A fragment of an early modern tract on grammar and metrics

Gordon Ó Riain

INTRODUCTION

This contribution presents an edition, with textual notes and translation, of a fragment of a tract which is concerned with the formation of compound words and alliteration. The contents of the text are examined in detail and the relationship in which it stands to the other grammatical and metrical tracts is addressed. A treatment of selected technical terminology and alliteration with the letter p is also provided. The fragment has, to the present writer’s knowledge, hitherto received no scholarly attention and is published here for the first time.

MANUSCRIPT

The text which is the concern of this study is preserved on a single, loose slip of vellum which is stored with UCD-OFM A 4. That codex is relatively well known as it preserves a copy of Acallam na Senórach which was used by Stokes in his edition of that text to supply additional passages not found in other manuscripts. By way of contrast, the slip has hitherto been mostly unknown to scholarship. It had been inserted loosely into A 4 before the Franciscan manuscripts were transferred to UCD Archives and is now preserved in a separate pouch. At an earlier stage, the slip formed part of a miscellaneous

1 I am grateful to Pádraig A. Breathnach and Caoimhin Breathnach for reading a draft of this essay. All translations are by the present writer unless otherwise indicated.
2 See Dillon, Mooney and de Brún (1969: 10–12).
3 Stokes (1900: x–xii).
assortment of fragments numbered A 31 in the same collection. It is described as follows in the Catalogue of Irish Manuscripts in the Franciscan Library Killiney where it is tentatively dated to the sixteenth century:

A slip of vellum folded into two leaves has been inserted loosely into MS. The leaves measure 23.5 cms (approx.) in width and 8.5 cms (tapering to 4 cms at fold) in height. Contents: (1) Grammatical material in Irish. Beg. chóir ní beith da comfhocul aigi. Foll. by “ag so leabhar Uuilliam I C(h)uilemh[a]in” (?), twice, in different inks. The grammatical material is continued on the verso. (2) Ossianic poem. Cidh be ait ambem anoicht. c. 15 qq., with continuation (illegible) on verso.

It may be observed that item (2), which is not recognised by the cataloguers, represents an acephalous copy of the poem beginning Anocht fiordheireadh na ffían edited from UCD-OFM A 20 (b) by Eoin MacNeill in Duanaire Finn. The owner who wrote his name on the slip was a member of the Leinster medical family of Ó Cuileamhain. An ‘Uilliam Ó Cuilleamhan’ is recorded as scribe of a short portion of NLI G 8, a medical manuscript written primarily by Éumann Ó Bolgaoi in 1548 with the assistance of a number of collaborators. However, his signature in G 8, in as far as this may be compared with the partially faded signature in our fragment, displays a number of differences in letter forms, most notably in the letters a and u. The medical connection may nonetheless be of significance as the script of the fragment bears certain general stylistic similarities to the small neat hands of the fifteenth-century scribe Donnchadh Ó Bolgaidhe, who wrote most of

4See Dillon, Mooney and de Brún (1969: xxii n. 58, 65–8).
5Ibid. 11; for the date (‘16th (?) cent.’), see ibid. 10.
6MacNeill (1908: no. 19). The copy in the slip begins at q. 8.
7For some remarks on the family, see Ní Shéaghdha (1967: 42, 94) where it is noted that they had connections with the medical schools of the Ó Bolgaidhe and Ó Conchobhair families. For an account of the latter school, see Nic Dhonnchadha (2006). For references to other members of the Ó Cuileamhain family, see ibid. 16 n. 18, Ni Shéagheda (1967: 67), eadem (1987: 36, 37) and the genealogy in RIA I v 1 (F) (no. 745), 13v; cf. also O’Curry (1861: 488 n. 54).
8See Ní Shéagheda (1967: 41). His signature will be found on p. 141. The formal variation -á(i)n might suggest that the surname ends in a long vowel -á(i)n, cf. IGT II §35. However, the name is sometimes spelt with -uin (Ní Shéagheda (1987: 36); cf. -ain, ibid. 37; Aoidheann Nic Dhonnchadha has also kindly drawn my attention to the spelling ‘o cuilamhuire’ in NLI G 11, 250 (upper margin), pace Ni Shéagheda (1967: 67) and the name is Anglicised as Culloon or Culhoun (MacLysaght 1957: 102). On the various forms of the name Ó Bolgaidhe, see Ni Shéagheda (1967: 41–2).
NLI G 11, and of the scribe of a fragment of a medical text preserved in RIA B iv 1 b (no. 1269, IB). While the resemblances might perhaps be tentatively put down to associated families or schools, they may simply be representative of a more general contemporary style, the upper limits of which have yet to be established.9

Some scribal features which may be registered include: (i) the spelling ae as opposed to ao;10 (ii) the writing of an epenthetic vowel in ‘aillim’ and, possibly also, in ‘eirighi’ (§§1, 5); (iii) the item ‘eirighi’, just adverted to, may, however, be more likely to indicate vocalisation of the historical velar fricative gh and represent a scribal pronunciation of ‘-ighi’ as a long vowel -i;11 (iv) the use of a suspension stroke to represent a final vowel in ‘a-tā’ (§§1–3, 7);12 (v) the radical consonant of a nasalised or lenited word is not always written by the scribe in §§5–7, e.g. ‘ar gloch’ (ar gcloch) and ‘mo hadhb’ (mo Shadhbh). This is conditioned by the context and is intended to be illustrative of the teaching imparted. Thus, it is consistently employed in examples of alliterating words, e.g. bean agus ar mean (§5), with one additional instance (ar geann, §5);13 (vi) the orthography of compound words in §3 fluctuates, now representing each of the individual elements clearly, now reflecting pronunciation, e.g. -dearg in findearg and geillearg.14 The latter procedure is recommended in the case of compounds in which the first element is a prefix (termed greim comhfhocuil) in IGT I, but such orthographical fluctuation is not confined to the present text and is, in fact, advised against in GGBM;15 (vii) attention may, lastly, be drawn to the imperative form Tobair which

---

9The scribe of the fifteenth-century manuscript RIA 23 B 3 (965), Diarmaid Ó Conaill, might also be included here. Compare Ni Shéaghdha (1967: 13) for remarks on similarities of certain fourteenth-century scribes of the Ó Cianáin family; cf. also Carney (1969: 127 and 122 n. 2).

10The spelling ao is not found before the fifteenth century according to SNG IV §2.7; see also Mackinnon (1904: 4) and Ó Riain (2013: 71–6).

11See also note on sgoilleinbh (§3) below. The epenthetic vowel and vocalisation of gh are attested by the thirteenth century, see SNG IV §§2.9, 2.11 and references cited there; see also Bretnach (1952: 53, 54 n. 3, 58, 59 n. 4), Ó Maolalaigh (2006) and idem (2008: 214–18).

12Other instances will be found, for example, in the fifteenth-century manuscript Liber Flavus Fergusiorum, RIA 23 O 48 (no. 476), see Bretnach (2011: 103 §2e).

13For comparable instances, see GGBM 112–13, 114, 137–8 and TCD D 4. 35 (no. 1431), 174, where words are also spelt without the radical letter to indicate the pronunciation of the mutated initial, a practice which is contrary to the teaching of GGBM 208–13 and IGT I §102 and is clearly employed as an expedient to teaching. For the earlier orthographical practice of omitting the radical of a nasalised word, see SNG III §4.10 and GOI §236 (2).

14See also note on doin[n]dian at p. 168 below.

occurs alongside Tabair in §6 (both written twice). This form is given as a variant of tabhair in a seventeenth-century grammatical tract which contains a number of non-classical forms and is apparently of Scottish provenance.

**CONTENTS**

The fragment begins and ends in mid-sentence and the surviving text deals with matters pertaining to the formation of compounds and alliteration. The teaching may be divided into sections in accordance with the specific issues treated of. A brief account of each section followed by a more detailed discussion of selected features will give an indication of the nature of the text and will also allow for the identification of topics which are the concern of other tracts.

The specific issues dealt with are:

(§1) Compounding of nouns which end in a vowel in the nominative singular and are identical in form in the plural (with the exception of the dative). The vast majority of nouns belonging to this class are io- and iā-stems which may be inflected as vocalic or as dental stems in Classical Irish. When used as the first element in a compound, the nominative singular or genitive plural may be adopted as the compositional form. The example employed to illustrate this teaching is boghadhonn ‘bow-brown’, formed from nominative singular bogha and donn. The commentary discloses that these elements may also be compounded as boghadonn, formed from genitive plural boghadh with dental inflection and donn, with delenition of the final dh of boghadh in contact with the initial d of donn. Compounding of this class of noun is also dealt

---

16 The form tobhair is first found in fifteenth century manuscripts according to O’Rahilly (1932: 178) where it is discussed and identified as a feature of Ulster Irish also found in this verb in Connacht. An example can, however, be adduced from the fourteenth-century Book of Uí Mhaine, f. 62vb22 (tobair); while this spelling is noteworthy, it is should be observed that the form tabhair is required in this instance for rhyme with bladhaibh. For examples of the verbal noun with -o- from RIA D iv 2 (no. 1223), see LSN pp. xlvi, lvi, and note also the form do thobair alongside do tabair in NLI G 11, 119b.7, 8. These manuscripts were compiled in Leinster, see LSN p. xxxii, RIA Cat. Fasc. 26: 3297–307 and Ni Shéaghdha (1967: 65–93), but D iv 2 has Connacht connections, see Ó Concheanainn (1997: 454 n. 7).

17 Black (1990: 10); see ibid. 3 and McManus (1996: 180 §5.4) on non-classical forms in the text. The form tobhair is not cited in IGT III §14.

18 This is the case for most nouns, cf. IGT I §§93, 118. Some restrictions on the use of the genitive plural with certain types of noun are discussed in IGT I §§93, 148 and GGBM 479–87; see further SNG IV §6.3 (b).

19 For further discussion of assimilation in the fragment and of the example boghadhonn which is shared with IGT I, see respectively pp. 135 and 140–1 below.
with in *IGT* I and the seventeenth-century grammar attributed to Tadhg Óg (son of Tadhg Dall) Ó hUiginn which was edited by Mac Aogáin in *Graiméir Ghaeilge na mBráthar Mionúr*.\(^{20}\)

(§2) Items which should not form the first element in a compound.\(^{21}\) These are listed as: nouns in the plural (excluding the genitive plural as is clear from §1, although not stated);\(^ {22} \) verbs; the adjectives *maith* and *olc* which have the compositional forms *d(e)agh-* and *droch-*; and the comparative forms of the adjectives *beag* and *mór*.\(^ {23} \) Similar, but more extensive, lists of such prohibited items are found in *BST, IGT* I and *GGBM*, while certain specific aspects of compounding are faulted in *IGT* V.\(^ {24} \)

(§3) Retrogressive palatalisation in compounds. The final consonant of the first element in a compound word is palatalised if the first vowel in the second element is palatal. Assimilation of quality, including retrogressive velarisation, is also treated of in *IGT* I and *GGBM*.\(^ {25} \)

(§§4–7) Alliteration. (§4) A consonant can alliterate only with another instance of the same consonant, while a vowel may alliterate with any other vowel.\(^ {26} \) It is pointed out that alliteration takes place between radicals and is not affected by nasalisation. This leads to a treatment of that mutation in §5.

---

\(^{20}\) *GGBM* 3313–16. For *IGT* I, see p. 140 below. (The discussion of compounding in *GGBM* 478–525, 4030–60 does not make specific reference to this class of noun.) On the attribution of the tract to Tadhg Óg Ó hUiginn, see Walsh (1947: 74–9) and Sharpe (2013: 235–6, 325); compare Ó Concheanainn (1968: 340).

\(^{21}\) Where reference is made to the beginning of a compound word (*tús comhfhocail*), the type of compound envisaged would appear, in general, to be made up of only two elements since the items faulted could not be placed, for example, in intermediate position in a compound made up of three elements. This underlying concept may find expression in the disapproval of longer compounds in *GGBM* 2864–5: Narab dhot dheoin chaufrios tú nísa mho iná dhá fhocul a comhfhocul dā mbia agad ad dhán ‘Let you not place willingly more than two words in a compound word which you will employ in your poem’. This is not, of course, to suggest that compound words of more than two elements do not occur; compare also *BST* 207.5 *IGT* I §§100, 137 and *GGBM* 551–3, 3215–17 where longer compounds are conceived of.

\(^{22}\) The plural is also faulted as the first element in a compound in *BST* 207.27 and *IGT* I §97. It is specified in *IGT* I §118, however, that the genitive plural is excluded from this prohibition; see further n. 18 above.

\(^{23}\) See further discussion of the last items below pp. 142–4.

\(^{24}\) See *BST* 206.25–207.15 (and notes on those lines; cf. also Mag. 401 l. 185 n.), 21a.3–4; *IGT* I §§96–100, 111, 113–19, 121–5 (cf. 126), 138, 148; *GGBM* 512–25, 3361–9; *IGT* V §§28, 129, 134, 137.

\(^{25}\) *IGT* I §2; *GGBM* 278–85, 496–503, 508–12, 2959–69 (termed *coimhfhreagra*), 3989–91, 4043–5; TCD D 4. 35 (no. 1431), 173. Not all of these passages are restricted to compound words.

\(^{26}\) Although *f* and *s* are given in the list, this statement does not in fact apply under certain circumstances to *f* and *s* as is made clear in §§6–7. See pp. 137, 171, 172–3, 174–5, 180–2 below.
(Lenition is only mentioned in the context of this metrical ornament with regard to specific consonants on which it places certain restrictions in §§6–7).

(§5) This passage includes two lists of letters. They may be compared to another list, consisting of eleven consonants, which is given in the traditional order of the Ogam alphabet as b, l, f, s, n, d, t, c, m, g, r in the previous passage (§4). The same order is not, however, adhered to in the first list in §5, owing to misplacement of l (s, n, l, m, r). This is a list of consonants which are not subject to nasalisation. The second list in this section gives the seven consonants which can be nasalised and adheres to the traditional order except that it includes the letter p in penultimate position (b, f, d, t, c, p, g); its correct position is uncertain.

These lists are followed in both instances by examples of words beginning with each letter listed. The only exceptions are f and d which appear to have been omitted inadvertently, presumably as a result of a copying error. (The letter f is dealt with in §6, but this would appear to be of no importance since examples of words beginning with s and p are given in §5 in addition to the separate treatment of these letters in §§6 and 7). The order in which the examples are listed in the second instance does not reflect that of the traditional alphabet or that of the immediately preceding list (m, l, s, r, n). In the third instance, the order is traditional with the exception of the position of the word beginning with p which is placed last although it occurs in penultimate position in the list.

Nasalisation is dealt with in detail in IGT V §§125–6 and in the technical poems beginning A aos dána, is aithnidh damh and Ca med focal féghar lend in the context of infixed pronouns and conjugated forms of the copula.

27For the order, see, for example, IGT I §4, and for the use of this order in the schools, see Ó Cuív (1966). The list does not include (i) p or ng which make up the total of thirteen consonants mentioned in IGT I §1 according to Mac Cáithigh (2014: 165 ll. 18–19 n.); (ii) h which was not considered a letter in its own right, IGT I §17, GGBM 29, 2899, cf. Mac Cáithigh (2014: 163 l. 5 n.). The omission of p may be an oversight given its occurrence in the second list in §5 or may reflect its non-traditional status, see p. 137 below. On the letter p, see Ó Cuív (1965: 162), idem (1966: 287), IGT I §1 and Appendix I below.

28The same consonants are listed in IGT I §104 in the order s, m, r, l, n in response to a question posed ibid. §1 as to the identity of the five consonants which cannot be nasalised (na cóig consuine gan ogham gan gháoidheilg n-uirrdhightí ar a ccóir uirrdhiughadh do thuigsin).

29See n. 27 above. It may be observed that p is the last consonant listed in IGT V §125. (The list of consonants there may be said to reflect generally the traditional order, although two letters occur out of sequence and another has been omitted entirely, perhaps due to a copying error. Explanations might be offered for the ordering of the letters, but this would require further discussion than could be provided in the present context.) The seven consonants which can be nasalised (na seacht cconsuine ar a tteid uirrdhiughadh) are listed in GGBM 129–30, 3928–31 and mentioned in IGT I §1, but not specified in that tract.

30See McKenna (1940) (= IGT V §§118–28), Ó Riain (2008) and NLI G 3, ff. 75r9–76vz (at f. 75v1–9 qq. 6–8). Editions of IGT V and the latter text are in preparation.
The mutation is also treated of in *GGBM* and receives some mention in *IGT I*.\(^{31}\) There is a slight difference between the texts with regard to the letter *p*. It is omitted in the technical poems, as it was not a part of the traditional alphabet, but is included in the other sources, thus at least partly aligning our text with them.\(^{32}\)

(§§6–7) Alliteration of *f*, *p* and *s*. The following rules are illustrated: (i) *f* alliterates with *bhf*; (ii) *p* alliterates with *bp*; (iii) *f* followed by a vowel alliterates with a vowel; (iv) *f* alliterates with *bp*; (v) *sd* alliterates only with *sd*; (vi) *sg* alliterates only with *sg*; (vii) *sb* alliterates only with *sb*; (viii) *sm* alliterates only with *sm*; (ix) *f* followed by a vowel alliterates only with another lenited *s* followed by a vowel; (x) lenited *sl*, *sn* and *sr* do not alliterate with one another or with lenited *s* but only with another lenited *sl*, *sn*, *sr* or *s*. This is because lenited *s* is not pronounced before these consonants.\(^{33}\) (The rules regarding alliteration of the letter *p* receive further discussion in Appendix I below.)

The fragment breaks off in the course of this topic. With regard to assessing the relationship with other tracts, it may be noted that certain faults related to alliteration are laid down in *IGT V*, while only stray comments concerned with the ornament are found in *IGT I* and *BST*.\(^{34}\) Some of these have to do with the letter *s*, however, and this represents a further connection between the fragment and those texts. The treatment the ornament receives here can be said to be more comprehensive and, indeed, more methodical than that encountered in *IGT I* and *BST*. More fully comprehensive treatments of the metrical ornament are, however, found in *GGBM*.\(^{35}\)

### Identifation of Additional Topic

In addition to establishing the contents of the tract as we have it, it is possible to identify a topic which was dealt with in a part of the text that no

---

\(^{31}\) *GGBM* 120–43, 3109–33, 3925–33; see n. 28 and 29 above.

