

The story of the monk and the devil*

Zusammenfassung

Im vorliegenden Artikel wird der altirische Text ‘The story of the monk and the devil’, der einen Teil der Sammlung The Monastery of Tallaght darstellt, diskutiert. Die Episode ist in zwei Handschriften (Dublin, Royal Irish Academy, MS C i 2 und MS 3 B 23) überliefert. Durch Gegenüberstellung dieser beiden Versionen können bisher unklare Passagen geklärt und (neu) übersetzt werden. Die genaue sprachwissenschaftliche Analyse ausgewählter Passagen zeichnet ein linguistisches Profil des Textes. Die verschiedenen phonologischen, morphologischen sowie orthographischen Merkmale werden am Ende präsentiert.

Introduction

The story of the monk and the devil forms part of the collection *The monastery of Tallaght*, edited by GWYNN & PURTON (1911–12). This compilation of texts deals with the instructions and practices of Máel Rúain and his disciple Máel Dithruib (cf. FOLLETT 2006: 101). According to GWYNN & PURTON (1911–12: 121–2), it was composed between the death of Máel Rúain (*AU*² 792), the founder of the *Céli Dé*, and the death of Mael Dithruib (*FM* 840). On account of references to Diarmait, abbot of Iona (815–831), the date can be narrowed down further. This leads FOLLETT (2006: 102) to propose a period of composition ranging from 815 to 840.¹

The episode concerning the monk and the devil is preserved in two manuscripts: Dublin, Royal Irish Academy, MS C i 2 (fol. 38r), hereafter C² – this acephalous version was edited and published by BERGIN (1905) –, and Dublin, Royal Irish Academy, MS 3 B 23 (p. 43–4), hereafter T, edited and published by GWYNN & PURTON (1911–12: 153–4, §66) and recently by LASH (2014).³ The

* The work on this article was undertaken as part of the ERC-funded project *Chronological Hibernicum* (Horizon 2020 grant agreement No. 647351). I express my gratitude for assistance and suggestions to the editors and readers, and Elizabeth Boyle, Deborah Hayden, Elliott Lash, Kate Mathis, Silva Nurmio, David Stifter and Fangzhe Qiu.

¹ See below (= Selected linguistic features) for a detailed discussion of the dating.

² The abbreviations to refer to the manuscripts are used according to FOLLETT (2006: 102, 105).

³ As part of *The Parsed Old and Middle Irish Corpus (POMIC)*, the story of the monk and the devil is featured in the file ‘The Monastery of Tallaght’.

two manuscripts seem to derive from a common original. The comparison of the versions of the text transmitted in the two manuscripts shows that the scribe of C tried to copy more faithfully, whereas the scribe of T made several alterations to the source. Furthermore, it is shown that T sometimes summarises the text more fully transmitted in C. For detailed analyses of the passages in question see ‘Discussion of the differences between the manuscripts’ below.

Apart from the above-mentioned editions, the story is also discussed in GROSJEAN (1963: 253–4), FOLLETT (2006: 105) and WAGNER (2006: 139–40). Despite these works, a comprehensive linguistic analysis of the text and a full translation of the version transmitted in C are still lacking. The following article offers a comparison of the two versions (both in diplomatic and orthographically normalised editions) and a translation of the text in C, as well as a detailed discussion of the differences between the two versions, and a discussion of selected linguistic features.

The manuscripts

In an intricate discussion of the history of the manuscripts transmitting texts of *The monastery of Tallaght*, FOLLETT (2006: 101–14) suggests that the two manuscripts C and T⁴ are ‘dependent upon the same exemplar’ (FOLLETT 2006: 106). The detailed analysis and comparison of the present text in T and C below will lend further support to his conclusions.

RIA C i 2 (C)

This composite manuscript belongs to the Stowe collection and seems to have been produced as a collaborative work in a bardic school in the 15th–16th century (cf. *RIA Cat.*, fasc. XXVII: 3414–18). It consists of sheets of vellum interleaved with paper and contains various textual fragments. The present text occurs on folio 38 recto and verso, followed by *Laisrén’s carnal vision*. This in turn is followed by a scribal note:

Orait⁵ annso dona macaib fogluma 7 is catad in scel bec he 7 na tarbra
ai[th]bhir na litir orum 7 is olc in dub 7 in memram gann 7 is dorcha ánlá⁶

⁴ The manuscripts Dublin, Royal Irish Academy, MS 23 P 3, and London, British Library, MS Additional 30512, also belong to this family, but do not feature the story of the monk and the devil.

⁵ In this and the following passages cited from unedited texts, expansions are indicated by italics, missing letters and words are supplied in square brackets and superfluous letters are enclosed in round brackets. Word-division and punctuation are editorial.

⁶ There are marks found over *i* in *lítir*, *ín* and *ín*. These, however, are definitely not length-marks, but hair-strokes to mark the single minim of the letter *i*.

‘A prayer here for the students; and it is a hard little story, and do not reproach me concerning the letters, and the ink is bad, and the parchment scanty, and the day is dark’
(FOLLETT 2006: 105).

RIA MS 3 B 23 (T)

This vellum manuscript is dated to the 15th century (cf. *RIA Cat.*, fasc. XXVII: 3360–4). The scribe ‘*Tadcc Ua Rigbard[ái]n*’ added his name on page 51. Pages 33–47 and 51–2 transmit the *Rules of the monastery of Tallaght* as well as short legends and episodes connected with Máel Rúain and other monks, edited and translated by GWYNN & PURTON (1911–12) and LASH (2014). The narrative of the monk and the devil occurs on pages 43 and 44, where it is also followed by *Laisrén’s carnal vision*. In this manuscript, however, a scribal note appears between the two stories (p. 44a32–4):

doscribus sin domdoig 7 inddí sceol so 7 nihainfis *acht* día *necar* doniam
indnos

‘I have written this on my own account, and these two tales; and it is not in ignorance, but to set them forth that we proceed in this way’

(GWYNN & PURTON 1911–12: 154).

The texts

The plot

A monk is visiting Findio mac Fiatach (Finnian of Mag Bili⁷). On his way he meets a woman, *et postulauit ilda concubitum eius*⁸ ‘and she asked him to have sex’. She desires not only to lie together with him, but also lays hands upon him (*fo-ceirtt lāmae fair*).⁹ Following their encounter the monk confesses to Findio mac Fiatach. The saint recommends that, since a demon has contrived it, he should not go into penitentiary but carry on with his life under the same rule (*isintt urtt chētna*).¹⁰ Satan, however, also approaches the monk and tells him that Findio’s counsel is of no use, and he should rather confess to Comgell of Bangor. Comgell, however, gives the same advice. Satan approaches the monk once again and says that he will obtain no cure from either Findio or Comgell, but should go instead to Colum Cille – who, coincidentally, has just landed nearby in his *currach*. After the monk has confessed to him, Colum Cille says: ‘You have crucified Christ once of yourself by sin; secondly, in the person of Findio, because you did not believe what he said by the Holy Spirit; thirdly, in

⁷ According to Ó RIAIN (2011: 323), this saint died in 579.

⁸ See T2 below.

⁹ See T3 below.

¹⁰ See T7 below.

the person of Comgell; fourthly, in mine.’ He imposes fifteen years of penance, because of the contempt the monk has shown for a ‘true member of Christ’ (*firbald Crīst*),¹¹ i.e. Findio.

The two versions

In his discussion of the different manuscripts of the *The monastery of Tallaght*, FOLLETT (2006: 105) states that the text of C ‘follow[s] the text of T almost verbatim’, but ‘also contain[s] passages not found in T’. As will be shown below, I cannot agree fully with the first statement. The comparison of the two manuscripts shows that, despite their similarities, there are also passages in which the text differs significantly. To give one example: towards the end of the episode, i.e. T19 and C14, C features more Irish than T, which has mainly Latin in this line.

The following passages are transcribed from the high-resolution scans available at the *Irish script on screen* website <https://www.isos.dias.ie/>. The ‘transcription’ aims to provide an accurate representation of the text from both manuscripts (i.e. C and T, respectively). Abbreviations in the manuscript are represented by ‘-’ and unambiguous compendia, e.g. for *ar*, are expanded in italics.¹² In the ‘orthographically normalised text’ the length marks, which are frequently found over the neighbouring/following consonant here, are moved to the vowels (where there are no length marks in the manuscript, macrons are used); dashes and dots are introduced according to the practice used in *GOI* (see §34).

