THE IRISH ROMANTIC TALES

AND THEIR RELATIONSHIP TO

IRISH AND SCOTTISH GAELIC ORAL TRADITION

by

Alan J. Bruford
(author)

Thesis presented for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy of the University of Edinburgh, in the Faculty of Arts, May 1965.

EX BIBL UNIV. EDINBURGEN

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.

I am grateful to the University of Edinburgh and the Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies for the financial help which has made this thesis possible, and for providing facilities for study; and to Professor K. H. Jackson for his constant supervision and help. Much of my work is based on material in the archives of the Irish Folklore Commission, and I am indebted to all the Commission's staff: especially to the Director, Professor J. H. Delargy, for his encouragement and advice; to the Archivist, Seán Ó Súilleabháin, for his friendly guidance; and to Seán Ó hEochaidh for my introduction to the Gaidhealtacht. For help in studying the MSS of Eachtra Chonaill Gulban and other Romantic tales I am indebted to Fr. Pádraig Ó Fianachta and the Librarian of Maynooth College; to Mr. W. O'Sullivan of Trinity College, Dublin; to R. A. Scanlon and Prof. Brian Ó Cuív; and to the library staff of the Royal Irish Academy, the National Libraries of Scotland and Ireland, and University College and King's Inns, Dublin. My past and present colleagues at the Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies, and the School of Scottish Studies, and other friends in Dublin and Edinburgh, have helped in many practical ways as well as by their interest.

CONTENTS

		Page
Introductory note.		1
Chapter One: The Romantic Tales, style, content and history.		4
	Subject-matter and sources	4
	Ethos and background: archaism	16
	Style and language	24
	Historical sketch (tales and MSS)	30
Chapter Two: From written romances to folktales.		47
	The spread to oral tradition (use of MSS for reading aloud)	47
	Effects of the Gaelic tradition of storytelling	61
	Popular and unpopular tales in oral tradition: Old Irish survivals	70
	Popular and unpopular tales in oral tradition: Romantic tales	77
Chapter Three: Tales and motifs in oral tradition		91
	Tales containing evidence of early oral transmission: DGP	92
	Eg.171 (EIA, EE)	103
	GF	106
	BCL	113
	LCC	114
	ECM and associated tales	120
	Other Romantic tales: CG	129
	CRI	163
	EIA	174
	OCL, OCT, OCU	183
	Fenian tales: TDG	185
	TS	193
	Less popular Romantic tales: AM	197
	TGG	203
	EMM	205
	RL	208

(Chapter Three, continued)

Types of change affecting motifs 211
(Adaptation to new environment) 219

Causes and conditions of change
in motifs; motivation 226
borrowing introduction,&c 232
visualisation 237
embroidery 241

Series of changes 245
Changes affecting a whole story 247
(Deliberate changes) 256
Conclusions 260

Appendix to Chapter Three: Folktales from lost MSS,
and a compilation 265

Folktales possibly from lost MSS:
The werewolf's tale 266
Maonus na Luinge Luaithe 269
Eachdraidh Mhànuis 271
Kil Arthur 274
An Ghlas Ghaibhleann 275

A compilation: Loinnir mac Leabhair 276

Chapter Four: Verbal formulae in oral tradition 278

Runs and other floating traditional
formulae 278
(The sailing run) 279
(Histories of run-phrases) 289
Verses 293
Dialogue 300
Floating paragraphs 301
Names 305
Change and persistence in verbal
formulae 310

Bibliography I: Romantic tales i
(a) Introduction: MS collections i
(b) MSS and folk versions vi
(c) Titles & key to abbreviations xxxi

Bibliography II: Books and periodicals xxxiv

This thesis is a study of a group of romances written in Irish between the fourteenth and nineteenth centuries, as they are reflected in the Irish and Scottish Gaelic folktales which have been collected during the past hundred years. These stories are referred to below, in both their written and oral forms, as the Romantic tales: they may be defined as original prose hero-tales composed in Early Modern Irish (which was also for a time the literary language of Gaelic Scotland) and not intended to be taken primarily as history or allegory. The last clause is designed ad hoc, to exclude a number of stories which have very rarely passed into folk tradition, and are therefore irrelevant to the primary subject of this study; but some of them will be referred to from time to time. The Romantic tales as defined here include stories which may be conventionally assigned to the Fenian, Historical, Mythological, Ulster and Arthurian cycles, as well as those stories of the adventures of fictitious foreign heroes which are sometimes called the Romantic cycle. They specifically exclude translations, though not adaptations, of foreign material. They form a homogeneous body in style and to a great extent in subject matter, and their development will be discussed in Chapter I.

Certain other usages should be clarified here. I use "Gaelic" when I wish to include both Irish and Scottish Gaelic, though in practice the common tongue of the written tales will generally be referred to, following the

prevalent usage, as "(Early Modern) Irish". "Scottish" is used for "Scottish Gaelic" when the context makes it clear that this is the meaning: material in Scots hardly enters into this thesis. "Leath Cuinn" for practical purposes means Gaelic Ireland apart from Munster. "Northern" applies to material from Leath Cuinn and Scotland, or where the context excludes Scottish material, from Leath Cuinn alone. "Cork", "Galway", "Donegal", "Waterford" are normally used to mean the counties in listing folk versions. Subdivisions of counties such as "W. Kerry" and "Connemara" are also sometimes used.

I have tried, with varying success, to be consistent in the use of folklore terms. Stories derived from a single written source, or with a basic plot as well-defined as those of the individual international tale-types of the Aarne-Thompson index, are generally referred to simply as "stories" or "tales". "Type" is used of a variant which is fairly homogeneous over the area of, say, a county, in the manner of Von Sydow's national "oecotypes". "Variant" applies to a group of two or three stories which differ from the norm, and "version" means a story as collected from a single teller. Parts of a story are referred to as "motifs", "episodes" or "incidents": an "episode" is usually longer than an "incident", and a matter of a few words is called a "detail".

Apparent inconsistencies in the numbers of versions

quoted of a story from a certain area may arise from the absence of the episode or detail under discussion from single versions, which will therefore be left out of this part of the argument. However, as much of this thesis has been written in Scotland on the basis of notes and summaries of material in Ireland, it has not always been possible to check exact figures, and space sometimes does not permit the drawing of fine distinctions between similar motifs. For both these reasons the figures given are sometimes deliberately vague: "a dozen" or "some twenty". Exact statistics, in any case, cannot prove anything in folklore.

I have translated quotations in Gaelic, except personal epithets and titles of stories, in the text of the first three chapters. Chapter IV is concerned with verbal comparisons, and translations there would hardly be relevant. I have not thought it necessary to explain terms well-known to any student of early Irish literature, such as geasa or Tuatha Dé Danann. The spelling in quotations is that of the source, but for minor additions or alterations of punctuation and accents: in direct quotations from the older MSS expanded contractions are indicated in the customary way by italics.

References and abbreviations which are not explained in footnotes will be found in the bibliographies at the end. Bibliography I lists MS collections and MSS of Romantic tales, and all the oral versions drawn on in writing this thesis. Bibliography II covers the most important printed books and periodicals used.

CHAPTER ONE.

The Romantic Tales:

content, style and history.

CHAPTER I.

Ireland, like Iceland, stands outside the main literary stream of mediaeval Western Europe. Where French influence was paramount, verse lays preceded prose romances, and there was a common stock of heroic legend, mostly associated with the Matter of France and the Matter of Britain. Ireland, however, had a native literary tradition which was already old in the eleventh century, at the time of the earliest French lays. Just as the Irish language continued to be written in a hand older than the Carolingian Renaissance, while other vernaculars, adapted to writing at a later date, used the Gothic script, so the Irish romances of the later Middle Ages drew far more heavily upon the native prose literature, which goes back to the eighth century, than on any continental source. Certainly in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries Gaelic, like other languages, produced a large crop of heroic lays designed for a fairly wide audience: but these Ossianic lays rarely used Arthurian or Carolingian plot-material, and never Arthurian or Carolingian names. The reaction in favour of prose romance which followed in the fourteenth century, when the Norman baronial families of Ireland were almost completely assimilated to the native princes, simply meant the renewed flowering of a style of prose writing which had been practised continuously since the age of Bede. A few Arthurian and Carolingian tales were translated, and many tales used the background of the Ossianic poems, but the language and

to a great extent the subject-matter of the Romantic tales spring directly from those of the later Old Irish tales. That translations existed does not mean that they had a wide influence.

The continuity of this tradition needs to be emphasised, since Flower[1] has dwelt mainly on the other side of the picture, and more recently Seán Ó Tuama's study of popular love-lyrics[2] has shown how completely mediaeval Ireland conformed in that field to the continental standard. The prose hero-tales, however, should be grouped, not with lyric poetry, but with the conservative bardic praise-poetry.

The plots of the Romantic tales tend to be as episodic as those of continental romances, but most of them conform to one of two patterns which were already well established by the Middle Irish period. The first of these is typical of Fenian tales and poems, from the earliest anecdotes in Meyer's Fianaigecht and in Acallam na Senórach, to Teacht mhic Ridire an Ghlaisuaithne in the nineteenth century, and many folktales current today. It tells how an adversary from the Otherworld, or from overseas, threatened the Fenians or other Irish heroes with force of arms or magic, but was eventually defeated. An early example is the twelfth-century Ulster tale Aided Guill meic Carbada.[3]

1. R. Flower, The Irish Tradition, (Oxford 1947) Ch.IV, especially pp. 135-8.
2. An Grá i nAmhráin na nDaoine (Dublin 1960).
3. Edited by W.Stokes, RC XIV p.396.

The other pattern, that of most of the non-Fenian Romantic tales, is the overseas adventure (Eachtra). This is usually motivated by a quest which may begin in a way reminiscent of the first pattern with a foreigner carrying off a woman from Ireland or otherwise insulting the heroes. Perhaps the earliest example is the second half of the Old Irish Táin Bó Fraích. The quest imposes a unity on the story which is absent from many continental romances. The pattern, common in the latter, where the hero is forced into exile for some reason, and then has adventures, hardly occurs in Ireland before the eighteenth century. The quest in some of the earliest examples is an imposed one, such as is the basis of many folktales in Ireland. There are examples of this in the Ulster cycle, in Tochmarc Emire and Fled Bricrenn ocus Longes mac nDūil Dermait, and in Eachtra Airt meic Cuind and Oidheadh Chloinne Tuireann, all stories known in some form in the Middle Irish period or earlier. The quest for vengeance, as in the Old Irish Immram Maíle Dúin, is almost as common a motive for the hero's journey abroad as the pursuit of a wife.

The episodic construction which the Irish romances share with their continental contemporaries is typical of all early romance, and may derive from the circumstances of publication: there is some reason to think that the continental romances were read aloud in serial form, an episode each night.[1]

1. Chaytor p.4; 58

The construction of some Irish tales suggests that the episodes were deliberately designed to be self-contained, so that in case of an interruption the audience, unlike that of modern serials, would not be too tantalised by the desire to know what came next. There are few instances of the practice, common in French Arthurian tales and poems, of describing the adventures of two heroes at the same time, hopping from an episode of one to a scene of the other: in most Irish romances there is only one hero at a time, and usually only one for the whole tale. However, about a third of the Romantic tales contain some sort of story-within-the-story or "in-tale". These again are parallelled on the continent, but not exactly: in the Irish tales the narrator always tells of his own experiences, or of something that he has seen himself. There are no story-telling competitions like the Seven Wise Masters or the Decameron; the closest parallel to these among the Romantic tales is Feis Tighe Chonáin, but that is based on the Acallam and all its stories concern the Fenians themselves. Otherwise no story has more than one in-tale of any length, and a special development of the technique occurs in some early tales - DGP, LCC, MRE - where the episodic in-tale, rather than its introduction, is itself the main story. It is probable that in-tales in Irish are directly derived from the imitation of the Aeneid in Táin Bó Cuailnge, where Fergus and his fellow-exiles tell of Cú Chulainn's boyhood deeds which they had witnessed, and that the Oriental models which were imitated in the rest of Europe reached Ireland too late to have much influence.

Superficially, the Irish romances resemble the Spanish and Portuguese romances, which were so popular during the sixteenth century throughout Europe, more closely than the earlier French stories. In fact, there is unlikely to have been any direct Spanish influence on the Romantic tales before the seventeenth century. Then one or two obvious imitations were composed, and there is evidence of the influence in the translations of three romances from the Spanish of Juan Pérez de Montalbán by Fr. Maghnus O Domhnaill about 1700. The end of Francis Kirkman's third book of The Honour of Chivalry, of which the first book is a translation of the Spanish Belianis de Grecia[1] states that the story is "famous at this day in Ireland": this may be merely a puff for Kirkman's invented continuation, set partly in Ireland, but as several names from Belianis are used in RL, it seems likely that the Spanish, or the older English translation, was indeed popular in Ireland. Most of the better Romantic tales, however, were probably written before 1550, when the Spanish tales themselves were newly printed and not likely to have reached Ireland in quantity: many are older than 1550, when the Spanish tales were unwritten or at least unprinted. It is more likely that the similarities are due to the influence in both countries of earlier romances and folklore.

Arthurian and Carolingian stories - La Queste del Saint Graal, Fierabras, Florent et Octavian, and the chronicle of the pseudo-Turpin - along with the romances

1. London 1650-72

of William of Palerne, Guy of Warwick and Bevis of Hampton, are all found in Irish translations of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries: but their influence was at most a very general one. That is to say that Irish romances also are full of battles in foreign countries: but they are far richer in strange and wonderful details. The translations which had most influence on the authors of the Romantic tales were those of the travels of Marco Polo and Sir John Mandeville, the "Letter of Prester John", and the oriental Seven Wise Masters, which Kirkman[1] claimed was used to teach children to read in Ireland in the mid-seventeenth century. Five Irish tales use the names of Arthur and his knights; but of the five, only MI is noticeably different from the other Romantic tales in style or content, though motifs in EMO and AM are apparently from continental sources.

The opening of AM, however, is an example of the sort of difficulty which faces anyone trying to trace foreign motifs in Irish tales. Flower[2] calls it "a passage clearly based on some text of Perceval le Gallois", whereas Mühlhausen[3] saw it closer to the original source of the opening of Perceval. So many "Celtic" motifs in Arthurian literature have now been found in their earliest recorded form in Irish, that, when later Irish romance shares something with an Arthurian tale, it is impossible to say whether it is

1. Op. cit, preface
2. Op. cit. p.136
3. ZCP XVII p.I; cf. below p.197 ff.

drawing upon the Arthurian source or on an early Irish parallel. What can be recognised as Irish often is the treatment of the motif. The fool Perceval is sent after a cup which a knight has stolen from Arthur's table. In AM the cup is transmogrified into the king of India's cup, which the knight's father, the king of Ioruaidh, lent to Arthur for a year and now wants back: he got it originally from the king of India in exchange for a sword he made with his own hands, for he is no ordinary king but a smith (nf gnáth-rí ar an Ioruaidhe acht gabha - a piece of lore found elsewhere). This sort of elaboration is typically Irish.

Similarly, what are loosely referred to as "Oriental" motifs are often as much Irish as Eastern. Take the adventure with a griffin in CG. Griffins certainly come from the East: but they are commonly depicted in Continental Celtic art from 500 B.C., and the name is used as a metaphor for a warrior in the earliest Irish poetry. Stories might as easily be invented about such a familiar concept as about, say, dragons in English. The only detail of the story in CG which is shared with oriental tales is that a griffin can carry a man, which was probably always part of the concept. It is a sort of sea-bird, not a bird of the mountains: this detail seems to be usual only in Irish and Icelandic sagas, though it may derive from the early mediaeval travellers' tales which are no doubt the source of the episode in the Middle Irish Aided Muirchertaig meic Erca, where Muichertach dreams of a griffin carrying him off from a sinking ship.[1]

1. See Ch. III , p. 153 note 1.

The other details - the young griffins peck at the hero and release his bonds, he kills them and the mother carries him off in vengeance and drops him into the sea, are not parallelled in any tale that I know, and are probably the invention of the author of CG. It is nonsense to call the whole of this episode "oriental". The basic idea of the Indian rope trick in CCR is no doubt Eastern, but it is extended with a mass of comic detail which is probably the author's. Again, what seems to be a borrowing from the introduction to the Arabian Nights in ENC is considerably changed - the two hidden onlookers do not themselves talk to the woman and find how she has deceived the genie (Gruagach) and obtained a string of rings from her many lovers: this part is played by an otter whom she summons with a whistle and instructs to bury her next day! Here, in any case, the motif of the rings could well have come to the Irish tale from a mediaeval European exemplum only distantly connected with the Eastern tale.

In fact, until the late period when details of foreign lands seem to be quoted from sources such as Hakluyt and Defoe, such details are often supplied from the descriptions of the earthly paradise in the Old and Middle Irish immrama. CRI, a story which drags in by the tail such wonderful details as the immortal youth reared on poison (cf. motif F959.6.2), borrows the island inhabited only by a cat, the sheep which changed colour on crossing a boundary, and the rider in the sea, from Immram Curaig Maíle Dúin and Immram

Brain. From the latter comes the clue which pulls the ship back to shore in DGP (as orally preserved). The spring overhung by a tree with singing birds which is a well-known feature of the Celtic otherworld stands outside the underground palaces in EIA and TCS, and the latter story borrows the island of women and its whole construction from the immrama.

It is hard, again, to be certain whether a motif is borrowed from folklore. When what is now a well-known folk-motif occurs in a fifteenth or sixteenth-century tale - for instance, the "Everlasting Fight" in CG - it is impossible to say whether the literary story has borrowed a motif from mediaeval oral tradition, or folklore has assimilated the episode from a Romantic tale. In view of the strong literary influence on all branches of Irish oral tradition, the latter must always be admitted as a possibility. The giant-fights and enchanted princesses which appear in Romantic tales such as CRI, and even earlier, are the stock-in-trade of international märchen; but they are also to some extent the stock-in-trade of the mediaeval European literature which contributed something to the final shaping of the märchen which are told today. The most that can be safely said is that the Romantic tales draw on the whole range of traditions, from whatever source, current in Ireland when they were written. Most of all, they draw on other Romantic tales; so that the motif of the princess in a high tower - perhaps originally belonging to the Irish oecotype of AT 530 - appears in at least six of the earlier Romantic tales, or the name, usually for a villain,

of Macaomh Mór mac ríogh na Sorcha in eight.