\(^{32}\) See n. 27 above.

\(^{33}\) The rules regarding alliteration of *f*, *s* and *p* are given respectively in *GGBM* 2484–6, 3505–8 (*f*); *IGT I* §§13, 39, 71, *BST* 213.10–15, *GGBM* 2486–93, 3509–17 (*s*); for *p*, see Appendix I below. For additional remarks on *sh*, *shl*, *shn* and *shr*, see *IGT I* §34, cf. also ibid. §102, *GGBM* 77–8, 111–13, 166–73, 2362–4, 2392, 3099–104, 3924, 3947–51, TCD D 4. 35 (no. 1431), 174, C. Breatnach (1990: 145), Ó Cuív (1966b: 96, 97–8, 102), Ó Dochartaigh (1988: 23–6), SNG VIII §3.3.

\(^{34}\) *IGT V* §§7, 9, 93; cf. also ibid. §96 and §§54–71, 74 (on linking alliteration in the opening couplet known as *lurgu bhrisde*); *BST* p. xvii; Mac Cárthaigh (2014: 166 ll. 21–2 n.).

\(^{35}\) *GGBM* 2476–2503, 3462–3517.
longer survives. This may be determined on the basis of the following remark: ní lór línd ar labrumur do na cáeltaibh tuasud ‘I consider what I said above concerning the palatal forms of vowels to be insufficient’ (§3). This makes it clear that our text had more to say about palatalisation and this observation may be taken a step further by examining the term cáeladh, used here in the dative plural. The term is rendered in DIL as the ‘act of making (becoming?) slender, attenuation (of vowels)’. The only other instance to hand of the term in the plural occurs in IGT I §14 which is headed Dona cáoltuibh [bh]udheasda ‘Concerning the palatal forms of vowels now’. This passage is concerned with demonstrating the forms adopted by velar vowels when palatalised, as for example in Cáoladh .eó. shinidh fhada ag dul a n.eói ‘long eo when palatalised (lit. palatalisation of long eo) becomes eó’.

A comparable treatment of vowels is found in Rudimenta Grammaticae Hibernicae where the verb extenuātiō corresponds to cáeladh as may be seen in the following example: Vocales extenuantur et crassescunt regulariter et irregulariter; quando regulariter, mutatur ... eo longa in eoi, ut deór, don deóir ... ‘Vowels are palatalised and velarised regularly and irregularly; when regularly ... long eo is changed to eoi, as in deór, don deóir (‘a tear, of the tear’). The usage of the term cáeladh in IGT I and the similarity of treatment there and in the Rudimenta allows the tentative inference to be made that our tract dealt with this topic in a similar manner at an earlier point, now lost. Moreover, the treatment of that topic in other texts forms part of a larger discussion of the alphabet and it is conceivable that this observation may give some indication of wider concerns of our tract.

36For other instances of the verbal noun, see BST 210.25 (bis)/29b.29–30 (ter), 71b.31; IGT III §§1 (p. 168 l. 7), 23 n. 12, 83; IGT I §§14, 74, 100, 146 and 149 (the examples from IGT I are registered in DIL s.v. cáelad). It is also found in the form cáolughadh in BST 210.24, IGT III §§1 (p. 168 n. 9), 22 (cf. also §106) and IGTI §1 (these examples are not registered in DIL s.v. cáelugad). Note also forms of the finite verbs cáolaid (IGT I §74) and cáolaighidh (IGT I §§14, 150; GGBM 2964–5). The variation of -adh with -ughudh (al. -achadh) in the verbal noun is to be viewed as optional in the case of these denominative verbs and is also encountered in the case of sealbhadh / sealbhughadh (IGT III §§96, 106) and iollradh / iollrughadh below; compare GOI §§524, 525 and Des. p. 359. Further examples of such variation from the early modern period include crutha(igh) idh and datha(igh)idh, for which see IGT III §§80, 106, 122. (For variation between -ughudh and -achadh, see GGBM 911–13, IGT III §106, and IGT I §151; cf. also O’Rahilly (1932: 69–70).)

37IGT I §14.

38See GGBM 798–831. Compare also n. 25 above and vv. 17–19 of the poem beginning Comhardadh cionnas is cóir where the palatal vowels are also listed but the terms used of them are iseal(l) and isle, see Ó Riain (2013: 55, 62–3).

39Compare also the accounts of the alphabet in Aibidil Gaoidhilige & Caiticiosma (Ó Cuív 1994: 58–67); Nugent’s primer for Elizabeth I (ff. 8r–9r; digitised at www.isos.dias.ie (Farmleigh House);
ILLUSTRATIVE EXAMPLES

The fragment contains no poetic citations, but does present examples of single words or phrases employed in each section of the text to illustrate points under discussion. A handful of these are shared with other texts, as follows:

(i) *droichfhear* §2 (IGT I §97); (ii) *marbh na fir* §2 (GGBM 721, 774 marbh *na fiora*; cf. also IGT I §151 marbh *fiora*, IGT II §65 *marbh fíra* HP (v.l. meall *fíra* CC); (iii) *ar gceann* §5 (GGBM 134, 3930); (iv) *ar mbean* §5 (GGBM 3930); (v) *boghadhonn* §1 (IGT I §142); (vi) *glaisliabh* §3 (IGT I §37); (vii) *beagmhó* (see below).

The use of the personal names Fearghal, Pilib/Filib, Pól and Sadhbh in a number of examples in BST may also be noted. Most of the examples listed above are admittedly run of the mill. Those listed at (v)–(vii) are, however, somewhat less commonplace and warrant further comment as they may be of significance.

(v) *boghadhonn* ‘bow-brown’
This is cited as an example of a compound in which the first element is a noun which may be inflected as a vocalic or dental stem. It may be noted that in this case, not only is the example identical, but there is also a close contextual correspondence between the passages in question which are reproduced below. Similarities extend partly to wording (*a chomhfhocal ón ainm úathaidh agus ón táobhreach isiol iollraidh* ... *a chomhfhocal ón táobhreach ard iollraidh*; *comfhocul aigi ón ainm uathaidh agus ón táebhreach iollraide*). Differences arise, on the one hand, from the fact that the genitive plural when inflected as a vocalic stem (the ‘low’ genitive plural) is not discussed in (b) below and, on the other, from the context in which the passages occur. Passage (b) appears

---

40 It seems reasonable to assume that the part of the tract now lost contained poetic citations, as do all the other grammatical and metrical tracts.

41 Compare also *marbh fear* at GGBM 729, 738.

42 I have not included here instances such as the use of *lámh* in §5 (*lámh, ar lámh*) to illustrate that *l* is not nasalised and its more general use as a headword in the tract on declension (IGT II §192) or the use of *bogha* as an example of spelling or as paradigm in GGBM 270, 839–43.

43 Fearghal e.g. BST 187.18; Pilib/Filib and Pól e.g. BST 187.6–7, 206.8; Sadhbh e.g. BST 203.5–9, 214.28–30. The possibility that in §5 *mór* may represent a personal name is raised in the Notes at p. 169 below.

44 See discussion above pp. 134–5.

45 With regard to the fact that the ‘low’ genitive plural is not discussed in (b), it should be borne in mind that that passage represents the acephalous beginning of our text. See further note on §1 (táebhréim iollraide) below.
to be intended as a statement of a general rule regarding this noun class, whereas in *IGT* I such nouns have been discussed earlier in the text and also in the immediately preceding passages; (a) also occurs in the context of teaching regarding the spelling of final vowels (although not specifically commented on in the passage).

(a) *Bogha agus donn, boghadhonn* a chomhfhocal ón ainm úathaidh *agus* ón táobhréim ísiol iollraidh, *boghadonn* a chomhfhocal ón táobhréim ard iollraidh (*IGT* I §142).

*Bogha and donn, boghadhonn is its (sc. *bogha*) compositional form (lit. compound) based on the nominative singular and on the genitive plural when inflected as an *io*-stem (lit. with regard to the low genitive plural), *boghadonn* is its compositional form (lit. compound) based on the genitive plural when inflected as a dental stem (lit. with regard to the high genitive plural).*

(b) ní beith da comfhocul aigi ach[t] *boghadhond* a-māin *agus* a-tá gac focal is cōir d’ainm *uathaid agus illraid mur sin* i.e. comfhocul aigi ón ainm *uathaid agus* ón táebhréim *illraid agus* ní fuil do deifriugud eturra *acht* duir go n*uath ag ēirghí (ēirighi MS) ar deiredh* in táebreíme illraid do-nī *áenduir lom díbh. [§1]*

*it should only form a compound as *boghadhonn* (“bow-brown”) and each word which has the same form in the nominative singular and plural (lit. which is correct as nominative singular and nominative plural) is like that. That is, it has a compositional form (lit. compound) based on the nominative singular and [another] based on the genitive plural and there is no difference between them save that *dh* occurs at the end of the genitive plural which makes a single unlenited *d* of them (sc. *dh* and *d* in *boghadonn*).*

(vi) *glaisliabh* ‘blue mountain’

This represents one of six examples cited in §3, the purpose of which is to show that the first element of a compound is palatalised if the second element begins with a palatal consonant. This is seen in the present instance in that the final *s* of *glas* is palatalised when compounded with *sliabh*. It may, however,
be noted that the same example is employed in *IGT* I to show that two instances of *s* are assimilated in a compound, being thus reckoned as one:

Tiad dá .s. na chéile a ccomhfhocal mur so: glas *agus* smior, glaismior sin; glas *agus* sliabh, glaisliabh sin. Imtheachd do-rinne .s. an tshléibhe ann sin. (*IGT* I §37)

‘Two instances of the letter *s* combine in a compound word like this: glas (“yellow (?)”) and smior (“marrow”), that is glaismior (“yellow (?) marrow”); glas (“blue”) and sliabh (“mountain”), that is glaisliabh (“blue mountain”). The *s* in sliabh disappeared in that case.’

In fact, all six examples in this section of the fragment are not only suitable to exemplify the doctrine of assimilation of quality. They could also appropriately demonstrate the following assimilatory effects of adjacent consonants at compound junctures which are not, however, made the subject of commentary: (i) *nn* (< *-nn* and *d-*) in *doinndian*; (ii) *b* (< *-bh* and *b-*) in *duibearn*; (iii) *n* (< *-n* and *d-*) in *findearg*; (iv) *ll* (< *-l* and *d-; -l* and *l-*) in *geillearg* and *sgoilleinbh*.47

It may be noteworthy, then, that two specific instances of sandhi phenomena receive brief mention in other passages of the fragment.48 The effects of adjacent consonants on one another in compound words is a matter which receives a great deal of attention in *IGT* I and the pedagogical poem beginning *Feadha an oghaim aithnidh damh* which was edited by R. A. Breatnach in *Éigse* 3.49 The topic is also dealt with in *GGBM*.50 It would not, however, seem possible to determine to what extent, if any, they could be regarded as giving an indication of topics dealt with in more detail in the lost portion of our tract.

46See also *IGT* I §36, *GGBM* 3336–8, 3782–3. For *glas* ‘blue’ in the context of ‘mountain’, see *DIL* s.v. 2 *glas* I (b); for *glaismior*, tentatively interpreted as ‘yellow (?) marrow’, see, perhaps, ibid. I (f) ‘of shades of grey’ and (g) ‘discoloured’ etc.; compare also Murphy (1953: 321 s.v. *smaois*). The alternative would be to render it as ‘fresh marrow’, see *DIL* loc. cit. II (b). I am grateful to Professor Pierce Grace for assistance with this example from a medical point of view.

47(i), (iii) and (iv) (*ll* < *l* and *d*) are optional. For (i) and (iii), see *IGT* I §41, *GGBM* 162–4, 2360–1, 3323–7, Breatnach (1941: 41 q. 21); (ii) *IGT* I §42, *GGBM* 149–50, Breatnach (1941: 40 q. 16); (iv) *IGT* I §41, *GGBM* 161–2, 2360–1, 3319–23, Breatnach (1941: 41 q. 23).

48§§1 (<*dh* and *d-*); 6 (<*mh* and *bhf-*). See discussion at pp. 134 and 171–2 respectively.

49See Mac Cáithigh (2014: 176 57–8 n.) (for *IGT* I) and Breatnach (1941) (a list of relevant points made in the poem is given ibid. 51). General studies of adjacent consonants will be found in Ó Cuív (1965: 147–8), idem (1966b), (1986), and (1987).

(vii) beagmhó
This example illustrates a correct compositional form and occurs alongside an accompanying example, mórlugha, as follows:

\[
\text{nī cōir is lugha mé nā tú mur a-tā sō is lugha agus is mō mē nā tú, is beagmhō mē nā tú, is mō agus is lugha mē nā tú, is mórlugha mē nā tú}
\]

‘is lugha mé nā tú (“I am smaller than you”) is not correct as in is lugha (“smaller”) and is mó mé nā tú (“I am bigger than you”), [that is] is beagmhō mé nā tú (“I am slightly bigger than you”), is mō (“bigger”) and is lugha mé nā tú (“I am smaller than you”), [that is] is mórlugha mé nā tú (“I am rather smaller than you”).’  (§2)

The purpose of this passage may simply be to set down the teaching that the comparative form of an adjective is excluded from acting as the first element in a compound. This would be in line with other tracts. The first instance of lugha and the second instance of mó in the passage cited above would, accordingly, be representative of the category of the comparative and employed in preference to the technical term for that category which is iomarbháigh. There is nothing particularly unusual in this suggestion. It may be observed, however, that the adjectives beag and mór act here as modifiers of the comparative forms to which they are attached, thus the compounds beagmhó and mórlugha mean ‘slightly bigger’ and ‘rather smaller’ respectively. For this reason, it may be significant that a form bec máo occurs in the St Gall glosses on a passage of Priscian which is concerned with degrees of comparison and diminutives. The relevant text and gloss read as follows:

Thais quam ego sum maiuscula est, id est, ‘paruo maior* quam ego’

*inbec máo .i. isbec as máo oldáusa .i. is bec inderscugud

51See n. 24 above.
52For examples of the term, see e.g. IGT V §112, BST 198.25–8, IGT I §§153–5, IGT IV §2, IGT IV 1011 (n. 13).
53The examples cannot be regarded as dvandva compounds as such formations would be meaningless in these combinations. With the compound mórlugha, compare a periphrastic phrase such as ‘Mō budh beag dá mbeithea ann’ in Mac Cárthaigh (2012: 173 q. 23a) (rendered ‘... would not be so bad if we had you’ [sic]). For this periphrastic construction with the comparative of mór, see further BST 71b.16–19 and R. A. Breatnach (1990: 4–8).
‘Thais is a bit older than I am, that is slightly older than I’
‘a little greater i.e. she is a little greater than I, i.e. the distinction is small’. 54

The form in question is not without its difficulties, however. The editors query the manuscript reading bec máo in this instance and tentatively suggest that bec máo be regarded as a compound or, alternatively, that bec be emended to dative singular biuc to form an adverb.55 The former suggestion has the advantage of retaining the manuscript reading. It is also adopted in DIL where the compound becmáo is described as artificial.56 If this is the case, the example in our fragment might then be taken to represent a shared occurrence of the compound. A possible connection, whether direct or indirect, with the grammatical tradition reflected in the glosses on Priscian might not be too far-fetched given the function of the adjectives in question as modifiers.57 A further consideration may be the unusual nature which has been proposed for the example involved. At present, I have no examples to hand of beag, or indeed mór, compounded with comparatives or superlatives in bardic poetry, although some examples of mór in such combinations are cited in DIL from other kinds of texts.58 There is, however, some evidence for the compounding

54Stokes and Strachan (1903: 99): 45a15; see also Hofman (1996: I 247, II 223–4 and II 207) on the term derscugud. The source of the citation is Terence, Eunuchus (referred to as unidentified in Hofman (1996: II 223), although the text from which it was excerpted is mentioned by Priscian, see Keil 1855–80: II 101 l. 12); for text and translation (on which the above translation is based), see Barsby (2001: 370, 371) (with mäuscúlast for mäuscudula est), cf. also idem (1999: 182 l. 527 n.).
55‘leg. inbiuc, or is becmáo a compound?’, Stokes and Strachan (1903: 99 n. c).
56DIL B 48.57–9; see also GOI §382 (4) where it is noted that ‘[i]n the Glosses Latin adverbs are often rendered by the uninflexed forms of the comparative and superlative with in(d) ... Such forms ... occur only as isolated glosses, the language of which is probably somewhat artificial ... Still the Vita Tripartita has in mó “more” ... and in mó ocus in mó ... in continuous sentences’. Note that the glosses mäanu and laigeniu which are found in the same passage of the St Gall glosses (Stokes and Strachan 1903: 99 45a12, 13) are also described as nonce formations in DIL s.v.
57It may also be significant in this regard that the example illustrative of the compositional form of maith, namely deaghmaith ‘very good’, represents an additional instance of an intensifier in the relevant passage. See also note on word below (p. 167) for a substantive usage of the compound with the meaning ‘a noble’ (where the initial element is nonetheless an intensifier).
58See DIL M 170.9–11 (mór compounded with the comparative and superlative of álainn) and ibid. 166.79–80, 168.23–30, 170.13–14 (for compound mòrmò, on which see R. A. Breatnach 1990: 5). Note further the use of beag and mór with the base form of adjectives: DIL M 170.7–9, 11–13 and DIL B 48.39–57; cf. also M 170.15–22. For the use of the superlative of mór as the second element in a compound, see romhó in the line Crann is romhó maith re maoidheamh ‘A tree whose goodness is (the) very greatest to recount’ in Carney (1945: no. 6 q. 43a l. 627).
of mór with the degrees of comparison in a passage in BST. The passage in question is concerned with the spelling of unstressed vowels in comparative forms of an adjective ending in -amhail and reads as follows:

Na mná as m(h)ínbhanamhla ionáid ar mnáine a n-ur [sic leg. MS .u.] ’s a n-onn [sic leg. MS .o.]; na mná as mórbanamhla [-na- MS] ináid ar mnáine mar sin; an tráth a-tá mór na mholadh ann, agus an tráth as comhfhocal ón ainm bhaíse a n-ur [sic leg. MS .u.] ’s a n-onn [sic leg. MS .o.] ’s a n-ailm [sic leg. MS .a.] as, .c. an tráth sin é.59

McKenna interpreted the first compound, minbhanamhail, as being comprised of the elements mín ‘smooth’ and banamhail ‘womanly’.60 The interpretation offered here differs and takes min to represent the adjective mion ‘small’. This seems preferable as it provides a contrast to the second compound in the passage, that is mórbanamhail. This suggestion finds support in the fact that comparable contrasts between opposites occur in the foregoing passages.61 The proposed use of mion- as opposed to beag- is of interest, although this may be conditioned to a certain extent by a desire to provide alliteration with mná (despite the fact that the examples do not represent lines of verse), and may suggest that compounds formed from beag/mion or mór and the comparative degree of an adjective had more currency than might appear to be the case at first glance. Nevertheless, the Old Irish gloss on Priscian remains the closest available parallel to beagmhó.