RIA C i 2 (C)

Transcription fol. 38ra2–8	Orthographically normalised text ¹³ C
[...] 7 d-x illi niconfīu deitsu am anasbeir finnia fr it is mor anaprainn ¹⁴ for opairt 7 nipater ¹⁵ deínnic hus deit aglanath isnír ath mór incomaircell dobeir finnia deit ish	(1) et dixit illi ‘nīcon fīu deit-su ām a n-as·beir Finnia frit. (2) Is mōr an aprainn fo·rōpairt ocus nī pater de[m]nichus deit a glanath, is ní rath mór in co- mairc[h]ell do·beir Finnia deit.

¹¹ See T19 below.

¹² Cf. UHLICH 2006: 14, n. 1, for this practice.

¹³ The individual parts are numbered to facilitate detailed discussion of the differences between the two manuscripts’ accounts, for which the normalised text will be used.

¹⁴ As BERGIN (1905: 221) notes, the scribe used the acute accent ‘freely ... as a distinguishing mark over short *i*’. These hair-strokes are reproduced in the transcription, but ignored in the normalisation.

¹⁵ There are two double strokes each, of unknown function, below to the left of the *e* and the *r*.

fol. 38ra9–26

ed asmaith deit ergc
 co comgell corruca brith
 fort docoidsom ón da-
 7 confesus est illi 7 d-x comg
 ell isfocen aín tothíchtu
 níconbía bríg his,n nís,n
 ínsatan arítralastar in
 s,n dotastad etir tuaid
 7 dodbreth atech penne
 nípacobuir im- dosum
 7 rl- 7 comgellus d-x ead
 em uerba omnia q- d-x
 finnia. INtan dολουíd
 ab benchar sechtir
 isann gabais port cu
 rach coluím chille
 7 satanas sua s,t illi
 ut iret adcolumbam.

fol. 38rb2–17

Nípaicc thesu-tre f
 innio 7 chomgell olse
 som is hed asmaith
 deit perge adcolumb
 am o//o tigs,de dosom
 Dachóidson da- forua
 iseis,de dorat achoib
 sena dosom hituus
 7 d-x illi co¹⁷ lumba quat-
 cruc,í fixist, x-pm pert
 emet ipsum peccando
 s-o ínninnio t¹⁸ resaní na
 drucis aithgnu 7 nat
 rochretis quod illi pers-p
 m sc-m t-t,o incomge
 llo ínquarto inme as

C

(3) Is hed as maith deit, ergc co Comgell co-rruca
 brith fort.’
 (4) Do-cōid-som ón danō et confesus est illi et dixit
 Comgell:
 (5) ‘is foc[h]en ám to thíchtu. Nícon·bía bríg hisinn-
 í sin.
 (6) In Satan arit-rālastar insin dot astad etir túaid
 ocus dod breth a tech penne.
 (7) Nípa c[h]obuir immurgu¹⁶ do-sum’ et reliqua.
 (8) et Comgellus dixit eadem uerba omnia quae
 dixit Finnia.
 (9) In tan do-luid a bBenchar sechtir, is ann gabais
 port curach Coluimb Chille et Satanas suasit illi ut
 iret ad Columbam.

(10) ‘Nípa íccthe-su tre Finnio ocus Chomgell’, olsē-
 som.
 (11) ‘Is hed as maith deit perge ad Columbam.’
 (12) Da-chóid sōn danō, fo-rúatig-side do-som.
 (13) Is ēi-side do-rat a choibsena do-som hi tuus et
 dixit illi Columba ‘quater crucifixisti Christum, per
 temet ipsum peccando, secundo in Finnio tresa n-
 í nad-rucis aithgnu ocus nat-rochretis quod [dixit]
 illi per spiritum sanctum, tertio in Comgello, (in)¹⁹
 quarto in me.

¹⁶ The abbreviation *im-* is expanded to the Old Irish form *immurgu* on account of *immurgo* in T6 below.

¹⁷ Spacing caused by erasure between *o* and *l*.

¹⁸ Spacing caused by erasure between *t* and *r*.

¹⁹ This *in* is superfluous. It seems to have been caused by an eye-skip to the *in* after *quarto* (f. also *quarto* in T18).

fol. 38rb18–23

birsu fritsu thra
 olsesom olcolum cille
 cuic bliadni deec pen
 de fobithin na etoris
 en s; n 7 nadim micne do
 ratais forfirball c-r.

C

(14) *As·bir-su frit-su thrā*, *olsē-som ol Colum Cille*,
 ‘cūic bliadni deec pende fo bīthin na ētorisen-sin
 ocus na dimmicne do-ratais for firball Crīst’.

RIA MS 3 B 23 (T)

Transcription

p. 43b27–32

Fe-t robai luid araile mano- do findio
 m-cuiatach f-sétt. tecmoncuir ban
 scal immaildi fris arsn,t ãit 7 postu

lauit ilda *concupitum eius*. Focairtt la
 mae fair fadeoig *commaranic caradrad*
 i-se.

p. 44a1–8

Nicotaldsom *iarum der dia graduat statim cotan*
 ic dochum findio 7 *confesus est illi culpam*

suam. Findio d-x *niconbia bríg is,ndi sin*
*Deminn*²² aridralist- sin olsesiom dotbr-
 siu uánna 7 dotfastad eit- túaid 7 dot
 br- ateg pendi coropimd-gad deit fiaça-

Nípacobair *immurgo dosom sech niraga*
 sa hiteg pende 7 nitb-asam eit-tuaid

Orthographically normalised text

T

(1) Fecht ro·bai luid araile manoch do
 Findio mac Uiatach for sétt. (2) Tec-
 moncuir²⁰ banscāl immaild[ē]²¹ fris
 arsin t[s]ēit et postulauit ilda

concupitum eius. (3) Fo·ceirtt lāmae
 fair fadeōig co 'mma-rānic caradrad
 irse.

(4) Nico-tald-som iarum dēr dia grūad
 statim co-tānic dochum Findio et con-
 fesus est illi culpam suam.

(5) Findio dixit 'nīcon-bīa brīg isind-
 ī sin. Dem[un] arid-rālistar sin', olsē-
 siom, 'dot breith-siu uánna ocus dot
 fastad eiter túaid ocus dot breith a
 teg pendi corop imdergad deit fia[d]
 c[h]ách.²³

(6) Nípa c[h]obair immurgo do-som
 sech ni-raga-sa hi teg pende ocus
 nit-bēra-sam eiter túaid.

²⁰ Although the initial *t* is not enlarged much its green colouring speaks in favour of transcribing it with a capital letter.

²¹ This emendation was suggested by Jürgen Uhlich, since the final vowel was a stressed long *ē*, see BREATNACH 2003: 136.

²² This form is odd, because the nominative singular is otherwise always attested as *demon/-un*, and no parallel could be found for *deminn*. Following GWYNN & PURTON (1911–1912: 153), it is emended to *demun* in the orthographically normalised text.

²³ Cf. GOI §836.

p. 44a9–32

T

Rogai dosaccrafic 7 is,ntturtt chetna biæ
tre ca- oena doluid inds,an chuici iarsin
7 atgladastar tria aslach tanaidi 7 dx-

(7) R[e]gai do saccrafic oculus isintt urtt
chētna biæ tre cach oena.’

(8) Do-luid ind Satan chuici iar sin
oculus at-glādastar tria aslach tanaidi²⁴
et dixit ildi.

ildi. Nipamor aglanad deits,u indcom
airle dobeir findio deit. IS sed isma
ith deit ercc cocomgald coruccæ br-

(9) ‘Nīpa mōr a glanad deit-siu in
c[h]omairle do-beir Findio deit. (10)
Is ed is maith deit ercc co Comgald
co-ruccæ breith fort.’

f-t dochoidsom ón da- 7 confesus est illi 7 dx-
comgeld. IS fochen am dotichtu níbia

(11) Do-chōid-som ón danō oculus con-
fesus est illi et dixit Comgeld. (12) ‘Is
fochen ām do t[h]īchtu; ní-bía brīg dē-
sium’,

brig des,um 7 comgellus dx- eadem u-
ba q- dx- findio. Andand doluid abend
char sechtair. IS and gabuis p-t cur
u-h col- cildi 7 satanas sua s,t illi ut
īret adcolumbani nibahicc deitsiu

(13) et Comgellus dixit eadem uerba
quae dixit Findio.