Such proper names in the Romantic tales can be used to illustrate the diversity of their sources at its widest, along with their basic conservatism. The names of Arthur's knights are borrowed only in Arthurian tales: the exception is the use of Artúr and Úr in EIA. The English prefixes Sir and Cing are only used with them, and titles such as Diúce are also generally signs of a foreign source: the list at the end of EIA in Eg. 171 - prionnsaighe, dūibhci, marquesidhe, iarlidhe, barūn, ridairidhe 7 rō-uaisle na crIocha - is typical of modern folktale, not of the Romantic tales. Such titles as An Ridire Corcra, Ridire an Eearraidh Uaine, are also rare outside Arthurian tales. Elsewhere the native and indeed to all intents fictional titles macaomh and gruagach are usual in such combinations, more often with an epithet in the genitive describing a possession or the origin of the character (Gruagach na bPuball, Macaomh an Uaignis) than with an adjective. The other source of borrowed names is classical literature and its translations, which is chiefly used to supply the names of all those foreign kings whose fate is to be conquered, or rescued, by Irish heroes: Helidorus, Casidorus, Picus, Fabhonius - these last two, in CG, obviously borrowed from the Aeneid. The lists are supplemented with names which must have been taken from chronicles of recent foreign history: Gustabhus, Conradus, Gensericus. Other kings have names from the stock which serves indifferently for giants, Lochlannaigh, and Saracens.[1]

1. The latter two categories seem to have been regarded as interchangeable; thus the Arabians and their allies in RL are referred to as Danair.

This includes names of Norse origin (Maghnus, Aralt, Sioghra) together with names of Fomorians from the earlier literature (Breas, Tinne, Loisgionn) and metrically monosyllabic names descriptive of dangerous characters (Borb, Garg, Dolbh.) A few foreigners, good and bad, have meaningless names, of which the best known are Cod, Cead and Míchead in CRI. Heroines have often descriptive names, as in folktale: Gruaidh Griansholus, Áilleagán na Bantracht, Dathchaomh; and there are also a few witches with descriptive names in late tales: An Mhilltionach, Dúil Uathmhar! But by far the commonest patters of name in the Romantic tales, both for Irishmen and foreigners, consists of a common Irish name, or at least one known from the earlier literature, followed by a descriptive and usually alliterative epithet: Iollann Airmdheirg, Séadna Saorbhéasach, Eithne Uchtsholus.

The highly conventional geography of the Romantic tales comes from similar sources. A few names are associated with the Arthurian cycle, though curiously enough the name usually given to Arthur's capital is purely Irish, Dúnadh an Halla Dheirg, and belongs to the type of name used for most other fictional capitals: Cathair na dTrí Sruth, Dún na Daibhche Deirge. Classical borrowings are again used to fill out lists in some tales: the extreme case is reached in CG, where Conall, after wooing the daughters of the kings of Calydon and Thebes (Calidonia, Tiabanda) for his companions, has to recover his own wife from Constantine, king of Greece, ruling in Athens, whose

vassals rule Homeric tribes (Mirmidonia), classical republics (Acaia, Arcadia), Roman provinces (Panonia, Dalmacia) and even Austria. Meanwhile the Emperor of Constantinople, evidently a Turk, is ravaging the domains of the Emperor of Germany (Almaine). The historical Irish hero, Conall Gulban, belongs to the early fifth century A.D. Most tales, however, confine themselves to a set of purely conventional kingdoms, of which some are apparently of Norse origin (Lochlann, Dreóllainn) or at least associated with the North (Ioruaidh, Inis Tuile, Innse Orc), while others are from the Mediterranean and of classical origin: Sorcha (Syria), Antuaidh (Antioch), Críoch na gCaolach (Colchis). These are supplemented by the modern kingdoms of western Europe, and a limited number of more exotic names: Eigipt, Innia, Africa, Aisia, the latter two roughly in the sense of the Roman provinces. In general the Lochlann group of conventional names and the Greece-Sorcha group are not mingled indiscriminately: but it often seems that Greece is only a few days' sail from Lochlann. It is perfectly reasonable for Mícheál Coimín in the eighteenth century to identify Sorcha with Sweden and place Ioruaidh in Africa. All foreign kingdoms were more imaginary than real: the writer of MRE makes the capital of Spain the Túr Breoghain of Leabhar Gabhála, not a real Spanish city; and in EMO Melóra rides from Britain to Babylon on horseback, but takes ship from there to "Asia" and India. Later tales insert names from further afield, such as China and Tartary, in italic letters, without attempting to adapt them to Irish, and late MSS replace the Tiabanda[1] and Isbeirne by Thebes and Hesperia in italics.

1. Literally "Thebans".

They use the names of the imaginary Tír an Óir (Land of Gold) and even the Old Irish earthly paradise Tír Tairngire for kingdoms in Asia and Africa.

The ethos and general background of the Romantic tales remain almost entirely those of the Old Irish tales. Take what Chaytor says of the continental romances:[1] "All this imaginative literature .... which was read or heard from one end of Europe to the other, is marked by two essential characteristics; it is based upon religious sentiment and belief, and the ideal upheld is that of the knightly virtues. The knight is the vassal of God, as of his earthly overlord, and earthly love, in its highest manifestation, is a reflection of love divine". As far as this goes, Ireland was beyond the bounds of Europe. Etherealised courtly love, for instance, rarely appears. As in earlier Irish tales, it is almost always the woman who takes the initiative. True, Deirdre in OCU and Cearbhall and Farbhlaidhe in BCF die for love, but Gráinne in TDG lives on to marry the aged Fionn and become a laughing-stock to his men. BCF is the only story from our period whose main theme is love, and most of its contents are imitated from existing Old Irish sources: the two women visiting Ireland in the form of birds from Aided Derbfhorgaill, the feast where all but the lovers are put to sleep from Scéla Cano and TDG, the lovers' death when each is told that the other is dead from the story of Baile and Ailinn. There is also a passage of broad farce when Cearbhall thinks he is

1. Chaytor p.3.

scratching Farbhlaidhe's leg under the table, but finds that it is her father.

The convention that lovers could be faithful for a lifetime after meeting only for a few minutes, or in a dream, or even after hearing reports of each other, was of course extremely useful as a device for motivating a plot, and was often used. It is an Old Irish convention, and has nothing to do with continental codes of love. Admittedly few heroes of Romantic tales share the beds of the local maidens with the same freedom as Cú Chulainn - the Amadán Mór is one who does - but the love motif is seldom stressed much, if at all, and the heroes are not above sharp words to their womenfolk. Conall Gulban remains faithful to his Eithne in the face of temptation from the king of Lochlann's daughter, but his previous treatment of Eithne is not noticeably chivalrous: rather than bandy words with her, he puts her over his shoulder and jumps out of the window with her. When she complains that he is carrying her off only by the speed of his running (do thoradh a reatha), he takes the hint and turns back to kill the pursuing guards; but first he reads her a lecture on pride, and tells her that after this he will not carry her any further: she can walk.

There is not much sign of the knightly virtues either. Feudal loyalty to a lord may have been part of the Irish way of life from early times, but it plays little part in these tales, where the heroes are usually kings' sons out for what they can get: more like folktale heroes, in fact,

than paladins of chivalry. Defeated enemies have their heads cut off when they are down, or at any rate are securely bound rather than put on parole; though they may thereafter become the victor's allies. In EIA no man ever answers the hero's questions until he has been knocked down. In the late tales of Sgéalta Rómánsuíochta, closer to folktale, characters even cut the heads off their bound enemies. Hostile women are regularly killed, and sometimes as in BCC raped first. Generosity is the only virtue commonly shown by heroes of Romantic tales. To return to loyalty, the Fenians sometimes show allegiance to their leader and to the group: Diarmaid is unwilling to elope with Fionn's wife. But in TS Fionn's followers and even his son Oisín refuse to fight on his behalf because of former injuries; and all the Fenians are hostile to their nominal overlord Cormac.

Even more surprising than this neglect of chivalry, to anyone who knows Ireland today, is the complete absence in most of the Romantic tales of any Christian sentiment, even on the part of the author. This applies not only to stories set in pre-Christian Ireland, but also to those set in foreign lands, and to the Arthurian tales themselves. Gawain in EMM swears by the elemental gods (luighim fona déithibh dúileacha) and the heroes of MI and AM use Cú Chulainn's oath by the gods of his tribe, toingim a ttoingidh mo thuath. The most solemn oath is by sun and moon. The one reference to God (an Coimdhe cumhachtach) in CG is a scribal addition in a single MS. When a character dies,

his funeral games are said to be celebrated and his name inscribed in ogham over his grave: this applies to the fourteenth-century Cearbhall and Farbhlaidhe, and to the newly christened children of Lir as well as to pagans. That it is just a conventional phrase borrowed from Old Irish, however, is clear from the passage in CRI where Cod, having buried his brothers, holds their funeral games single-handed - and presumably awards himself all the prizes. It is never clear what sort of marriage customs are implied, but there is no mention of the clerics who figure prominently in folktale descriptions of weddings. When clerics do appear, they are usually neither the holy sages of Arthurian romance nor the conventional butts of ribald humour who appear in lighter late mediaeval fiction, but sinister figures with a suggestion of the supernatural. An Manach in CRI is Macaomh Mór's tutor in magic, as the manaigh lomnochta are Ridire an Lochrainn's teachers of druidry in EMM; the "monks" who appear in LCC and DGP are magicians who abduct women, and the "hermit" of the latter tale has supernatural traits. Conceivably the word manach has become confused with its homophone manach or monach, "guileful"; but there is in any case a tendency for supernatural characters in Irish tales to appear in clerical garb, as in Serc Mongáin and Eachtra Chléirigh na gCroiceann. This fact alone, that former gods appear in the guise of monks, makes it doubtful whether the un-Christian and even anti-Christian flavour of the tales can be ascribed to a lingering rivalry between the bardic order and the Church. It is more probably merely another sign of conservatism, consisting as it does largely of a tendency to use time-honoured

phrases whether or not they are appropriate to the situation. The appearance of overtly Christian heroes in some late tales (RL, GG), and the miraculous conversion of pre-Patrician Irishmen in others (ETS, DMD,) is due to Spanish models rather than to the disappearance of the bards.

In many ways the world of the Romantic tales is that of Cú Chulainn rather than that of Red Hugh or Silken Thomas. The heroes are hardly ever described as riding horses - another feature which seems un-Irish - and as the chariot of the Ulster cycle is seldom mentioned, they appear to travel everywhere on foot. Sea transport is more often by curach than by more pretentious vessels. Examples will be given later of folk versions where these seeming peculiarities have been corrected to make the hero travel on horseback or steer a full-rigged ship himself. In Eachtra Mheldra agus Orlando the author feels obliged to explain the nature of tournaments and the reason for heraldry: Ciodh trách̀ta fá gnáth mu'n am so a mbailtibh rígh agus róthighearnadh cluiche dá ngoirthidh giústáil nó iomruagadh, agus isé an cluiche sin: marcuidheacht, agus lámhach, agus briseadh sleagh a ccorpuibh agus a ccneasaibh a chéile, agus meabhrugh croibhnirt agus cleasa goile agus gaisgidh .... is leis an ionar do bhíodh air uachtar an éididh sin, dá ngoirthaoi cót éidigh, do haitheantaidh na ridireadh an uair sin, do bhrígh go mbídis a bhfolach ó bhonn go bathais acht amháin a ndá shúil agus a mbéal agus a srón.[1] (However, a sport was practised in those days at the seats of kings and great

1. M. Mhac an tSaoi, Dhá Sgéal Artúraíochta, Dublin 1946, l. 135-40, 480-84.

lords which was called jousting or tournament, and that sport consisted of horsemanship, and galloping, and breaking lances in the bodies and breasts of one another, and the study of dexterity and feats of valour and arms .... it was by the tunic which was worn over the armour in those days, which was called a coat of arms, that knights used to be recognised at that time, since they were covered from head to toe but for their two eyes and their mouth and their nose). This was written probably in the early seventeenth century, at a time when in England portraits were still painted in full armour, and tournaments were still held as court entertainments.[1] Probably the author was describing something which he and many of his readers in fact knew, but which had to be explained because it was outwith the conventions of his genre. Fighting on foot was the only accepted practice in such tales. On the other hand such an improbable convention as the defeat of hundreds by one hero with no assistance needed no explanation, because it was established by long usage in such tales.

In fact, the battles and single combats in the Romantic tales are described with far less technical detail than those in the works of Malory, or for that matter Ian Fleming. There is a tendency to exaggerate the prowess of the hero, while submerging the actual details in conventional phraseology which tells us nothing about the fighting methods of mediaeval Ireland. The field of battle is drenched with blood and similes, the demons of the air cry aloud with horror, but

1. The last English court tournament mentioned by R.C. Clephan, (London, [1919]) The Tournament, was in 1619.

every combat ends with the beheading or binding of the defeated warrior. It is part of the convention that every hero has rope with him to tie up his prisoners. Occasionally a truce is called at nightfall, and both parties are said to be wounded, but there is never any indication where they are wounded. In battles with several named combatants on each side all that happens is that hero A is hard pressed by B until rescued by C, and so forth. The armaments which are often described in detail before the battle remain those of the Old Irish tales, though the sling has disappeared. It is hard to avoid an impression that the nobles of Ireland were not interested in fighting battles, only in winning them.

The same lack of realism often applies to the combatants. Giants - not enchanters or pagan brigands, but folktale ogres - appear far more often than in continental romances. If he is not an ogre, the hero's opponent nearly always has some magical power, or at least the reputation of being invincible, to make the fight more exciting. Often in Fenian tales, and in a few others (AM, ECC, TCS), they belong to the Tuatha Dé Danann, though this makes them none the less mortal. Female warriors and hags - the Cailleach of Gaelic tradition, more a malevolent goddess than a human witch - are often unchivalrously slaughtered, as in all periods of Irish fiction. Fiery dragons do not appear, but there are plenty of the oll-phiasta, water-monsters of the Loch Ness variety, which replace them in Gaelic tradition. Equally common is the venomous hound or otter, (cú nimhe,

dobhar-chú nimhe,) an invulnerable fire-breathing creature which is usually killed in one of the ways in which Cú Chulainn was variously supposed to have killed the smith's hound.[1]

As in most romances, any character who has a name or a significant role is a noble warrior, or at least a supernatural: if a commoner appears he is likely to be a disguised supernatural. The only regular exception to this rule is the shepherd (aodhaire) who serves in a classical device to inform the hero about the country in which he has just arrived. The protagonists are for the most part kings' sons (mic ríogh: the English loan-word prionnsa is rare even in modern folktales). Kings themselves are rarely shown stirring from their palaces except for an important pitched battle: this convention that a king does not go on expeditions abroad may be as old as the contemporary poem which calls Harold Hardrada, the king of Norway killed at Stamford Bridge in 1066, son of the king of Lochlann.[2]

Learned digressions are more typical of earlier tales from the thirteenth century or before: such are the opening of OCT, where the mention of Nuada is made the occasion of introducing the totally irrelevant story of how his

1. It has to be invulnerable to conventional weapons to explain the unconventional killing with the bare hands, or a ball down the throat, which in the original follows from the hero being an unarmed boy. Cú Chulainn's dog itself becomes a Cú neimhe in a late mediaeval poem: E. Knott, Irish Syllabic Poetry (Dublin 1957) p. 59.

2. R.T. Christiansen, The Vikings and the Viking Wars in Irish and Gaelic Tradition. (Oslo 1931) p. 417

artificial hand and eye were made, or that of the later Cath Muighe Rátha, which goes off into a digression about the measurement of time. This sort of thing is less usual in later stories, but there are still stories told to account for imaginary place-names and magic objects; ENC, MDD and TGG give three different accounts of the origin of Cú Chulainn's weapon, the Ga Bulga, all based on the account that it was made from the skin or bones of a water-monster.[1] With superb effrontery, the unidentified eighteenth-century Munster schoolmaster or farmer Tomás Ruiséal, author of ECL, remarks at one point that a different account of his hero's affair with a certain woman is given in the Cín Droma Sneachta, the very ancient lost MS quoted as an authority in some Old and Middle Irish sources. Many other examples could be given of archaisms in the Romantic tales, but perhaps it is enough to conclude by quoting the definition of learned men used in CRI: lucht léighte liag agus leabhar (readers of flagstones and books). It is typical of the mentality of the author that he mentions ogham stones before pen and paper such as he was probably using himself.

It would hardly be fair, however, to say that the stories read as if they had been written with a hatchet. The style of the Romantic tales has been much criticised: they seem wordy and bombastic beside Old Irish stories. This, however, is typical of stories intended for oral delivery. All mediaeval romances have a stock of clichés to describe the more commonplace events, and as Saintsbury pointed out many years

1. Cf. the poem summarised in Heldensage p.412.

ago, this is acceptable to a hearer where it may irritate a reader. The cliché serves to relax the tension. Is ann sin do labhair Rí na Sorcha, agus iseadh ro ráidh[1] needs no effort to understand, and leaves the mind of the hearer free to concentrate on the meaning of the speech which follows. Then perhaps a similar formula before the next speech will give time for the implications of the last to sink in. Similarly the use of two synonymous alliterative adjectives gives the hearer two opportunities of grasping their meaning. The basis of the style is rhetoric of the sort used in political speeches or sermons: the repetitions are for the audience's benefit, not, as in traditional poetry, for the reciter to rest his memory.[2]

This use of tension and relaxation gives life to the style. In the earlier tales speeches by characters are usually short and pithy, as in Old Irish stories, and may throw some light on the speaker himself: later, however, dialogue was mostly used, as in folktales simply to carry on the story, and Sgéalta Rómánsuíochta are full of long flat speeches which illustrate the author's colloquial Irish but not his character's personality. These late tales also lose the distinction between leisurely and urgent narration made by varying the tense of the verbs in earlier

1. "Then it was that the king of Sorcha spoke, and this is what he said".

2. On the other hand, Irish tales use few of the specific devices borrowed from classical rhetoric which Chaytor lists (op.cit. p.59 ff.), such as apostrophe and personification of inanimate objects, soliloquies, or the repetition of whole sentences in different forms.

Romantic tales. The historic present, which is used to speed up the action in Latin and French, is rare in the Irish of these tales;[1] but the absolute third person singular preterite in -is is commonly used to give the same effect of immediacy. This tense produced the accelerando of the narrative, and something like a crescendo could be achieved by the use of the "runs" which describe battles, journeys and feasts. Unlike the runs of modern folktales, these are not entirely stereotyped, but draw on a stock of phrases which could be amplified or varied at will by the addition or substitution of alliterative adjectives and nouns. Obscure and archaic words are often included, along with anything that will add to the onomatopoeia and alliteration, whether or not it makes sense: the meaning of this part of the story is not of much importance, compared with the sound. Runs, in fact, correspond to the "purple passages" of a speech, or the part of a sermon which the most admired Highland preachers used almost to sing. Probably the reciters, like some folktellers today, began to raise their voices and speak faster when these passages were reached. Not all runs, however, use a wash of sonorous words to recreate the excitement of a battle or a storm at sea: there are also descriptions which appeal to the visual imagination, though these are less frequent, and more often stereotyped, than the colourful pictures of scenes and characters in Old Irish tales on which they are modelled.