59 BST 203.28–204.3. McKenna should have read m(h)órbanamhla and c(h)omhfhocal since he supplied lenition after the relative form of the copula in the first instance. His second semi-colon and second comma should be deleted. See also ibid. 17a.9–12: Na mna as minbhanamhla inaid na mna a n-onn ’s a n-ur; na mna as morbanamhla mar sin ; an trath a-ta mor na mhol(adh) ann agus a chomhfhoc(al) anma baisde, .c. a n-onn ’s a n-ur ’s a n-ailm e.

60 McKenna’s explanation of the text as a whole reads as follows: ‘This passage seems to say merely that, when banamhail is compounded with an adj. (e.g. mín, móir) or a proper name (e.g. Móir), the ending of its compar. may have the usual variations, -amhla, -amhlo, -amhlu’, BST p. 134 (204.1–3 n.). Clearly, his interpretation is incorrect since ‘a’ is not mentioned in the first sentence. However, a full elucidation of the passage cannot be attempted here owing to considerations of space; accordingly, only points relevant for present purposes are discussed.

61 BST 203.17–27; 17a.14–16. For example, Banumhla iad iná m’fheare . le daghumhla tiad timcheal . c. ‘they (the men) are more womanly than my husband, they go about so demurely [correct]’ BST 203.23 (McKenna’s translation). Note also the observation made in DIL M 141. 9–10 that compounds with mion are often opposed to a compound with mór (albeit with reference to compounds formed with substantives).
The level of significance to be attached to shared examples such as those considered above in (vi) and (vii) is not entirely clear. On the one hand, it seems impossible to overlook the potential dual function of the relevant examples, and this could hardly have escaped the attention of the compiler or, indeed, the users of the tract. On the other hand, it is entirely conceivable that these items may simply represent standard teaching examples which could have been employed in different contexts and with different purposes. This does not, of course, rule out the possibility that they may derive from a shared textual tradition or shared stock of examples or that they may reflect the influence of one text on another. Accordingly, it is important to draw attention to the identity of the examples employed in exploring connections between the various grammatical and metrical texts.

**Presentation**

A further feature which can be cited as aligning the fragment with certain other tracts is the manner of presentation adopted. This consists in the main of expository prose accompanied by the kind of lexical items just discussed to illustrate the teaching. The text is on occasions based around the example with following prose explanations or commentary placed in a secondary or supporting role (§§6, 7). This combination of styles is maintained throughout all passages of the fragment which, it may be noted, deal with several distinct topics. We have no other recourse than to regard this as indicative of the general character of presentation. Without wishing to overgeneralise, this style of presentation can be said to be broadly similar to *IGT* I, the *Rudimenta* and Tadhg Óg’s grammar in which continuous prose explanations, as the primary medium of instruction, are combined with lexical examples and, to a much lesser extent than in the other tracts, with poetic citations. *BST* contains...
elements of this and another approach. It is generally based around an example (whether that takes the form of poetic citations, lexical items or syntagmic units), while its prose exposition is far less extensive than that of IGT I, the *Rudimenta* or Tadhg Óg’s grammar. Despite the fragmentary nature of our text, then, its general character would appear to be sufficiently established to align it more closely with the last-mentioned texts in which the instruction is placed primarily within a continuous prose framework.

**TECHNICAL TERMINOLOGY**

Examination of the contents of the fragment thus far reveals that the topics it deals with are also the concern of other texts, most notably IGT I, *Rudimenta Grammaticae Hibernicae* and Tadhg Óg’s grammar. It has also been established that the fragment shares other features with those texts. Attention may now be turned to items of technical terminology. The object of this exercise is to identify further similarities and differences between the fragment and other grammatical and metrical material. Any bearing this may have on the relationship of the fragment with other tracts will be assessed more fully once each term has been examined. The items which have been selected for discussion are *sealbugud* and *urrdibad*. Of course, these are not the only technical terms which occur in the fragment. Others are, in order of occurrence, *comhfhocul*; *focal is cóir d’ainm uathaid agus illraid*; *ainm uathaid*; *táebréim illraid*; *(duir) go n-uath*; *ходимugud*; *oibrigud*; *urálam*; *cáeladh*; *guthaige*; *lethan*; *cáel*; *cáelaidh*; *uaim*; *fiodh*; *condsain*; *lomaidh*.66

65Compare Dillon’s somewhat impatient comments on *BST*: ‘The author of the tract is not very systematic. His work consists of a number of examples, — some made up by him, some quoted from the bardic poetry, — and of the rules he means to establish. Sometimes the examples come first and then the rule, sometimes the order is reversed, and occasional comments are added’ (Dillon 1927: 332). *IGT* II–IV differ in that they are built around headwords and blocks of poetic citations with little commentary (see comments in Breatnach 2000: 13), while *IGT* V is generally built around poetic citations with prose explanations or commentary placed in a secondary or supporting role, Ó Riain (2016: 3–4).

66See discussion of ‘focal is cóir d’ainm uathaid agus illraid’; ‘ходимugud’; ‘oibrigud’; ‘urálam’, and ‘lomaidh’ in the Notes. For *cáeladh*, see p. 138 above. For some of the other terms, see (Ó Cuív 1965: 152–3, 160).
(1) sealbugud (§5)
This term means literally ‘possessing’. It is used in the fragment to denote
nasalisation in constructions which are cited here in dictionary form:

(a) téid sealbugud X i Y ‘lit. the possessing of X becomes Y’ or
    ‘X when nasalised becomes Y’
(b) téid a s(h)ealbugud a X i Y ‘lit. its possessing goes from X into
    Y’ or ‘it changes from X into Y when nasalised’
(c) cuiridh X a s(h)ealbugud ar Y ‘lit. X places its possessing
    (sc. the form it adopts when possessed) on Y’ or ‘X nasalises Y’

The first phrase, and other related ones, also occur with reference to nasalisation
in texts preserved in the fourteenth-century manuscript NLI G 3, namely
IGT V and a poem beginning A aos dána, is aithnidh damh. There the form
of the noun is sealbhadh, e.g. sealbhadh beithe ag dol i muin ‘the sealbhadh of
b becomes m’. Such terms are not found in phrases indicating nasalisation in
IGT I, BST, the Rudimenta or Tadhg Óg’s grammar. That mutation is indicated
throughout those texts by a different term which is not, to my knowledge,
attested in this sense in the earlier material and is discussed under (2) below.

The construction of the above phrases may be explained by adverting to
the technical meaning of the noun sealb(ug)ad. It denotes an infixed pronoun
or a personal form of the copula in its earliest attestations in early modern
material. In the present text, the term sealbugud may indicate personal forms
of the copula in some cases, such as ar Sadbh which might be rendered ‘we are
(= I am) Sadbh’ or ‘our Sadbh’. In most, however, it is best taken as denoting

67The poem is edited in Ó Riain (2008). The same manuscript also preserves a poem beginning
Ca med fhocail féigtar lend where the following phrases are used in the context of nasalisation
(sealbhadh): aithighidh consain (cruth), cuiridh consain i gcruth éagsail, do-ní clochmhódh
consaine, do-ní X do Y (qq. 3–8 at ff. 75r15–75v9).
68Ó Riain (2008: 38 q. 2a); see ibid. 40 q. 1b n. See also IGT V §§119, 125, 126 (where the
phrases ní théid sealbhadh X amach and ní théid sealbhadh X esdi féin are used of consonants
which are not subject to nasalisation). None of these usages are recorded in DIL. For the variation
sealb(ug)ad, see n. 36 above.
69These are more specifically designated sealbhadh oibrighthe and sealbhtha molta γ tathaire in
IGTV §§27, 118–19, 122–6, 128. See BST Appendix 1 p. 250 (l) for the term sealbhadh oibrighthe
in that text. The term sealbhadh is used exclusively of infixed pronouns in IGT I (§82); for its use
in BST, see Appendix 1 to that text and n. 71 below; compare also McManus (1996: 177 §5.2 (3)).
(Note McKenna’s comments on BST pp. 254, 258, 259 that some instances where he has expanded
the abbreviation .s. as sunnradh may belong under the heading sealbhadh and vice versa. These
and some other instances may warrant further examination.)
70See further Notes at p. 170 below.
a possessive pronoun (which is followed by nasalisation) on the basis of the illustrative examples cited e.g. ar nglac ‘our hand’. The term is used in the sense of a possessive in BST and in Rudimenta Grammatica Hibernicae. Whether or not it is also invested with this meaning in material preserved in NLI G 3 cannot be determined on the basis of usage as it occurs only in the context of infixed pronouns and personal forms of the copula there. It might, however, be surmised that the term was first adopted with reference to the possessive on the basis of the literal meaning of sealbh(ugh)adh, that is ‘possessing’, and it may, therefore, be considered likely that the term represents a calque on Latin possessivus. The term could then have been applied to infixed pronouns and personal forms of the copula which resemble, or in some persons are identical to, the possessive pronouns in appearance. The next stage, the use of the term in phrases which denote nasalisation, could conceivably have arisen from the use of illustrative examples of infixed pronouns and personal forms of the copula in persons which are followed by nasalisation (whether to illustrate these grammatical categories or the mutation itself).

Before turning to the next term, a further use of sealbh(ugh)adh in GGBM must be mentioned. This occurs in a phrase which denotes a radical letter,
namely litir shealbhtha / shealbhoighthe (‘a letter affected by sealbh(ogh) adh’ or ‘lit. a possessed letter’). In two of the three instances of this term, it is employed in the context of a letter subject to mutation by a possessive pronoun, the mutation in question being nasalisation. The use of this term by the authors of GGBM is undoubtedly connected to phrases outlined above which indicate nasalisation. It presumably referred originally to a letter affected by a (nasalising) infixed or possessive pronoun or personal form of the copula. It may have arisen in contexts such as Sealbhadh beithe ag dol i muin cited above where b (beithe) is the radical or the letter affected by sealbhadh.77 Instances of the phrase litir shealbhtha / shealbhoighthe are worth quoting in full as they are not unconnected to the usage in our text and will be found in Appendix II below. It would appear, however, that the use of phrases involving sealbh(u(h)adh) to describe nasalisation is confined to texts preserved in NLI G 3 and our fragment.

(2) urrdibad (§7)
This term denotes lenited s in the fragment. The same term (in the form oirrdibhadh) is in use in this sense in IGT V. It is applied to both lenited s and lenited f in commentary on Auraicept na nÉces in the forms airdibdad / airdipdad. These passages are discussed below. The first has to do with the incorrect use of ts for sh, the second with the powers of the letter h.

(a) IGT V §94
The passage in question is concerned with the occurrence of ts in instances in which sh would be expected and describes the circumstances in which this might arise. This usage is faulted as in the example nī do šaland tsSaxsanach [sic leg.] ‘any English salt’. Lenition of s is described there by the term oirrdibhadh.78 The same process would appear to be termed cadad ar uathadh .s. in BST and IGT I.79

76Termed ‘an litear ar a cuirthear an t-uiirrdhioghadh’ in IGT I §6; cf. also GGBM 128 (consonam propriam seu radicalem) and fiodh dùthchasa in n. 156 below.
77See n. 68 above.
78The term occurs in three instances, two of which are qualified by lochtach ‘faulty’ and brēgi ‘false’ and advert to the fault (i.e. ts for sh). For remarks on and examples of ts for sh, see Ó Cuív (1983: 12 n. 28), where the statement that this passage in IGT V lays down that ‘ts was correct under certain conditions’ is quite mistaken as evidenced by the words lochtach and brēgi there. It does, however, presumably give an indication of the circumstances in which ts arose in the spoken language as suggested by Ó Cuív. (There are a number of difficulties in the passage in question which would necessitate more extensive commentary than could be feasibly provided in the present context; for this reason, the passage is not reproduced here.)
79See BST 213.6 (and n.), 9a.18 and IGT I §69 (pace Mac Cárthaigh (2014: 235) whose explanation requires that part of the relevant passage be regarded as parenthetical). Note also the
(b) Treidi doghni uath .i. bogad γ semigud γ airdibdad ... Airdibdad immorro forta [dá] taebomna .i. for sailig γ for ferna (.i. taebomna amal fedaib) .i. orro dibdudh .i. a mbricht ass di raith ama araibdad sailech .i. a s[h]al, a s[h]uil. Airdibdad ferna .i. a fhind, a f[h]ir, ind f[h]eda.

‘H causes three things, to wit, bogad, lenition of final (?), sémidug, lenition of initial (?), and airdibdad, extinction ... Airdibdad, extinction, however, comes upon two consonants (i.e. consonants become like vowels), that is, the letters s and f, that is, extinction is on them, that is, their being deleted altogether, such as the extinction of s, to wit, a shál, his heel; a shúil, his eye. Extinction of f, to wit, a fhind, his hair; a fhir, O man; ind fheda, of the letter’.80

Passage (a) is found in IGT V which may, at present, be dated to some time between the second half of the thirteenth century and the second half of the fourteenth century on the basis of identifiable citations and personages mentioned in the tract taken in conjunction with the date of writing of the manuscript.81 Passage (b) is preserved in the Book of Ballymote which has been dated to the end of the fourteenth century.82 Thus a superior date within the fourteenth century is provided for both passages. It may also be noted that the term with which we are concerned does not occur in other texts which can be dated to around the sixteenth century or later. In the grammatical and syntactical tracts, lenition of s is referred to by the term urrdibad of the others

---

80Text and translation: Calder (1917: ll. 1264, 1280–4) (‘short’ recension); cf. ibid. xlv–xlvi, ll. 4338–42 (‘long’ recension) and note that at l. 4344 sémidug is also used of f (a fher). For the editor’s ‘short’ and ‘long’ recensions, see Calder (1917: xiii). For a reassessment of the manuscript tradition and identification of witnesses not known to Calder, see Ahlqvist (1983: 22–9).

81On the date of NLI G 3, which contains passage (a), see Ó Riain (2008: 35 n. 5) and references cited there. On the date of IGT V, see idem (2016: 7 n. 40).

82For the date of the Book of Ballymote, see Ó Concheanainn (1981: 24). For remarks on the dating of commentary to Auairceapt na nÉces, see Ahlqvist (1983: 31–2) where it is assigned to c. 1100 with later additions (this criteria upon which this dating has been arrived at would benefit from further discussion). See also Calder (1917: xxxi) and discussion in McLaughlin (2005b: 125) where a section of the commentary is time with a terminus ante quem of c. 1060.

83For urrdibad applied to s, see e.g. BST 213.10, 213.16, 9a.18; IGT I §§34, 39, 69; GGBM 2490; cf. also Ó Cuív (1965: 152). It may be significant, pace Mac Cáithigh (2014: 166), that the term séimhioghadh is only used in the tracts in the context of s when it is not the only or main consonant under discussion, e.g. IGT I §§1 (p. 1 l. 28), 20, or with reference to the unlenitable clusters sb, sd, sg; cf. also §§34, 39; for its use with reference to ts, see n. 79 above.
may be related to a possible connection between the term for lenited s in the fragment and a term for nasalisation found in BST, IGT I, the Rudimenta and Tadhg Óg’s grammar, as will be seen. Attestations of this term are listed below where notice may be taken of the variation in form: (a) uirdhiobhadh, (b) uirdhioghadh, (c) urrdhubhadh. The manuscripts in which these forms occur date from the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.84

(a) urrdhibhadh [sic leg.]/urrdiobadh/uirrdhiubadh/uirrdhiobhadh:
BST 8b.15 [C]; BST 239.7 [P]; IGT I §1 (quater) [B]; GGBM 2946, 3053, 3054, 3063, 3109, 3110, 3116, 3118, 3120, 3122, 3123, 3127, 3129, 3131, 3139, 3501.
cf. also uirrdhiobha(igh)idh (verb): GGBM 3119 (bis), 3121, 3142

(b) uirrdhioghadh/uirrdhiughadh/oirrdhioghadh:
BST 195.1, 207.27–8, 211.15 [P]; IGT I §§1 (quinquies), 5, 6, 7 (bis), 8, 18 (bis), 39, 71, 78 (bis), 104, 157, 159 (bis) [P]; IGT I §5 [A]; GGBM 120, 124, 125–6, 2362, 2367–8, 2494–5, 2861, 3926.

(c) urrdhubhadh:
BST 7b.45, 21b.21 [C].85

Both George Calder and Gerard Murphy, following the medieval etymology, suggested that this term for nasalisation derived from the word given in DIL as airdibdud which means literally ‘extinguishing’ or ‘destroying’.86 We have also encountered this word in the sense of lenited s and f.87 It must be remarked that

84 The sigla employed may be resolved as follows: A and B are NLS 72.2.2 and RIA B iv 1 (a) (no. 236a), fragmentary copies of IGT I printed in Mac Cárthaigh (2014: 150–62); C is RIA C ii 3 (no. 1218); P is RIA 24 P 8 (no. 752).