(14) An dand do-luid a Bendchar
sechtair, is and gabuis port curuch
Coluim Cildi et Satanas suasit illi ut
īret ad Columba[m].²⁵

trefindio 7 comgeld olseis,om is-is

(15) ‘Nība hīcc deit-siu tre Findio oculus
Comgeld’, olsēi-siom.

maith deid perge adcolumbam. Doch

(16) ‘Is ed is maith deid perge ad
Columbam.’

oid ón da- 7 dorat acoibsena dosom
7 dx- ildi columba. s-t crucifixs, xp-m
pertemed ipsum peccato fo infindio
q- n- credidisti q- dx- ildi perip-m sc
a-m t-cio incomgello quarto inme

(17) Do-chōid óndanō (18) oculus
do-rat a c[h]oibsena do-som et dixit
ildi Columba. ‘Sicut crucifixi[sti]
Christum per temed ipsum peccato
[secundo]²⁶ in Findio quod non cre-
didisti quod dixit ildi per [spiritum]
sanct[u]m tertio in Comgello quarto
in me.

adbirsa fritsa olcol-cilli cuicc
bliadna dec pendi fobithin nad
imicin doratais f-firbald cr- .i.
findio. FINIT

(19) Ad-bir-sa frit-sa’, ol Colum Cilli,
‘cūicc bliadna dēc pendi fo bīthin na
dīmicin do-ratais for firbald Crīst .i.
Findio. Finit’.

²⁴ GWYNN & PURTON (1911–1912: 154, n. 2) emend to *tánaisi* ‘second’. This is not necessary, since *tanaide* ‘subtle, abstracte, of the spiritual as opposed to the corporeal’ (*eDIL*) is sufficient to denote the opposite of the first, physical seduction by the woman.

²⁵ The *ni* is emended to *m* here on account of the parallel *ad Columbam* in T16.

²⁶ The *fo* in the manuscript is a copying mistake. The scribe overlooked the abbreviation stroke in *s-o* = *secundo* (f. C13 above) and confused the similar letters *s* and *f*.

Comparison of the two versions

Since the text in C is acephalous, the story begins with *et dixit illi 'nīcon fīu deit-su ām a n-as-beir Finnia frit'*, 'and he said to him: 'Indeed, that which Findio²⁷ says to you is not fitting for you'. C, therefore, contains no description of the monk's actual sin. This, however, is not the only difference between C and T. A closer look at the two manuscripts reveals that the sequence of individual sentences is also different. The following table aligns corresponding passages according to their occurrence in the plot:

RIA MS 3 B 23	RIA C i 2
(T1) Fecht ro-baī [...]	
(T2) Tecmoncuir banscāl [...]	
(T3) Fo-ceirtt lāmae [...]	
(T4) Nico-tald-som iarum [...]	
(T5) [...] sin. Dem[un] arid-rālistar [...]	(C6) In Satan arit-rālastar [...]
(T6) Nīpa c[h]obair immurgo [...]	(C7) Nīpa c[h]obuir immurgu [...]
(T7) R[e]gai do saccrafc [...]	
(T8) Do-luid ind Satan [...] et dixit ildi.	(C1) et dixit illi [...]
(T9) Nīpa mōr a glanad [...]	(C2) Is mōr an aprainn [...]
(T10) Is ed is maith [...]	(C3) Is hed as maith [...]
(T11) Do-chōid-som ón danō [...]	(C4) Do-cōid-som ón danō [...]
(T12) Is fochen ām [...]	(C5) is foc[h]en ám [...]
(T13) et Comgellus dixit eadem [...]	(C8) et Comgellus dixit eadem [...]
(T14) An dand do-luid [...]	(C9) In tan do-luid [...]
(T15) Nība hīcc deit-siu [...]	(C10) Nīpa iccthe-su [...]
(T16) Is ed is maith [...]	(C11) Is hed as maith [...]
(T17) Do-chōid ón danō	(C12) Da-chóid son danō [...]
(T18) oculus do-rat a c[h]oibsena [...]	(C13) Is ēi-side do-rat a choibsena [...]
(T19) Ad-bir-sa frit-sa [...]	(C14) As-bir-su frit-su [...]

²⁷ T's variant *Findio* of the name is chosen in the translation, since it is also used by GWYNN & PURTON and LASH.

Discussion of the differences between the manuscripts

(T5) Findio dixit ‘nicon-bia brīg isind- ī sin. Dem[un] arid-rālistar sin’, olsē- siom, ‘dot breith-siu úanna ocus dot fastad eiter túaid ocus dot breith a teg pendi corop imdergad deit fia[d] c[h]ách’.	(C6) In Satan arit-rālastar insin dot as- tad etir túaid ocus dod breth a tech penne.
---	---

On account of the missing beginning of the present tale in C and the incomplete nature of the genealogical tract which precedes it, FOLLETT (2006: 105) argues that the loss of a folio from the manuscript is likely. This is supported further by the evidence of passages C6 and C7. The parallel alignment of the two versions above shows that they occur at the wrong place in the story. By comparing the two manuscripts a possible reason for their misplacement comes to light. C5 features the phrase *nicon-bía brīg hisinn-í sin*, cf. *ní-bía brīg dē-sium* in T12. It will be argued below that the presumed original had *nicon-bía brīg* as is attested in C. The crucial point of this passage is that *nicon-bía brīg isind-ī sin* already occurs earlier in the story, i.e. in T5, in the part which is presumably lost in C. An eye-skip to the wrong part of the exemplar while copying is most likely the reason for the misplacing of passages C6 and C7. The scribe, however, seems to have noticed his mistake. Therefore, he stopped in the middle of the second sentence and wrote γrl (= *et reliqua*). This is the first indication that the respective passage was already in the (now lost) beginning (cf. T5). Furthermore, it seems most plausible that the full version of the saints’ reply would have been told at the first mentioning of it and not here – i.e. similarly to T5. The third clue that C6 and C7 are misplaced is that C8 is (nearly) identical to T13, and they both refer back to the first reply by Findio (lost in C). All of the above makes C6 and C7 superfluous at their current position.

(T9) Nīpa mōr a glanad deit-siu in c[h]omairle do-beir Findio deit.	(C2) Is mōr an aprainn fo-rōpairt ocus nī pater de[m]nichus deit a glanath, is ní rath mór in comairc[h]jell do-beir Finnia deit.
--	--

The two manuscripts are very different here. T looks like a short summary of the text transmitted in C. The possibility that C is an expansion of T also has to be considered. It seems, however, rather implausible since C has potential *lectiones difficiliore*s. One of them is a form to which BERGIN (1905: 226) could not assign a meaning, i.e. *comairc[h]jell*, although he analysed it as a compound, *com-air-cell*. A possible explanation could be that it comprises a verbal noun **airchell* to the verb *ar-cíallathar* [‘has sorrow for, cares about’] plus the prefix *com-* ‘together, mutually, equally’, meaning therefore ‘compassion, lenient

treatment'. This form is not attested elsewhere, and in the other manuscript, T, the much more common *comairle* 'advice, counsel, admonition; consolation; decision, resolution, plan; conspiracy; handling, management' is used in its place.

Another interesting form, i.e. *de[m]nichus*, was explained by BERGIN (1905: 226) as being 'apparently for *demniges*, but the form is doubtful.' Indeed, the form is slightly unusual, but can be explained by hypercorrection.²⁸ Nonetheless, a query on *eDIL* has not returned any similar spelling of an active present indicative 3rd singular relative form of the verb *demnigid(ir)* 'confirms, certifies', nor of any other *-igidir*-verb. The grammatical analysis, however, is clear, since active forms of this original deponent verb (and of deponents in general)²⁹ occur already in the Milan glosses: *demnigte* (Ml. 16a15, 75a8), and *demnigmi* (35b1).