1. The present is used instead of the preterite or perfect in certain irregular verbs: tig, do-bheir, and especially téid - do-chuaidh is hardly ever found. But this is the generally preferred form, not a historic present.

Many features of this style can already be found in Early Middle recensions of older material such as Togail Bruidne Da Derga or the Book of Leinster Táin: indeed a number of run-like passages from the first appear in Romantic tales. The scribes who copied the more obscure passages can have had little idea what they meant. Even the educated Fr. Maghnus Ó Domhnaill in his MS of CG (1706) turns imbas for Buais 7 Boind into iomas for bhuair 7 for bhoin, suggesting that he understood it as "plenty upon cattle and cow" rather than "inspiration 'symbolised by nuts) on the rivers Bush and Boyne" which seems to be the original meaning. The real reason for including such passages was the desire to impress the audience with the author's learning. The same applies to the classical references used by some authors. The author of CRI, for instance, had evidently read Lucan's Pharsalia, probably in the Irish translation, An Cath Catharda; he keeps comparing battles to the Cath Catharda - presumably meaning the battle of Pharsalus - and ascribes the division of the three continents, Europe, Asia and Africa, to Caesar, Pompey and Crassus! Similarly the author of CG twice brings in the names of the twelve winds in Latin: the second time he succeeds in getting all of them in by making all blow together on the field of a particularly fierce battle. Fortunately the tradition of dindshenchas, the invention of etymologies for place-names which were themselves often fictitious, was moribund by the time of the Romantic tales, and there are hardly any examples of the boring aetiological anecdotes which spoil Táin Bó Cuailnge

for the modern reader. Only the example of the Acallam in giving a second, "ancient" name beside the modern name of each place mentioned is followed in itineraries in some of the Romantic tales set in Ireland, and these are often copied from older sources.

The language of the stories hardly concerns us here: it is classical Early Modern Irish in the earlier tales, though it lacks the polish of the Irish of bardic poetry or of Keating; fortunately few tales attempt the archaic language affected by the O'Clery school: in the two exceptions, Coimheasgar na gCuradh and Gabháltus Conaill Gulban, the latter probably by an O'Clery, the effect is like a typical seventeenth-century historical romance with archaic words or phrases thrown in where the author could think of one. The spellings of scribes and authors of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries are often influenced by their native Ulster or Munster pronunciations: but their syntax and vocabulary still follows the highly formalised classical models. What matters for this study, however, is that the language of narration and dialogue, if not of descriptive passages, is for the most part simple enough and like enough to modern Irish to be understood today, at least if read aloud by someone accustomed to give the words the dialect pronunciation familiar to his hearers. The examples to be quoted in Ch. IV will give an idea of how close, at least on paper, the language can be.

About half the Romantic tales contain passages in verse.

These are presumably inspired by the poems, mostly earlier than the prose which surrounds them, interpolated into many earlier Irish stories. The "Three Sorrows" (OCU, OCL, OCT) all contain verses, in the latter two probably contemporary with the prose text, and the popularity of these early Romantic tales may have encouraged the use of verses in similar stories. On the other hand most of the Fenian tales, and the Battles, and one or two other stories known to be early (LCC, EMM) are either in prose throughout, or contain only a few poems which seem to be older than the prose text; the only exceptions among Fenian tales are TS and TDG, and in the latter the poems seem to have been added later. The late tales, written after the collapse of the bardic order and beginning to resemble folktales, do not usually include verses.

Unlike the poems in early tales, those in Romantic tales have little artistic value and do nothing to carry on the telling of story. Frequently they are dialogues whose substance has already been given in the prose. Occasionally they may do something to fill in the emotions of a character, like some of the poems in Icelandic sagas: but in general they are merely decorative résumés of facts and sentiments which have already been made clear in the prose. Their function must have been mainly to break up the prose and relax the tension: perhaps in early public recitations they would actually be sung or chanted to harp accompaniment.

Presumably they were also meant to exhibit the author's skill as a poet; but in this sort of verse it does not seem to have been required, as far as we can tell from the corrupt MSS that survive, that the strict rules of dán díreach should be followed - just as it is not required today that book illustrations should be in the style of the most admired paintings. The verses in the one story attributed to a professional poet (MI) are considerably better than average. Easily the most popular metres in most tales are deibhidhe and ae freisligheh, which could be attempted by the most amateur poet; but rannaigheacht and other more complex metres sometimes appear, and there are a few examples of the class of composition known as rosg, descended from the Old Irish retoric. The verses in later tales[1] mostly appear by their use of hypermetrical syllables to be in stress metre, but they generally imitate the short lines and rhyme schemes of the more popular syllabic metres, so that in fact they look much like poems in the earlier tales as preserved in late and corrupt MSS.

Though the general archaism of subject-matter and language makes it difficult to date most Romantic tales even to the nearest century, it seems worth while to attempt a short chronological account of their development and the MSS in which they are found, to supplement the more detailed accounts of single tales which will be given later. We will not be much concerned with stories thought to date

1. EAF, ECM, ETS, ELG, MRU.

from the fourteenth century. Most of these are of a rather learned character, with the flavour of the cloister found in so many Old Irish tales which, like these, purport to have a basis in Irish history. A great deal of material with a folktale flavour is mixed up with the accounts of historical or supposedly historical battles, and there is no reason to think that it was associated with these events in tradition before the authors of the stories put them together: a combination of history with fairy-tale episodes is found in Caithréim Conghail Cláiringnigh (sixteenth century?) and many Romantic tales of the latest period, whose authors can hardly have been familiar with ancient unwritten tradition.

A few of the tales with which we are concerned appear in fifteenth-century MSS. Eg. 1781 (1487) contains Leigheas Coise Céin, an episodic romance, with a frame-story set in the reign of Brian Bóroimhe and with a distinct folktale flavour, whose curiously summary narration will be discussed in Ch. III. The contents list shows that this MS once also contained a version of Céilidhe Iosgaide Léithe, a poorly constructed Arthurian tale whose main interest must always have been in its descriptions of otherworld splendours. Two stories in the Book of Fermoy (c.1457) which are basically Middle Irish, both being listed in the twelfth-century tale-lists, are clear forerunners of the Romantic type of tale. Compert Mongáin opens with a typically fantastic war in Lochlann, and was later developed by comparatively slight additions and modernisations into Tóraigheacht Duibhe Lacha,

which but for the early MS could be taken for an original composition of the eighteenth century. Eachtra Airt meic Cuind, after an introduction which explains the origins of the hero's wicked stepmother, is pure fairy-tale, with one of the most common plots of Irish folktales today: the hero is put under geasa to find an enchanted maiden. The narration seems to be somewhat condensed, but it includes the first instance of the popular motif of the princess rescued from a high grianán. A comic story in Rawlinson B.512, another fifteenth-century MS, Erchoitmed Ingine Gulidi, had a very similar history to Serc Mongáin, except that the later version, Ceisneamh Inghine Guile, became extremely popular in late Munster MSS: but it hardly concerns us here.

Few other Romantic tales appear in MSS before 1500: but it seems likely that many of those most popular later were composed in the fifteenth century. This includes many of the Fenian tales: An Bhruidhean Chaorthuinn, Bruidhean Bheag na hAlmhaine, Cath Fionntrágha, Eachtra Iollainn Iolchrothaigh, Feis Tighe Chonáin, Tóraigheacht Dhiarmada agus Ghráinne, Tóraigheacht Shaidhbhe,[1] which are sparely told, with plenty of dialogue, few poems, and not too many runs except in battle scenes. The same style is continued in what may be rather later Fenian tales, sixteenth rather than fifteenth century: Bruidhean Eochaidh Bhig Dheirg, Tóraigheacht an Ghiolla Dheacair, and the usual short version of Eachtra Lomnochtáin. The principal new feature

1. CF is in the fifteenth-century MS Rawl. B.487; MRE and FTC in early sixteenth-century vellum MSS; BC and BBA in a Scottish MS bound with a letter of 1603; the others in good seventeenth-century MSS, but as a résumé of TS is given in MRE it seems to be older than the latter.

in these is the exploitation as a comic character of Conán mac Mórna, and this reaches its climax in the far more long-winded story Tóraigheacht Taoise Taoibhghile, apparently a seventeenth-century tale from Connacht. The same wordy style appears in the sixteenth- or seventeenth-century Bodach an Chóta Lachtna, a mere anecdote which takes up more pages than some of the earlier stories.

Beside the Fenian tales, the stories most often copied by eighteenth- and nineteenth-century scribes were Oidheadh Chloinne Uisneach, Oidheadh Chloinne Lir, and Eachtra an Mhadra Mhaoil. OCU and OCL are found in Scottish MSS of the fifteenth or sixteenth century, though their actual date of composition is disputed. The third "Sorrow", Oidheadh Chloinne Tuireann, is at least as old, but hardly more than half as many MSS contain it as the other two. It is typical of episodic Romantic tale, and very readable, but perhaps the poems which it contains were less famous than those in the companion stories. Incidentally, the grouping of all three stories together is rare in MSS before the nineteenth century. Eachtra an Mhadra Mhaoil first appears in Eg. 1782 (1517) and is clearly an early story. It is hard to see any other reason for its great popularity. The plot is almost as diffuse as that of OCT, and while the latter has Irish heroes and the excitement of the heroes' struggle to win the magic objects demanded by Lugh, EMM has Arthurian heroes and a comparatively tame pursuit of an enchanter for vengeance. Perhaps its popularity is due to its resemblance to an extremely popular folktale.[1]

1. See p. 206 &p. 226 ff.

Two stories from about 1500 did not survive into later MSS, though they are fully developed Romantic tales of the same pattern as OCT and EAC, the Eachtra proper, telling of the overseas adventures of a hero from early Ireland. Stair Nuadat Find Femin is now incompletely preserved in TCD H.2.7. (before 1500) and may be the composition of its scribe, Uilliam mac an Léga: but the end is a summary like that of LCC. Eachtra Thaidg meic Céin, in the Book of Lismore (c.1500), contains an episode in the Earthly Paradise reminiscent of the older immrama, but it is most notable for the basis of its plot, the abduction of the hero's wife by what is clearly a Barbary pirate,[1] which was later used by the author of the most popular of the sixteenth-century tales, Eachtra Chonaill Gulban.[2] This story is full of lively incidents, many of them shared with modern folk tradition, though the many battles and duels described in lengthy runs make hard reading today. Later written tales

1. There seems to be no record of Moorish raids on Ireland in the fifteenth century, but it is not impossible that they took place.

2. As Hyde pointed out, this can hardly be much earlier than 1500, as Constantinople is represented as being in the hands of the Turks since time immemorial; compare sixteenth-century Spanish romances, where it is always held by the Greeks. The distribution of widely differing MSS by 1700 suggests that it was written at least a century before that. A likely date would be about 1537, when Manus O'Donnell of the line of Conall Gulban succeeded the pro-English Aodh Óg. The rulers of Thomond and Desmond had recently written to the Emperor Charles V asking for help against the English, and had received favourable replies, and the siege of Vienna by the Turks in 1529 was a recent memory; this would give a propaganda point to a story in which Manus' ancestor helped the German Emperor to defeat the Turks who had invaded his dominions.

and folktales borrow from it extensively, and it will often be referred to in the following chapters. The other two most popular stories from about this date, both in MS and oral tradition, are Eachtra Chloinne Ríogh na hIoruaidhe and Eachtra Iollainn Airmdheirg.[1] In these also the MS tale bears a resemblance to folklore. CRI borrows few actual folk motifs, but the narrative is set, more clearly than most Romantic tales, in the dream-world of märchen, populated by giants, princesses in distress, and humans transformed into beasts and birds. At the same time it has the episodic construction, elaborate battle-scenes, and delight in the marvels of foreign lands, of written mediaeval romance. EIA, on the other hand, uses the plot of an international märchen, AT 301, and indeed has partly replaced the latter in Irish oral tradition; but the heroic background of the tale would hardly be out of place in a story of the Ulster cycle, and the central battle-scene is as extensive as any in CG.

Less popular tales, but also early in spirit, are Eachtra an Amadáin Mhóir, Tóraigheacht an Chairthe Sgárlóide, and the Edinburgh version of Díthreabhach Glinne an Phéice. AM is connected with an earlier lay, which described the hero's faithfulness to his word in the face of magic temptation: a prose version of this ends the story as we now have it, rather abruptly and inconsequently - the MSS may be incomplete. The earlier part of the story has an Arthurian background,

1. CRI was in the library of Colgán, who died about 1657. At least one of the references to "Iollann" by Dáibhidh Ó Bruadair, not much later, is to the hero of EIA.

whose relationship to the Perceval theme will be discussed later. The hero's simplicity is used with some comic gusto throughout this part of the story: this sort of light treatment of the heroes is one of the ways in which Irish romances stand out from their continental contemporaries. TCS, like CIL, turns on the brutal vengeance taken by a supernatural visitor for an insult: the setting, in an imaginary Scandinavia and the surrounding seas, somewhat resembles that of the immrama, though lacking their sense of religious wonder. There is also an episode in an underground kingdom, possibly copied from EIA. DGP, a fragment as it stands, can be seen from folk versions to have been a fine story, which like LCC consisted of an introduction and a long episodic in-tale: its curious history will be discussed below.

These, with the sentimental Bás Cearbhaill 7 Farbhlaidhe and the satires Eachtra an Cheithearnhigh Chaoilriabhaigh and Eachtra Chléirigh na gCroiceann, are the stories which I would regard as belonging to the classical period of the Romantic tales, if such a contradiction in terms is possible. Some other stories from the sixteenth or more probably the early seventeenth century seem to show signs of decline, either under foreign influence or by exaggeration of native features. In some cases it is hard to distinguish the baroque from the deliberately comic. One of these is Tóraigheacht Taoise Taoibhghile, mentioned above, which in spite of its great length is unfinished in all the MSS: it fills out a fairly simple plot with bombastic speeches, hyperbolical runs and flowery poems, which leave the impression of a tour

de force rather than a story. In Tóraigheacht Gruaidhe Griansholus the comic intention of the exaggeratedly heroic sentiments put in the mouth of Cú Chulainn is more obvious: this lumbering hero equipped with a boatload of purely mechanical "cleasa" is as unlike the youthful sirite of the Táin as possible. The self-mocking tendency of many of these tales has here been blown up into heavy burlesque, such as was used with more purpose by the author of the stories of Clann Tomáis a little later. Similarly the antiquarian spirit is carried to excess in stories like Gabháltus Conaill Gulban (early seventeenth century) or Coimheasgar na gCuradh (perhaps even later) which consist of little but interminable accounts of imaginary campaigns in would-be archaic Irish.

The imitation of Continental romances began with plots, but soon spread to style also. The Arthurian Eachtra Mhacaoimh an Iolair and Eachtra Mheldra agus Orlando are quite good examples of Romantic tales except for their borrowed plots and the changes in background which they entail. Thus the quest in EMO is Irish enough, resembling that in OCT, but the Amazon Meldra and the witch who enchants Orlando are both rather different from the female warriors and supernatural hags of older Irish tradition. MI is well written by an author whose name for once is known, Brian Ó Corcráin, a poet connected with Maguire of Fermanagh about 1600[1] but the admitted French source[2] shows itself in the theme of the scattered family eventually reunited, and in

1. See Ch. II, p. 48-49.

2. This could be any of a number of stories listed by O'Rahilly, GJ XIX, p. 357-8, but if so it is very freely adapted.

the moralising comments on the villains' treachery. Eachtra Ridire na Leomhan is more closely based on a Continental model, again unidentified: possibly a combination of several, for the hero's title and the character of Friston, king of Cyprus, seem to be borrowed from Beljanis de Grecia, where the hero's brother is "the Knight of the Lions" and two other characters are Friston and Fellestone, king of Cyprus. Irish material was also worked into the lengthy romance, including the folk episode of the Knight without Laughter, and some names of characters from CG: Séadna Saorbhéasach .i. an Macaomh Mór mac Ríogh na Sorcha, an tAmhus Órarmach, an Dolbh. But the foreign influence in the greater part of the story is made clear by the battles of Christians against Saracens - the forces of Europe who fight the Turks in CG are never said to be Christians - and long letters from one character to another, a device never used in older Irish tales.

Few of the stories listed so far are found in MSS earlier than 1650, and in most cases the earliest MSS are of Northern Irish or Scottish origin. To avoid misinterpreting this fact we must digress for a while to consider the MSS of Romantic tales and their scribes. The area of greatest literary activity in fifteenth- and sixteenth-century Ireland seems to have been North Connacht and S.W. Ulster: an area of some fifty miles' radius surrounding Sligo. Among the poetic and scribal families represented in the area were the names of Mac a' Bháird, Mac Con Midhe,

Mac Fir Bhisigh, Ó Cléirigh, Ó Clumháin, Ó Dálaigh, Ó Duibhgeannáin, Ó hEoghusa, Ó Maolchonaire and Ó hUiginn. Moreover, though few MSS of tales survive that can be ascribed to the troubled times between the accession of Elizabeth and the Restoration when English administrators like Sir Henry Sidney encouraged the destruction of Irish books, the work of the Four Masters in this area must have done something to ensure the preservation even of fictional material: several stories first appear in the MSS of their follower Dáibhidh Ó Duibhgeannáin. Gaelic Scotland also had seen great literary activity in the comparatively peaceful years of the fifteenth century, and a number of beautifully written but usually undated MSS survive which must belong more or less to the sixteenth century, though we know from the work of Edward Lhuyd and the students of the Ossianic controversy that far more have been lost since 1700. Even as late as 1690, when the scribal tradition in Scotland was almost extinct, the Argyll schoolmaster Eoghan MacGhilleóin wrote MSS which contain the first known copies of some stories.

In Ireland the eighteenth century was a period of revival for the writing of MSS. Antiquaries in Dublin encouraged the copying of MSS by scribes such as Seán and Tadhg Ó Neachtain and Stephen Rice, and later by Aodh Ó Dálaigh and Muirís Ó Gormáin. In the ancient province of Meath and in South and East Ulster tales as well as poems were both composed and copied throughout the eighteenth century. On the other hand very few MSS have come down to us from Connacht or the West of Ulster. But the main

centre of scribal activity from about 1730 to 1830, and the source of the vast majority of surviving Irish MSS, was Munster, and particularly the city of Cork. Distinguished scribes such as Fr. Eoghan Ó Caoimh had been active in this area before 1700: but the new expansion was largely an amateur affair. All over Munster schoolmasters and even poor farmers copied stories and poems from any MS they could lay their hands on. In the early years of the nineteenth century the patronage of antiquaries such as Bishop Murphy and John Windele encouraged the professionals once more, and the Cork scribes led by the Ó Longáin family virtually mass-produced beautifully-written and badly-spelt MSS.