85 The above examples include the following (i) genitive singular and (ii) nominative/accusative plural forms: (i) uirrdibaidh [sic leg.] IGT I §1 [B] (Mac Cárthaigh 2014: 151), urrdhubaidh BST 7b.45, 21b.21, uirrdhiobhaighthe GGBM 3118, urrdhiughthe IGT I §§1, 159 [P], BST 211.15; (ii) uirrdiobhta IGT I §1 [B] (Mac Cárthaigh 2014: 151), urrdhiobhaighthe GGBM 3116, urrdhiughthe IGT I §§1, 7, 8 [P].

86 Calder (1917: xxiv (citing O’Molloy’s seventeenth-century grammar as his source for the term), 317); Murphy (1961: 90). Note also Ó Flannghaile (1908: 19 n.) ‘Uirdhiughadh (eclipsis) was sometimes considered a derivative of diobhadh or dioghadh cutting off, destruction, O. Ir. dibad, but more usually it is written ur-dhubhadh, a compound of dubhadh darkening, from dubh, black, dark.’ Compare DIL s.v. airdiugad ‘nasalisation’ which is listed as a separate word and where a cross reference is given to airdibdud but accompanied by a query. The six examples cited there are from IGT I. For the medieval etymology, see p. 150 above.

87 See above p. 150.
no details of the proposed derivation were provided by Calder or Murphy. This necessitates some comment on certain formal and semantic aspects of the matter here. The salient points to be taken into consideration are as follows:

(1) The long vowel in the headword *airdíbdud* (*air* - + *díbdud*) in *DIL* may present a formal objection to the proposed derivation. However, there is no evidence to suggest that the vowel *i* in the second syllable in forms (a)–(b) above is long and the variation with the ending -ughadh in (b), which appears to represent the verbal noun ending, would seem to support a case for regarding the vowel as short. Murphy also regarded the vowel as short.88 The rhyme *uirhíughadh* with *cuimhniughadh* in a poem which appears as an envoy to O’Molloy’s *Grammatica Latino-Hibernica* may bear out this suggestion.89 The length of the vowel might then be explained in one of the following ways: (i) A short vowel would be in accordance with a principle formulated by Thurneysen which states that long vowels in unstressed position are shortened, e.g. *airchetal* (*air* - + *cétal*).90 This suggestion depends, of course, on the word *airdíbdud* representing an old formation. If, however, it was a more recent formation in Early Irish, the vowel would have been long. It could also have been relengthened under the influence of *díbdud* where the *i* falls under the stress. (ii) If the vowel was long, a short vowel might perhaps be explained as having arisen due to the fact that long unstressed vowels tended to be shortened in later Irish.91 The evidence for this process would appear to be relatively late, however.92 Accordingly, the short vowel in forms in (a) and (b), if not explicable by (i), may perhaps be best explained as due to the analogical influence of etymological associations to be mentioned in (3) below.

(2) The development from *airdíbdud* to *uirdhíobhadh* etc. involves loss of the dental spirant -dh- or confusion with *airdíbad* which was similar in form and meaning and with which *airdíbdud* was easily confused.93

(3) Variation between *bh* in (a) and (c) and *gh* in (b) may be connected with the phonetic realisation of *dh* or *gh* as *bh* which is attested in certain instances

88Murphy (1961: 90) gives the Early Irish form as *airdibdud*.
89*DBM* no. 41 q. 13cd. See remarks on authorship in *DBM* II 210.
90*GOI* §43.
91See O’Rahilly (1932: 101–6) (refers to a process found in parts of Ulster); cf. also Ó Dochartaigh (1978), O’Rahilly (1942).
92O’Rahilly (1932: 105).
93Compare *DIL* s.v. *airdíbad* ‘act of extinguishing completely, quenching’. On the cluster *dhbh*, see Ó Maolalaigh (2006: 43) and references cited there; on confusion of *díbad* and *díbdud*, see Charles-Edwards (1969).
from the Middle Irish period.\textsuperscript{94} Forms with \textit{gh} in place of \textit{bh} may also reflect reinterpretation, or association, with the verbal noun ending -\textsuperscript{ughadh}.\textsuperscript{95}

(4) The form \textit{urrdhubhadh} at (c) above might perhaps be regarded as a separate term with the same meaning as (a) and (b), but it would appear more economical, given the fact that it refers to the same grammatical process as (a) and (b), to interpret it as a product of folk etymology in which the second element has been associated with the compound verbal noun \textit{urrdhubhadh} ‘blackening’ or ‘obscuring’.\textsuperscript{96} Just such an association is in fact encountered in a discussion of nasalisation in the \textit{Rudimenta}. There the author equates \textit{uirrdhiughadh} with the Latin term \textit{eclipsis} and compares the grammatical process to darkening:

\begin{quote}
\textit{Uirrdhiughadh}, quod ecclipsem significat, est praefixio alienae consonantis principio dictionis; ideo dicitur ecclipsis quia consonam propriam seu radicalem ita tenebris obfuscat ut nullus appareat eius sonus.\textsuperscript{97}
\end{quote}

‘\textit{Uirrdhiughadh}, which means an eclipse, is prefixing an extraneous consonant to the beginning of a word; it is called an eclipse because it obscures by darkness a proper or radical consonant in such a way that none of its sound may appear.’

The occurrence of the spelling \textit{urrdhubhadh} in Bardic Syntactical Tracts suggests that such an association was not unique to the \textit{Rudimenta}.\textsuperscript{98}

(5) The semantic development of the term may be explained by adverting to the processes involved and their connection with the meaning

\textsuperscript{94}See \textit{SNGL} III §3.19, O’Rahilly (1930: 185, 195) and idem (1932: 79–80 and 268 (80 l. 2 n.)).
\textsuperscript{95}It may be observed that there are examples of the verbal noun ending spelt -\textit{ubhadh}, see O’Rahilly (1930: 185, 190). Note also that the technical term \textit{iomdhubhadh}, for which see note on term below (pp. 165–7), occurs in the form \textit{iomdhubhadh} on occasion; for the form with -\textit{gh}-, see \textit{DIL} s.v. \textit{imdugud} and \textit{BST} 21a.4; \textit{IGT} I §§2, 97, 116, 127, 147, 151–5; \textit{IGT} II §1 (MS P); \textit{IGT} III §106 (p. 244 n. 6); \textit{GGMB} 366 (v. l.), 401 (v. l.), 413, 4004, 4014; for forms with -\textit{bh}-, see \textit{BST} 206.26, \textit{IGT} III (loc. cit.) and \textit{GGMB} 366, 401 (in these instances a form with \textit{gh} has been entered in the margin in Marsh’s Library Z3.5.3 (MS A); see \textit{GGMB} pp. 16 n. 12, 17 n. 16, 17).
\textsuperscript{96}\textit{DIL} s.v. \textit{airduhad} to which the following examples (all instances of non-technical meaning) may be added: Ní Úrdail (2003: 38 q. 7d) (attributed to Muireadhach Albanach Ó Dálaigh), \textit{AithdD}. no. 36 10c (Tadhg Óg Ó hUiginn d. 1448), \textit{IGT} III 926 and \textit{BST} 235.4–5/17a.34–5.
\textsuperscript{97}\textit{GGMB} 125–9.
\textsuperscript{98}The sixteenth century is given as the date of writing for manuscript \textit{C} of \textit{BST} in \textit{RIA Cat. Fasc. 26: 3267}, although it is noted ibid. 3268 that the only date in the relevant section of the manuscript is 1619 when it was owned by a poet named Aodhagán.
‘extinguishing’. The character of the radical letters \( f \) and \( s \) is significantly altered or obscured when lenited just as the radical consonant is obscured or extinguished in pronunciation when nasalised.

In light of these points, the proposed etymology would appear to be plausible.\(^9\)\(^9\)

Thus it would seem that one and the same term is used of lenited \( s \) (and \( f \)) and nasalisation in different sources, the possible importance of which will be discussed in the next section. The difference in meaning noted here may perhaps have some orthographical reflexes. The first is the spelling of nasalised \( f \) as \( ḟ \) in some sources, the earliest instance of which the present writer is aware occurs in the fourteenth-century manuscript NLI G 3.\(^\text{100}\) The same spelling had been employed since the ninth century to represent lenited \( f \) (and \( s \)).\(^\text{101}\) The second possible orthographical reflex is the practice of inserting a mark of lenition above a radical letter which is preceded by nasalisation as noted by McKenna in the fourteenth-century Book of Magauran (NLI G 1200), e.g. Mag. I. 1099 na mbhreath (genitive plural).\(^\text{102}\) The use of a punctum delens over nasal consonants in early manuscripts should also be noted, but it is unclear if this practice has a bearing on the present discussion.\(^\text{103}\)

**Assessment**

The above examination has shown that certain terms or phrases found in the fragment are shared only with material not later than the fourteenth century as against the usage of BST, which may be dated to the late-fifteenth or sixteenth century, and IGT I, which dates from the sixteenth century.\(^\text{104}\)

\(^9\)Incidentally, this means that the Modern Irish grammatical term urú is derived from a secondary form. However, it may be noted that Cormac Ó Cadhlaigh uses the form uirdhiú in Gnas na Gaedhilge (1940).

\(^\text{100}\)See IGT V §§15, 93, 135 and compare SNG I §4.8 where this spelling is noted with reference to the fifteenth-century Leabhar Breac (RIA 23 P 16 (no. 1230)). Additional examples will be found in the fourteenth-century Book of Magauran (NLI G 1200; cf. Mag. 428 l. 3492 n.) ll. 2187 (Fáil), 2259 (Fabhair), 2692 (Fáil), 3830 (fád), 4227 (fél Febal) and a fifteenth-century manuscript bound as part of the Yellow Book of Lecan at col. 129.8 (ar féir), 143.23 (fa fúighinn), 164.30 (ca fálaich), 166.2 (da fúair), 171.35 (na féir), 212.19 (a fóil) corresponding to editions in Ó Cuív (1969: 54 q. 8d) (the editor was unaware of the copy of the poem in this manuscript; see n. 141 below), DDé no. 9 q. 6d, AithD no. 8 q. 6d, 40c, no. 15 q. 27c, DDé no. 23 q. 33d. See also Uhlich (2008: 232) for an instance from Rawlinson B 512 (late fifteenth century).

\(^\text{101}\)See GOI §§33 (3).

\(^\text{102}\)See Mag. p. xvi. Examples will also be found in NLI G 3 (IGT V §§125–6, 128).

\(^\text{103}\)See GOI §§33 (1), 236 (3).

\(^\text{104}\)Mac Cárthaigh (2014: 2) suggests that the latest citations in IGT I ‘that can be dated with any certainty belong to the period before the death of the poet Tadhg Óg Ó hUiginn in 1448’. In spite
Whether or not greater significance is to be attached to this observation is, however, uncertain as the differences in terminology could be approached in three ways. Firstly, the differences could simply be dismissed as coincidental or capricious. The distribution of the terms in the sources suggests that this is an unlikely and unsatisfactory approach. A second approach to the variation in terminology would be to allow for the contemporaneous existence of multiple terms, possibly reflecting local usages in different schools. Such fluctuation is encountered on occasion from one tract to another, and sometimes within the same tract. With regard to the terms discussed above, the differing senses of the term *urrribad* could then perhaps have been retained side by side. While this is conceivable, it is not altogether likely given the frequency with which the linguistic processes to which they refer occur in the grammar of Irish. When taken together with the potential for confusion which these differing senses might give rise to, one referring to lenition, the other to nasalisation, one might be led to question if both meanings would have remained in active use for any great length of time. Our sources would not, in fact, appear to reflect a continuation of the earlier attested meaning and this leads to another possible approach. This third approach would be to regard the differences we have encountered as reflecting developments over time, with new terms or meanings displacing older ones. The earliest attestations of the term *urrribad* in grammatical literature suggest that the original sense applied to lenition of *s* and *f* and that the meaning of nasalisation represents a secondary development. This would mean that the earlier attested sense of lenition of *s* became obsolete and that other terms for lenition were extended to take over its functions. By the same token, it would seem that phrases for nasalisation involving *sealbugud* were largely replaced, thus representing an innovation of this and without any apparent basis, he agrees with Bergin that the tract ‘was probably compiled later than the others’. Evidence for a later date may, however, be to hand in a citation from the poem beginning *Ní theid caitheamh i geloinn Táil* (identified in Breatnach 2000: 14 n. 28) discussed by Pádraig Breatnach elsewhere in this volume, cf. Mac Cárthaigh (2014: 243 779–80 n.). (It may be observed in the context that the essence of the argument for dating poems in *rannaigheacht* appeared in Breatnach and Breatnach (2005: 31–2).)

103For differences between schools, see *IGT* III 924 and Ó Cuív (1994b: 404); see also the chapter by McManus elsewhere in this volume. For a record of a difference of opinion with regard to terminology in the Middle Irish tracts, see *MV* III §47 and Murphy (1961: 88) s.v. *mór*.

104It should be borne in mind that where such variation occurs in a tract of a later date, such as *IGT* I, it could conceivably represent an amalgamation of earlier terms or of divergent usages. Compare also Kelly (1991: 73), 103–4 for remarks on variation in terminology in the twelfth- and thirteenth-century arts of poetry and prose in Latin.
in the way that mutation was expressed.\textsuperscript{107} It may be noted in passing that the second and third approaches adverted to here, that is rival methods in use and developments over time, are allowed for by Bergin in his discussion of the \textit{Native Irish Grammarian}.\textsuperscript{108}

Before turning our attention to questions of dating, one passage in Tadhg Óg Ó hUiginn’s grammar which may represent a piece of evidence for the possible confusion, or equation of, the two senses of \textit{uirrdhioghadh} should be dealt with. The passage in question contains a discussion of the circumstances in which \textit{t} is prefixed to \textit{s} after the article and the process is included under the heading \textit{don uirrdhiobhadh consaine ‘on consonantal nasalisation’}.\textsuperscript{109}

After the prefixing of \textit{t} to \textit{s} is described, the following comment is made: \textit{Gidheadh ní huirrdhiobhadh díleas é ar an adhb[\(h]\ar nach ttig an t mar sin acht a ndiaigh in dá fhocal sin ‘an’ nó ‘don’, γ nach dona fóclaibh chuireas uirrdhiobhadh iad san, γ nach ttig t re s γera ‘Yet it is not a true nasalisation for the reason that the \textit{t} only arises in that way after those two words \textit{an} [def. art.] and \textit{don} [prep. \textit{do} and def. art.] and they do not belong to the words which cause nasalisation and because \textit{t} does not precede \textit{s} (i.e. in nasalisation (?)) etc.’.\textsuperscript{110} Knowledge of the term \textit{uirrdhiobhadh} as applied to lenition of \textit{s} could conceivably have prompted the author to include \textit{ts} under the heading of nasalisation (also \textit{uirrdhiobhadh}). Indeed, the passage might in fact suggest that the author was familiar with \textit{IGT V}, or another text, in which the faulty usage of \textit{ts} was described by the term \textit{oirrdibhadh} (lochtach, brégi).\textsuperscript{111} If so, his inclusion of the prefixing of \textit{t} to \textit{s} under the rubric ‘nasalisation’ and his comment may reflect the falling together of the senses of these terms and an attempt to deal with what he perceived as a discrepancy in terminology and might suggest that the use of the term with application to \textit{s} had become obsolete.\textsuperscript{112} However, it is not inconceivable that the prefixing of \textit{t} to \textit{s} may have been listed schematically under this heading simply because it resembles nasalisation in that one letter is prefixed to another in spelling.

\textsuperscript{107}The terminology discussed in Appendix II may reflect some limited but specific and restricted continuation of expressions involving \textit{sealbugud}. There was not, of course, the same potential for confusion in this regard (unlike the differing meanings of \textit{urrdibad}) and, accordingly, there may have been less motivation for doing away entirely with such terminology. The same remarks might be applied to the passage discussed in the following paragraph.

\textsuperscript{108}Bergin (1938: 10).

\textsuperscript{109}\textit{GGBM} 3109–33.

\textsuperscript{110}\textit{GGBM} 3127–30.

\textsuperscript{111}For discussion of the passage in \textit{IGT V} in which these terms occur, see p. 149 above. Compare also \textit{IGT I} §67.

\textsuperscript{112}See n. 106 above.
DATING

There is nothing in the fragment to suggest that it does not belong to the early modern linguistic period.\textsuperscript{113} The date of the sixteenth century proposed for the manuscript provides a \textit{terminus ante quem}.\textsuperscript{114} More precise dating is fraught with difficulty, however.

It will be appropriate at this point to allude to the method of dating the other tracts. The criteria which are employed to assign approximate dates to \textit{IGT} I–V and \textit{BST} are twofold. The first relates to the date of the earliest manuscript copies and the second to the date of the latest identifiable verse citations in the texts.\textsuperscript{115} These criteria indicate the latest possible date of compilation of the tracts in the form we have them and provide \textit{termini ante quem} in the fourteenth-century for \textit{IGT} V and other material in NLI G 3 and in the late fifteenth or early sixteenth centuries for \textit{IGT} I–IV and \textit{BST}, with \textit{IGT} I possibly being slightly later as suggested by Bergin.\textsuperscript{116} \textit{Rudimenta Grammaticae Hibernicae} and Tadhg Óg’s grammar have been traditionally assigned to the seventeenth century on the basis of the authors associated with those works (Giolla Brighde Ó hEódra hasa d. 1614; Tadhg Óg Ó hUiginn (born 1582/3). The date of the Latin text of the \textit{Rudimenta} is now in some doubt in light of Caoimhín Bretnach’s argument against the authorship of Ó hEódra hasa elsewhere in this volume. It must, at any rate, postdate 1444 (the date of the latest dateable citation) and can be no later than the date of writing of the earliest manuscript copy in 1634.\textsuperscript{117} More precise dating awaits further research.\textsuperscript{118}

As there are no poetic citations in the fragment, the only area from which any information relevant to its date might be gleaned apart from the date

\textsuperscript{113}For notice of some non-classical forms in the text, see p. 168 below. For purposes of comparison, it may be noted that non-classical features are found, for example, in the prose of \textit{IGT} V, e.g. §§9, 24 (\textit{roimh in} for \textit{rés in} and \textit{ad-rubrumar} for \textit{adubhrama(i)r}), and for the language of \textit{IGT} I, see Mac Cárthaigh (2014: 25–49).