(T14) An dand do-luid a Bendchar sechtair, is and gabuis port curuch Coluim Cildi et Satanás suasit illi ut iret ad Columba[m].	(C9) In tan do-luid a bBenchar sechtir, is ann gabais port curach Coluimb Chille et Satanás suasit illi ut iret ad Columbam.
--	---

The scribe of T modernised the spelling here once more, i.e. *intan* (cf. C's *In tan*) to *andand*. Two other noteworthy issues concerning this passage are not connected with the manuscripts themselves, but arise from Bergin's edition. GROSJEAN (1963: 252) observed already that BERGIN (1905: 222–3) unnecessarily emended C's *ab benchar* to *ab Bennchair* 'Abbot of Bangor'. The comparison with the other manuscript, T, shows that the reading should be rather *a bBenchar*, i.e. the preposition *a* 'out of, from' plus a dative singular of the place-name *Bennchor* (Bangor, Co. Down). The *ab* in *ab benchar* therefore is not the Latin loanword *ap* 'abbot', but indicates the "gemination" (cf. *GOI* §§240, 243) after the preposition *a*. Similar examples are, e.g., *a-ppecad* (Wb. 3b3), *la-gglais, cubbráth* (STOKES & STRACHAN 1901–1903, II, 238.9, 242.19 (= Book of Armagh)). This interpretation is supported further by the fact that Comgell mentioned immediately before this (C8, T13) is the founder of Bangor.³⁰ Since the protagonist of the tale, our libidinous monk, is nowhere else referred to as an abbot, and is also never connected with Bangor, the given interpretation should be favoured over Bergin's. Another unnecessary emendation in his edition concerns the final word of this passage. Bergin transcribes it as *sech tir*, as if there were a spatium between *sech* and *tir*, translating accordingly 'past the land'. In the manuscript, however, there is no space between the letters *h* and *t*. Strangely, in his notes, Bergin suggests reading *sechtir* 'out' instead, even though it is found in the manuscript already! This reading is further supported by *sechtair* in T.

²⁸ Cf., e.g., the overview presented by McCONE 2000: 33–4.

²⁹ Cf. *GOI* §514.

³⁰ Cf. Ó RIAIN 2011: 217–9, esp. 218.

The spellings *gabuis* and *curuch* in T with *u* in the second show the rounding effect of a neighbouring labial or guttural sound on schwa.³¹ *Gabais* and *curach* would be expected here, as given in C. Once again, the spellings seem to derive from a modernisation of the presumed original by the scribe of T. A spelling *u*, instead of an *a* in the second syllable of the third singular preterite of *gaibid*, is both possible and attested, e.g., in *Uga Corbmaic meic Cuilendāin* (MS 23 N 10): *Gabuis diabul cacht cin clith [...]* (MEYER 1915: 47, §24). The *u* in *curuch* also seems to be caused the rounding effect mentioned above. A rounded schwa between neutral consonants is either spelled with <a> or <u>/<o>. A misreading seems to be the reason for the spelling *Columbani* for *Columbam* in T. The scribe probably mistook the *m* of the Latin accusative form *Columbam* as the sequence *ni*.

(T15) ‘Niba hicc deit-siu tre Findio ocus Comgell’, olsēi-siom.	(C10) ‘Nīpa iccthe-su tre Finnio ocus Chomgell’, olsē-som.
--	---

T has the verbal noun of *iccaid* ‘pays, compensates for, etc.’: *icc* in place of the past participle of the same verb that is used in C. This, however, is grammatically incorrect, because the prepositional predicate *tre Finnio ocus Chomgell* would demand the substantive verb here. It seems as if the scribe of T misunderstood the equivalent of C’s *iccthesu* – which must clearly have been in the original – and transcribed it as *hicc deitsiu* instead. This is another indication that the scribe of C copied more faithfully.

(T17) Do-chóid ón danō (T18) ocus do-rat a c[h]oibsenā do-som [...]	(C12) Da-chóid sōn danō, fo-rūatig- side do-som. (C13) Is ēi-side do-rat a choibsenā do-som hi tuus [...]
--	---

In his edition, Bergin leaves the form *fo-rūatig* untranslated, but gives ‘pf. of *fo-ud-tech* (?)’ as a possible derivational basis (BERGIN 1905: 223, 226). Although not stated explicitly, the implied root seems to be **tek^u-e/o-* ‘to run, to flee’ (cf. OIr. *teichid* ‘flees, runs away’; see KPV 629–31). In *eDIL*, the verb is recorded under the headword **fúataing*³² ‘carries off forcibly, steals (property or person)’ (<http://dil.ie/24710>), but the editors remark that in this specific example ‘the sense is obscure, perhaps there is an omission’. This *eDIL* headword (derived from **fo-uss-deng*) is a compound verb of PC **di-n-g-e/o-* ‘to press, to form’ (cf. OIr. *dingid* ‘presses, thrusts, ...’; see KPV 276–8) plus the preverbs **uo-uss-*. The PIE root of this verb is **d^heiǵ^h-* ‘to coat, to knead’ (see LIV² 140–1). It is indeed hard to make sense of a form meaning ‘carries off forcibly, steals’ in this particular passage. Prior, however, to exploring the details, the context of

³¹ For a detailed discussion of these matters, see MCCONE 2015: e.g. 118, 122, 127–8.

³² This entry also mentions the formally parallel ‘fosruataig carried it off (a cow) *Dinds*. 113’.

its occurrence needs to be examined more closely. In the preceding sentences, Satan advises the monk to go to Columba, because he would not be saved through Findio and Comgell. What follows is the crucial passage above:

(C12) *Da-chóid sōn danō, fo-rūatig-side do-som.*

(C13) *Is ēi-side do-rat a choibsena do-som hi tuus [...]*

The subject of the first clause is the monk, who follows the advice of Satan once again and goes to Columba. The critical question concerns the subject of the second clause *fo-rūataig ...* As argued by GRIFFITH (2013: 69–70) ‘[...] *-side* signals to the hearer / reader that the referent is not the cognitively most salient one (which would be referred to by *-som*), but rather an item of more removed salience’. This means that the use of *-side* instead of *-som* indicates a change of subject here, i.e. that the monk is not the subject of *fo-rūataig*. The preceding sentences suggest that either Satan or Columba could be meant. Since the first clause implies that the monk has already left Satan behind, it is very likely that the subject is Columba, the most recent addition to the story. In the following sentence, *is ēi-side do-rat a choibsena do-som*, the subject is expanded once more by the enclitic form of the anaphoric pronoun *-side*, because the topic under discussion changes yet again. If the author had used the *nota augens* this would have indicated to the reader that the same person as before is acting. It is the monk, however, who confesses to Columba and not the other way around.³³ The use of *-side* in two consecutive sentences to denote the change of the subject perfectly matches Griffith’s hypothesis: ‘*-som* most likely refers to an old or continuing topic while *-side* refers to a new one’ (GRIFFITH 2013: 70). This means that while the monk is the subject in *da-chóid sōn*, the subject of *fo-rūatig-side* is Columba, while in the following sentence the monk is the agent once again.

In addition to this, the present text shows a further possible function of the anaphoric pronoun in *ēi-side*. In texts featuring dialogues between female and male protagonists, the agent is frequently marked by the corresponding *nota augens*, and *-som* most likely refers to an old or continuing topic while *-side* refers to a new one. While the acting persons are always clearly distinguishable in dialogues between women and men, this practice can lead to confusion when the participants are of the the same gender. This means that to avoid confusion by using, e.g., *-som¹ ... -som² ... -som¹*, the switch to an established subject may be marked by *-side*, which is otherwise reserved for new topics (as per GRIFFITH 2013). The following example is taken from the dialogue between Manannán mac Lir and Fiachnae Lurgan’s wife in *Compert Mongáin* §§5–6 (WHITE 2006) and shows the usage of the female and male *notae augentes* to distinguish between the two protagonists:³⁴

³³ Cf. the shorter version in T18, where neither *-side* nor *-som* is used.

³⁴ The *notae augentes* are emphasised in bold.

As-bert-sa³⁵ frie [...] – ‘He said to her [...]’

As-bert-si [...] – ‘She said [...]’

As-bert-sa: [...] – ‘He said [...]’

The following examples are taken from *Comrac Liadaine ocus Cuirithir* (MEYER 1902: 16–17 & 22–3):

Intan iarum no-téged som timchell martra, no-íata a tech fuirri-si. No-íata dno fair-som, intan notéged sí.	‘So whenever he went around the grave-stones of the saints, her cell was closed upon her. In the same way his would be closed upon him whenever she went.’
---	--

Luid sium didu [...]. Doluid sí for a iarair-som [...].	‘He however went [...]. She went seeking him [...].’
---	--

These three passages show that a change between established subjects of the opposite gender is expressed by the corresponding *nota augens*. In the present passage, however, the established partners in conversation are both male. A simple marking with the *nota augens* would look like this:

**Da-chóid sōn danō, fo-rūatig-side do-som. Is ēi-som do-rat a choibsena do-som [...]

This illustrates that the use of *-som* alone would lead to ambiguity. Therefore *-side*, which is usually only used to introduce new subjects, here appears in the sense of *-som* to indicate the change to an already known subject. The anaphoric pronoun can therefore assume a secondary function similar to the *nota augens* and serve as a makeshift substitute for it, in order to clarify the topic of discussion in cases where the sole use of the latter would be otherwise ambiguous. To illustrate the foregoing discussion more clearly:

Clause	Subject
(C12) Da-chóid sōn danō	Monk
(C12) fo-rūatig-side do-som	Columba (to Monk)
(C13) Is ēi-side do-rat a choibsena do-som [...]	Monk (to Columba)

Now that the agents of the clauses are determined, the problematic verbal form *fo-rūatig* may be tackled. As mentioned already, a verb meaning ‘carries off forcibly, steals’ does not make sense here. A possible solution was proposed by Pedersen (VGKS II, 653), who also, though not explicitly, appears to take Columba as the subject of the clause by translating the suggested compound ‘fo-od-[to-n-g-]’ as ‘zurechtweisen’. He derives the verb in question from PC

³⁵ For a discussion of the use of *-sa* as the 3sg. m. *nota augens* instead of *-som* I refer to CAREY (1995: 81–2) and STIFTER (2009: 283–4).