The result of this development is that the majority of surviving MSS from before 1725 are from Scotland, Ulster, North Connacht or Dublin; after that date the vast majority are from Munster. Hence tales which appear early are likely to be in Northern MSS; those which do not appear before 1725 may only be found in Munster MSS. Cath Fionntrágha, which exists in a single fifteenth-century MS from Mayo and 53 Munster MSS after 1700, is not untypical. It does not follow that tales found first in Northern MSS all originated in the North, far less that those found only or mostly in Munster MSS were composed in Munster, for it is likely that stories even in written form passed readily from one part of the

country to another.[1] On the other hand, in areas where scribes were particularly active, authors too may have been particularly active: many scribes were probably also authors. It is fair to assume that more early tales were written in Leath Cuinn, to which perhaps Scotland should be added, than in the South: even in the eighteenth century there is a higher proportion of original material in Northern MSS.

The Romantic tales written after 1650 have seldom passed into oral tradition, but they continue to provide evidence of folk motifs known to their authors. A number of stories survive from seventeenth-century Ulster which are shortened, simplified imitations of the classical type. The best is the acephalous Eachtra Aonghusa meic Fhirdiach, the story of the wooing of the son of the king of Tír Tairngire, which ends with the pure folktale incident of the giant's head which must be prevented from rejoining the body. The stories published as Sgéalta Rómánsuíochta - four of them attached to the Ulster cycle and one to the Fenian cycle - are almost written in dialect, but they exhibit a very professional technique. At least three of them use the same characters and are evidently by the same hand: they use a small stock of motifs

1. Compare Flower's opinion (The Irish Tradition, p.124, referring to the translations of the fifteenth century): "It is clear that there was considerable interchange of literature between the two districts" of Munster and N.Clare-Connacht-S.Donegal. Iomarbhágh na bhFileadh indicates a similar position in the early seventeenth century.

borrowed from earlier tales and from folklore, differently distributed about the quest theme of each story. The language is simple, with no elaborate runs or poems, and apart from an annoying tendency to recapitulate "the story so far" at length, which suggests that they were designed for serial reading, they make very entertaining light fiction, strongly reminiscent of modern detective novels. Eachtra Éuchtaigh owes even more to folklore, and will be discussed below.[1] A rather different and much less readable type of tale is represented by Eachtra na gCuradh, Teagmhála Duibh mhic Deaghla, and Eachtra Mhuireadaigh mhic Dìain Dèirg, with their histories of of interminable campaigns interspersed with a few perfunctory and unoriginal magical incidents. DMD contains one or two folk incidents as well as a sermon; ENC uses a story from the introduction of the Arabian nights, and begins rather well with its Red Branch heroes exploring Africa like characters out of Defoe.

We can identify two authors of Romantic tales from the early eighteenth century: Seán Ó Neachtain, a Meath schoolmaster of Connacht origin who had something of a following in Dublin, and Mícheál Coimín, a landowner in Co. Clare. It is in their work that outside influences are most obvious. Ó Neachtain's longest heroic tale, An Gleacaidhe Géuglonnach, contains a few recognisable though unconventional runs, and an episode set in Ireland and linked to the Ulster cycle; otherwise it could be taken for a direct translation from

1. p. 105.

the Spanish, with such typical features as the setting in Byzantium, battles with Saracens, enchanted grottos, letters between the characters, and long-lost relatives meeting each other without knowing it. Coimín, rather later, seems to show the influence of the sentimental novel. Eachtra Thoroilbh mhic Stáirn and its sequal Eachtra Chloinne Thoroilbh [1] are purely Irish in style, with poems but few runs; it is the emotional content which is new. Torolbh loses his wife half-way through the story, cannot forget her death in the battles into which he flings himself, and finally retires to die a hermit with a Jewish companion who instructs him in the true Faith. The sequel has passages reminiscent of aetiological folktale, but the chance meeting of Torolbh's sons with their long-lost sister provides the usual touching scene, and the end, where they drown themselves on hearing of their sister's abduction by Diarmaid, may be intended to be tragic, though if so it has been mismanged: the reader's sympathy is transferred to Diarmaid, who has to contend with monsters to reach the girl.

Also from Clare, to judge by the only two MSS, is Cuireadh Mhaoil Uí Mhananáin ar Fionn agus Fiana Éireann, a late story of the bruidhean type very much like the (probably) much older Bruidhean Eochaidh, though rather more popular in language. A large part of the plot is based on the mediaeval Fagháil Chraoibhe Cormaic. It might be one of

1. These stories are ascribed to Coimín by common tradition: I know of no MS ascription, but they occur in MSS said to be copied from his Leabhar na Fáisdine.

the Romantic tales which O'Curry claimed had been "invented" within his own memory. Two other late tales from Munster, Eachtra an Deirg and Eachtra Chuinn Láidir, are very likely the work of the scribe in whose MSS (c.1772) they first appear, Tomás Ruiséal, of whom nothing else seems to be known. He was an indefatigable chronicler of imaginary campaigns in a comparatively traditional style, who also wrote sequels to CRI and EIA. The most appealing feature of his style is a tendency to exaggerate in a way too fantastic to be taken seriously, like some folk tellers. His heroes range as far as China and Tartary in their conquests, and habitually kill up to twenty thousand men single-handed in a day. When Conn Láidir and his friends want to get to Peking in a hurry, their druid transforms them into puffs of wind.

Ruiséal was not the only Munster scribe to add episodes to well-known Romantic tales. There are MSS of TS with an introduction, irrelevant to the main story, based on the "Finding of Bran" episode of FTC: one MS of MRE, written by Seaghán Ó Tuama in 1819, contains additional adventures in the in-tale: and the version of LSR published by Bergin and MacNeill extends the original to more than twice its length by adding a long in-tale imitated from that in CG, and some comic adventures of Conán. This must be a late addition, for it occurs in very few of the MSS, and the in-tale draws extensively on the voyages of Sinbad, presumably from Galland's Arabian Nights, first published in English from 1705 (?) to 1708.

The efforts of the Ó Longáin school of scribes to record every tale they could lay hands on for Bishop Murphy's library seem to have been responsible for the last and most varied group of stories found in Munster MSS. Most of them first appear in the volumes entitled Gadaidhe Géar na Geamhoidhche at Maynooth, which contain the prose romances transcribed for the Murphy collection. Eachtra Luigheach Ghuilshleasach is an unfinished romance attached to the Ulster cycle, no doubt copied from a fragmentary Ulster MS. Eachtra Mhic Ríogh Uladh, despite the title, need not be of Northern origin, for the plot is a free adaptation of parts of the Spanish romance of Primaleon. Both these stories are ornamented with verses: those in MRU are openly in stress metre.

Díthreabhach Ghlinne an Phéice and Giolla an Fhiugha, also perhaps of Northern origin, are not copied from earlier MSS, but seem rather to be folk versions of older Romantic tales taken down and partly rewritten in a more literary style.[1] Eachtra Chéadaigh Mhóir and the companion tales[2] which appear in MSS of the same school, though not in the Murphy collection, are also adapted folktales, again perhaps of literary origin. Still other lost Romantic tales may be told today in folk versions: I have suggested what some of them may be in the Appendix to Ch.III. Certainly many Romantic tales have lived on in oral tradition since the breakdown of the MS system, and we must next consider how this came about.

1. Detailed arguments in support of this conclusion are given below, p. 92 - 112.
2. See p. 120 - 122.

CHAPTER TWO.

From written romances to folktales.

The Spread to Oral Tradition

It is first necessary to consider for whom and by whom the Romantic tales were composed. There is hardly any direct evidence on these points, but most of the parallels point in one direction. Early mediaeval romances in French and other vernaculars were generally the composition of professional poets. In the twelfth century they may have been learned by heart and recited by professional jongleurs: in later accounts the picture is more commonly of reading aloud from a manuscript by any literate person, often a woman, to a large or small audience, and there are occasional accounts of reading to oneself. In the earlier period jongleurs may have performed at open-air assemblies and fairs, but the opening address of many verse romances to "seigneurs" or "lordings" shows that the author's primary intention was that his work should be recited in the halls of the nobility, where the greatest rewards were to be had.[1]

1. Evidence for all these points is collected in the article by Ruth Crosby, Speculum XI, p. 88-110. The address to the audience does not appear in Irish romances, but the commonest type of opening would be effective in oral delivery. It consists of a monosyllable which would catch the attention of the hearers, followed by a string of adjectives of no importance before the significant part of the sentence, so that the audience could settle down to listen: "Rí ro-uasal rathmhar....do ghabh flaithios... i nÉirinn, darab cómhainm...." "Fleadh mhór-chaoin mhór-adhbhal...." or "Sealg, fiadhach agus fianchosgar.... do comóradh le....". The change from the more natural "Boí rí" or "Boí fled la...." of older tales seems to be deliberate.

At the time when the classical Romantic tales were composed, it seems likely that their main audiences would be of the last kind. The flowering of these stories coincides closely with the period when a powerful Irish-speaking aristocracy, of mixed Norman and Irish descent, was able, in a comparatively settled state of society, to patronise the arts. In short, the Romantic tales were probably written for the same patrons for whom the scribes and poets of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries worked, if not by these same scribes and poets. By this period the old distinction between fili and senchaid had been blurred, if indeed it had ever been more than a theoretical one - the two tale-lists which in their present form date from about the twelfth century both enumerate the mass of stories which a fili, not a senchaid, was expected to know.[1] In the Middle Irish Cath Maige Tured one man serves as file 7 senchaid to the Tuatha Dé Danann. At the end of the sixteenth century members of such families as Ó Cléirigh in Ulster and MacMhuirich in Scotland were certainly active both as poets and as historians; they were also their own scribes. In Ireland these professions might also be combined with holy orders, and priests like Eoghan Ó Caoimh and Maghnus Ó Domhnaill were ready to copy and translate romances, if not to compose them.

Only one surviving Romantic tale bears a probable attribution to an author - as opposed to colophons ascribing the tale to imaginary contemporaries of the hero - and he is a poet. It occurs at the end of the earliest MS of MI,

1 RC XII p. 76.

written by Dáibhidh Ó Duibhgeannáin in 1651: "Bíodh a fhios agat, a léightheóir an sceóil-si, gurab amhla do fuair misi .i. Brian Ó Corcráin, cnámha an scéil-si ag duine uasal adubhairt gurab as Frainncis do chualaidh sé féin dá innsin é; agus mar do fuair mise sbéis ann do dheasuigh mar so é; agus do chuirim na laoithe beaga-sa mar chumaoin air; agus ní raibh an scéal féin i nGaedhilg ariamh gonuige sin".[1] (Be it known to you, reader of this story, that I, Brian ó Corcráin, had the framework of this story from a gentleman who said that he had heard it told from the French; and as I enjoyed it, I worked it up in this way; and I have put in these little poems to set it off; and the story itself was never in Gaelic before this). Brian Ó Corcráin is fairly certainly to be identified with a poet who addressed poems to Cú Chonnacht Maguire of Fermanagh about 1608.[2] The unusually careful verses in the story confirm that he was more of a professional poet than most other composers of romances: though the verses in the older tales have had more time to be corrupted, and there is no need to suppose that MI is the only story written by a poet. In any case the writers of romance had probably had some training in bardic schools: their prose style itself seems to reflect the language of dán díreach, where most metres require alliteration in every line, and the most convenient way of filling up a line is with strings of unnecessary adjectives.

1. Quoted in GJ XIV, p. 191.

2. See the note by Bergin in Studies X p.257. He copied a book for another Maguire, Fr. Donnchadh Mag Uidhir. See Flower, Catalogue II p.353.

If poetry and prose tales were written by the same class of authors for the same class of patrons, we may assume some resemblance in the manner of performance. Thomas Smyth's account of the public recital of a praise-poem[1] shows the reciter (reacaire) singing or chanting to the harp. A similar but more enlightening account is in the Memoirs of the Marquis of Clanrickarde:[2] "The poet himself said nothing, but directed and took care that everybody else did his part right. The bards having first had the composition from him, got it well by heart and now pronounc'd it orderly, keeping even pace with a harp touch'd upon that occasion". It seems from this that the file wrote down the poem for the reacaire ("bard") to learn by heart. Bardic verse by this period was thus dependent upon manuscript: it was preserved for posterity in the patron's duanaire, and the poem which a Dublin merchant bought to give to O'Conor[3] was presumably a written copy of a poem.

Thus it is reasonable to assume that prose tales also depended on manuscripts, as did the learning of lawyers and physicians.[4] It seems likely that they were designed for reading aloud rather than for learning and recitation by heart, for the elaborate runs are different each time they

1. Quoted in 7 Centuries, p.49
2. Edition of 1722, p.170: quoted by G. Murphy, Glimpses of Gaelic Ireland (Dublin 1948) p.44.
3. He thought (wrongly) that a praise-poem was an investment. The source of this story continues to elude me.
4. See Campion's Historie of 1571, quoted in 7 Centuries, p.95

appear and must be intended to be recited as they stand. Great feats of memory have been recorded among illiterate reciters, but it is unlikely that a literate reacaire could memorise more than half a dozen tales exactly in a lifetime, which would give him a pitifully small repertory. If the MS was followed closely, it must have been read; and if it was not meant to be followed closely, why was it written out in full? Professionals could also tell stories in some form without the book, however, or so it seems from Tadhg Dall Ó hUiginn's description of a visit to a patron to whom, and to some visiting poets, he told a story while they were all in bed:[1] as he received substantial rewards for this - unless he is speaking elliptically of stories told in return - it seems to have been a full-length tale. By this time, towards 1600, reading aloud was probably on the decline, and stories were being written with the solitary reader in mind: for seventeenth-century tales such as TGG and EMO often apostrophise the reader in the same way as the seventeenth-century colophon to MI quoted above, which does not suggest that he is reading aloud to a larger audience.

It is possible, then, that stories may have passed into oral tradition by being learned by professional poets and reciters, and also through other literate people who read them for amusement; but the majority of those who knew them will have known them by having heard them read aloud. By 1700, when the bardic order had virtually ceased to exist, many stories had no doubt perished entirely: others survived only in oral memory: others still lived on in manuscript.

1. ITS vol.XXII, p.181 ff.

UNIV. EDINBURG

These last continued to be read, silently and aloud. There may have been MSS in use in areas from which none survive today, but in general it seems best to assume that there were few people capable of reading Irish MSS outside the areas where they were still being copied. A few MSS seem to have had some influence in Scotland after 1700. There is an account of one of the MacMhuirich family giving readings which may have included prose tales to audiences in Uist or Skye about 1730.[1] "I have seen a Gaelic manuscript in the hands of an old bard, who travelled about through the Highlands and Isles about thirty years ago, out of which he read, in my hearing, and before thousands yet alive, the exploits of Cuchullin, Fingal, Oscar, Ossian, Gaul, Dermid and the other heroes celebrated in Mr. Macpherson's book ... The name of the tribe which produced these hereditary poets and shenachies, was Macmhurich". Their MSS contained "verse as well as prose", and some of them certainly contained hero-tales: one of the most famous, which Edward Lhuyd heard of from Dr. Beaton from Mull in 1700, survived the pillage by Macpherson and other enthusiasts which overtook some of its fellows and the fate of being cut up for tailors' measures which met others, and was for a time in the possession of a man from Uist who learnt stories from it. His son, Hector MacLeod, told Campbell of Islay this in 1871, and repeated stories

1. Letter from Dr. John Macpherson, minister of Sleat, to Dr. Blair, dated November 1763, in Highland Society Report Appendix p.10.

which he knew from the MS through his father.[1] MSS of Fenian lays were treasured by families in Mull and Lorne in the eighteenth century, and it is possible that MSS of prose tales survived there among people who were interested in such things.

I have not come upon any such evidence of a continuing MS tradition in Ulster and Connacht. In Connemara, Roderick O'Flaherty, the last representative of the school of learning founded by the O'Clerys, was said to have lost all his Irish MSS by 1709, when Molyneux visited him,[4] and thereafter, very few MSS were written in Connacht, mostly by or for Charles O'Conor of Belanagare, who would have kept them in his own library. Parsons' account of "natural bards" in the mid-eighteenth century "with their people around them, in bad weather in their houses, and without doors in fair, repeating the histories of ancient heroes and their transactions", seems to refer to oral tradition; in any case, it is not localised in any one province of Ireland.[2] The account of "the manner of preserving the accuracy of tradition" given by a clergyman in Co. Derry about 1814[3] certainly includes no appeal to manuscripts, for the best version of a passage

1. See my note on "A lost MacMhuirich manuscript", SGS X, p.158 ff.
2. Remains of Japhet (1767).p.148: quoted by P.J. Dowling, The Hedge Schools of Ireland (Dublin, c.1934) p.9.
3. Dowling, op. cit. p.10.
4. Note to R. O'Flaherty, Iar Connacht (Dublin, Irish Archaeological Society

in "traditionary stories" is said to be decided by a vote of those present. It must be assumed that matters were rather different in the parts of S.E. Ulster and Meath where stories continued to be copied and even composed throughout the eighteenth century: but it is doubtful whether the writing and reading of MSS in this region had much influence on storytelling in the present Gaidhealtachts of Ulster and Connacht.

In Munster, at any rate, we have direct and unequivocal evidence that the MSS which were written in such quantities there were intended to be read aloud. The fullest account is O'Grady's[1]: "large manuscript collections .... for the most part written by professional scribes and schoolmasters, and being then lent to or bought by those who could read but had no leisure to write, used to be read aloud in farmers' houses on occasions when numbers were collected at some employment, such as wool-carding in the evenings; but especially at wakes. Thus the people became familiar with all these tales. The writer has heard a man who never possessed a manuscript, nor heard of O'Flanagan's publication, relate at the fireside the death of the sons of Uisneach without omitting one adventure, and in great part retaining the very words of the written versions". Notice that those who could not read or find someone to read for them evidently memorised stories at these readings to re-tell at home. When Eugene O'Curry[2] writes that "it is within my

1. S.H. O'Grady, Tóruigheacht Dhiarmada agus Ghráinne, Ossianic Society Transactions, Vol.III (Dublin 1857) p.29.
2. MS Materials of Ancient Irish History (Dublin 1861) p.299.

own memory that in Clare, and throughout Munster, the invention and recital of such romantic tales continue to afford a favourite delight to the still Gaedhlic-speaking people", the context shows that his "romantic tales" are those with which we are principally concerned, and their "recital" must have depended upon written tradition. Even small farmers used to copy MSS which they had borrowed, and hedge schoolmasters may have used them to teach their pupils to read Irish, as they used chapbook romances to teach them English. A few MSS preserve colophons which ask for a prayer for the reader (léightheóir) as well as for the scribe. The solitary reader would need no urging to pray for himself, but the reader aloud might well ask the audience's blessing for himself in the scribe's words.[1] Not only farmers, but the Irish-speaking gentry had MSS read aloud in their houses, and their servants must have got to know the stories. The preface to the MS collection of Romantic tales Gadaidhe Géar na Geamhoidhche, written for Bishop Murphy of Cork, makes it clear that the Bishop was expected to use it in this way: "....goidionn sé an oidhche, ní hé amháin ón léaghthóir, acht fós ó na cluinteóiridhe".[2] ("It" - i.e. the book, "The Cunning Filcher of the Winter Nights" - "steals away the night not only from the reader, but also from the hearers").