\textsuperscript{114}See p. 132 above.

\textsuperscript{115}See \textit{IGT} I p. ii and \textit{BST} p. ix. For important remarks on the dating of the tracts, see Bretnach (2000: 12–13).

\textsuperscript{116}See previous note and n. 104 above. It will be well to bear in mind that the various recensions of \textit{IGT} II–IV and \textit{BST} have yet to be studied and such study may have a bearing on questions of dating; for remarks on the recensions of \textit{IGT} II, see Bretnach (2015). On the dates of \textit{IGT} I and V, see n. 104 and p. 150 above.

\textsuperscript{117}The citation at \textit{GGBM} 2239–40 is identified in Ó Riain (2008b: 215).

\textsuperscript{118}The dates of the prosody by Ó hEódra hasa and Tadhg Óg’s grammar would appear to be supported by citations from the sixteenth century therein, see \textit{GGBM} pp. 95, 99, 100. Ó hEódra hasa’s prosody presumably post-dates his graduation which is assigned to 1592 by Mhág Craith (1980: 110).
of the manuscript itself is that of technical terminology. Allowing for the
possibility of developments over time in terminology and using relevant items
as a rough dating criterion is not in and of itself an unthinkable proposition.
Certain terms used in the *Rudimenta* and Tadhg Óg’s grammar can be
shown to represent innovations, while *Auraicept na nÉces* contains terms
which fell into disuse.119 Following this line of investigation, then, one could
perhaps argue a tentative case for relative dating, placing the composition
of the fragment before the date of *Bardic Syntactical Tracts*, in which the
latest citations are by poets who died no later than c. 1500 and the earliest
manuscript copy dates to the sixteenth century.120 How much earlier is more
difficult to assess.

It must be stressed that this suggestion is tentative and is presented here
simply as a possibility. Ready acknowledgment is made of the difficulties
presented by the fragmentary nature of the tract, the small number of terms
available for sampling, the absence of a full study of the technical terminology
of the tracts, and the nature of the preservation of the sources (some in an
early copy, others only in late copies but thought to derive from earlier
stages); the differing thrusts of individual tracts might also be taken into
consideration. Consequently, in assigning potential dates for the compilation
of the fragment, it will be prudent to leave the overall range wide, that is to
say that it was compiled at some time during the classical period with the
date of the manuscript, the sixteenth century, as a *terminus ante quem* while
acknowledging that, in the present instance, the close connection between the
terms which have been examined may strengthen the argument for regarding
them as reflecting developments over time and thus allowing for a narrowing
of the range of dates.

In spite of the inconclusive nature of the analysis of terminology, the
importance of examining the tracts with due regard for occurrences of
terms in individual texts and a sensitivity to differences, however they are
ultimately explained, should not be underestimated. Indeed, a full study of
the terminology in all the grammatical texts might provide a more secure
framework within which the possible approaches outlined earlier could be
assessed and allow for a more secure conclusion to be reached in this matter.

119See, for example, Ó Cuív 1965 and n. 106 above.
120McKenna states that ‘every one of the quotations thus identified is from poets (Donnchadh
Móir ... Maolmhuire Ó hUiginn, &c.) who had passed away before 1490’ (*BST* p. ix). He does not
specify further, but his date appears to be based on an attribution of a citation at *BST* 72b.10 to a
Maol Muire Ó hUiginn whom McKenna is presumably identifying as the son of Tadhg Óg who
died in 1488 (see *TD* II 316).
By way of conclusion, some final observations may be made on the fragment’s relationship to the other tracts. The combination of grammar and metrics in our text is not unique. Both *IGT* V and *BST* respectively contain fairly substantial portions concerned with grammar and metrics, so much so that the titles given those texts by their editors are to a certain extent misnomers. As we have seen, however, the strongest connections of the fragment lie with *IGT* I and the seventeenth-century grammars.

Indeed, the combination in our fragment of broader metrical issues with the kind of material dealt with in *IGT* I is noteworthy and, in this context, it may be a useful exercise to compare the contents of the fragment with parts of two lists with which *IGT* I begins. These lists provide a catalogue of fundamental aspects of the alphabet (§1), of language and of poetry (§2) which a student should know, but not all of the items listed are dealt with in that tract.\(^{121}\) A comparison between these lists and the fragment reveals some correspondence, not only in terms of subject matter as discussed earlier, but also in the order in which these matters are listed. This may be seen below where the corresponding items are highlighted in bold and labelled with letters a to e.

... [a] cáit a ttéid cáolughadh a nguthaidheadh leathan... As diobh aithne ar [b] chiáluitubh úathaídh agus iolraidh, agus na crotha dona ceartuibh ó mbeantur comhfocal, agus [c] na gnéithe don Gháoidhilg nach cóir a ttús a chomhfhocal, agus an mhéid nach cóir na ndeireadh. Dligidh aithne reanna agus úaithe agus [d] úama agus chomhardaidh ... agus dlighidh dá phriomhlochd na soidélach do sheachna .i. [e] cáol re leathan do ghuthaidhibh... (*IGT* I §§1–2)

‘... where the palatal forms of their velar vowels go ... Among them (i.e. the many branches) is knowledge of singular and plural senses and the declensional forms from which a compound word can be derived, and the elements of Irish which are not correct as the first element in a compound word, and those which are not correct as the final element. He should know about deibhidhe-rhyme and consonance and alliteration and fully-stressed rhyme ... and he should avoid the two main faults of the ignorant that is palatal vowels with velar vowels ...’

\(^{121}\)See remarks on these lists by Mac Cárthaigh (2014: 1–2).
Item [a], it will be recalled, was identified as belonging to an earlier point of the fragmentary tract which is no longer extant.\footnote{See pp. 137–8 above.} Items [b] and [c], which follow each other in the list, correspond to sections 1 and 2 of the fragment. There is a gap between these items and [d] which corresponds to sections 4–7 and another, larger gap before [e] which is dealt with in section 3 of the fragment and is the only item to occur out of sequence. These correspondences, while striking in some respects, are not complete and a number of items are passed over. Nevertheless, it would seem that these and other correspondences discussed earlier are sufficient to classify the fragment as being of IGT I-type but including specifically metrical material.\footnote{Compare Mac Cárthaigh (2014: 2, 3).} Unfortunately, not enough of the fragment survives to allow us to define the relationship between these two texts and the lists with which IGT I begins with any greater precision. Connections with the *Rudimenta* and Tadhg Óg’s grammar which have been remarked upon (the topics covered, the manner of presentation and the seemingly more concentrated and methodical treatment of subject matter) suggest that the fragment can also be ranked to some extent as one of the precursors of those texts, one which has until now been absent from the record. This fragment, and the text on metres presented by Pádraig Ó Macháin elsewhere in this volume, provides a small insight into a grammatical and metrical literature which was clearly more extensive than that which has been transmitted to us.

**Edition**

The text is edited below and is accompanied by a translation and textual notes. Spelling has not been normalised. Length marks, capitalisation, punctuation, word and paragraph division are editorial. Hair strokes, which are often written by the scribe over the letter *i*, have not been reproduced. Abbreviations are expanded in italics. Editorial insertions are enclosed in square brackets and any other departures from the manuscript are registered in the critical apparatus. Ellipsis enclosed in square brackets indicates a lacuna in the text. Words or letters under discussion in the text are marked in bold following the practice adopted by Bergin in his editions of *IGT*. The spelling of examples in the text is intended to reflect pronunciation in some instances and has not been altered where this is the case except that a radical letter has been supplied in square brackets in nasalised words. The form of Irish words cited in the translation has been normalised where appropriate as a clarification of the
points being made. With regard to the translation, technical terms have been rendered by corresponding English metrical or linguistic equivalents where possible, with literal renderings of the terms supplied in round brackets.

**TEXT**

[1] [...] chuir ní beith da comfhocul aigh [t] bhogadhond a-maín agus a-tá gac focal is cór d’ainm uathaíd agus illraid mur sin i. comfhocul aigh ón ainm uathaíd agus ón taebréim illraid agus ní fuil do deifriugd eturra acht duir go n-uath ag éirghi ar deiredh in taebréime illraid do-ní ēnduir lom díbh.a

[2] Et ní cóir imdugd a tosach comfhocul[i]l [...] amail a-tá mná nò fir, agus ní cóir oibriugd amail a-tá marbh na fir nò buail na fir nò na mná, agus ní hē sin a-maín acht gac focul uraíaim bhús ann is oibriugd hē, agus ní cóir maith ná olc a tosach comfhocail mur a-tá olc agus fear, droichfear sin, agus amail a-tá maith agus maith, deaghmaith sin, agus ní cóir is lugha mē nā tū mur a-tá só is lugha agus is mō mē nā tū, is beagmhō mē nā tū, is mō agus is lugha mē nā tū, is mōrlugha mē nā tū.b

[3] Et ní lór lind ar labrumur do na cáeltaibh tuasad uair gac inadh a mbí guthaigh leathan roim guthaigh cæl cælaidh sì an guthaige leathan biis roimpi amail a-tá dond agus dian, doin[ndian sin, agus mar a-tá glas agus sliabh, glaisliabh sin, agus mar a-tá dub agus bearn, duibbearn sin, agus mur a-tá fin agus derg, findearg sin, agus mur a-tá geal agus dearg, geilllearg sin, nò sgol agus lein[nbh, sgille[nbh (?) sin.c

[4] Do na huamannaibh ann sò sìs i. na feadhá is cóir a n-aigid a céile; [(1) v]  b. fā do dō agus l. fā dō, f. agus s. agus n. agus d. agus t. agus c. agus m. agus g. agus r. mur sin uile, uair ní gabann consdain díb sin consdain eile `na aiged acht é féin fā dō, agus is cóir na huili guthaigh a n-aigid a céile.d

[5] Agus is iad sò na consdaine nac tēit a sealbugud a consdansaibh eile s. n. l. m. r. agus ag seó dearbud air sin: mór, ar mór as cóir ann sin, lámh, ar lámh sin, agus Sadbh, ar Sadbh sin, agus rōn, ar rōn sin, agus

---

a§1 gac] c dotted in different ink; ón (ainm) o formed from another letter; éirghi eirghi

b§2 (Et ní) cóir] Space left at beginning of line (f. [1]r3); material apparently erased before coir; deaghmaith] deadh maith

c§3 (Et ní (lór)) cóir expunged after ní; [findearg sin,] agus] followed by et and an erased letter; sgol] sg stained; it appears that g has been formed from a c; (agus) leinbh] leim; sgilleleinbh] sgoil sgoilleinh (through partial ditography)
d§4 (agus) s.] first dot omitted.
neart, ar neart sin. Agus ní mór sin do na consdanaibh eile seo sís .b. .f. .d. .t. .c. .p. .g. amail a-deraid na [f]ocuil seo sís: bán, ar mbáin is cőir and sin, agus tuath, ar [d]tuath sin, agus ceanna, ar g[c]eanna sin, agus garg, ar ngarg sin, agus port, ar [b]port sin, uair gac consdain as a tét a sealbugud a consdain ele cuiridh ailm .r. a sealbugud air agus gidh edh sin gac consdain dib as a tét a sealbugud is cőir a n-uaim a n-aigid a consdaine féin é amail sō: bean agus ar m[b]ean; trom agus ar d[t]rom; cloch agus ar g[c]loch; glac agus ar nglac; peall agus ar b[p]eall, agus is cőir na huamanda-sin uile.\[6\]

Tabair seo a láim b[f]ir agus Fergal, òir ní cőir ach[t] láim b[f]ir uair lomaidh in dá consdain-sin a cēile; Tabair sō a láim b[P]ilib agus Pōl; Tobair sō a láim [Fh]ilib agus Æadh; Tobair sō a láim b[P]ilib agus Fáilbi, is cőir na huamanna-sin uile.

Agus ní gabann .s.d. ní ele 'na aigid acht .s.d. ele agus ní gabann .s.g. acht .s.g. ele agus ní gabann .s.b. acht .s.b. ele agus ní gabann .s.m. acht .s.m. ele. Mo hadhb agus mo hiūan is cőir sin, mo hadhb agus mo hláine ní cőir an uaim-sin uair ní cőir a[n] t-urdribadh teagmus re hucht consdainti a n-aigid an urrdibhaidh teagmus re hucht guthaige mur a-tā sō mo hláini agus mo hiūan agus mo hriān uair ní cőir mo hriān nā mo hláine nā mo hńathad uair mo lāine agus mo rian agus mo náthad is cőir ann sin.

Smacht agus sbleaghach, sdairbeach agus sgairb ag sin ceithre huamanna as nach [...]\[7\]

Translation

[1] [...] correct (?) it should only form a compound as boghadhonn (‘bow-brown’) and each word which has the same form in the nominative singular and plural (lit. which is correct as nominative singular and nominative plural) is like that. That is, it has a compositional form (lit. compound) based on the nominative singular and [another] based on the genitive plural and there is no difference between them save that dh occurs at the end of the genitive plural which makes a single unlenited d of them (sc. dh and d in boghadhonn).

\[7\] lāine hlaine; ceithre] .iii.
[2] And an adjective ending in -ach is not correct as the first element in (lit. in the beginning of) a compound word [...] as in mná or fir nor is a verb as in marbh na fir (‘kill the men’) or buail na fir or na mná (‘strike the men’ or ‘the women’), and not only that but every imperative is a verbal form (lit. every command there is a verb), and neither maith (‘good’) nor olc (‘bad’) are correct as the first element in (lit. in the beginning of) a compound word as in olc and fear, that is droichfhear (‘a bad man’), and as in maith and maith, that is deaghmhaith (‘very good’), and is lugha mè ná thú (‘I am smaller than you’) is not correct as in is lugha (‘smaller’) and is mò mè ná thú (‘I am bigger than you’), [that is] is beagmhó mè ná tū (‘I am slightly bigger than you’), is mò (‘bigger’) and is lugha mè ná thú (‘I am smaller than you’), [that is] is mòrlugha mè ná thú (‘I am rather smaller than you’).

[3] And I consider what I said above concerning the palatal forms of vowels to be insufficient for everywhere a velar vowel precedes a palatal vowel the latter palatalises the preceding velar vowel as in donn and dian, that is doinfinidian (‘brown and swift’), and as in glas and sliabh, that is glaisliabh (‘a blue mountain’), and as in dubh and bearn, that is diubbearn (‘a dark gap’), and as in fion and dearg, that is findearg (‘wine-red’), and as in geal and dearg, that is geillearg (‘bright red’), or sgol and leinbh, that is sgoilleinbh (‘school children (?)’).

[4] Concerning instances of alliteration here below. That is the letters which correctly correspond to one another: b twice and l twice, f and s and n and d and t and c and m and g and r are all like that, for not one of them allows another consonant to correspond to it except itself (lit. except itself twice) and all vowels correctly correspond to one another.

[5] And these are the consonants which are not affected by nasalisation (lit. forms of which when affected by sealbugud do not become other consonants) s, n, l, m, r and here is confirmation of that: mór, ar mór (‘our great amount’ / ‘we are big’) is correct in that case, lámh, that is ar lámh (‘our arm’), and Sadhbh, that is ar Sadhbh (‘our Sadhbh’ / ‘we are Sadhbh’), and rón, that is ar rón (‘our seal’), and neart, that is ar neart (‘our strength’). And it is not so for the other consonants here below b, f, d, t, c, p, g as these examples illustrate (lit. words say): bán, ar mbán (‘our fair one’ / ‘we are fair’) is correct in that case, and tuath, that is ar dtuath (‘our t.’), and ceann, that is ar gceann (‘our head’), and garg, that is ar ngarg (‘we are rough’), and port, that is ar bport (‘our place’), because ar nasalis (lit. places in the form it adopts when affected by sealbugud) every consonant which can be nasalised (lit. whose form changes when affected by sealbugud) and yet each of those nasalised
consonants (lit. whose form changes when affected by sealbugud) correctly corresponds to its radical (lit. own) consonant in alliteration as in bean and ar mbean (‘our wife’ / ‘we are a woman’), trom and ar dtrom (‘our weight’ / ‘we are heavy’), cloch and ar gcloch (‘our stone’), glac and ar nglac (‘our hand’), peall and ar bpeall (‘our rug’) and all of those instances of alliteration are correct.

[6] Tabhair seo i láimh bfir (‘place this in a man’s hand’) and Fearghal, for only láimh bfir is correct since those two consonants (sc. mh and bh) delenite one another; Tabhair só i láimh bPilib (‘place this in Pilib’s hand’) and Pól; Tobhair só a láimh Fhilib (‘take this from Filib’s hand’) and Áedh; Tobhair só i láimh bPilib (‘place this in Pilib’s hand’) and Fáilbhe, all of those instances of alliteration are correct.

[7] And sd allows only another sd to correspond to it (sc. in alliteration), and sg only another sg, and sb only another sb, and sm only another sm. Mo Shadhbh (‘my Sadhbh’) and mo Shiuán (‘my Siuán’) that is correct, mo Shadhbh and mo Shláine (‘my Sláine’) that alliteration is not correct for a lenited s which precedes a consonant does not correctly correspond to a lenited s which precedes a vowel as in mo Shláine and mo Shiuán and mo shrian (‘my bridle’) because mo hrian or mo hláine or mo hnáthad (‘my needle’) are not correct for mo láine and mo rian and mo náthad are correct (sc. pronunciations) in that case.