**tu-n-g-e/o-* ‘to swear, to vow’ (see *KPV* 648–52), which is a crossing (*KPV* 650–1) between **tek-* (*KPV* 631–4) and **lung-e/o-* (*KPV* 460–3). This Celtic verb poses many morphological problems in the Celtic languages, which, according to *KPV* 650, are solved ‘durch die Annahme von Suppletivismus und darauffolgender Kreuzung’. For a detailed discussion I refer to Schumacher (*KPV* 650–2). What matters here is that *fo-rūatig* could be the third singular augmented preterite of an otherwise unattested compound verb OIr. **fo-otaing*,³⁶ consisting of the root for swearing and the preverbs **uo-* and **uss-*. Phonologically, a sequence **uss-t-* should yield **ut-*. In a context in which lowering has taken place, this shows up as **ot-*, and later this **o-* also occurs where no lowering is expected.³⁷ *GOI* §849 shows that the distribution is stressed **oss-* vs. unstressed **-uss-*, and also that before *l*, *r* and *n* it appears as *ó/úa* and *ú*.³⁸ Examples are OIr. *in-otat* ‘enters into, happens upon’ (< **en-uss-teig-*, *KPV* 638) for unlowered **ot-*, and *do-autat* (< **to-ad-uss-teig-*, *KPV* 638) for **ut-*. **Fo-otaing* can be explained analogously. Pedersen gives ‘zurechtweisen’ = ‘to reprimand, to rebuke’ as the meaning of this verb, which fits the context here perfectly. This particular meaning seems to be caused by the preverb **uo-* ‘under’, yielding, for the semantics of the compound verb, something along the lines of ‘to put down’. On the basis of the foregoing discussion, C12 can be translated as ‘Thus he [i.e. the monk] went then, [and] he [i.e. Columba] rebuked him [the monk]’. Columba appears to know what has happened already, since he is able to reprove the monk even before the latter has confessed his sin. This is consistent with his status as saint, a status which imbues him with prescience. This can be seen in several episodes related in Adomnán’s *Vita sancti Columbae*, e.g., his prophecy regarding the future of the sons of King Aidan (chapter i.8).³⁹

<p>(T18) <i>ocus do-rat a c[h]oibsena do-som et dixit ildi Columba. ‘Sicut crucifixi[sti] Christum per temed ipsum peccato [secundo] in Findio quod non credidisti quod dixit ildi per [spiritum] sanct[u]m tertio in Comgello quarto in me.’</i></p>	<p>(C13) <i>Is eī-side do-rat a choibsena do-som hi tuus et dixit illi Columba ‘quater crucifixisti Christum, per temet ipsum peccando, secundo in Finnio tresa n-í nad-rucis aithgnu ocus nat-rochretis quod [dixit] illi per spiritum sanctum, tertio in Comgello, (in) quarto in me.’</i></p>
---	--

This passage shows further inaccuracies in the transcription by the scribe

³⁶ Several other compound verbs of the simple verb *tongaid* ‘swears, takes an oath’ are featured in *eDIL*: *ar-toing* ‘swears on behalf of, guarantees’, *as-toing* ‘refuses (lit. swears away from)’, *con-toing* ‘swears’, *do-toing* ‘swears away, denies by oath’, *for-toing* ‘over-swears, proves by oath, attests, deposes’, *fris-toing* ‘forswears, abjures, renounces’, and *imm-toing* ‘swears about, around’.

³⁷ Cf. STIFTER 2014: 235–6, n. 31.

³⁸ For a detailed discussion of the preverb **uss-*, see RUSSELL (1988).

³⁹ ANDERSON & ANDERSON 1991: 30–2.

of T (*crucifixi[sti]*, [*secundo*], [*spiritum*]), but also by the scribe of C (*[dixit]* and (*in*)). The second is found in a Latin passage as *fo infidio*.⁴⁰ GWYNN & PURTON (1911–12: 154) observe that C has *secundo* here, and therefore translate ‘secondly, in the person of Findio’. Reading the passage as it is found in T would give two prepositions in a row: Irish *fo* ‘under’ followed by Latin *in* ‘in’. Obviously, this does not make sense. The scribe of T must have misread the Latin abbreviation *so* (as in C) for the Irish preposition *fo*. T’s third inaccuracy is found in the following passage, which Gwynn & Purton read as *quod dixit ildi per ipsum sanctam*. This makes no sense either, therefore the editors choose once again the text transmitted in C for their translation, ‘what he said by the Holy Spirit’. The problematic part is their expansion, of what appears in T as *iḫm*, as Lat. *ipsum*. Since C has *spm* here and Lat. *ipsum* is not usually abbreviated thus, I suggest it as one more example of careless transcription by the scribe of T, which should not be expanded as *ipsum* at all. It looks, instead, as if the scribe of T misread an original *s* as *i*. This is caused by the fact that this scribe uses an <i> which reaches below the line. Such an <i> which is in close proximity to the next letter can therefore easily be confused with an <s> in ligature. In other words, the spellings of the word in T and C are formally nearly identical apart from the second, top-right part of the <s> which is lacking in T.⁴¹ The passage should therefore be read as *spiritum sanctum* as well, as in C, with emendation of *sanctam* to *sanctum*.

(T19) ‘Ad-bir-sa frit-sa’, ol Colum Cilli, ‘cūicc bliadna dēc pendi fo bithin na dīmicin do-ratais for firbald Crīst .i. Findio. Finit’	(C14) ‘As-bir-su frit-su thrā’, olsē-som ol Colum Cille, ‘cūic bliadni deec pende fo bithin na ētorisen-sin ocus na dīmmicne do-ratais for firball Crīst’.
--	---

T has the orthographically and phonologically younger form *bliadna* of the nominative plural of *bliadain* ‘year’, where C retains the older spelling *bliadni*. Furthermore, the hiatus in *deec* is still orthographically expressed⁴² by the scribe of the latter, where T reflects the more progressive pronunciation *dēc*. This passage also features one of the rare instances where the transcription of T has to be preferred over that of C. The latter has the pleonastic *olsē-som ol Colum Cille* ‘said he said Colum Cille’ where the former has only the more natural *ol Colum Cilli* ‘said Colum Cilli’.

⁴⁰ See the transcription of the MS further above.

⁴¹ Pers. comm. Jürgen Uhlich.

⁴² BREATNACH (1994: §2.8) also mentions Middle Irish spellings with a double vowel for words which do not originally contain a hiatus (pers. comm. Jürgen Uhlich). In fact the spelling with <VV> could also stand for a long vowel here. There are, however, only two words spelled with double vowels in C (*deec*, *tuus*), which both go back to original hiatus.

Normalised texts

RIA MS 3 B 23 (T)	RIA C i 2 (C)
T1 Fecht ro-baī luid araile manoch do Findio mac Uiatach for sétt.	
T2 Tecmoncuir banscāl immaild[ē] fris arsin t[s]ēit et postulauit ilda concubitum eius.	
T3 Fo-ceirtt lāmae fair fadeōig co 'mma-rānic caradrad irse.	
T4 Nico-tald-som iarum dēr dia grūad statim co-tānic dochum Findio et confesus est illi culpam suam.	
T5 Findio dixit 'nīcon-bīa brīg isind- ī sin. Dem[un] arid-rālistar sin', olsē-siom, 'dot breith-siu úanna ocus dot fastad eiter túaid ocus dot breith a teg pendi corop imdergad deit fia[d] c[h]ách.	C6 In Satan arit-rālastar insin dot astad etir túaid ocus dod breth a tech penne.
T6 Nípa c[h]obair immurgo do-som sech ni-raga-sa hi teg pende ocus nīt-bēra-sam eiter túaid.	C7 Nípa c[h]obuir immurgu do-sum' et reliqua.
T7 R[e]gai do saccrafic ocus isintt urtt chētna biæ tre cach oena.'	