1. I am indebted to Dr. Hermann Pálsson for drawing my attention to the significance of this type of colophon, which is common in Icelandic manuscripts.

2. Maynooth, Murphy MS 18. Some volumes have the preface in a different form: the corresponding passage in Murphy 19 reads: ".... is ioghnamh mór (?read mar) caithiomh aimsire 7 cuideachtan don léaghthóir maraon le lucht a éisteachta".

Although we have no accounts of such readings elsewhere in Ireland in the nineteenth century, it is know that poor scholars travelled to Munster from Leath Cuinn in order to complete their hedge-education in the classics.[1] Romantic tales in Irish were not necessarily despised by those who could read English and Latin, and some of them must have brought stories back either in manuscript or at any rate in their heads. Thus along with the fifty eighteenth- and nineteenth-century MSS of CG which survive from Munster there is one fragment written in Co. Down in 1818 by an amateur scribe who was not at home with the script or the contractions; the text is more like a purely Munster group than the surviving Northern MSS, and may well be a copy of a text that was brought north.

It seems likely that, in Munster at least, the reading of manuscripts faded imperceptibly into the repetition of stories which the teller had heard read, and so by lapses of memory into the telling of folk versions. This process will have been repeated constantly in outlying areas throughout the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, producing a multiplicity of folk versions which themselves might travel to other areas and even other provinces of Ireland: and the eventual disappearance of MSS would hardly have any immediate effect on the volume of folk versions available. Moreover, by the time manuscript readings died out, they could be replaced to some extent by readings from printed editions such as O'Grady's TDG, of which Seán Ó Conaill in Kerry was able to repeat part fifty years

1. Dowling, op. cit. p.89-91.

after hearing that part read twice.[1] It is likely that recitation of stories word for word as they had been heard was still common in the late nineteenth century. This was the impression that Joyce had[2]: "The storyteller never chose his own words - he always had the story by heart, and recited the words from memory, often gliding into a sort of recitative in poetical passages, or when he came to some favourite grandiose description abounding in high-sounding alliterative adjectives", a run, in fact. The "sort of recitative" in the runs suggests that these were the stock folk runs standardised into a single form for each situation, rather than MS runs word for word, which would be hard to learn. The account seems to apply to Munster: "This sort of entertainment was quite usual among the farming classes of the south of Ireland." The "farming classes" probably mean the more substantial Irish-speaking farmers rather than the poorest smallholders: they were the people who had formerly had MSS. In spite of Delargy's statement: (GST p.7 (181.)) "neither does it appear from the evidence available that story-telling was peculiar to any class of the rural community", my own reading in the IFC MSS suggests that in Munster the best versions of long hero-tales are likely to be told by such fairly well-to-do people. Similarly the Rev. W. Matheson has suggested to me that the best tradition-bearers in the Scottish Highlands and Islands tend to be the descendants of the tacksmen, the landholders who continued to patronise the native arts when the chiefs left for Edinburgh

1. GST p.27 (201)

2. P.W. Joyce, Old Celtic Romances, London 1879, preface.

and London in the eighteenth century. Perhaps the loss of Gaelic by these classes is one reason for the decay of the longer stories today. Certainly versions following MSS as closely as some which Curtin printed as folktales, probably in good faith from oral recitation, could not be found today: his versions of some Fenian tales (GD, CF, MRE) could almost have been read from the MS.

The collections of the Irish Folklore Commission show that in recent years tales of the Romantic type have been as widely told in Connacht, at least in Co. Galway, as in Munster, and there are plenty from Mayo and Donegal. In Galway there may have been MSS in circulation recently, according to the accounts given to Seán Mac Giollarnáth: "Cá tar linn daoine a chonnaic 'lán bosga'de leabhra Gaedhilge ag á n-a seanóirí ach níl leabhar aca le fághail indiu".[1] (We meet people who have seen their elders with "a whole boxful" of books in Irish, but not one of these books is to be found today). Like the book from Loughrea mentioned below,[2] these may have been MSS from Munster, or printed books in Irish: it is likely enough that Munster MSS, as well as oral versions derived from them, reached Galway from Co. Clare. But many tales there, and certainly further north, must go back to readings in the seventeenth century and earlier, or to MSS of that period which survived to be read in the eighteenth century but are now lost. The single Connacht version of LCC, whose surviving MSS are both from Connacht and older than 1700, is a good example: the story never entered the written tradition of Munster, though it was known as a folktale in Scotland. In Scotland too its MS source

1. LML p.ix.
2. p. 74-75.

- if indeed this particular story had one - and that of most other tales must have been older than 1750 at least. Contact with Ireland was not entirely broken: Peter Turner, a soldier who had presumably served in Ireland, brought back some MSS about 1800, and they are now in the National Library of Scotland. These are not Munster MSS, however, and it is very doubtful whether the Munster revival had any effect at all upon Scotland.

The situation may be clarified a little by anticipating some conclusions from the next chapter. Oral versions of a story which closely follow the MS are commoner in Munster than in other parts of Ireland: but not by much. They are also common in Scotland. There are, moreover, Kerry variants of some of the more popular tales which, though very much altered from the MS, have been collected from many tellers: such local "oecotypes" have also developed in Connemara. This seems to indicate that in these outlying areas the stories have been in oral tradition for a considerable time. The folk oecotype could then have become standard, so that versions closer to the MS, which would have a less compact plot, might be rejected in favour of the oecotype. This would explain why versions close to the MS are more often found in Co. Cork than in Kerry, though more folktales have been collected in Kerry. It seems that storytellers in Kerry, Clare and Connacht were more apt to embroider upon their originals than those in Cork, Donegal or Scotland. This difference in attitude has had as much effect in the long run as the availability of MSS since 1700.

There is no reason, however, to suppose that oral versions actually preceded the existing MS redaction of any but three of the main Romantic tales. In most cases the oral versions vary considerably from one to another, but allowing for the fact that parts of a long tale will always be forgotten, the MS is always as good an archetype as any that might be reconstructed. The preservation of scraps of dialogue and poems illustrated in Ch.IV puts it beyond question that some versions of most stories derive from the MS: and in the vast majority of folk versions the preservation of the hero's and other names, which is not typical of international folktale or of any long story of non-literary origin except perhaps a few very localised types, creates a strong presumption that the MS is the original source. The written tales themselves certainly use folk-motifs or even the framework of international tales, but in form and language they are mediaeval romances. The three exceptions mentioned above need not really be exceptions to this rule: Leigheas Coise Céin, though better preserved in some ways in oral versions than in the extant MSS, bears all the characteristics of a literary composition, and though Giolla an Fhiugha and Eachtra Chéadaigh as found in late Munster MSS have evidently passed through an oral stage, there is some reason to suppose that this may have been based on an earlier literary version, as was certainly the case with Díthreabhach Glinne an Phéice.[1]

1. See the detailed discussion of these stories below, pp. 92-129.

Effects of the Gaelic Tradition of Storytelling.

After devoting so much space to largely hypothetical reconstructions of the way in which Romantic tales were told in earlier centuries, it seems unbalanced to omit any account of the way in which the recent folk versions with which this thesis is so largely concerned were told. No brief account of this, however, could pretend to improve upon that given, largely from personal experience, by Professor Delargy in The Gaelic Storyteller.[1] The following pages, therefore, deal only with those features of the storytelling tradition which must be taken into account in any comparative study of Gaelic folktales like that which follows in Ch.III.

In Ireland the class of stories most admired by folk audiences at the end of the last century was known as fiannaíocht. The literal meaning of this is "Fenian matter"; but the term was often loosely applied to Romantic tales not connected with the Fenians, and even to the longer international tales.[2] Among these hero-tales those of literary origin, being originally longer and more complicated in plot than international märchen, and fuller of hard words, were less easy to tell and therefore have been less often collected recently

1. Sir John Rhys Memorial Lecture for 1945, in Proceedings of the British Academy XXXI, p.177-221; and offprint. Referred to as GST, with page numbers of offprint first.

2. Cf. GST p.18-20 (192-4), where the accounts quoted place fiannaíocht directly above seanchas. The subdivision given ibid p.37 (211) would be academic to most tellers, who call Conall Gulban one of the Fenians, and combine international tales readily with Romantic tales. There are no separate Irish terms: hence in LSIC, CG is put with Scéalta fiannaíochta, EIA with sean-scéalta (folktales in general).

Very possibly there were always fewer tellers who dared to attempt them; the introduction to Carmichael's Deirdire[1] shows how an expert teller despised the efforts of an amateur, even his own brother, telling what seems to us quite a fine folk version. It must be remembered, therefore, that though by the numbers of versions collected international tales may seem more popular than Romantic tales, Romantic tales were more in demand. One result of this is that the features of the literary style dealt with in Ch.IV - runs and names - are regularly introduced into Gaelic versions of international tales.

The tellers of hero-tales were until recently almost always men: women as tellers of fiannaíocht were frowned on in Ireland,[2] though they regularly told the short local anecdotes known as seanchas, and it is likely that the women from whom long stories have been collected in this century would have remained passive tradition-bearers in the last. The list of Campbell of Islay's informants bears this out on the whole for Scotland: a few women had one long story or lay among a mass of short tales, but the only ones who had several were Janet Currie, a descendant of the MacMhuirich bards, and Mór Fletcher in Mull, who seems to have been unwilling to tell long stories like CRI and ECM of which she knew part. It is possible that this association of hero-tales with men reflects the memory of a time when their tellers were professionals.

1. See p. 184

2. GST p.7 (181).

Most of the better tellers in recent years have had a number of Fenian and Romantic tales in their repertory, of which they were proud, though all of them, as far as I know, told some international types also, and often seanchas, songs and all kinds of traditional lore. It is doubtful whether there was ever a teller who would not have told some stories of international origin. Hence it would be easy for literary motifs to enter international tales, and international motifs to enter literary ones, as we shall see often happens: for the teller made no distinction between the tales in his repertory, even in the style of their telling. A few tellers seem to have specialised in a quite different kind of long story, derived from English chapbooks, international tales of the comparatively realistic novelle type, and even from nineteenth-century novels. Recent examples were Pádraig 'ac Aodhain in S.W. Mayo, whose tales of Don Belianis and Kamar-al-Zeman are said to have been famous locally,[1] and Angus Macmillan in Benbecula, whose very long stories were almost all of the novelle type. It is noticeable that such tellers do not use the literary style, with runs and formalised narration, but a matter-of-fact style with a great deal of dialogue, such as is used for seanchas. This is true even of versions of Romantic tales by such tellers, such as 'ac Aodhain's very full version of CRI.[2]

1. Fr. T. Ó Cillín. Artúraidheacht Tíre an Áir, (Dublin, n.d.) preface.
2. Béal. XII p.106.

The importance of the style of telling to the Romantic tales is shown by the fact that, unlike international tales, which cross linguistic frontiers easily, they have seldom passed into English. The few versions told in English which I have come across have either been short summaries, or in exceptional cases[1] contain Irish words and were probably heard by the teller in Irish, though he was no longer able to speak it when he told them: they would hardly have passed to a second generation of tellers in English. It is not that the stories are bad stories in English: it seems that the tellers simply feel that their language is an essential part of them.[2]

Within the Gaelic-speaking areas, however, the stories seem to have been mobile enough. Until fairly recently a good teller could usually be sure of a large and interested audience, and among them there might be tellers from miles away in search of new stories. But the range of a story was not restricted to the distance a man could walk in an evening and be back for the next day's work. The travelling people who formed part of the old structure of society were often storytellers, and indeed the ability to tell a story was a good way to pay for a night's lodging, though that

1. The version of EMM, IFC 961 p.135; a Donegal version of CRI, IFC 336 p.46.

2. cf. GST p.16 (190): "He says that his storytelling has been spoiled by being forced, through love of the tales, to tell them in English to young people who did not know Irish. In that way, through lack of practice and an appreciative Irish-speaking audience, he had lost command over his vast store of tales, and in the end had forgotten almost all of them".

would seldom be refused without. The common Irish folktale about a man who had no story to tell when his host asked for one, and was punished by an alarming encounter with the fairies that night,[1] illustrates what a necessary accomplishment storytelling was thought to be. Recently in Ireland the main class of travelling tale-bearers were the tramps (bacaigh) but as Delargy points out[2] pedlars, drovers, carters, itinerant labourers and tradesmen, poor scholars, pilgrims, and many others used to travel the country on foot, needing lodging each night. Many Connemara tellers got stories from relatives who were boatmen or carriers, and exchanged stories with their fellows in Galway.[3] In Scotland stories such as EIA and ECM have been collected from tinkers, and the long version of LCC collected by Campbell was said by its teller to have come to him from a carter in Islay: drovers and the young people herding cattle at the shielings used to tell stories at night. But the most famous class of storytellers mentioned by Campbell's informants were the travelling tailors and shoemakers who used to come round the houses in the Highlands and make up the home-woven cloth and home-tanned hides. They would take up residence in a house as long as they were working for the owner and tell stories in the evenings, or indeed while they worked squatting on the table during the day too, if there was anyone to listen.

From such sources as these, and also very often from his

1. See OS & C under AT2412B.

2. GST p.28 (202)

3. LML p.ix - xii.

own parents and relations, a storyteller with a good memory could easily build up a large reportory, for he could memorise the plot of a story from one hearing and many details of the wording from two. Delargy gives examples of tellers in the present century from whom over 300 stories have been recorded. Most of these would be shorter stories, but many good tellers could tell fifty or more long stories, including both international märchen and Romantic tales, or tales compiled from native motifs. It is not surprising if some of them occasionally confused one tale with another.[1] A teller might have heard one of the better-known stories from several different sources, and be able to choose the version which he preferred, or select parts of each and combine them in his own way, as for instance Amhlaoibh Ó Loingsigh did with the version of TDG printed in Gadelica.

It is evident from this that once a story had found its way into oral tradition practically anything might happen to it. It could be carried anywhere in Gaelic Ireland or Scotland; no doubt dialect differences would tend to hamper movement between provinces, but areas like the North Clare coast, which had contacts both with the Munster traditions and manuscripts to the south and with the boatmen of the Aran islands and Connemara to the north, must have served as clearing-houses.[2] There could even have been contact between Scotland and Ireland in the last century through Donegal labourers working on Highland farms, Irish fishing-boats putting into Scottish ports, Highland soldiers serving, like Peter Turner, in Ireland, and

1. See below, Ch.III, p. 182-183.

2. Cf. also the manuscript from Loughrea mentioned in the note to p. 75

the like. Few of them would be interested in learning stories, but there must have been some.

While it travelled, the story would be likely to change both through lapses of memory and deliberate editing by tellers. Where it came to rest, it might develop into oecotypes. These local, even parochial oecotypes, which seem to contradict what has been said about the mobility of tradition, are probably the result of the reputation of a certain teller and his versions of stories throughout a fairly wide area. A parallel could be drawn with the way in which fiddlers like Michael Coleman, and more recently Seán Maguire, have influenced the playing of traditional musicians all over Ireland. Certain tunes - simple tunes as well as showy variations - are known everywhere in the way that Coleman or Maguire played them, and the musician who prefers to play them as he learnt them from his father will find it hard, unless he is a first-rate player with a strong personality, to play together with other musicians and even to please an audience with some knowledge of music. This admittedly is the result of gramaphone records and concert tours: but given that other storytellers and story-lovers would come ten miles to hear a good teller, it is reasonable enough to assume that a similar development could take place in the last century within an area of ten miles' radius - say West Kerry. Occasionally other versions survive in the area of an oecotype: as might be expected, these are showy, literary ones.

Where an oecotype did not arise, however, the number of tellers of this rather special class of native stories in any

area would be so small[1] that Walter Anderson's "Law of Self-Correction" would be unable to operate, and all the versions would gradually diverge from one another. This, at least, is my impression: it may also be due to the exuberant inventiveness of Irish tellers, and to the weak construction of Romantic tales which makes them particularly liable to fall apart. But one need only count the plus signs in Ó Súilleabháin and Christiansen's Types of the Irish Folktale[2] to see how hard it is to confine even an international tale in Ireland within the bounds of a single type.

How quickly, in fact, do stories change? This is another of the imponderables which we face. For one thing, a teller may have an active life of seventy or eighty years, and his stories may be passed on to another teller at any time during these seventy years. Probably tellers, unlike collectors, rarely get their tales from young boys: but they regularly develop the interest and start learning them at ten or earlier, and a tale so learnt could be passed on with little change by a teller of eighty or over like some of the IFC's informants. On the other hand it may be told to someone else who will remember it the day after it was first heard. Delargy gives examples[3] of stories which have passed between only two tellers in a century, if tradition is true. In Scotland particularly, where there is a great regard for ancient tradition among

1. Cf. GST p.34 (208)
2. Referred to as OS & C.
3. GST p.22-23 (196-7).

storytellers, a story could be learnt so accurately that it hardly changed at all in a century. A good example is the Uist story of Mànus described in the appendix to Ch.III. This was taken down by Hector MacLean in 1860 "from Donald MacPhie, Iochdar, South Uist, who learnt it from Iain Mac Dhomhnuill Ic Thormaid Domhnullach, Aird a mhachair, who died sixty years ago at the age of sixty". I am told by the Rev. W. Matheson, who has made a lifelong study of Uist family # histories, that this Iain Domhnullach was a man from near Sollas in North Uist originally, of a family which may have been connected with the MacRuairidh seanchaidhthe to Macdonald of Sleat: in any case, his great-grandson in direct male descent was the famous storyteller Duncan Macdonald (Dunnchaidh Clachair) of Peninerine. The latter also told the story of Mànus, and his version is longer than MacPhie's, and preserves some undoubtedly literary touches - the sword from Antioch, the description of the Muir Teachd - which MacPhie omits. This may be due to MacPhie's failing memory or his inability to recite slowly for dictation, so that the scribe or the exasperated teller himself left out these details: but his version of DGP is also poorer than Duncan Macdonald's closely related one. In any case this shows that a story three generations and 150 years from its source can be told as well as one removed by a single generation and 60 years, if not better.