Smacht (‘rule’) and sbleaghach (‘flattering’), sdairbeach (‘strong’ (?)) and sgairb (‘a shallow’) that is four instances of alliteration […]

**Notes**

[§1] ní beith: Form is third singular present subjunctive of the substantive verb. The usage appears to correspond to one described by Thurneysen in GOI §516 (a) (2) as follows: ‘In principal clauses the present subjunctive is used for commands where immediate compliance is not contemplated, e.g. in legal rules.’ The use of the jussive subjunctive would not seem to be common in the Early Modern Irish period, but is allowed for in IGT III 20–1 (cf. also BST 66a.9–10, GGBM 1662–4, Des. 257–9 §20 and McQuillan (2002: 43–5) and, for the use of ní and nír with the subjunctive, see also IGT III §1, GGBM 1572–5 and Ca med focial féghtar lend qq. 24–5 at NLI G 3, f. 76val, 3). Alternatively, the form would have to be emended, for example, to beite (verbal adjective) or bí (consuetudinal present), but such severe alteration is hardly warranted.

boghadhond: On this example, see above p. 140.
ach[t] (MS ach): The historical form of this conjunction is restored here and in §6 on the basis of a plene reading ‘acht’ in §7. The form ach represents a development of the conjunction which is attested as early as the fourteenth century, see Ó Riain (2013: 64 v. 3c n.).

focal is cōir d’ainm uathaid agus illraid: Term refers here to nouns which end in a vowel in the nominative singular but do not differ in form in the plural, with the exception of the dative, see SNG IV §§4.2, 4.13, 4.19, 4.21. As noted above p. 134, the vast majority of nouns encompassed by these terms are masculine io-stems, which may also be inflected as dentals in the plural, and feminine iā-stems, which may also be inflected as dentals in the plural and in oblique cases in the singular.

tāebhrēim illraid: The genitive plural intended in the context is that with dental inflection as is clear from the commentary, although not specified. The phrasing in the present text may simply represent shorthand for dental inflection or the sense may have been clear from the foregoing text which is now lost. Other tracts employ specific terms for distinguishing between vocalic and dental types of inflection respectively in the plural of this stem class and their usage would appear to be more precise than that of the present text. They include (i) the adjectives isiol and ard in IGT I §§18, 84, 94, 139, 140, 142, 144, 151, 155, 157, 158 and GGBM 849–50; (ii) variations on the phrases tēid a réim a and anaidh a réim i, e.g. IGT II §§2, 4, IGT I §87; compare also BST Appendix 8 and SNG IV §4.4.

comfhocul aigi ōn ainm uathaid agus ōn tāebhrēim illraid: This rule applies to most nouns as noted above, see p. 134.

deífrigu[d]: The historical spelling of this word is deithbrigud, see DIL s.v. For the development -thbh- → -f-, see SNG IV §2.11 (1) and references cited there.

do-nī āenduir lom dībh: Delenition of dh in contact with d is also set out in q. 25 of the poem beginning Feadh an oghaim aithnídh damh, Breatnach (1941: 41); IGT I §103, and GGBM 3313–16. The example given in the last source is abhradonn ‘having brown eyelashes’.

[§2]

imdugud: The nouns mná and fir (nominative plural) are cited as instances of this term in the present text as it stands in the manuscript. Elsewhere the term designates an ‘adjectival form terminating in -ach with quantitative definition abounding in’, DIL s.v. imdugud II and n. 94 above. It also refers to collective nouns ending in -ach in GGBM 412–15. (The term is glossed at GGBM 366 and 4004 by the noun multitudo which was used by some ancient grammarians in the sense ‘plural’ but was later generally replaced by pluralis according to Schad (2007: 254) s.v. multitudo; the examples given at GGBM
402–3 and 4015–16 clearly indicate that a word ending in -ach is intended.)

This gives rise to a problem in that no instances of words ending in -ach

are listed in the present passage. It is possible, however, that the term

may also be used to connote ‘plural’ rather than the more familiar i(o)l(l)r(ugh)adh

as was suggested by McKenna in his edition of the poem beginning Madh

fiafraidheach budh feasach which is attributed to Gofraidh Fionn Ó Dálaigh

d. 1387). The term imdugud occurs there in the context of a series of questions

which are concerned with ascertaining which individual items of each of the

following pairs are more numerous: consonants or vowels (q. 40) (in this case

it is also asked which have ‘the stronger title to renown’, cia dhiobhso [sic]
as lia briogh blaidhe); singular or plural (q. 41) and feirinsgne or baininsgne
(q. 42) (these terms are taken by McKenna as referring to declensional
patterns, see ibid. 74 and BST pp. 285–6). These questions are resolved in

chiastic order in quatrains 43–5. The answer which is of relevance for present

purposes reads: Lia iná an fheirindsgne ar fhoghnamh / an bhainindsgne
bhionnorlamh; / na hiomdhuighthe cia nach cluin? / lia iollruighthe náid
uathaidh ‘Ever-ready melodious baininsgne is more numerous in its
functions than feirinsgne; more numerous are plurals -who knows not of
them?- than singulars’, McKenna (1947: 70, 73 q. 43). As noted above, the

term na hiomdhuighthe was interpreted by McKenna as referring to the plural
(‘here equivalent to iollruighthe, has another technical meaning; cf. BST 206
25 note’, ibid. 75). The possibility that the term imdugud could be applied
to the plural is not implausible, if we are to judge by the primary meanings
given for the word in DIL s.v. imdugud I, namely ‘abundance, exuberance,
redundance; act of multiplying (trans. & intrans.), enhancing’. Nevertheless,
the passage may be susceptible to a different interpretation than that offered
by McKenna. It is conceivable that the term simply means ‘multiplications’
and refers not specifically to the grammatical category of the plural but to each
of the three individual items which are identified as being more numerous than
their counterparts in the pairs under discussion. If this suggestion is accepted,
the term imdugud would then best be taken to indicate an adjective ending
in -ach in the present text as in other sources. This presents another problem,
however, in that not only are no instances of words ending in -ach given in
the text, but examples of plural nouns are given while the term i(o)l(l)r(ugh)adh is
absent. The likeliest explanation is that some text has dropped out from the list
of items which should not form the first element in a compound in the course of
transmission and that agus ní cóir illrad should be supplied before amail a-tā
mùná. (Compare the list of such items in IGT I §97 where iomdhughadh follows
iollradh: iollradh no iomdhughadh. If the exemplar of the present text had the
two terms in a similar order the initial i(o)- and final -adh may have resulted


in an instance of eye-skip.) Alternatively, a scribe at home with the subject matter of the text may have inadvertently written the wrong term through a slip of the mind in which case we should simply emend *indugud* to *illrad* (the form used in the fragment) or *ilrugud* (which has a closer resemblance to *indugud*); compare Timpanaro (1985: 64) for confusion of phonically similar words with affinity of meaning.

*a tosach comfhocuil*[i]: The emendation to the genitive singular of *comfhocuil* is made on the basis of a second instance of this phrase in the present section (a tosach comfhocail) and is done in preference to regarding the form as genitive plural. The manuscript reading presumably arose through misexpansion of a suspension stroke. Compare the use of the genitive singular in similar circumstances in *plene* readings in *IGT* I §§99, 121 (*a ttús chomhfhocuil*) and *BST* 207.5 (*a ttús comhfhocuil cheirt*).

gac *focul urálaim bhīs ann* is oibriugud hē: This comment is presumably introduced as both of the examples which are cited to illustrate the category of verb (*oibriugud*) are in the imperative mood (*urálamh*), namely *marbh* and *buail*. It may be intended to clarify, given the difference in terminology, that the imperative forms given are illustrative of the wider category of the verb. It may be noted (i) that both terms occur together in passages in *IGT* I §78 and *BST* 66a.3–5; (ii) that in *IGT* V §18 an imperative (*marbh*) is simply described as *oibriughudh* ... *c[h]uireas bean asa rēm* (*‘a verbal form which places bean in the accusative case’*). For further instances of the term *oibriugud*, see *BST* Appendix VI, cf. also Mac Cárthaigh (2014: 205 ll. 279–81 n. and 240 ll. 754–6 n.).

deaghmaith: This compound is rendered ‘very good’ in *DIL* D 13.38–9; examples are also cited of a substantival use in the sense ‘nobleman’. Additional examples include *go ndligheadhaibh deaghmhaithiibh* ‘with very good rights’, Carney (1943: 1 l. 20) and Smith (2007: 140 q. 95b) (...*láech ro chaith*/noi mbliadna déc co degmaith (v.l. *fa deglaith, fa degmaith* ‘... (a warrior who spent) nineteen years very well’. Note also the abstract in *foda dhó bhus deghmhaiteas* ‘long will it be very good (lit. great goodness) for him’ in Ó Donnchadh (1931: 135 no. 17 q. 2d l. 8).

*marbh na fir* ... *buail na fir nō na mnā*: The nominative plural *fir* for accusative plural *fiora* is at odds with correct usage and represents an instance of the fault known as *anrēm illraiche* (*IGT* V §18; see also ibid. §149 and the forms of *fear* in *IGT* I §78, *IGT* II §65 and Gillies 2005: 69 §5). Its occurrence here is somewhat unusual given that the phrases in which the nominative plural occurs are cited as illustrative examples and are not simply part of the ordinary discursive prose. It may be explained in one of three ways. (1) It may be regarded as an instance of modernisation corresponding to the prose
register where the nominative plural is found in use for the accusative plural in the early modern period, see further SNG IV §4.8 where examples are given. (2) The phrase ‘nō na mnā’ in ‘buail na fir nō na mnā’ could perhaps be regarded as a correction of fir which was possibly introduced above the line, or in the margin alongside the main text, at some stage during the course of transmission. If so, it was subsequently incorporated into the main text having been misinterpreted as an addition. However, whether such a correction could be regarded as also applying to the instance of fir in ‘marbh na fir’ is uncertain, if not indeed unlikely, and as fir is written twice as the direct object, this may be an unnecessary conjecture. (3) A previous instance of the word fir (nom. plur.) in this passage may have prompted the scribe to write this form in the phrases under discussion. The first suggestion is perhaps the likeliest given the presence of other non-classical forms in the text, on which see p. 157 and notes on §§3 (roim), 6 (lomaid) below.

is beagmhō mē nā tū ... is mōrlugha mē nā tū: See discussion of these examples above pp. 142–4.

nā: The use of the comparative particle in the form nā in place of iná is faulted in IGT V §12; see also BST Dd.2–3, IGT IV 1018, GGBM 1078–81 and SNG IV §5.8 where examples of ná in verse are cited.

[§3]

nī lōr lind ar labrumur: For comparable discourse markers, see, for instance, Lór liom ar labhrus don bháthadh go léig ‘I consider what I have said concerning assimilation to be sufficient for the present’ in IGT I §48; see also IGT I §137, GGBM 3550–2 and Carney (1942: ll. 1026, 1149, 1292, 1835, 1944–5, 2000–2, 2145, 2484).

roim This is an unclassical form of the simple preposition (classical ré), see BST 195.13–21, O’Brien (1956: 176) and McManus (2005b: 158).

doin[n]dian: The spelling ‘doindian’ in the manuscript may in fact be intended to represent doinnian with the common spelling nd for nn. On spellings reflecting pronunciation, see above p. 133, and for further discussion of this and other compounds in the present passage, see pp. 134–5 and 139–41.

sgol agus lei[nbh] (MS leim), sgoillei[nbh] (MS sgoilleimh) sin: The first element in this compound is sgol ‘school’. The second element is spelt both with final -m and -mh in the manuscript. The noun léim ‘jump’ would seem to provide little sense, unless it is connected with a figurative use such as that encountered in AithDi. no. 1 q. 28 where a group of poets descending on a patroness’ house to receive her hospitality is likened to an attack on a foreigner’s dwelling: Minic lem chléir gidh creach ghearr / léim fa a teach mar bhudh teach [sic leg. or leg. bha (= fa); mur u tech MS] Gall ‘Often do my
poets rush to spoil her house as though 'twere the house of a Gall—and short work they make of it'. This notwithstanding, the spelling in -mh indicates that the final consonant is lenited. A word leimh/léimh (nominative) is unknown and emendation is therefore required. The solution adopted in the text is to read nominative plural leinbh (IGT II §15) on the understanding that an n-stroke has been omitted and that mh represents bh (for confusion of mh and bh, see SNG III §3.20). Compare the phrase leanab léighinn in IGT II 709. An alternative would be to suggest that a velar fricative has dropped out, reflecting developments in the spoken language (see n. 11 above), and to restore the noun (-)léigheamh ‘reading, studying’ (DIL s.v. légad). This is not entirely unproblematic, however, in that only léaghadh is listed in IGT III (§71) and, accordingly, a further emendation to (-)léigheann might be required. A compound sgoilléigheamh/-léigheann might mean ‘instruction in school’; compare the line do léagh ar sgoil Sgathuighe ‘who studied at Sgathach’s school’ in AithdD. no. 16 q. 48d and DIL s.v. léigeann (f). Other possible meanings include (i) private or communal reading or study in a school setting; (ii) reading undertaken in a school, possibly with the connotation of set texts; (iii) reading aloud in accordance with the pronunciation of dán direach as taught in school.

[§4]
.f. agus .s. These letters are, of course, subject to special rules which are given in §§5–7.

[§5]
dearbud: For dearbhadh used in similar contexts as proving a statement or rule, see for example Ag so dearbadh air ó Mhac an Bhaird ‘Here is a confirmation of it from Mac an Bhaird’ (IGT I §11) and anderbad hua desimrechtaib auctoritatis ‘to certify them by examples of authority’ (Stokes and Strachan 1903, 134 90a3; this example is cited in DIL s.v. derbad a). Compare also the phrase dá dhearbhadh (sin) in e.g. IGT I §6, BST 239.17, 70b.27.
mór: This could, perhaps, also be interpreted as a personal name. Note that the name Mór is used in numerous examples in BST, e.g. 200.16–201.3, 203.5–9, 205.6–7, 206.7, 214.28–30, 223.4–5, 11, 224.1, 225.22 241.9–10. See note on ar Sadhbh below and footnote 43 above.
ar mór: This and the other examples cited in the present section consist of the word ar, which is followed by nasalisation, and a noun. In some cases, ar can only be understood as the first plural possessive adjective, namely ar lámh; ar rôn; ar neart; ar [d]tuath; ar g[c]eann; ar [b]port; ar g[c]loch; ar nglac;
ar b[p]eall. In others, however, it may be interpreted either as the possessive adjective or as the first plural personal form of the copula, namely ar mór; ar Sadbh; ar mbān; ar m[bf]ean; ar d[t]rom; see further note on ar Sadbh below. In one instance, it seems implausible not to construe ar as a personal form of the copula, namely ar ngarg, as no examples of a substantival use of this adjective are given in DIL. In rendering these examples into English, all instances of ar have been given as first plural since nasalisation is associated with that person, although it may be more suitable in some cases, e.g. ar m[bf]ean, to regard the meaning as first singular, with plural for singular as often (cf. BST 203.16 and GGBM 1965–6). In instances where ar may represent a possessive or a form of the copula, both alternatives are given in the translation. On the omission of some letters in the lists of words exemplified and on the ordering of examples, see p. 136 above.

ar Sadbh: This example represents an instance of the fault known as iomarcaidh sunnartha ‘excess definition’ if ar is interpreted as the possessive (‘our Sadhbh’). The fault arises when a definite noun is further defined, see IGT I §15 and GGBM 1905–32, 2840–4. In the present instance, the fault arises because a personal name is defined by a possessive pronoun and further instances of it occur in §7 below (mo Shadbh, mo Sláine and mo Shiúán; cf. also note on mór above). The fault would be remedied by the presence of an emphasising particle attached to the name, as in ar Saidhbhne. The example in the present passage could be rendered ‘we are (= I am) Sadhbh’, interpreting ar as a personal form of the copula, thus avoiding the difficulties involved in taking ar as a possessive pronoun. However, the examples in §7 below just mentioned cannot be so interpreted and the fault would certainly seem to be present in those instances. Note also the same usage in the following couplet from a poem by Tadhg Óg Ó hUiginn (d. 1448): is é ar n-Art ar éise [sic leg.] an ríogh / gart a síol na déise as dual ‘he (Énri [sic]) is our Art taking after the first; corn takes after the seed in its stalks’, AithD. no. 17 q. 36cd (see ibid. II 362 where the ‘blot’ referred to is, in fact, an erasure).

bān: Rendered ‘fair one’ above. It might also be rendered ‘lea’ as a noun (DIL s.v. bán IIb).

a-deraid na [f]ocuil: The word focail must be interpreted in the context as referring to the forms which follow in the text as examples, a use which is also attested in: (i) Ca med ḟocal fégt h ar lend q. 12 (NLI G 3, 75v17–19): Ader rit ... / na sealbhta le foclaibh fen / is amlaidh sin badh shoiller [leg. soiléir] ‘I will relate to you ... the personal forms of the copula with examples; thus will they become clear’ (precedes 2 qq. in which the personal forms of the copula are exemplified in use with the noun fear, e.g. q. 13a Ad fear fear thu. tuigtheas as ‘Ad fear “you are a man” fear thu “you are a man” is
understood from it’) and (ii) *IGT* III §4: *An chichsin ní thógaib ceand achtApplying these rules to the examples in (i) and (ii), we can see that:* ar chúig fhoclaib, do-chichser, do-chichsem, do-chichsedh, do-chichsind, do-chichsead *c., agus ní c. uirre acht sin ‘Corresponding to [verbal noun] an chichsin there are only five forms; do-chichser, do-chichsem, do-chichsedh, do-chichsind, do-chichsead are correct, and no other such forms are correct’ (translation in Ó Cuív 1994b, 402). In (i) the relevant words are illustrative examples, in (ii) they represent specific forms.

ailm *r*. The letter names, ailm ruis, spell the word ar.