Translations

RIA MS 3 B 23 ⁴³ (T)	RIA C i 2 (C)
T1 Once upon a time a certain monk went on a journey to Findio mac Fíatach.	
T2 A woman happened to meet him on the journey. And she asked him to have sex. ⁴⁴	
T3 She laid hands upon him at last, [so that] there befell intercourse by tryst between them.	
T4 Immediately thereafter he did not stay to wipe the tear from his cheek, till he came to Findio. And [he] confessed to him his fault.	
T5 Findio said: ‘That shall not matter. A demon has contrived it’, said he, ‘to carry you off from us, and to set you among the laity, and bring you into a penitentiary, that you may be publicly put to shame.	C6 Satan contrived it in order to set you among laity, and bring you into a penitentiary.
T6 However, it will not be helpful to him, since you shall not go into a penitentiary. And he shall not carry you off among the laity.	C7 However, it will not be helpful to him’, etc.,
T7 And [you] shall continue under the same rule through each fast.’	

⁴³ Based on LASH’s translation (2014: under ‘Downloads’, → ‘The Monastery of Tallaght’). Purely formal or stylistic modifications to bring it into line with the more literal translation offered here for C are applied silently, some more substantial changes are indicated by footnotes.

⁴⁴ I disagree with LASH’s (2014) translation ‘And he asked her to be his concubine’. Firstly, it is ungrammatical because the subject *ilda* is feminine, and secondly, it seems implausible to me that he should ask her, since she is tempting him to commit a sin and not the other way around.

Normalised texts

RIA MS 3 B 23 (T)	RIA C i 2 (C)
T8 Do·luid ind Satan chuici iar sin ocus at-glādastar tria aslach tanaidi et dixit ildi.	C1 et dixit illi ‘nīcon fīu deit-su ām a n-as-beir Finnia frit.
	C2 Is mōr an aprainn fo-rōpairt ocus nī pater de[m]nichus deit a glanath,
T9 ‘Nīpa mōr a glanad deit-siu in c[h]omairle do·beir Findio deit.	is ní rath mór in comairc[h]ell do·beir Finnia deit.
T10 Is ed is maith deit ercc co Comgald co-ruccæ breith fort.’	C3 Is hed as maith deit, ergc co Comgell co-rruca brith fort.’
T11 Do-chōid-som ón danō ocus confesus est illi et dixit Comgeld.	C4 Do-cōid-som ón danō et confesus est illi et dixit Comgell:
T12 ‘Is fochen ām do t[h]īchtu; ní-bía brīg dē-sium’,	C5 ‘is foc[h]en ám to thíchtu. Nīcon-bía brīg hisinn-í sin.
T13 et Comgellus dixit eadem uerba quae dixit Findio.	C8 et Comgellus dixit eadem uerba omnia quae dixit Finnia.
T14 An dand do·luid a Bendchar sechtair, is and gabuis port curuch Coluim Cildi et Satanas suasit illi ut iret ad Columba[m].	C9 In tan do·luid a bBenchar sechtir, is ann gabais port curach Coluimb Chille et Satanas suasit illi ut iret ad Columbam.
T15 ‘Nība hīcc deit-siu tre Findio ocus Comgeld’, olsēi-siom.	C10 ‘Nīpa īccthe-su tre Finnio ocus Chomgell’, olsē-som.
T16 ‘Is ed is maith deid perge ad Columbam.’	C11 ‘Is hed as maith deit perge ad Columbam.’
T17 Do-chōid ón danō	C12 Da-chóid sōn danō, fo-rūatig-side do-som.

Translations

RIA MS 3 B 23 (T)

RIA C i 2 (C)

T8	After that the devil came to him and addressed him through (his) subtle tempting, ⁴⁵ and said to him:	C1	... and he said to him: 'Indeed, that which Findio ⁴⁶ says to you is not fitting for you.
		C2	Great is the evil you have engaged in and it is not a Lord's Prayer that ensures its cleansing to you, and the lenient treatment Findio gives you is no great favour.
T9	'The counsel Findio gives you will be no great cleansing for you.		
T10	This is what is good for you [to do]. ⁴⁷ Go to Comgell, that he may pass judgment on you.'	C3	This is what is good for you. Go to Comgell that he may pass judgement on you.'
T11	Then he went accordingly, and he confessed to him, and Comgell said:	C4	Then he went accordingly, and he confessed to him, and Comgell said:
T12	'Your coming is indeed welcome, this [thing] will not matter.'	C5	'Your coming is indeed welcome, that [thing] will not matter.
T13	And Comgell said [to him] the same words as Findio had said.	C8	and Comgellus said all the same words that Findio had said.
T14	When he came out ⁴⁸ from Benchor, just then Colum Cille's curragh reached harbour and Satan persuaded him to go to Columba.	C9	When he came out from Bangor, just then Colum Cille's curragh reached harbour and Satan persuaded him to go to Columba.
T15	'You shall get no cure through Findio and Comgell', said he,	C10	'You will not be saved through Findio and Comgell', said he,
T16	'this is what is good for you, [to] go to Columba.' ⁴⁹	C11	'this is what is good for you, [to] go to Columba.'
T17	Thus he [i.e. the monk] went then	C12	Thus he [i.e. the monk] went then, [and] he [i.e. Columba] reprimanded him [the monk].

⁴⁵ As argued in n. 24 above, GWYNN & PURTON's emendation of *tanaidi* ('subtle') to *tánaisi* 'second' is not necessary, hence the different translation here.

⁴⁶ T's variant *Findio* of the name is chosen in the translation, since it is also used by GWYNN & PURTON and LASH.

⁴⁷ This is not found in the original, but added by LASH (2014).

⁴⁸ Since the monk left Bangor, the translation is changed from 'along' to 'out' here.

⁴⁹ Cf. also T10 = C3.

Normalised texts

RIA MS 3 B 23 (T)

T18 oculus do-rat a c[h]oibsenā do-som et dixit illi Columba. ‘Sicut crucifixi[sti] Christum per temet ipsum peccato [secundo] in Findio quod non credidisti quod dixit illi per [spiritum] sanct[u]m tertio in Comgello quarto in me.

RIA C i 2 (C)

C13 Is ēi-side do-rat a choibsenā do-som hi tuus et dixit illi Columba ‘quater crucifixisti Christum, per temet ipsum peccando, secundo in Finnio tresā n-í nad-rucis aithgnu oculus nat-rochretis quod [dixit] illi per spiritum sanctum, tertio in Comgello, (in) quarto in me.

T19 Ad-bir-sa frit-sa’, ol Colum Cilli, ‘cūicc bliadna dēc pendi fo bīthin na dīmīcin do-ratais for fīrbald Crīst .i. Findio. Finit’.

C14 As-bir-su frit-su thrā’, olsē-som ol Colum Cille, ‘cūic bliadni deec pende fo bīthin na ētorisen-sin oculus na dīmīcne do-ratais for fīrbald Crīst’.

Translations

RIA MS 3 B 23 (T)

RIA C i 2 (C)

- T18 and made his confession to him. And Columba said to him: 'You have crucified Christ [once] of yourself by sin; secondly, in the person of Findio, because you did not believe what he said by the Holy Spirit; thirdly, in the person of Comgell; fourthly, in mine.
- C13 It was he [i.e. the monk], who made his confession to him [i.e. Columba] at first. And Columba said to him: 'You have crucified Christ four times, through yourself [and] the sinning itself; secondly, in the person of Findio, since you did not believe him, and that you have not believed what he [said] by the Holy Spirit; thirdly, in the person of Comgell; fourthly, in mine.
- T19 I pronounce upon you', said Colum Cille, 'fifteen years of penance because of the contempt you have brought upon a true member of Christ, namely, Findio.' The end.
- C14 Therefore, I pronounce upon you you', said Colum Cille, 'fifteen years of penance because of that unfaithfulness and the contempt you have brought upon a true member of Christ.'