Another example from Uist can be adduced to show a radical change in a single generation: the story about MacMhuirich printed by D.A. Macdonald in Scottish Studies VII p.209-15, where in one version the companion spirits of a

magic bird perform two tasks as the condition of its release, and in the other, more devolved one, the bird itself speaks and promises to perform one task. The two tellers were not actually drawing on the same source, but their sources were brothers. Similarly there are considerable differences between the two Donegal versions of DGP, which were learnt from the same teller, and two Kerry versions of CG which two neighbouring tellers got from a travelling tailor twenty or thirty years before. The differences in the latter may be explained, perhaps, by the fact that one of the tellers names another source for the same story elsewhere, and may thus be combining two versions. In DGP it may be worth noticing that the more complete version is not, as one might expect and as is true of the Uist story, the one told by a son of the original narrator.

Popular and Unpopular Stories: Survivals from Old and Middle Irish.

The remainder of this chapter will be devoted to an examination of the relative popularity of the Romantic tales and other Irish literary stories in Gaelic oral tradition. Which stories have become popular in oral tradition, and which have not passed into oral tradition at all, as far as can be discovered? And more difficult to answer, why have some become popular and others not?

A complete answer to the first question, of course, is

impossible until all the Gaelic folktales that can be collected have been collected and competently indexed. The figures given below are as complete as I can make them on the basis of a year's work in Dublin and two in Edinburgh. It has not been possible for me to examine every story in the Irish Folklore Commission's MSS or the School of Scottish Studies' Archive of tape-recordings, or even in the Campbell of Islay MSS: I have not seen the Carmichael and Henderson MS collections at all. But I think enough ground has been covered to give a good general picture of the relative popularity of the various Romantic tales.

Before dealing with the Romantic tales themselves, however, it is worth digressing slightly to examine the folk versions which exist of stories of Old and Middle Irish origin. This examination will also serve to illustrate one answer to the second question above: that some stories have not passed into folk tradition because they are not found in paper MSS of the sixteenth century and after, for very few such stories have become folktales. This can be seen from the stories of the Ulster cycle which have been collected recently. The fact that these are relatively few in comparison with oral versions of Fenian stories has little to do with the supposed popular origin of the Fenian cycle: it simply reflects the relative popularity of the two cycles in late MSS. Not much of Táin Bó Cuailnge is found in folk tradition, but it is more than is found of Acallam na Senórach.

A number of versions of Cú Chulainn's life story have

been collected in Leath Cuinn and Scotland. They often include the story of his fight with the smith's hound which gave him his name, his training with Scathach, and the killing of his son Conlaoch; Scottish versions include parts of the Táin, and a garbled version of Compert Con Culainn appears in Donegal. Some versions end with Cú Chulainn's death and Conall's vengeance; others ramble off into the curious comic folktale Cú na hAdhairce which seems designed to ridicule the hero.[1] A good deal of this could come from MSS of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. The story of Cú Chulainn's training, usually called Oileamhuin Chon gCulainn,[2] and the two divisions of his death-tale, Brisleach Mhór Muighe Muirtheimhne and Deargruathar Conaill Cheamaigh, are common in such MSS. Both the prose Oidheadh Chonlaoich and the ballad about Conlaoch's death are equally popular in MS, and this has correspondingly become the best-known of all tales about Cú Chulainn in folk tradition.[3] The Scottish extracts from the Táin deal mostly with the fight with Fer Diad, which occurs separately in many late MSS: but indeed the whole of Táin Bó Cuailnge appears in late MSS, including three or four written in Scotland, and these may have some connection with the Irish versions also of the story of the smith's hound, though this was no doubt well-known as an anecdote at all periods. This leaves only Compert Con Culainn, which is only known from the Donegal

1. See OS & C under AT 1376A+

2. The irregular, no doubt pseudo-archaic eclipsis is almost universal in late Munster MSS.

3. Irish versions are listed in OS & C under AT 873.

village of Rann na Féirste: and it is as confused a version as might be expected after perhaps five centuries in oral tradition. The infant Cú Chulainn is found by Conall Cearnach, not Conchobhar, and only the most general outline of the Old Irish story is followed.

Of the other early Ulster tales that are found in oral tradition, Oidheadh Chloinne Uisneach, which will be discussed later, and Tromdámh Guaire, known in Scotland in the last century, are both common in late MSS. The folk versions of OCU, as of the tales above, follow the Early Modern Irish text rather than the version of the story found in Old Irish. Modern versions of the remaining stories of the Ulster cycle are sharply localised. The story of Cú Roí's death seems to be found only in Munster, in connection with the mountains of Cathair Con Roí in W. Kerry or Taur in N.W. Cork, which are supposed to have been Cú Roí's castles. The whole effect of the story is aetiological, as the stones which Cú Roí's men were away fetching when he was killed are identified with some group of boulders visible today in all versions.[1] The form of the fuller versions, however, is derived from Keating, as can be seen by the mention of Man in place of the Fir Fálgae at the beginning. Táin Bó Flidais is also found only locally, in N.W. Mayo, the Irrus Domnann where the Gamanrad of the later text of the story were localised in the tradition of Keating's time; and it is bound up with local place-names such as Ráth

1. This mention of boulders visible today is apparently a folk contribution to all written forms of the story, though they are accounted for differently in the earliest version: see Heldensage p.431.

Mhorgáin. The text followed is again the Early Modern Irish one,[1] though two versions contain an additional motif[2] of the king betrayed by his wife cutting off a magic lock of hair, and all are as much composed of onomastic anecdotes which have no basis in the written text as of elements which have,

The only other early Ulster tale of which I have seen folk versions is Fled Bricrenn.[3] Two versions of this have been collected in Donegal and one in Co. Tyrone. The story does not seem to survive in MSS later than the sixteenth century, and it is not surprising, therefore, that the folk versions are much shortened and simplified.[4] Two of them concentrate on a very free version of the episode where the heroes guard Cú Roí's fortress, rather than on the beheading contest.

The few other versions of Old and Middle Irish tales which can be recognised do nothing to contradict the impression that the only MSS which have had much effect on oral tradition are Early Modern ones. Thus the version of Merugud Cléirech Coluim Chille collected in Connemara is one of the few tales

1. See Heldensage pp.334-351. The latest MS known to me is RIA BivI (1671), itself written in Mayo, but frequent references to Flidais and Oilioll Fionn in late Ulster tales, notably in Eachtra na gCuradh, suggests that it was well-known after this date.

2. Christiansen, ISFT p.75 quotes an independent version of this, preserving only the name Domhnall Dualbhuidhe from TBF.

3. Prof. Delargy's article on Eachtra Neraí in Féilsgribhinn Eóin Mhic Néill (Dublin 1940) p.522 is concerned only with a single motif which occurs both in the Old Irish tale and in a quite different modern folktale type. There is no likelihood that one has directly influenced the other: both tales have borrowed the same basically religious motif. A version of OCU (IFC 509 p.489) from Donegal includes the story of Conchobhar's death: the source is probably Keating.

4. One Donegal version combines the story with the late Ulster romance TGG.

which their teller explicitly stated that he had heard from a book.[1] The book came from the Munster border, near Loughrea, and if it was a manuscript, may have derived from a copy by one of the Ó Longáin family of a fifteenth-century MS: several such exist today. But it may have been Vol.IV of the Gaelic Journal where the story is printed on p.85. The two folk versions of Immram Curaig Maíle Dúin which have been collected are probably similarly derived from a recent reading of the modern Irish version printed by Fr. O'Growney in 1891.[2] One version is a brief English summary told purely as a moral anecdote against vengeance; the other is in Irish and much longer, but the teller, Beartla Ó Conaire, has an unusual repertory, including OCL and OCT, which suggests an origin in print, and his style of telling, without runs, is that used by tellers of stories from English printed sources.

In the case of the versions of Cath Muighe Mucramha collected by Campbell in the Western Isles, we know that one was derived from the MS mentioned above, p.52, and the other, more devolved versions may be presumed to stem from the same or similar sources rather farther back in time: in any case the source would be a Modern Irish MS, of which many contained this story. The folktale about Cormac and Mac Con which is found

1. Béal. X p.5. Cf. ibid. p.98: Dubhairt Seán Mac Con Rí liom gur chuala sé "Searbhóntaí Chuilmcille" dhá léigheadh as leabhar Gaedhilge ina óige. Níor chuimhneach leis cé'n leabhar é, ach thug duine leis é as ceanntar Bhaile Locha Riabhach, agus bhídís dhá léigheadh i nDumaigh-Íthir, an baile i nar tóigeadh Seán.

2. GJ IV, p.99 ff.

both in Scotland and Ireland[1] is quite a different matter: it owes little to written sources, and the tradition that Mac Con was half man, half otter, could be of considerable antiquity.[2] One or two other stories attached to legendary figures have apparently developed separately in oral and written tradition, like the history of Cormac and Mac Con. Thus it is impossible to find any direct connection between the folk versions of the riddling contest of Fionn and Cormac's daughter and the literary Tochmarc Ailbhe: only the basic situation is the same.[3] Similarly the many oral tales about Lugh and Balor seem to have developed independently of either of the extant texts of the literary Cath Muighe Tuireadh, though there is some slight reason to think that they may once have had a written form.[4]

1. Handbook p.590, No.5; OS & C under AT2412D: MWHT I, p.92; D. Thomson, The People of the Sea, (London, 1954) p.49-63.

2. Shorter versions of the tale, e.g. E. Ó Tuathail, Sgéalta Mhuintir Luinigh (Dublin 1933) p.123, probably do derive from CMM.

3. The literary tale is printed in ZCP XIII, p.251; oral parallels in print include JFC III p.46; Waifs & Strays I, p.82; "Feargus mac Róigh", Maighdean an tSoluis (Dundalk 1913) p.38.

4. See the appendix to Ch.III, p. 275.

Popular and Unpopular tales in Oral Tradition: Romantic tales.

Before considering why certain of the Romantic tales, as defined in the Introduction, have passed into folk tradition and others apparently have not, it will be as well to present the problem in the form of a table. The evidence on which this is based will be found in more detail in the bibliography, and is subject to the limitations outlined there: but as these should be the same for all the stories concerned, it may give a fair enough picture of the situation. The Romantic tales are given in order of popularity in MS: late stories which appear in only one, two or three MSS, after 1700, and not in oral versions, are omitted. A few popular tales of types not usually considered in this study are included at the end for comparison. The number of MSS is followed by the number of MSS written outside Munster before 1700; the date of the earliest MS (including Munster ones); the number of oral versions, with partial parallels (with OCL, short summaries of the story) in brackets; and the provenance of oral versions if there are only a few.

Title Initials	MSS	(Early N.)	First MS.	Oral Versions & (cf.)	Provenance
BC	72	(2)	1603(?)or before	?	
MRE	66	(3)	vellum c.1500?	3	Irish, prov.uncertain.
OCU	66	(2)	vellum 15th-16th century	35	
EMM	63	(3)	c.1517	1	Clare.
BCC	62	(1)	1690	7?	
CG	55	(1)	1684	55	
FTC	55	(2)	vellum, 16th century?	Episodes only	
CF	54	(1)	c.1470	11 (2)	
OCL	53	(2)	c.1600?	7 (8)	
LSR	50	-	1726	-	
TS	49	(3)	1671	11	
BCL	4	-	1744	3 (3)	
BBA	43	(3)	1603	-	Meath.
GD	41	(1)	1686(?)	1	Kerry.
TDG	37	(1)	1651	25 (2)	
ETS (& ECT)	36	-	1749	-	
OCT	34	(1 or 2)	1685-6	24 (2)	
CRI	35	-	(but Latin version c.1600)	2	Galwa y.
EIA	33	-	1701	31 (5)	
EBD	31	(1)	1679	5	Ireland, Argyll.
MI	18	(1)	1651	- (1)	Donegal
ENC	9	-	1743	-	
TCS	8	-	1702	-	
GF	7	-	1817	-	
AM	4	-	1716	4	
ECM	4	-	1831	169	
ED	4	-	1772	-	
RL	4	-	1716	- (3)	Kerry.
TTT	4	(1)	1671	-	
DGP	3	(1)	1690	10	
EMO	3	(2)	1679	-	
CIL	2	(1)	c.1678	-	
LCC	2	(2)	c.1484	6	
NFF	1		c.14	-	
TGG	1	(1)	1679	3	Donegal.
BCF (love story)	21	(1)	before 1648	-	
CCR (satire)	50	(1)	1690	3	Scotland.
CML (history)	42			-	

Stories with few and late MSS and no oral versions will be found in the bibliography under : DMD, EAF, ECC, ECL, EE, EF, EIA(2), ELG, GG, MDD, MOM, MRG, MRU, TDL, TES, TMT, TNE.

Title	Total	S	A	D	M	G	T	K	C	Others
ECM	169	4	5	14	4	18	-	22	4	1 Sligo.
			(provenance of most versions not checked)							
CG	55	6	5	-	3	10	2	22	7	----------
OCU	35	1	-	5	4	19	1	2	1	1 Monaghan; 1?
EIA	31(5)	2	6	5	2(1)	9(2)	-	3(2)	3	1?
TDG	25(2)	3	2	7	-	5	-	2	3(2)	1 Meath;1 Roscommon; 1 Waterford.
CRI	23(2)	-	-	7	4	2	-	8(2)	2	----------
CF	11(2)	-	-	-	-	6	-	5(2)	-	----------
TS	11	-	-	-	1	6	-	3	1	----------
DGP	10	6	1	2	1	-	-	-	-	----------
OCL	7	1	-	1	4(3)	1(2)	-	-	-	1 Cavan; 1 Leitrim; 1 Longford.
BCC	7	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	3	2?
LCC	6	1	4	-	-	1	-	-	-	----------
AM	4	2	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1 Scotland?
BCL	3(3)	(1)	1(2)	-	-	-	-	1	-	1 Limerick

The second table gives the distribution of oral versions of the more popular tales. The column headed S stands for Scotland north of Argyll; A: Argyll; D: Donegal; M: Mayo; G: Galway; T: Clare (Thomond); K: Kerry; C: Cork; ?: Ireland, provenance unknown. The order this time is by number of oral versions.

It is obvious that, although stories which are rare in MS are seldom found in folk versions, not all stories which are popular in MS are popular in folk tradition. Some of the stories absent from the second column may be so because of the comparatively late date of composition: LSR perhaps, ETS, ENC, ED fairly certainly. No story first composed after 1650 is known to me in a folk version. But there are clearly other factors to be considered. Most of the anomalous cases where there are more folk versions than MSS are also anomalous in that the extant MSS are later and appear to be derived from folk versions: this is true of GF and ECM, and partly true of DGP. TGG is only preserved in Donegal, perhaps through a single lost MS: there is evidence to show that the three folk versions have a common source later than the MS. LCC has no late MSS, but as many early ones survive as of the most popular tale in the list, so it is not surprising to find a fair number of oral versions.

In this case another factor must be considered. Campbell of Islay had heard of LCC as the longest story of its kind before he ever collected a version. It was famous in Scotland for this reason, even though many of the episodes from the MS which filled it out had dropped out by Campbell's time. Because of this prestige tellers would tend to learn it, whether or not they themselves considered it a good tale. CCR, originally a satire on sixteenth-century Irish princes, must also have been learned in Scotland purely as a tour de force. Similarly tales like CG and CRI must have been helped by the saying, which varies from region to region, about the best stories and lays.

The usual Scottish form is: "Gach dàn gu Dàn an Deirg; gach laoidh gu Laoidh an Amadain Mhóir; gach eachdraidh gu Eachdraidh Chonaill." [1] Here CG is the best story. Aversion from S. Uist gives an interesting local variant: "Gach eachdraidh gu Eachdraidh Mhànuis 's gach torrach (tòrachd) gu Torrach na Tàine 's gach luidh gu Luidh an Duirn."[2] Here two stories have been squeezed in: Táin Bó Cuailnge itself and a folktale whose MS origin seems certain,[3] neither of them known in Scotland outside the sphere of influence of the MacMhuirich manuscripts. The Irish version uses a slightly different idiom: "Ní sgéal go sgéal Chuid." [4] Here CRI is the favourite, but an alternative version mentions "Sgéal Chonaill" as in Scotland.

There was a tendency, therefore, for popular stories to become more popular, while others would be correspondingly neglected. Some cases of neglect remain hard to explain. Why does EMM, so popular in MS, not appear often in folklore? Part of the answer may be given by the description in Denis Buckley's warrant[5]: "An Madradh Maol dob' fhada mar sgéal" - it was a long story, but not an interesting one. It may also have suffered because it is partly identical with the popular folktale of the werewolf[6] so that a teller, asked for EMM, might tell the folktale instead. Why, again, does

1. Quoted in this form as a general saying by Hector MacLean, JFC III p. 164. The first two phrases are prefixed to the early nineteenth century Scottish Gaelic novel of the Great Fool, NLS CXXIII: see Ch.III, p. 201.
2. JFC MS XVIII, p. 166.
3. See appendix to Ch. III, p. 271.
4. Tomás Ó Máille, An Béal Beo (Dublin 1936) p. 143.
5. GJ IX p. 322
6. See appendix to Ch. III, p. 266.

TGG survive in oral versions when EMO, which not only is preserved in the same MS but was twice copied from it, implying that the copyists preferred it to TGG, does not? Perhaps the answer is that it did survive, but in an area where Irish has since been lost, whereas TGG was fortunate enough to reach Donegal; or perhaps that it survived and has been collected, but that the foreign names of the hero and heroine, less easy to remember than that of Cú Chulainn, have dropped out, leaving an unrecognisable folktale with the common enough theme of a quest for magic objects to free an enchanted person. If the quest were changed so that the hero instead of the heroine played the active part, the story would have nothing to link it with its MS original. A similar explanation could be extended to the quest tale OCT, whose only two modern versions are very likely derived from quite a recent reading.

In the case of TCS, an excellent story which deserves to have survived, the fact that all the MSS are southern and later than 1700 may explain at least why oral versions have not been found outside Munster: but more important, probably, is the resemblance of the long episode from which the story takes its name to the underground adventures in EIA, and so to AT 301, AT 329 in its usual Irish form, and so forth. Hence the story would tend to be assimilated to these better-known types, and even if the assimilation were comparatively slight, would probably be assigned to one of these types by anyone who read it. If I had ten years in which to read through all the Irish Folklore Commission's MSS, I might be able to recognise versions of every Romantic tale on the

table: but as I have had to depend mainly on other people's indexing, it is inevitable that the better-known tales should be better represented. It is worth noting that I found two of the three versions of RL by pure chance while reading IFC MSS: The same is true of the Donegal tale which uses the central motif of MI, the carrying off of a child by an eagle (though this could derive from a foreign source or the Irish translation Seachrán na Banimpire.)