[§6]

**Tabair seo a láim b[f]ir agus Fergal:** This is one of four examples of alliteration involving the letters f and p in §6 which we are subsequently told are correct (is cóir na huamanna-sin uile). These examples are comprised of two units connected by the conjunction agus. The first unit is a phrase containing a verb (tabair), object (seo), preposition (i) and noun phrase (lāim b[f]ir) in which the first element is in the accusative and, accordingly, the initial of the second element (genitive) is nasalised. The second unit consists of a noun which is syntactically independent of the first phrase (Fergal), the purpose of which is to illustrate that its radical alliterates with the mutated final word in the first unit (b[f]ir). For variation in one of the four examples, see the following note.

**Tobair sō a láim [Fh]ilib agus Áedh:** The personal name following láim is lenited. This may be interpreted in one of two ways: (i) the preposition might be interpreted as a ‘from’ which places a noun in the dative singular with the expected lenition following a noun in that case; (ii) láim is followed by lenition rather than the expected nasalisation after the accusative singular; this may reflect leeway regarding the mutation of personal names, on ‘asp[iration] of the initial consonant of a proper name in the gen. sg., independently of any consonant-affecting power in a preceding word’, see Murphy (1953: 131), *IGT* II 332, Mag. no. 27 q. 44c (MS) and Ó Macháin (2013: 697 q. 2ab).

**lomaidh in dā condsain-sin a cēile:** This comment adverts to the delenition of homorganic consonants across word boundaries. It is presumably to be interpreted as indicating the pronunciation of bh as b in the example láim b[f]ir (lāimh bhfīr), with delenition of bh in the combination -mh bhf- (the f is not, of course, pronounced in bhf). The phrase is therefore to be understood as a general remark on the effects of m and b on one another and would also mean that if the order of consonants was inverted, with mh following bh, the mh would be delenited. This is in accordance with the teaching of *GGBM* where it is stated that only the initial of the second word is delenited across a word boundary, see *GGBM* 190–7, 3158–95; cf. also ibid. 2319–21, 3206. It is accordingly less likely to indicate that the phonetic realisation of the letter
combination -mh bhf- is -m b- in a situation such as that presented. If this were the case, it could only be understood as reflecting pronunciation in speech as to allow for delenition of a final consonant across a word boundary would spoil instances of rhyme; compare comments on delenition and devoicing over word boundaries in Bergin 1921–23, 78–80. In addition to the latter objection, if delenition of the consonants on either side of the word boundary was intended, the examples lāim b[P]ilib would also involve delenition of lenited m followed by b, but this is not mentioned. For comments on the effects of b and m (also p and f) on each other, see IGT I §§42–3, 103, Breathnach (1941: 44 qq. 36–7), GGBM 198–200, 2328–33, 3171–5, 3191–4, 3327–31 (cf. Ó Concheanainn 1968: 343), 3963–4, cf. also O’Rahilly (1932: 152 n. 2). For further instances of lomaidh in the sense in which it is used here, see Mac Cárthaigh (2014: 198 ll. 193–5 n.). Note also the non-classical use of the third singular of the verb (lomaidh) with a dual subject (in dā condaisain-sín), on which see Des. 256–7 (§18) and SNG IV §7.30. This could, however, be emended to lomaid. b[P]ilib ... [Fh]ilib ... Fāiblí: For the forms of these personal names, see, respectively, IGT II §112 (Pilib/Filib); Fáilbhe (: áirmhe) in the poems beginning Cuirfead comaoin ar chloinn Táíl q. 68 (RIA B iv 2, 88; Book of the O’Conor Don, 307v (q. 67); NLI G 131, 212 etc.; cf. McManus and Ó Raghallaigh (2010) no. 139) and lúl an gheinealaigh ór gheinis q. 24 (RIA 23 O 78, 93; 23 L 17, 23v; 23 N 11, 196 etc.; cf. McManus and Ó Raghallaigh (2010) no. 291).

Tobair: For this form, see pp. 133–4 above.

[§7]

mo hlăini agus mo hiuān agus mo hrian ... mo nāthad is cōir ann sin: This sentence provides details of the impermissibility of (i) alliteration between words beginning with lenited s followed by a vowel and those beginning with lenited s followed by a consonant and (ii) of words beginning with lenited s followed by a consonant with any other combination. The idea is that just as Shiuán will not alliterate with shl-, shr-, shn-, so too shl-, shr-, and shn- will not alliterate with each other. The reason given is that the sh- is not pronounced when followed by l, n or r and so it is as if one were to alliterate a radical l, n or r with sh-; on pronunciation, see n. 33 above. There is a slight problem in the text as it stands in that snáthad is absent from the first set of exemplary words following mur a-tā sō. This might be explained in one of three ways: (i) the text may simply have been clumsily designed with an example of a word beginning with sn- omitted in the first set; (ii) mo shnáthad may have been omitted from the first set of words in the course of transmission; (iii) the present sentence might be regarded as introducing two distinct but related points by inserting
a divide after *agus mo hiún agus mo hrian* and omitting *uair*. The second suggestion is perhaps the likeliest, but I have not supplied the words or inserted a lacuna into the text as the first suggestion is equally plausible.

*mo lāine* (MS *mo hlaine*): The point being made here is that lenited *s* is not pronounced when followed by a consonant, as noted above, and the orthography is intended to reflect pronunciation as indicated by the spellings *mo rian* and *mo nāthad*. This makes it clear that the spelling with initial *h* in the present example is inadvertent and arises under the influence of the previous instance of *hlāini*. On the pronunciation of *shl* etc. in word initial position, see n. 33 above.

*hiún* For this form of the personal name *Siuán, al. Siobhán*, see q. 3 of the poem beginning *Nél rioghna ós ráith Lughaine* where *Siuáin-ne* [sic leg.; MS *sibamni*] consonates with ‘tuaili’ and ‘miaili’ in *a* and *b* (*d* is largely illegible), RIA 23 E 29 (no. 1134), 166. For the form *Siobhán*, see Risk (1974: 68 §224).

*sdairbeach* This form is not listed in *DIL* and there are no other examples to hand. It is tentatively suggested here that the initial *s* is prosthetic; for remarks on prosthetic *s*, see O’Rahilly (1927b: 27) and Gleasure (1973: 190–1). The orthography does not clearly indicate whether the *b* is lenited or not and the word is perhaps to be identified with that given in *DIL s.v. tairp(θ)ech* ‘strong, violent, vigorous, impetuous, etc.’ according to which ‘-*p*’ represents an original voiced -b- ... the form *tairpthech* (with voiceless -p-) is frequent only in late texts’. A form with initial *s* might perhaps be compared to: (i) Scottish Gaelic *stairbh(e)anach* ‘athletic, well-built person’ (Dwelly s.v.) (compare *starraban*, Campbell (1972: 229), and *starbanach* ‘stout fellow’, *starbhanach* ‘firm, steady; robust; noisy, rustling’, Dwelly s.v.); (ii) *stáirrfeach* ‘trampling or strutting about in fury, rage, bad temper’ (Dinneen s.v.). However, the etymology of these words is uncertain. (The word is perhaps unlikely to be connected with the Modern Irish adjective *tairfeach* < *tairbh(θ)each* as the classical form of this is *tarbhach/torbhach*, see *DIL s.v. torbach* and *tarbha*, *torbha* in *IGT* II §3).

*sgairb* See discussion of this word in Murphy (1953: 317) s.v.
§6 of the fragment represents a fuller treatment of alliteration involving the letters \( f \) and \( p \) than is found in other tracts. Of particular interest is the rule that radical \( f \) alliterates with nasalised \( p \) as this is not recorded elsewhere to the present writer’s knowledge. With this in mind, it is worth drawing attention briefly to some aspects of alliteration involving the letter \( p \). This takes the form of (i) an examination of comments in the prosodies and (ii) a preliminary collection of examples of \( p \) in alliteration in certain combinations.

(i) Comments in the prosodies
The only explicit comments in any of the other prosodies occur in \( GGBM \) and have reference to alliteration between \( phf \) and lenited \( p \) (\( ph \)). The rules given there differ, however, in that the first mentions only alliteration between \( ph \) and another \( ph \) (comparable to rules regarding \( sh \)), while the second adverts only to alliteration between \( ph \) and \( f \) (based on the identical phonetic realisation of \( ph \) and \( f \)). Whether or not the wording of these passages is to be interpreted strictly as confining alliteration with lenited \( p \) to another \( ph \) or \( f \) respectively is not entirely clear. It could be argued that alliteration of \( ph \) with \( f \) and \( ph \) is envisaged in both cases.

\[ Ní \ cóir \ ph \ gan \ ph \ oile \ na \ aghaidh \ (GGBM \ 2494) \]

‘\( ph \) is only correct with another \( ph \) corresponding to it [in alliteration].’

\[ an \ úair \ thig \ h \ ar \ p, \ as \ eadh \ as \ sèimhiogadh \ dho \ f, \ & \ mar \ sin \ as \ f \ do-ní \ uaim \ ris \ an \ uair \ sin, \ ut: \ ‘Admhaim \ dhuit \ mo \ pheacadh \ féin’ \]

\( GGBM \ 3502–4 \)

‘when \( h \) affects \( p, f \) is its lenited form [\( sc. \) it becomes \( f \)], and so it is \( f \) which alliterates with it then as in Admhaim \ dhuit \ mo \ pheacadh \ féin \ “I confess to you my own sin”’.

A further item of evidence is found in a passage in \( BST \) which is not specifically concerned with alliteration, but incidentally provides material regarding the letter \( p \). The text has to do with lenition after an abstract noun and was interpreted by McKenna as follows: ‘\( lór, \) acting as verb-noun subject of the sentence, puts \( gile \) in gen. fem. which of course does not lenite’.\(^{124}\)

\(^{124}\)\( BST \) p. 123 (198.3–7 n.). See also \( BST \) 1aa.27–8, 68a.8–10 and \( IGT \ IV \) (p. 255).
which is relevant for present purposes is that the various copies of this passage demonstrate alliteration between (a) \( f^- \) and \( ph^- \), (b) \( p^- \) and \( p^- \), and (c) \( f/p^- \) and \( ph^- \). (The choice of the name Pilib/Filib to illustrate the principle is motivated by the fact that a form with initial \( Fh \) will not alliterate with \( P \) under any circumstances. The use of the form Pilip in (b) is, accordingly, less clear than passages (a) and (c); however, (c) would appear to require emendation.)

(a) \( Lòr \) burba Filib ar Phól . lòr a chunga ibhid fhion .c., lòr burba Fhilib ar Pól .l. (BST 198.6–7)

‘Rough enough was P. to P., sparingly enough they drink wine’ (McKenna’s translation);

(b) Lor burba Pilip ar Pol . lór a c(h)um(h)ga ib(h)id fhin .c. [...] lor burbacht Pilib ar Pol lor a c(h)umghacht ibhid fhin , l. sin o na chur a leath indsgni (BST 8a.54);

(c) lor burbachd Filib ar Phol . lor a chumhacht ibhid fhion .l., lor burba Philib (leg. Filib or Pilib?) ar Phol .c. (BST Dc.14–15).\(^{125}\)

In addition to this passage, it may also be noted that the label \( cóir \) is found applied to a citation in \( IGT \) II and III which contains an example of alliteration between \( p \) and \( ph \), (b) (iii) below.

(ii) Examples
Brian Ó Cuív pointed out that examples are found of \( ph \) alliterating with \( bp \) or \( p \) in contrast to rules given in the standard handbooks.\(^{126}\) McKenna also described alliteration of \( p \) and \( ph \) as ‘not unusual’.\(^{127}\) Additional examples of alliteration of (a) \( ph \) with \( bp \) and (b) \( p \) with \( ph \) are given below. Instances of alliteration of \( p \) with radical \( b \) and \( f \) are discussed in (c) and (d). With regard to some of the examples listed here from \( Mag. \), \( PB \), \( AithdD \). and \( DDé \), it may be noted that the editor (Lambert McKenna) was under the mistaken impression that forms with initial \( Ph \) in personal names such as \( Pól \) were

\(^{125}\)Passage (c) would appear to require emendation to Filib or Pilib in accordance with the rule being demonstrated, namely that the abstract noun is not followed by lenition in the relevant circumstances.

\(^{126}\)See Ó Cuív (1962–63: 240) (of the examples cited there, a number involve proper names, while one should be read as \( gach phuirt phiasdaigh \) (as in the more recent edition in \( GBMCM \) no. 17 q. 42d) with lenition after \( gach \) (gen. sing.) preceding a masculine noun). For the rules given in the standard handbooks, see Knott (1957: 11) and Murphy (1961: 37). Ó Cuív’s remarks do not seem to have received attention; see, for example, \( SNG \) IV §1.5.

\(^{127}\)BST p. 171 (224.2 n.).
permitted unaffected variants. In the case of other examples which also involve the restoration of a manuscript reading, the emended text as printed in the relevant edition is also given for ease of comparison. The translations are those of the editors where available.

(a) ph - bp
(i) Ní beag tré Phádraig na bpeann GBMCM no. 17 q. 42a [sic leg. = MS];
   ed. Ní beag ar Pádraig na bpeann
   ‘Because of Patrick of the pens... is sufficient’
(ii) lór do phianadh na bpeacthach DDé no. 5 q. 42d [sic leg. = MS];
    ed. lór do phianadh na bhfeactach
    ‘enough to punish sinners’
(iii) Tig do Phól i bpurt nimhe DDé no. 6 q. 32a [sic leg.];
    ed. Tig dó Pól i bpurt nimhe
    ‘His passion and our sins’
(iv) a phásis is ar bpeacaídhne PB no. 25 q. 25b / Ó Cuív
    (1994: 203);
    ‘His passion and our sins’
(v) rug tré ghrádh ó Phurt na bpian DDána no. 38 q. 7d
    ‘in love He rescued from the Place of Pains’ (transl. McKenna 1928: 380);
(vi) do chen aigh cách múr port bParrtais a tochd ad ráth armhais ard
    Book of the O’Conor Don, 367r3 q. 27cd
    (leg. mar phort bParrthais);131
    ‘their entering your lofty fort of smooth weapons like Paradise has redeemed all’

128See DDé 140 (no. 6 q. 34a n.), PB 236 (no. 24 q. 12d n.) and Mag. 423 (l. 2704 n.).
129McKenna coins the form na bhfeactach as a variant of peacthach in his edition, see DDé p. 140 (where a cross-reference is given to what appears to be a form of peacadh, cf. DIL s.v., not a variant of peacadh as McKenna seems to have thought; it should be noted that the manuscript is faded at the relevant point in the cross-referenced text).
130The relevant manuscripts read as follows: Tig dopol apurt níne Yellow Book of Lecan, 140; Tucc do phól a bport nimhe TCD 1340 (H 3. 19), 25; Tič do pol a port nimhe NLS 72.1.29, 11r. The rest of the quatrain in the edition reads i n-éaraic a aithrighe / d’éis a sbreaghta [sic] ón Sbiorad Naomh / ionad leabtha dá leaththaobh ‘Paul, as reward of his penance, reaches God, a home in compensation for his chiding by the Spirit’ (McKenna’s translation). It will be clear, however, that ionad leabtha must be taken as the subject of Tig (‘A resting place by his side comes to Paul in heaven’).
131This example could also be emended to read mar phort Parrthais (cf. Ó Riain 2010: 102 n. 1c) and included under (b).
(b) $p \cdot ph$

(i) diol a pheacaidh peall gaoiside
$DD_{	ext{é}}$ no. 30 q. 6b
ed. (Dá mbé ag duine /) i ndioll a
pheacaidh peall gaoiside

‘If a man wear, to atone for his sins, a horse-hair shirt’ (*recte* If a man were
to have atonement for his sin, [there should be] a horse-hair shirt ... (?)

(ii) Ní fhaca i bpurt do na portaibh /
puball mar do phuball snáith
$DD_{	ext{á}}$na no. 41 q. 44b;\(^{132}\)

‘I have not seen in any place a baldaquin like your threaded (sc. fine-
thread?) baldaquin’

(iii) do chan re phobul Pádraig
ed. do chan re phobul Phádraig

‘so spoke Pádraig to his folk’

(iv) Gan guth codarsna do chroid
in pobalsa do Phátraic .c.
$IGT$ II 739 (= $IGT$ III 648);\(^{133}\)

‘This people believed in Patrick without a dissenting voice’

(v) na pubaill (leg. pobail) ó Phurt Láirge
ed. na pubaill a Purt Láirge

‘the tents [leg. people] from Port Láirge’

(vi) An mion tighe ata san phailís
port ina mbíd bráighde gall

‘The splendid building which the palace is is a place in which hostages
of foreigners are wont to be’

(vii) grádh an phobail dona peacthaibh

‘the people’s love for sin’

---

\(^{132}\)Alternatively, this example could be read with *phuball* (direct object of verb).

\(^{133}\)The source of this citation is identified in Breatnach (1997b: 30).

\(^{134}\)The word *phailís* could perhaps be taken as a placename.