Selected linguistic features

On account of external, non-linguistic evidence, the range of composition of *The Monastery of Tallaght* can be narrowed down to 815–840:⁵⁰

- (1) Máel Rúain, who died in 792 (AU), is only referred to in the past tense.
- (2) Máel Dithruib, whose death is recorded in the *Annals of the Four Masters* in 840, is, with one exception at the end of the text, referred to in the present tense. Because of the author's first-hand knowledge, he was probably living in the same monastery as Máel Dithruib, i.e. Tallaght (cf. FOLLETT 2006: 102).
- (3) References to Díarmait, who was abbot of Iona from 815 to c. 831, lead FOLLETT (2006: 102) to narrow the range of composition down to 815–840.

The proposed date of composition agrees with BERGIN's (1905: 221) conclusion that 'the language, on the whole, belongs to the period of the Old-Irish glosses'. In what follows, selected linguistic and orthographical features will be discussed and, where applicable, they will be compared to other texts of the Old Irish period.

⁵⁰ Cf. GWYNN & PURTON (1911–12: 121–2) and FOLLETT (2006: 101–2).

Phonological, morphological and orthographical features

- The second singular of the conjugated preposition *do* ‘to’ appears as *deit* (C1, 2 (2x), 3, 11, and T5, 9 (2x), 15) and once *deid*⁵¹ (T16), and not in the more frequent variants *duit*, as in Würzburg and St Gall, and *dait*, as in Milan. The spelling *deit*, however, is attested already as an allomorph in Würzburg and Milan, e.g., Wb. 6^a11, 12, 6^c27, Ml. 91^b16, 129^d22. Three times (C1, T9, T15) the form is found with the second singular *nota augens*, which always appears as *-siu* in T, but as *-su* in C. Comparing this with the three major glossed corpora reveals the following distribution of the *nota augens* after the second singular conjugated form of the preposition *do*:

	-siu	-su	-so
Wb.	5: <i>duitsiu</i> (6b14, 10c10) <i>deitsiu</i> (30a8) <i>detsiu</i> (5b29, 32c12)	1: <i>detsu</i> (5b29)	1: <i>détso</i> (6c7)
Ml.	29: <i>daitsiu</i> (21b7–8, 27b9, 40b3, 43d18, 44a14, 62d8, 65b13, 71b19, 73d12, 86c6, 87d8, 88a4, 88b7, 89a6, 90d17, 91a6 (2x), 91b16, 93d5, 93d8, 94a6, 101c8, 103a9, 116d7, 129d19, 140c3) <i>duitsiu</i> (44b23, 44c19, 92a20)	1: <i>deitsu</i> (129d22)	
Sg.	1: <i>daitsiu</i> (2a7)		1: <i>duitso</i> (208b5)
T	2: <i>deitsiu</i> (T9, T13)		
C		1: <i>deitsu</i> (C1)	

There are examples of *-su* (1) and *-so* (1) in Würzburg. In these cases, however, the conjugated preposition is spelled without an *i* on either side of the *-ts-*: *detsu* (Wb. 5b29, cf. 6c7). While the lack of an *i*-glide before the *-t* may be purely orthographical,⁵² the spelling *-su* indicates neutral *s*. Although the sample of St Gall is very small it shows, together with Ml. 129d22, that the use of the *nota augens* with a non-palatal *s* was possible after the palatal dental of the second singular conjugated form of the preposition *do*. The following table⁵³ gives the distribution of all the instances where the 2sg. *nota augens* occurs after a palatal consonant:

⁵¹ This spelling reflects the Classical Modern Irish variation between *deit/d*, see McMANUS 1994: 435. For the background of this variation see McCONE 1981.

⁵² Cf., e.g., *GOI* §86 (a) and McMANUS 1986: 10.

⁵³ There are no examples of this found in the Cambrai Homily (edited by STOKES & STRACHAN 1901–1903, II, 244–7), the Mongán tales (edited by WHITE 2006), the Gospel of Thomas, or the poem on the Virgin Mary (both edited by CARNEY 1964).

	-siu	-su	-so
Wb.	8: <i>as-birsiu</i> (12d17) <i>ro-n-anissiu</i> (29d9) <i>detsiu</i> (5b29, 32c12) <i>deitsiu</i> (30a8) <i>duitsiu</i> (6b14, 10c10) <i>huaitsiu</i> (5a7)	2: <i>detsu</i> (5b29) ⁵⁴ <i>huaitsu</i> (32a12)	1: <i>détso</i> (6c7)
ML.	86 ⁵⁵	1: <i>deitsu</i> (129d22)	
Sg.	2: <i>daitsiu</i> (2a7) <i>as-mbirsu</i> (208b5)		2: <i>duitso</i> (208b5); <i>as-mbirso</i> (208b5)
Blathm. ⁵⁶	4: <i>do-dichissiu</i> (st. 148) <i>tuistinsiu</i> (st. 158) <i>ro-n-aitsiu</i> (st. 181) <i>maicsiu</i> (st. 205)		

In Milan, *-so* or *-su* is never used after a palatal consonant, nor is it in the poems of Blathmac. There is, however, one instance where *-siu* occurs after a non-palatal consonant: *indiutsiu* ‘in you’ (Ml. 107a15). The certain example in which *-su* is found after a palatal consonant in Würzburg is *huaitsu* (Wb. 32a12). Otherwise, the Würzburg and Milan glosses, the poems of Blathmac and T⁵⁷ each have the forms as expected after a palatal consonant in Classical Old Irish. St Gall features *-siu* and *-so*, and C has *-su*. SCHRIJVER (1997: 20) argues that *-so* was the original form of the second singular *nota augens* and that it ‘regularly became *su* after a high back vowel (*u*) and *siu* after a palatal (= high) consonant or front vowel’.⁵⁸ His comparison of deictic ‘*-í-siu*’, however, has to be dismissed now, since BREATNACH (forthcoming) has shown that after deictic *í*, demonstratives are stressed.

- Original hiatus is still graphically expressed in the forms *tuus* and *deec* (both in C). In general, however, it has to be stressed that mere orthography here does not necessarily form evidence for an early dating,

⁵⁴ This example and the following (*détso*) could also feature a non-palatal dental (see above).

⁵⁵ The sample is too numerous to be set out in detail in this table. There are two examples in which the manuscript misspells the expected palatal ending of the preceding word, i.e. the gen.sg. *aicniudsiu* [leg. *aicnidsiu*] (Ml. 96d1) and the 2sg. present *do-mbiursiu* [leg. *do-mbirsiu*] (Ml. 111c13).

⁵⁶ The queries on the poems of Blathmac were carried out by using BARRETT 2017.

⁵⁷ In addition to the already mentioned examples with *deit*, T also has *dot breith-siu* (T5).

⁵⁸ He discusses neither *huaitsu* in Wb. 32a12 nor the cases of *-so* after palatal consonants in St Gall.

because the double spelling of vowels in such late manuscripts can also indicate longvowels according to Middle Irish practices.

- Apart from *Comgald* in T10, the second syllable of the personal name *Comgell* is always spelled with earlier <e> of the 7th century. In later sources, it is spelled with an <a> reflecting a schwa, hence *Comgall*. A parallel in the *Annals* which shows the original vowel in the 7th century is *Eugen* (AU 667.2) and later the younger spelling *Eugan* (AU 774.8, 776.10, 834.2). On account of the evidence of the *Annals*, Ó MÁILLE (1910: 55) concluded that the change of -ě- > -a- between non-palatal consonants took place early in the 8th century. Names, however, tend to keep their (archaising) spellings for a long time.
- The nominative plural of *bliadain* is found in the orthographically older form *bliadni* (without indication of the neutral quality of the preceding cluster) in C, where T has the younger spelling *bliadna*.
- The unvoiced final dental of *glanath* could also possibly serve as an indicator of an earlier date (cf. STIFTER 2013: 173). In the other manuscript, the form is written *glanad* with a voiced final consonant.