The Fenian tales (underlined in the tables) must be considered as a group. In spite of the high regard which tellers in Ireland and indeed in Scotland have had for Fiannaíocht, many individual stories are hardly represented in oral tradition at all. This may in part be merely apparent once more, and due to inadequate indexing: though surely the most amateur indexer ever employed by the Folklore Commission would recognise the story of the Giolla Deacair, which is well known from modern reprints. Again, it is not surprising that a late and verbose story like TTT should not be represented;[1] or a late story like LSR; or the whole of a long compilation like FTC. But oral Fenian tales tend to fall into two main types: a bruidhean-type and a helper-type. Tales of a supernatural helper are rare in written tradition, though there are some examples among the lays. The only prose tales of the type are BCL, ECM and GD. Far the most common oral type of helper-tale is that in which the helper is resurrected at some stage. All the 140 "Céatach" versions indexed in the IFC and many others probably belong to this

1. The story in Béal. IV p. 196, referred to by Murphy, D.Finn III p. xxxix note, is not related to TTT except in containing the name Taobh Gheal Tais.

type; the "Céatach" story proper, of which ECM is a nineteenth-century written version, is a developed version of this which could be of literary origin.

The bruidhean type is also considered by Murphy[1] to be primarily oral. This is very likely true, but the argument which he then uses to demonstrate that the immensely popular "Bruidhean Chaorthuinn" motif is not derived from the literary tale after which it is usually called, is based upon false premises. The motif tells how the Fenians were invited or enticed to a feast in a supernatural hall and found themselves stuck to the ground where they sat or lay: they were rescued by Diarmaid and/or others of their number who had been left behind, who had to obtain a magic liquid, in the literary version the blood of three kings among their enemies, to release them. In most versions it is added that the supply of blood ran out when Conán was still stuck to the ground, and he had to be torn loose. Murphy argued that in the original form of the story he lost the skin of his buttocks: this is an ancient comic motif which occurs in late Greek accounts of Theseus' adventures in Hades, but though it is normal in folk versions the author of the MS tale left it out because he considered it vulgar. Unfortunately neither of these last two statements is true. At least half the folk versions of the motif which I have seen do not mention Conán's buttocks, but the earliest MS does. Murphy must have been using Pearce's edition or an Irish MS which had been bowdlerised. NLS XXXIV (c. 1603) is unequivocal:

1. Op. cit. p. xxiii

"D'fhāg Conān croicionn a dhā shāl 7 a dha tslinnén 7 maol a dhā mhās 7 maol 'dhā ghualann ag lenmhuin don talamh, ganadh de sin do lean an forainm fair .i. Conān Maol mac Mōrna." ("Conán left the skin of his two heels and his two shoulder-blades and the round (maol) of his two buttocks and the round of his two shoulders sticking to the ground, so that it is from that that the epithet clung to him, that is, Bald Conán (Conán Maol) mac Mórna.") There is no reason why the motif should not have spread from this MS version. It is easily the most popular of the Romantic tales in manuscript, and it could have spread to all areas where Gaelic is spoken in the three centuries before 1900, even if we assume that it is not much older than the first MS. The use of Conán as a comic character (as he normally is in folktales) may well begin with this story.[1] The detail quoted may actually have been borrowed by the author from the classical story about Theseus, or most probably, independently developed from the basic situation to account for Conán's epithet Maol in a typically extravagant Irish way; neither is more unlikely than the wandering of the motif across Europe in folk tradition.[2]

Whatever its origin, the BC motif is immensely popular: so popular that it has virtually ousted all other bruidhean

1. He does not appear in FTC (14th century?) where the Conán of the title is a different, non-mortal character; nor in MRE or TDG. In BBA, TS, and CF (15th century) he is evil-tongued, but not an important comic character. BC is probably roughly contemporary with the last.

2. The grafting of sheepskin on Conán's wound, which appears in some folk versions, is presumably a folk improvement: for a similar motif, possibly its origin, cf. AT 1911A in OS&C.

tales from folk tradition, and this seems to be the reason why EBD, BCC and perhaps LSR, which belong to this type, are rare in oral versions. On the other hand, numerous oral versions provide a different introduction to the BC motif; this is often in the form of a helper-tale, perhaps suggested by the fact that the villain of the MS tale, Míodhach, was brought up by the Fenians. So for instance in the Fionn 7 Lorcán type quoted by Murphy a quite independent helper-tale is tacked on to the beginning, and the bruidhean part of the story begins with the Fenians sticking to a magic horse and cart, perhaps a borrowing from GD by association with the sticking to the floor later.[1] The Scottish oral versions where the villain is called Blàr Buidhe seem to derive from a lost ballad. For this reason I have given no number of oral versions of BC in the table: several hundred versions of the motif are indexed in the IFC: perhaps fifty of them may preserve the other main features of the MS tale.

Among other Fenian tales of known literary origin, TDG and TS are the only ones which seem to be well-known, and a shortened version of CF is current in Connemara as well as Kerry. A good account of the latter is given in Miss O'Rahilly's edition, pp. xviii-xx, and I have nothing to add to this except to note that the "Everlasting Fight" motif only occurs in one or two versions, and Murphy's implied argument[2] that this is part of an original folk

1. The idea that this could be the earliest form in which the motif appeared, as Murphy almost seems to imply, is absurd. The story is only indexed in IFC in a dozen versions, less than the versions of the full literary BC, and it is certainly a compilation; a Scottish version of the first part is in the Islay LCC, but after the death of the second helper who demands the hero's attendance at his funeral, a totally different motif follows, the popular Scottish story of the hag who swells.
2. Op. cit. p. xxxiv

version of the story seems ill-founded. That the battle lasted for a year shows that the King of the World had an enormous army: to suppose that they were being artifically resuscitated as well spoils the effect of this statement. The popularity of the story in Connemara as well as Kerry seems to show that it is not a purely local tradition, even if some local tradition of fighting at Ventry is its basis, and the form of all the versions shows that they are based on the MS account. Scottish tradition localised the battle in Islay.[1]

Why there are so few folk versions of MRE and GD, two of the best Fenian tales, and the first one of the most popular of all the Romantic tales in MS, is hard to explain. The construction of MRE is perhaps too complex to survive a folk rendering, and it shares a number of motifs with other tales: the maiden in the grianán with CG, the body carried off in a boat and resurrected with ECM - where the roles of the sexes are reversed - the invader killed by Oscar with TS and some of the lays. But this hardly seems an adequate reason, and it would be difficult to apply such arguments to GD.

Other stories which appear in both written and oral forms may derive in the latter from a semi-literary oral tradition of Fenian material. For instance, the episode of the finding of Bran in FTC,[2] with the motif of the wonderful helpers, evidently draws on folklore, and may have been as popular a folktale in the fourteenth century as it is today. The

1. LNF p.137.
2. Cf. Handbook p.595, No.26.

Teach Cuanna episode of the same story, an allegorical variant of the bruidhean theme, is parallelled but not imitated in a folk type[1] which suggests that the two stories diverge from a common origin older than the written version. Other indications that early Fenian tales were not entirely dependent upon MSS can be found in MS tales themselves. For instance, MRE includes summaries of TS and a lost Fenian tale: but the version of TS given there differs in certain respects from the modern MSS.[2] This may be due to imperfect memory on the author's part, but at any rate it is clear that he was not able to consult the tale in MS. Again, in BBA a story is told of Fionn's visit to Lochlann which is a summary of something much like a modern folktale, except that Goll and not Conán is the hero.[3]

Macgnímartha Finn, in its Middle Irish form, may also have had oral parallels which are the source of the many Scottish and Irish oral versions: as Murphy says[4] "these excellent folk-versions can hardly derive from the poorly constructed twelfth-century recording of the story, extant to-day in a single manuscript only. It therefore seems

1. Handbook p. 592, No. 13.

2. For instance, only one island is visited on the way to Dreóllainn. Its King Gormshúileach, friendly in the full version, is killed, along with a hero who in the full version appears in Dreóllainn. Osgar fights Ciotach at the end because the other Fenians refuse, not because they have already been defeated and bound. Conán does not appear.

3. Handbook p. 595, No. 30. A rather different version is given by a Scottish Gaelic lay, cf. JFC III p. 382, LNF pp. 83 - 86.

4. The Ossianic Lore and Romantic Tales of Medieval Ireland (Dublin 1955) p. 18)

certain that the tale has at all times been essentially a folktale." I have not, however, examined the compilation Caithréim Fhinn mhic Chumhaill which is common in late Munster MSS: this may include an account of Fionn's boyhood which could be the source of Irish oral versions. In any case such features as the naming of Loch Lurgan from the shanks (loirgne) of the dead nurse, or the naming of Fionn himself by chance, show the literary nature of this "folktale".

Many Fenian folktales exist which have no parallel in the Romantic tales: they make up about half of those listed in Handbook pp. 589 - 97. Some of them can be derived from existing ballads, others no doubt come from lost ones; still others are combinations of motifs from various sources, like many Irish folktales of every kind. A few are international anecdotes attached to the Fenians, like the counting-out puzzle Áireamh Fear[1] nDubháin, which seems to have been attached to Fionn because his name means "fair" or "white", his opponent being "black". A similar body of miscellaneous folktales, though smaller, has grown up around the Ulster cycle. Indeed, some of them are shared between the two cycles, for instance the story of the hero in the cradle pretending to be his own child to frighten the visiting giant, which is told of Fionn, whose opponent is sometimes Cú Chulainn, and of Cú Chulainn and Garbh mac Stáirn.[2] Even the Cú na hAdhairce story, where the name is obviously appropriate only to Cú Chulainn, has been told of Oisín.[3]

But we are concerned here only with stories which have

1. Handbook p. 590, No.4.
2. Irish versions are listed under AT 1149 in OS&C.
3. Béal. VII p. 230; Handbook p.593, No.17.

demonstrable affinities with MS prose tales. Of these it can be said in general that those which are really popular as folktales fulfil three conditions: they are popular also in manuscript after 1500; MSS written before 1700 usually exist and in all cases the story was probably composed before 1650; they contain striking incidents, often close to international folktale in spirit. The two exceptions to the first rule, LCC and DGP, are not found in Munster, where most late MSS were written. Certain stories which seem to fulfil all these conditions are not often found as folktales: in part this may reflect mere accidents of collection and cataloguing, and their resemblances to other well-known tales may have contributed to their disappearance or non-recognition, but no wholly satisfactory explanation can be given. In the next chapter these stories will have to be passed over for lack of material, while we examine the changes which have overtaken those Romantic tales which are popular in oral tradition.

CHAPTER THREE.

Tales and motifs in oral tradition.

The study of oral versions of Romantic tales undertaken in this chapter has three aims. The first is to show that the influence of the written tales on folklore far outweighs the influence of folklore on the written tales: though the latter make use of folk motifs, many motifs now popular in Gaelic folk tradition derive from the romances, and it cannot be stated with certainty that any Romantic tale is based on what was originally a folktale. The second aim is to show how motifs and details, whose original, written form is known, have changed in oral tradition. Some groups of changes will be noticed in treating the stories concerned, others will be classified at the end of the chapter in an attempt to list the forms and causes of such changes in Gaelic tales. The final object of this chapter is to show how whole stories change in oral tradition: again, something will be said about this in dealing with the stories one by one, and more general conclusions will be drawn at the end of the chapter.

The first group of stories to be considered are the anomalous cases: stories whose oral versions may be closer to the original form than the extant MS versions. The comparisons of these are designed mainly to elucidate the history of the story, but occasionally interesting developments are followed up for their own sake, as in the stories studied later.

Romantic Tales containing evidence of early oral transmission

Díthreabhach Glinne an Phéice is the title of a story in Murphy MS 18 (3d2) at Maynooth, part of the compilation called Gadaidhe Géar na Geamh-oidhche written for Bishop Murphy at Cork in 1817. It is printed in the book of the same name published by three Maynooth scholars in 1915. There is a copy of this MS in RIA MS 24.B.35 (1841), but far more important is the existence of what must be an earlier version of the same story in a fragmentary form in National Library of Scotland Gaelic MS XXXVI (1690). The plot may be briefly summarised: Murchadh son of Brian Bóraimhe, following a wonderful stag and hound, meets a mysterious "hermit" cutting wood. The hermit invites him to his castle, but resents the interest which Murchadh shows in his wife. He explains how he won the stag and hound, and later his wife, in battle; and how she was stolen from him three times running immediately after. Next morning Murchadh wakes to find that the castle has vanished, but the deer and dog are by his side.

This story is not uncommon in oral tradition. I know of seven versions from Scotland and three from the North of Ireland:

(A - the Edinburgh MS.)

(B - the Maynooth MS.)

C - JFC II p.209.

D - Sgialachdan Dhunnchaidh p. 17.

E - From an unnumbered MS in IFC, collected by Donald Macdonald in Eriskay, 1933.

F - SSS RL 767.

G - IFC 1030 p.51.

H - G. Henderson, The Norse Influence on Celtic Scotland, p. 288. (English Summary)

J - JFC MS IX p. 83.

Of these Scottish versions, C is from Islay and ultimately from Colonsay, F was collected in Arisaig, and the remainder are from Uist and Barra.

K - IFC 56 p. 156.

L - IFC 170 p. 56.

Both of these derive at one remove from the same teller in central Donegal: K is summarised in Handbook, p. 605, No. 21.

M - contributed by Douglas Hyde to Miscellany presented to Kuno Meyer (Halle 1912); from near Kiltimagh, Mayo.

B, the version of the Maynooth MS, can immediately be seen to be a poor one. It opens with a howler which any Munster schoolmaster at the time it was written should have been able to avoid, for the story of the battle of Clontarf was common in contemporary MSS: it makes Murchadh mac Briain king of Ireland (árd-rí). At the end it compresses an important part of the story into a couple of sentences; "Trí lá ann d'fhanas 7 do chailleas mo bhean gach lá diobh 7 do fuaras í ag trí gruagaigh do bhí i n-oileán fairrge i bhfad uainn. Gidheadh do leanas-sa ins an réim dhirig iad 7 marbhas iad; an dara lá ag rígh na Sorcha; 7 an treas lá ag trí h-uiristinibh deamhnaidhe, nó gur leanas-sa iad gach lá diobh 7 gur díth-cheannas ar nós na ngruagach gach aon díobh go dtugas liom fa dhiaigh gus an áit so í." ("I stayed there three days and lost my wife each of these days, and I found that three gruagachs who were in an ocean island far away had her; however, I followed them directly and killed them. The second day the king of Sorcha had her,

and the third day three devilish Saracens (reading with O'Rahilly siristínibh), so that I followed them each of these days and beheaded each one of them like the gruagachs, and brought her with me at last to this place"). All the oral versions give further details of these advantures, and are in substantial agreement with one another.

The Edinburgh MS only survives as far as the beginning of the in-tale, and even so the later pages are torn and illegible in places: but it is immediately clear that the text is different from that of B, fuller in incident and more classical in language. Assuming that the story originally extended to the end of the book, and that as many pages have been lost at the end of the volume as at the beginning, the in-tale must have covered some 14 leaves compared with the 8 leaves of the introduction; so it is likely to have been much fuller than in B, where the proportion is 107 lines (including a long run of 14 l) to 78, and the text of the introduction is in any case only half as long as in A.
A agrees in some respects with most of the oral versions against B, though the Irish oral versions agree with B in omitting details of the insults offered to Murchadh and in calling Murchadh king; and in the in-tale all the oral versions agree on details which are not mentioned by B.
It is certain that the oral versions do not derive from B, and it is very probable that the common source is the MS version now represented only by the fragment A. B could therefore represent a "short recension", such as exist for other Romantic tales, based on a corrupt MS tradition; but it seems to me very much more likely that it derives from an Irish oral version, in some respects closer to the MS than

more recent tellings, but in general poorer. Runs of a more literary type than are usual in folktales will have been added by the scribe. Evidence for this view will appear in the detailed comparison of versions which follows.

In the Edinburgh MS the story opens with an account of a hunt made by Brian and his sons, whose development as a floating oral formula will be examined in Ch. IV. In most versions of the story to which it originally belongs, however, it has been lost or substituted for, though three Scottish versions retain the list of Brian's sons. Then Murchadh sees and pursues a deer with a gold and a silver antler, which is being followed by a red-eared hound.[1]

Murchadh's itinerary is given in full in the MSS in two quite different forms. In A he jumps the Shannon and goes North by Tíre Mhaine and Co. Roscommon - there is a whole series of names around Céis Corainn, most of which occur in MSS of CCR and TDG - and past Sligo, until he reaches a lonely glen later identified as "Glean Eicia mhic Cail" (Otherwise Glen Eig--(?)) As Scottish oral versions agree on a dental in this name,[2] it is tempting to suggest that the original was Glenade[3] in the Dartry Mountains. If so, the scribal slip which produced a c in the Edinburgh MS seems to have influenced the source of B, but not of Scottish oral versions. "Glinn an Phéice" (the valley of the peak) would then be the scribe's rationalisation of a form

1. ABCDEHJM: all but C preserve description of at least one of the animals.

2. C: Gleann féite Macallain. D: Gleann Eillt. E: Gleann Eud. F: Clann Èide mhic Dealain. G: Clann Èide mhac Callain. H: Gleann Èitche mhic Cailein. J: Gleann Eitidh Mac Callain.

3. Glen Éda, Hogan.

which acquired an initial f (as in C.). He has also presumably provided an itinerary from his imagination to meet the literary convention which demanded such details: he makes Murchadh, after more realistically swimming the Shannon, follow the animals through Co. Clare and arrive in North Leinster (íochtar Laighean), no doubt below one of the peaks of the Wicklow mountains.[1]

Here for once B shares a detail with many oral versions which A lacks: Murchadh gets lost in a magic mist. The sound of an axe leads him to the hermit, who is cutting wood (in all versions: this is the sort of picturesque detail which is easily remembered in oral tradition). The hermit is described in a way which has been preserved in many Scottish versions, and given a name to some of them: A: "fear aibide mōre 7 atain bhig 7 luirge croise 7 paidrīn crāmh". (A man with a big cassock and a little hat, a cross staff and a bone rosary).[2] F and J replace this description by a traditional form of the supernatural, with one arm, one leg and so forth: but J mentions the habit later, and (like H) the lorg croise. The Irish versions also are less full: B: "Díthreach Ghlinne an Phéice 7 'aibíd trusáilte ó ramhar a cholpa go ramhar a schliasta". (The hermit of the Valley of the Peak, and his habit girded up from the thick of his calf to the thick of his thigh). M makes the hermit mention "mo phaidrín crann

1. At least one Irish version (L) follows A rather than B, for it implies that the hermits house is at "Tón Shligigh".

2. C: fear na hata bige 's na boinneide mòire. D: fear eabaide duibheadh, luirge ceàrnaidh, phaidrean chnamh agus phaidrean unga. E: fear abaide-duibh, 's luinge cearnaich 's baidein cnàmh os cionn a mhala. G: fear aibide duibheadh, luraguidh ceàrnaich, is baidean crành as ciunn a mhaladh.

agus mo leath-bhróig dheiridh", and L calls him "Nimineach Beag na hEadaige agus Fear na hAbaide Glaise". This last owes something to a name which usually appears when the hermit is named by his enemies in the in-tale: this may explain why it does not occur in A now. It is not in B either, but all three Irish oral versions have it (K: Fimineach Beag na hEadailte. M: Fìmineacha Feamaoineacha), and several Scottish versions have a related rigmarole.[1] The first word is evidently the rare Irish fimineach, a hypocrite, which Dinneen quotes from two early dictionaries.

