the imbalance affecting the study of that text and arise from the present writer’s ongoing work to produce a new edition and comprehensive studies of the text.
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