References

- ANDERSON, Alan Orr, & Marjorie Ogilvie ANDERSON (ed.), 1991: *Adomnán's Life of Columba*. Revised by Marjorie Ogilvie ANDERSON. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- AU²: Seán MAC AIRT & Gearóid MAC NIOCAILL, *The Annals of Ulster (to A.D. 1131). Part I. Text and translation*. Dublin: Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies, 1983.
- BARRETT, Siobhán, 2017: *A study of the lexicon of the poems of Blathmac, son of Cú Brettan*. PhD thesis, National University of Ireland, Maynooth.
- BERGIN, Osborn Joseph, 1905: 'A fragment of Old Irish', *Ériu* 2, 221–226.
- BREATNACH, Liam, 1994: 'An Mheán-Ghaeilge'. In: Kim McCONE, Damian McMANUS, et al. (ed.), *Stair na Gaeilge in ómós do P[h]ádraig Ó Fiannachta*. Maigh Nuad: Roinn na Sean-Ghaeilge, Coláiste Phádraig, Maigh Nuad, 221–333.
- BREATNACH, Liam, 2003: 'On words ending in a stressed vowel in Early Irish', *Ériu* 53, 133–142.
- BREATNACH, Liam, 2017: 'Some developments in the use of the demonstrative pronouns', Paper presented at *Variation and change in the syntax and morphology of medieval Celtic languages*, workshop hosted by *Chronologicon Hibernicum*, National University of Ireland Maynooth, 13–14 October 2017. To appear in Elliott LASH, David STIFTER & Fangzhe QIU (ed.), *Corpus-based approaches to variation and change in the syntax and morphology of medieval Celtic languages: proceedings of three ChronHib workshops (14 December 2016, 4 April 2017, 13–14 October 2017)*.

- CAREY, John, 1995: 'On the interrelationships of some *Cín Dromma Snechtai* texts', *Ériu* 46, 71–92.
- CARNEY, James (ed.), 1964: *The poems of Blathmac son of Cú Brettan, together with The Irish gospel of Thomas and A poem on the Virgin Mary*. Dublin: Irish Texts Society (vo. 47).
- FM: John O'DONOVAN (ed.), *Annala rioghachta Eireann. Annals of the kingdom of Ireland, by the Four Masters, from the earliest period to the year 1616*. 7 vols. Second edition. Dublin: Hodges, Smith & Co., 1856 (Third edition Blackrock, Co. Dublin: Edmund Burke, 1998).
- FOLLETT, Westley, 2006: *Céli Dé in Ireland. Monastic writing and identity in the early Middle Ages*. Woodbridge: Boydell Press.
- GOI: Rudolf THURNEYSEN, *A grammar of Old Irish*. Revised and enlarged edition. Translated from the German by Daniel A. BINCHY and Osborn BERGIN. Dublin: Dublin Institute of Advanced Studies, 1946 (reprinted with supplement 1975).
- GRIFFITH, Aaron, 2013: 'Irish *suide/-side* 'the aforementioned'', in Anders AHLQVIST & Pamela O'NEILL (ed.), *Celts and their cultures at home and abroad. A Festschrift for Malcolm Broun* (Sydney Series in Celtic Studies 15). Sydney: The Celtic Studies Foundation, University of Sydney, 55–73.
- GRIFFITH, Aaron, & David STIFTER, 2013: *A dictionary of the Old-Irish Glosses in the Milan Codex Ambrosianus C 301 inf.* [online at www.univie.ac.at/indogermanistik/milan_glosses.htm], accessed 28.3.2018.
- GROSJEAN, Paul, 1963: 'Notes d'hagiographie celtique, no. 51: Un fragment des Coutumes de Tallaght et la Vision de Laisrén', *Analecta Bollandiana* 81, 251–259.
- GWYNN, Edward John, & Walter John PURTON (ed.), 1911–1912: 'The Monastery of Tallaght', *Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy* 29 C, 115–179.
- KAVANAGH, Séamus, 2001: *A lexicon of the Old Irish glosses in the Würzburg manuscript of the epistles of St. Paul*. Ed. by Dagmar S. WODTKO. Wien: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- KPV: Stefan SCHUMACHER, *Die keltischen Primärverben. Ein vergleichendes, etymologisches und morphologisches Lexikon* (Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft 110). Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachen und Literaturen der Universität Innsbruck, 2004.
- LASH, Elliott, 2014: *The parsed Old and Middle Irish corpus (POMIC)*. Version 0.1. <https://www.dias.ie/?s=pomic&submit>.
- LIV²: Helmut RIX *et al.* (ed.), *Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben*. Zweite, erweiterte und verbesserte Auflage. Wiesbaden: Reichert, 2001.
- Mart. Don.: John O'DONOVAN, James H. TODD & William REEVES (ed.), *The martyrology of Donegal. A calendar of the saints of Ireland*. Dublin: Irish Archæological and Celtic Society, 1864.
- MCCONE, Kim, 1981: 'Final /t/ to /d/ after unstressed vowels, and an Old Irish sound law', *Ériu* 32, 29–44.

- McCONE, Kim, 2000: *Echtrae Chonnlai and the beginnings of vernacular narrative writing in Ireland: a critical edition with introduction, notes, bibliography and vocabulary*. Maynooth: Department of Old and Middle Irish, National University of Ireland, Maynooth.
- McCONE, Kim, 2015: 'Unstressed vowels and consonant quality in Old Irish: *u* or non-*u*?'. In: Liam BREATNACH, Ruairí Ó hUIGINN, *et al.* (ed.), *An XIV Comhdháil idirnáisiúnta sa léann Ceilteach. Maigh Nuad 2011. Proceedings XIV International congress of Celtic studies. Maynooth 2011*. Dublin: Dublin Institute of Advanced Studies, 109–135.
- McMANUS, Damian, 1986: 'Ogam: archaizing, orthography and the authenticity of the manuscript key to the alphabet', *Ériu* 37, 1–31.
- McMANUS, Damian, 1994: 'An Nua-Ghaeilge Chlasaiceach'. In: Kim McCONE, Damian McMANUS, *et al.* (ed.), *Stair na Gaeilge in ómós do P[h]ádraig Ó Fiannachta*. Maigh Nuad: Roinn na Sean-Ghaeilge, Coláiste Phádraig, Maigh Nuad, 335–445.
- MEYER, Kuno, 1902: *Liadain and Curithir. An Irish love-story of the ninth century*. London: D. Nutt.
- MEYER, Kuno, 1915: 'Mitteilungen aus irischen Handschriften', *Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie* 10, 37–54.
- Ó MÁILLE, Tomás, 1910: *The language of the Annals of Ulster*. Manchester: University Press.
- Ó RIAIN, Pádraig, 2011: *A dictionary of Irish saints*. Dublin: Four Courts Press.
- RIA Cat.: Thomas F. O'RAHILLY, Kathleen MULCHRONE *et al.* (ed.), *Catalogue of Irish manuscripts in the Royal Irish Academy*. Fasciculi I–XXVIII. Index I, II. Dublin: Royal Irish Academy / Hodges, Figgis & Co. / London: Williams & Norgate, [1926]–1970.
- RUSSELL, Paul, 1988: 'The Celtic preverb **uss* and related matters', *Ériu* 39, 95–126.
- SCHRIJVER, Peter, 1997: *Studies in the history of Celtic pronouns and particles*. Maynooth: Department of Old Irish, National University of Ireland, Maynooth.
- STIFTER, David, 2009: Review of WHITE 2006, *Keltische Forschungen* 4, 281–286.
- STIFTER, David, 2013: 'Towards the linguistic dating of early Irish law texts', in Anders AHLQVIST & Pamela O'NEILL (ed.), *Medieval Irish law. Text and context*. Sydney: The Celtic Studies Foundation, University of Sydney, 163–208.
- STIFTER, David, 2014: 'The history of the Old Irish preverb *to-*', in Elisa ROMA & David STIFTER (eds.), *Linguistic and philological studies in Early Irish*. Lewiston/Lampeter: Edwin Mellen Press, 203–246.
- STOKES, Whitley, 1910: *A supplement to Thesaurus Palaeohibernicus*. Halle a.S.: Niemeyer.
- STOKES, Whitley, & John STRACHAN (ed.), 1901–1903: *Thesaurus Palaeohibernicus*. 2 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press (reprinted, including STOKES 1910, in 2 vols, Dublin: Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies, 1975).

- UHLICH, Jürgen, 2006: 'Some textual problems in Rónán's lament I: two quatrains concerning Echaid's daughter (*Fingal Rónáin* lines 180–7)', *Ériu* 56, 13–62.
- VGKS: Holger PEDERSEN, *Vergleichende Grammatik der keltischen Sprachen*. 2 vols. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1909, 1913.
- WAGNER, S. Morgyn, 2006: 'Ritual impurity and the Céli Dé: sin, theology, and practice in the eighth and ninth centuries'. Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Edinburgh.
- WHITE, Nora (ed.), 2006: *Compert Mongáin and three other early Mongán tales*. Maynooth: Department of Old and Middle Irish, National University of Ireland, Maynooth.

Maynooth
bernhard.bauer@mu.ie

Bernhard BAUER