\(^{135}\)A previously unnoticed copy of this poem (beg. *Tugadh mo choimhéad do chóigeart*)
is found on col. 128[a]--129z in a fifteenth-century manuscript which is bound as part of the
Yellow Book of Lecan. Only a large initial $T$ is visible on col. 128[a] as the rest of the text is
covered with gauze; 21 qq. are found on col. 129 beginning at q. 5 of the edition. That manuscript
reads *donar* for *dona* in the present line, but as *do* and *ar* should become *dar* this reading would
not appear to be acceptable.
(viii) *libh a peannaid an pheacúigh* DDé no. 6 q. 23d [*sic* leg.];

ed. (nach *fuil*) *libh i bpeannaid a bpeacadh*

‘who do not penance like you (recte from the sinner’s suffering)’

(ix) *Is meince do pheacuígh Pól* DDé no. 6 q. 34a

ed. *Is meince do pheacuígh Phól* [*sic leg. = MSS]*;

‘More often ... did Paul sin’

(x) *breith an phobail i bParrtha* DDé no. 18 q. 30d

ed. *breith na bpobal i bParrthus* [*sic leg. = MS]*;

‘to bring His [sic] people to Paradise’

(xi) *Peadar do ba páirt daingean* DDé no. 20 q. 7b

MS: *peadur doba part daingen YBL 196* (leg. *pháirt*)

‘[Peter,] firm was his alliance (?)’ (transl. *DIL* P 173.71–2)

(xii) *go ndearnadh Pól ón pheacadh* DDé no. 21 q. 5d [*sic leg.*];

ed. *go ndearnadh Pól ón bpeacadh*

‘That Paul became what he was after sin’

(xiii) *Do fuilngeadh leis go lá a pháise / pian* PB no. 8 q. 15ab;

‘Till death he bore ... pain’

(xiv) *Do bhí i ndán do dhíon an phobail / Pádraig* PB no. 10 q. 10ab;

‘Patrick ... was fated to save the people’

(xv) *Fuair Caiseal re cois a pháirte / Pádraig* PB no. 10 q. 29ab;

‘He found Caiseal on his side’

(xvi) *Fa cuid do phurgadóir Phádraig / pian* PB no. 10 q. 39ab;

‘The suffering ... was only part of Patrick’s purgatory’

(xvii) *sruth iónalta an phobail Pól* PB no. 24 q. 12d [*sic leg.*];

ed. *sruth iónalta an phobail Phól*

‘Paul, cleansing flood of the world’

136The relevant manuscripts read *libi aipennaid inpechtaidh YBL, 139; libh abpeannuid an pheacudh TCD 1340 (H 3. 19), 25; lib a pennad an peacaidh NLS 72.1.29, 11r.*

137This example is included here on the basis that *do ba* is followed by lenition according to *SNG IV §7.27.*
(xviii) Nír pecach a páirt chogaidh  

(Book of the O’Conor Don, 261r q. 47a;)

‘Their part in war was not sinful’  

(leg. Níor pheacach a bpáirt chogaidh)

(xvix) biodh ar th’uídh gur pheacaigh Pól  

(ed. biodh ar th’uídh gur pheacaigh Phól  

AithdD. no. 100 q. 27d  

[sic leg.];)

‘remember that Paul too sinned’

(xx) do thonn fhéile ó phort co port  

(DMU no. 12 q. 14b;)

‘the wave of your generosity from bank to bank’

(xxi) níor gadadh poinn dod p[h]romac  

Breatnach (1942b: 240 q. 4d).138

‘none of thy provender should have been stolen’

In certain instances above, emendation might be, or has been, proposed. However, such suggestions may be unnecessary in light of the other examples collected since these would appear to be sufficient to call into question the validity of the rules of the standard handbooks, as Ó Cuív proposed.139

138Some uncertain examples may also be mentioned: (i) is í an phian-sa pian do thogh ‘this suffering is the suffering he chose’ (DDána no. 58 q. 32c) for which, however, I note a variant reading with the article before the second instance of pian (i.e. an phian) in NLS 72.1.29, 10r and Belfast 29, 317; (ii) fada don phobal ré phort (leg. ré bport ‘before [the] gate’?) ‘long were its folk at its gate’ (DDé no. 20 q. 41c). The manuscript (Yellow Book of Lecan 197) reads ‘re port’. McKenna’s translation indicates that he was taking re as containing a possessive adjective (a). If the preposition is ré ‘before’, we would expect réna according to BST 192.6–7. It might, however, be interpreted as re (<> fri) in which case McKenna’s text stands; (iii) do-ním mu r do pheac Pól (23 D 14 (no. 1), 22, cf. DDána no. 57 q. 25a v. l.; this reading is shared by NLI G 127, 152 donim mar do pheacaíd póil [sic]) corresponding to the text of the edition Do-ním-se mar do-ní Pól which reflects the readings of TCD 667 (F 5. 3) and RIA 3 C 18 (no. 782).

139Ó Cuív (1962–63: 240). So, for instance, in (a) (v) ó ‘from’ could be emended to a ‘from’ (cf. (b) (v)); in (b) (xii), (xiii) and (xxi) the relevant nouns could perhaps be lenited if placed in the accusative after a passive verb (on the use of the accusative after the passive, see Murphy (1953: cxvii–cxix), Des., 247 (§3), Breatnach (1943: 75–6), LSN p. lxxxviii, Ó Raghallaigh 2010: 180 q. 30d n.), cf. also DDána 454 (no. 68 q. 4c n. where, however, all but one of the examples may be disregarded as follows: those from no. 68 and 122 are not diagnostic; riogha in no. 71 cannot be accusative and should, at any rate, perhaps be read as riodha, pace Williams (1980: no. 12 q. 1c n.); that in no. 75 might be read as nominative in accordance with the readings of a copy in Det kongelige Bibliotek, Ny kongelig Samling 268b, 40v); in (b) (xx) go port could be read as do phort. As noted above, however, such suggestions may be unnecessary.
McKenna noted that this alliteration is found on occasion. Examples to hand are:

(i) *I bParrthas na mbileadh dtoirtheach*  
‘In Paradise of the fruitful trees’  
*DDána* no. 31 q. 7a;

(ii) *I bParrthas [leg. bParrdhas] na mbile n-úr*  
‘in fresh-treed Paradise’  
*DDána* no. 38 q. 8c

(iii) *mac Prímh fa bras meanmanradh*  
‘the son of Priam of lively courage’

(iv) (*... tug Toirdelbach .*) *snaidm pósta dá bláthagain*  
*Caithr. Thoird. 27.*

‘to her own blooming face ... Turlough ... conceded the marriage knot’

It may be observed that the letter *p* is nasalised in examples (i) and (ii). We could perhaps read *bpósta* (after acc. sing. *snaidhm*) in (iv).

(d) *p* - *f*

(i) *Crecuire crīche Luibhni. dā mac Saidhbhe sūlghuirme. dā Pilib na bfled naidhe. dlighid dā fher d’ēgaīne .c. UCD-OFM A 10, 4v13–14*

‘The raiders of the territory of *Luighne*, the two sons of Sadhbh of the blue eyes, the two Pilibs of bright feasts, they should lament two men, correct’

(ii) *fiacha (: grian) fine a bpéin iomchrais NUIM R 76, 180 : fiaca fine a bpein iomchrais NLI G 40, 6 (q. 12b)*

‘she bore a race’s debts in pain’.

---

140 See *DDána* p. 440 (no. 31 q. 7a n.).
141 (iii) is included here on the basis that alliteration occurs in all other lines in this piece.
142 We might read *fiach a fine* and translate ‘the debt of her race’.
Alliteration of this type is specified as a rule in our text. Two diagnostic examples are to hand at present against which it may be tested. The first, with lenited \( p \), (dā P[h]ilib na b[h]fled[h] nā[dh]e) occurs in a fragment in UCD-OFM A 10 which may be associated with the textual tradition of \( BST \). The second example is of fine alliterating with \( \text{bpéin} \) since the penultimate stressed word in every line must be involved in alliteration. It occurs in a poem beginning \( \text{Maith an bhainliaigh bean Íosa} \) found in two eighteenth-century manuscripts where the piece is attributed to Ó Dálaigh Fionn. Attributions to this author in manuscripts of that date are, however, often spurious. The metre is \( \text{rannaigheacht bheag} \) and the use of imperfect rhyme in the opening couplets establishes a date later than c. 1500 for the poem. These examples would appear to establish in practice the rule that \( f \) alliterates with \( p \). In particular, the source of the first example and the use of the label \( \text{cóir} \) (c.) there would appear to be important evidence in support of the rule in our text.

Alliteration of radical \( p \) with \( f \) (as specified in our text) and \( b \) might be justified plausibly by reference to the precept that \( p \) is one of two consonantal ‘diphthongs’. That is to say, it is made up of two sounds, namely \( b \) and \( f \) (dá dhefhoghrach na cconnsuineadh ... foghar .b. γ fearn a mbeithe bogtha).

---

143Another uncertain example may be mentioned here. MacKenna (1952: 139 33d n.) drew attention to alliteration between \( p \) and \( f \) in the following instance from a poem by Gofraidh Fionn Ó Dálaigh: cloch fhógras gach righnia do réir . prímhLia Fál ‘the stone which commands obedience for each warrior-prince, the great Stone of Fál’ (MacKenna 1952: 134, 137 q. 33cd). Elsewhere, however, he regarded \( \text{frímh} \) as a doublet of \( \text{prímh} \) (see \( \text{AithD} \). II s.v. and \( \text{fear frímeolach} \) ‘any man excelling in wisdom’ \( \text{AithD} \). no. 61 q. 12d), presumably following Bergin (1921–23: 84).

144For the rule regarding the penultimate stressed word, see Mhág Craith (1969). The rule is adhered to in all lines of this poem.


146See McGrath (1946: 185–6 n. 4).

147For the dating implications of the absence of perfect rhyme in the opening couplets of poems in this measure, see the important contribution by Professor Pádraig A. Breastnach elsewhere in this volume.

148Accordingly, it would seem unnecessary to suggest emending the relevant text from (\( \text{Tobair sò a láim} \) b[P]ilib (agus Fáilbi) to bhFilib. While this might perhaps be done if further examples are not found to bear out the rule in practice, alliteration of \( f \) with its nasalised counterpart has already been established in §6 (first example) and such repetition would appear to be redundant.

149\( \text{IGT} \) I §6; see also \( \text{GGBM} \) 55–7, 2350–1, 3153–6. The other \( \text{dhefhoghrach} \) is \( \text{ng} \). Note that in \( \text{GGBM} \) 2349–50 the statement that the double consonants \( rr, ll \) and \( nn \) represent three of four consonantal ‘diphthongs’ (\( \text{deafhoghraigh} \)), the other being \( \text{ng} \), would appear to be an innovation.
The phonetic realisation of lenited and nasalised *p* coupled with the non-traditional status of this letter may be additional factors to be taken into consideration with regard to this teaching.\(^{150}\) The permissibility of employing *p* and *f* to form a metrical closure (*dúnadh*), as prescribed in *IGT* I §6, may also be adverted to in this context.\(^{151}\)

Clearly a complete collection and analysis of alliterating examples of the letter *p* set against the teaching of the tracts would be desirable, but only a brief preliminary discussion of this topic has been possible within the confines of the present study.

\(^{150}\)For the status of the letter, see n. 27 above.

\(^{151}\)See Ni Dhomhnaill (1981: 51 §3.23 i) and McManus (2005b: 165) (who adds one example to those given by Ni Dhomhnaill); the following instances may also be added: *AithdD*. no. 39 q. 43; *Mag*. no. 9 q. 38 (cf. also ibid. q. 37 and n. on l. 1050 on *ph* corresponding to *f*).
APPENDIX II

*Litir Shealbhtha / Shealbhoighthe*

The term *litir shealbhtha / shealbhoighthe* has been introduced and discussed above. The passages in which the term occurs are reproduced here. The setting of the first passage is a discussion of alliteration, the second concerns grammatical elision, the third a treatment of nasalisation.

(i) Dā tteagnhadh uírrd[h]ioghadh ar fhocul ris an b[h]fiiodh ndít[h]chas .i. an litir s[h]ealbhtha, as cóir uaim dho chur: ‘bean ar mbuachuill’, ‘feidhm ar bhfir’, cóir dh’uaim.\(^{152}\)

‘If nasalisation should affect a stressed word, it is correct to alliterate with the original letter (lit. native letter), that is the radical letter (lit. letter affected by sealbhadh): bean ar mbuachuill (“our herdsman’s wife”), feidhm ar bhfir (“my (lit. our) husband’s effort”), alliterate correctly.’

(ii) As eadh as báthadh guthaidhe geinearāltia ann, in tan bhios an t-iarmbērlas ‘mo’, nō an t-iarmbērla ‘do’, agus focal ar bith thionnsgnas ō ghuthaidhe nō ó f agus ghuthaidhe go neimhinmheadhōnach na dhiaigh, báidhtear an o uile annsin ag ceangal d an ‘do’ nō m an ‘mo’ don fhocal sin bhios mar sin na dhiaigh mar litir don fhocal chēdna, nō amhoil badh i an m nō an d badh litir shealbhtha don fhocal chēdna.\(^{153}\)

‘General elision of a vowel is when this unstressed word *mo* (“my”), or the unstressed word *do* (“to”), and any word which begins with a vowel or with *f* and a vowel following it [i.e. the unstressed word] separately (lit. non-internally), the entire *o* is elided in that case joining the *d* of *do* or the *m* of *mo* to the following word as [if it were] a letter of the same word, or as if the *m* or the *d* was the radical letter (lit. letter affected by sealbhadh) of that word.’

\(^{152}\)GGBM 2494–7.

\(^{153}\)GGBM 2984–90. *Do* is taken as a preposition on the basis of the following discussion at 3001–16. It could also represent the second singular possessive pronoun. For further instances of the term *neimhinmheadhōnach*, see ibid. 2973, 2994, 3019, 3102, 3161, 3165, 3203, 3447, 3632, 3771, 3773.
(iii) As eadh as uirrdhiobhadh consaine án, consaine dh’áiridhе ria cconsaine dh’áiridhe thosaigh focail, dā ngoireann an ghaoidhealg ‘litir sealbhhoighthe’, agus an chuid thig mar sin do sgrīobhadh & do chanamhoin mar chuid don fhocal, & báidhtear an consaine as litir sealbhhoighthe san chanamhoin, acht gidheadh sgrīob[h]har araon iad ...\footnote{\textit{GGBM} 3110–15. For \textit{do sgrīobadh} in the sense translated, see \textit{DIL} s.v. \textit{l do V 5}. The terms \textit{forainn sealbhbaightheach} and \textit{forainn sealbhtha} at \textit{GGBM} 2992–3, 3066 (cited in iv below) are probably Latinate as suggested by the term \textit{forainn}.}

‘Nasalisation of a consonant is a certain consonant before a certain initial consonant in a stressed word, which \textit{gaoidhealg} calls a radical letter (lit. a letter affected by \textit{sealbhoghadh}), and the component which thus comes about is to be written and spoken as part of the word and the radical (lit. the consonant which is a letter affected by \textit{sealbhoghadh}) is obliterated in speech, but nevertheless they are both (sc. both letters) written ...

The verb \textit{sealbhaidh} is also used with reference to the radical consonant in \textit{GGBM} where it is synonymous with \textit{tionnsgnaidh ó} (earlier \textit{tig ar}):

(iv) Atáid tuairim dheich b[h]focal ann chuireas lomadh ar ghuthaidhe mar so, ‘a’ ar son foranma sealbhth[a,] in uair sealbhhas nō thionnsgnas ō ghuthaidhe gibē cinēl a mbia d’[h]focal, do chinēl bhannda dā ngoireann in ghaoidhealg ‘baininnsge’, mur ‘as ionmhuin lé mnáoi a hucht’, ‘a hēudan’, ‘a heochair’, ‘a hannsacht’ ...

\footnote{\textit{GGBM} 3064–9 (punctuation emended). For \textit{cinél} meaning ‘gender’, see \textit{GGBM} 639–40, \textit{DIL} s.v. \textit{cenél} (f) and Calder (1917: 323 s.v.). The phrase \textit{a heochair} could also be rendered ‘its edge’.}
It was suggested above that the term may have arisen as a result of phrases which indicate nasalisation and involve the term *sealbh(ugh)adh*. Thus, while the occurrence of the term *litir shealbhtha / shealbhoighthe* in *GGBM* might at first glance imply some knowledge of phrases denoting nasalisation discussed earlier, it should be pointed out that the term is only used of a radical letter and that nasalisation is referred to in the texts in *GGBM* by an unrelated term. The term *litir shealbhtha / shealbhoighthe* appears therefore to represent either a development in usage or a limited continuation of related terminology in a specific usage. It may also be observed that in (ii) and (iv) above the term occurs in a context unrelated to nasalisation. Furthermore, in three of the four passages above the relevant term forms part of an explanatory or synonymous phrase where it is coupled with another term and is introduced, or followed, by the conjunction *nó* (i, ii, iv). This would appear to correspond to a usage which has been described by Falconer with reference to the tale *Lorgaireacht an tSoidhgh Naomhtha* as follows:

A new word may be followed by an explanation, e.g., *dhá lége .i. sé mile, asmiron .i. cloch co ndath nglas*; or it may be coupled with an earlier synonymous word as in *(do-ronad) glóir γ fêsta (dó), cuimne γ rēsūn ...* This practice is reflected elsewhere in *GGBM* where seemingly older items of technical terminology are paired with apparently innovative terms by means of the conjunction *nó/ná* in collocations such as *d’oghum nā dho sgrībhneorachd*. This may suggest that the term *litir shealbhtha / shealbhoighthe* was obsolete or obsolescent. At the very least, the third example above implies that the term was associated with a particular register, termed *gaoidhealga*. This might be interpreted simply as the Irish language as opposed to, say, Latin. To judge by the context, however, it may refer to
‘technical language’ or an upper register and be comparable to phrases such as goirid an t-áos dána (‘the poets call’) and atá ag na fileadhoibh (‘the poets have ...’), found elsewhere in the text.\textsuperscript{160}

\textsuperscript{160}For another instance of gaoidhealg in this sense, see GGBM 3528. The word may be used in a similar sense in an eighteenth-century poem edited by Ó Conchúir (2002: 280 q. 5bcd) (where it can hardly be intended literally): \textit{ní thig ionsmadh na n-adhmad / gan oideas in alt don cheird / gan noidhios gart gan Gaedheilg} ‘the construction of verse does not come without instruction in the way of the craft, without ample knowledge of contractions, without Irish’. The phrases goirid an t-áos dána and atá ... ag na fileadhoibh occur at GGBM 3484 and 3154; note also the phrase \textit{do-bheirid na seinphiliudh air sin} in GGBM 2610 and references to \textit{veteres} at GGBM 268, 336, 419, 1203, 1430, 1562 and \textit{periti} at ibid. 1097, 1307, 1684, 1774; cf. also ibid. 1283 (\textit{apud graves authores}) and 1432 (\textit{meliori iudicio}). Compare also the contrast of prose (prós) and verse (dán; fileata) in GGBM 2977–8, 3153, 3156, 3268, 3440, 3521 (cf. also verse and speech, GGBM 1682–9).