Most versions, but not B, reproduce the hermit's request to Murchadh in A to lift the faggot of wood on to his back, which he does with difficulty or not at all. DEHJKL add a new motif: Murchadh has great difficulty in keeping pace with the hermit. This seems to have been further developed in B, where Murchadh loses the hermit in the mist, but succeeds in following the track of a herd of goats which were with him.[2] Now follows a series of incidents, in the Scottish versions only, where the hermit insults Murchadh by entering the castle side by side with him (AD), sitting in a gold chair and leaving the silver one for Murchadh (ACDEJ), and refusing to drink from the half-empty horn which Murchadh hands him - he cuts the horn in half so that it is a full one, and repairs it by magic (ADEHJ, cf.C). He apologises later, when Murchadh reveals who he is.

The telling of the in-tale is evidently provoked by Murchadh's too obvious interest in the hermit's wife, which

1. D: am feamanach mór fàbhsach - fear gun time gun taise gun tròcaire gun ghaol Dé gun eagal duine; similar formulæ in CEJ.

2. Goats tend to be associated with giants in Gaelic folktales, perhaps because of the popular "Polyphemus" motif.

leads the latter to explain why he has good reason to be afraid of possible abductors. In some versions, however, (EGHKL), the woman is not the hermit's wife but his daughter, or a woman he has won as a bride for Murchadh, and Murchadh marries her at the end, thus providing a happy ending such as is normal in folktales. Only B has a repeated formula, like that in oral versions of Leigheas Coise Céin, to punctuate the in-tale: "is fós, a Mhurchadh, do ba deacair do aon neach a fhéachaint liom-sa féin, 7 is fada silleadh súl ar mhnaoi duine eile agat, is ní gan ceannach fuaras-sa féin bean". (And moreover, Murchadh, it would be hard for anyone to contend with me, and you are long casting an eye at another man's wife, and I did not get a wife myself for nothing). This could be an oral addition, as the formula in LCC seems to be: as far as can be seen it does not occur at the beginning of the in-tale in A, but it does not appear there in B either. Ostensibly the story is told to explain how the hermit won his magic deer and dog, and only the formula makes it clear that he is really worried about his wife. This subtle way of revealing the hermit's thought by degrees could be the original author's device, but if so no folk version has preserved it.

It is not necessary to summarise the in-tale in detail, for it can prove nothing about the relationship of the oral versions to A, which has lost these pages. In the first part most versions are in general agreement, but in the Irish versions the hermit wins his wife as a reward for saving her from an abductor who has tied up everyone else in the hall where he is a guest: in Scottish versions he is often rescuing the wife already promised to him, and the

binding of the other guests does not appear. The Irish variant makes the better story, and the situation resembles those in EMM and other Romantic tales. The three abductions which follow are described in all the oral versions more fully than in B, and all of them agree on some of the main points: so they surely reflect the original account now lost from A. The first abduction, by three harpers who play sleep-music (DEGHJ), has dropped out of Irish versions, but is typically Gaelic: compare the harper of the Forest of Wonders in CRI. The second abduction, apparently corresponding to the "Saracens" of B, is by three "monks" (manaich) with supernatural powers in Scotland, and an Irish version (K) mentions "triúr mac Ríogh na Manach Bán". The hermit burns their magic equipment, but they still have the hooks and lines with which they were fishing when he landed: they catch the stern of his boat with these, and he only saves himself by cutting off the stern-post (DEFGHJM).[1] The third abduction is by Macaomh Mór, mac ríogh na Sorcha - compare Rí na Sorcha in B - and the hero dresses as a beggar and forces his way into the hall where Macaomh Mór is about to marry his wife (CDEFJKLM).[2] Most versions also agree on the way in which the hero is tricked by his father-in-law or another relative into going to hunt each day while his wife is being abducted (CDEFJKLM).

1. The motif is borrowed from the prose of the Old Irish Immram Brain, and appears in a version of AT 313 from Gairloch, JFC I p. 60. In Uist versions the "monks" are named, and one of the names is evidently the literary Corrán Cathmhílidh.

2. Cf. the discussion of this motif below, p. 180-181.

These details cannot derive from B: but is B derived from a faulty oral version, or an obscure or illegible MS exemplar which the scribe could not copy? Two passages in B are admittedly abbreviated in a way which suggests that the scribe was copying something which he did not understand himself: "fá ghleanntaibh d. d. is fá choillteacha d. d." in the run describing the hunt at the beginning, and "colg do cumadh re Bulcan ar bruach linne in^{t} c. lionain" in the run describing the gruagach's armour in the in-tale. In the first case the most likely explanation is that the run was copied, abbreviations and all, from another MS source, to decorate the rather baldly told folktale.[1] The second run describes the sword as having been made by Vulcan - a well-known cliché - on the banks of a pool, presumably somewhere in Hell. Probably the tradition referred to is that of Poll Tighe Liabáin, a sort of Irish Avernus,[2] variously localised in Ulster and Connacht. Again the corruption seems to be a literary one:[3] though as the superstition is a Northern one only today, it seems as if the run must have been taken from a Northern MS. Much of the narration suggests a folk re-telling: literary words are confused - foircheadal, instruction, for foircheann, end - and colloquial or dialect forms not usual even in late

1. A has quite a similar passage at this point: "fana doiruibh dosacha diamhaire duilleacha". But so might any tale with a hunting-run.

2. See GJ XII p. 66 ff., and OS&C under AT 960B.

3. I have seen a reference to "Poll Tighe in Lēābāin" in an early 18th-century Ulster MS, Queen's 6.

MSS introduced - féachaint, Sorac for Sorcha, is for agus or 7. Some passages are told in language suggesting seanchas or poor oral narration, rather than the language of Romantic tales even as told by good folk tellers: "Lá gha rabhas ar an ngleann úd i n-a bhfeaca tusa mé, tárla gruagach do bhí annso im chomarsanacht orainn 7 athach mór do bhí ar an gceanntair so ag rith ar an ngruagach". ("One day when I was in that valley where you saw me, I met a hero who was a neighbour of mine, and a great big giant who lived in these parts chasing after the hero"). "Do-chonnairc ... an Díthreach 'na shuidhe i gcathaoir óir oirloisgithe 7 corn óir don tsórt sin láimh ris". ("He saw the hermit sitting in a chair of burnished gold, with a golden horn of this sort (burnished?) beside him").[1] Another passage is a badly garbled bespelling run of the usual oral type patched with a literary phrase: "Atá geasa orm nách fuilingid fíor-laoigh mo athar 7 mathar is measa ná mé féin do mharbadh i gcath 7 i gcruadh-chomhrac muna ndeachainn dá fhéachaint"... In this "nach fuilngid fíorlaoich" is in an old literary run[2], and the rest is purely oral (cf. Ch.IV).

It seems likely from this that B is a compilation little older than the manuscript in which it is found (1817), based fairly closely on an oral version. The teller may himself have seen a MS of the story, but more probably it had been in oral tradition for some time: for it agrees in negative respects and in one positive detail, the binding of the company by the first abductor, with the other Irish oral

1. This seems to be the only relic in B of the insults with the chairs and the horn in A.

2. E.g. in Aided Fergusa, SG I p. 243.

versions. The abbreviation of the later episodes to mere headings may mean that the teller had forgotten the details, or perhaps more likely that he had tired, as tellers did before the invention of recording machines, of repeating passages for a slow-writing scribe. Or possibly the scribe himself tired of the work. In any case it is easy enough to imagine how the scribe later worked up his notes of the folktale into what seemed to him good literary Irish, with the help of suitable runs from manuscripts.

I have dealt with this story in some detail because of its curious history. Had a few more pages been lost from the manuscript of A, it would be impossible to tell whether the story had ever been written before B: faced with a bad story in a late manuscript and a good story in Scottish folklore, it would be difficult to avoid concluding that the story had either originated in oral tradition or been greatly improved by passing into it. It is a part of my thesis that hero-tales of this kind, containing original motifs and not merely consisting of borrowings from other stories, do not normally originate in oral tradition, and that though some tales are indeed better in folk versions than in their original manuscripts, the improvement seldom consists in the addition of new motifs. The differing MSS of DGP prove that the existence of a late and bad MS does not rule out the possibility that there was an earlier and better written version of a story which is also known in folklore. Before discussing certain cases where this

assumption is of value, it will be as well to consider a manuscript which gives further support to the view that eighteenth-century writers edited folktales to make them look like literary hero-tales of the usual type.

This is Egerton 171 in the British Museum, written by Labhras mac Ealairneadh in 1791, probably in Co. Meath according to Flower. The first story in it is a version of Eachtra Iollainn Airmdheirg which differs entirely from the usual version in both its slightly varying recensions. It will be discussed in detail later, along with other written and oral forms of the story: at present it is enough to notice the features in it which point to oral transmission. Thus there are far fewer proper names than in the other MSS: of those which do survive, only the well-known Macaomh Mór, the hero's name (which appears throughout as Ollonn, occasionally Iollonn, Imdhearg) and Gruagach na Puible (here "na bPoball") are recognisable, the rest being replaced in typical folktale fashion by names like Gruagach an Oileáin which are purely descriptive. The heroine Eachtach becomes "Helen Óg". Again, the middle of the story seems where legible to follow the usual MS account more closely than most modern oral versions, though of course very much shortened; but, as often happens in oral transmission, the beginning and end have been changed. The beginning is quite different; Iollann's father is king of Lochlann, not Greece, and Iollann has been betrothed since birth to the daughter of the king of Greece. When Macaomh Mór attacks Iollann's father, apart from knocking out three teeth, he carries off

Iollann's betrothed who is sitting at the king's side.[1] The end of the story shortens Iollann's adventures after being left underground by his brothers, to about the same degree as those oral versions which mention them at all, and entirely omits the incident where he serves a fuller in disguise before revealing himself at his father's court. As in a few modern versions, he begs for the lives of his treacherous brothers to be spared, but the folk motif common at this point, by which his brothers are proved illegitimate, is not introduced.

The language of the story is by no means entirely popular, but looks like that of a scribe who knew, without always fully understanding, the MS tradition. The opening: "Feacht n-aoin do Rígh Lochlainn a ccathar na Beirbhe Lochlannaigh do tuismeadh ginn mic do", is hardly the language of a folk teller, though it is also far too abrupt an opening for the usual type of Romantic tale in MS. Admittedly recent tellers who took a pride in their telling of such tales have been known to use archaic phrases which they probably did not understand, but they seldom kept up the style throughout a story. It seems probable that this story, like DGP, was rewritten from notes, or memory, of an

1. The wedding has been postponed while Iollann and his brothers fight a campaign. This version of the story may be influenced by the by-form of AT 301, the international folktale on which EIA is ultimately based, beginning with the disappearance of the three princesses who are later rescued by the hero. I know of three modern versions of EIA which include the abduction at the beginning: two from Co. Cork, and one from Connemara, where the girl is Iollann's sister and not his betrothed; none from the North.

oral version by an eighteenth-century writer, no doubt the scribe of the MS. Why he did it is more puzzling; MSS of EIA are common, and there were several written in Meath by this date. Unless the scribe lived further north or his neighbours refused to lend him their MSS, it looks as though he preferred a version that he had perhaps heard in his childhood.

The second story in Eg.171 is entitled "Eachtra agas Āirdsgēul Ēuchtach (sic) mhic RĪgh na mBan Fionn". Flower has pointed out its "marked folk character". I cannot recognise it as any modern folktale type; it may well be a compilation of the ephemeral sort often favoured by tellers of hero-tales, but there is no proof that the compiler was not the scribe. The opening is interesting, and may be related to Eachtra an Amadáin Mhóir and the Perceval-Peredur legend, though the immediate source is as likely to be a version of AT 650. The Crochaire Tárnochtaighe appears, but this is only a name for a fairly benevolent giant, not the treacherous character who usually bears this name in folktales. The story contains a couple of runs of distinctively oral type. The fact that the hero bears the name of the heroine of EIA in other MSS suggests that the teller, or the scribe if he wrote the story himself, knew the name but had forgotten whose it was.

Some other cases where late MS stories are based on folk motifs may be dismissed with a mention. Eachtra Léithín uses the tradition of the Hawk of Achill which is still told as a folktale.[1] The story is common in

1. Printed by Douglas Hyde, Celtic Review X p. 116 (literary tale), p. 212 (folktale).

eighteenth-century MSS but may well be older: the tradition itself is so old that it can hardly be determined whether it is literature or folklore: it is reflected in Old Irish historical tales and the Welsh Culhwch ac Olwen. Another story printed by Hyde, Eachtra na gConnachtach, is an eighteenth-century comic story including anecdotes about the misunderstanding of English by Irish-speakers which are still told today.[1] The eighteenth-century Teagmhála Duibh mhic Deaghla includes an episode still told as a folktale of a fortunate fisherman.[2] Other cases of popular folk motifs used in Romantic tales are described under CG and RL below.

Giolla an Fhiugha may well have had a history similar to that of DGP. It appears in the Murphy collection, and none of the other six MSS I know of is much earlier: they are all, of course, from Munster. There are at least 13 oral versions: one from Waterford, six from Kerry, four from Galway, and two from Scotland; there may be a third which I have not found in JFC MSS.

The evidence for the oral origin of this story is not conclusive. It rests on the colloquial language in which it is told, the folk character of some incidents, and the distribution of the oral versions. What is undoubtedly the

1. Lia Fáil I p. 153 ff; cf. OS&C under AT 1697.
2. S. Laoide, Mac Mic Iasgaire Bhuidhe Luimnighe (Dublin 1909)

central part of the written story was collected by Campbell of Islay from two tellers in 1870 and 1871: one had learned it in Islay not long after 1800, the other in South Uist about 1830. It is highly unlikely that these stories, where GF is woven together with motifs from other tales, derive from MSS which cannot be shown to have existed before 1800.

As Hyde says, "the language of this tale is modern, and it does not differ very much from what may be heard from old storytellers of the present day". This is true of almost the whole story: there is no trace of working-up such as occurs in DGP and Eg. 171, and the runs are of types otherwise only found in oral tradition. Admittedly the style is a joyous parody of the learned and alliterative manner of the older Romantic tales, but in this is resembles the style of the best storytellers of today, especially in Connacht. The learned references soon wind up as nonsense formulae, as when the list of Brian's sons ends with "Giolla an Ghaid mac Fhinnbhearra mic rígh Albanaigh". No scribe with any pretensions at all to a knowledge of Irish history would have written "re linn rígh Uladh bheith ann san gCraoibh Ruadh" (when the king of Ulster was in the Red Branch) without naming Conchabhar. Occasionally one can see where the scribe has taken a hand: where the text has "an sean rígh .i. Brian Bóirmhe" it is likely that the teller only spoke of the "old king", and the scribe added his name: and probably the long and fairly correct genealogy at the opening was added by the scribe - not that folk memory cannot retain such things, but the style of this teller does not suggest that he would bother with

them. Some of his nonsense runs will be quoted in Ch.IV. Here I need only add the list of kings on p. 22, "Rígh fá thuinn, Aird-rígh Éireann, agus rígh Féinne"[1], quote the formula on p. 12: "Do budh eólach damh-sa féin Flathadh agus budh ró eólach, agus dam budh eólach é"[2], and note that in the MSS the title is simply "Giolla an Fhiugha", not as O'Grady calls it "Eachtra Ghiolla an Fhiugha", to show that we are obviously dealing with something very like a folktale. I can see no way of proving when exactly it was written down, but the existence of only seven MSS, all nineteenth-century ones from Munster, suggests that it dates from not very long before 1800.

There is little in the Irish oral versions to show that they do not derive from the extant MS form of the story. They do not extend further north than Connemara, so that the influence of the MS is possible; and the fact that most versions preserve the end of the story, where Murchadh kills a giant in the country under the lake, in some detail, makes it fairly certain that they do not derive from a hypothetical earlier MS, which would hardly have included such a typical folk episode. They might still derive in some cases from the teller, no doubt a famous one, from whom the MS version was taken down. The rather complex beginning of the story naturally tends to be simplified: in general, the Kerry versions pay more attention to the gifts sent to Murchadh by the Queen of Pride, whereas the

1. The king under the waves, the High King of Ireland, and the king of the Fenians.

2. I knew Flathadh well myself, and I knew him very well, and it is I that knew him well.

Connemara versions tend to omit this near-irrelevant introduction and give more details of the winning of the magic cauldron. Several versions, including that from Co. Waterford, make the cauldron and its capacity for feeding great numbers the central point of the story, which it hardly is in the MS.[1] At the end, three of the versions from Co. Galway reproduce all the details of Murchadh's adventures in the land under the lake precisely as in the MS, including the dialogue with a hag who calls him "Muraichín gránna ó Éirinn" (ugly little Murchadh from Ireland) and when buried under a heap of stones complains merely of shortness of breath, the three shepherds who carry him on their backs for seven miles each, and so forth. In the other versions there is a good deal of confusion as to whether he rescues a girl from one giant, three giants, or a monster, and whose daughter she is: the sort of confusion that occurs in versions of AT 300.

One of the Scottish versions forms part of the long version of Leigheas Coise Céin collected by JFC from an Islay teller living in Paisley[2]. It has therefore been adapted so that the name of Murchadh has disappeared, but the story is certainly GF. The servant is called "fear na casaig sliobasta liath-ghlais" (the man with the ungainly light-grey coat), which seems to be the name of Bodach an Chota Lachtna in Islay tradition, and most of that story is

1. There may be an element of wish-fulfilment in this, contrasting with the poor standard of living of the Irish peasant; but changes of emphasis in stories for this sort of reason are not in fact common in Ireland - descriptions of food and clothing use the conventional words of the runs.

2. See below, p. 115ff.

incorporated as an introduction to GF here. In this version, when Murchadh cannot fit a shank to his servant's axe, he is obliged to serve him for a year in return: acting on a hint, he kills the water-monster, finds his servant's axe in its back and his son in its belly, and is rewarded with the hand of the servant's daughter. There seems to be a reminiscence in this sequence of events of Murchadh's adventures under the lake, but this may be an illusion. The other Scottish version, from S. Uist, only exists as an English summary in JFC MS XVIII; but it took half an hour of very rapid recitation to tell. The name of the story and the servant is "Mac an Fhiadhaich", which could perhaps represent a corruption of Giolla an Fhiugha or the like, reinterpreted in the light of the servant's first appearance as a hunting gillie. He or another servant of Murchadh's is also called "an Ceatharnach Caoilriabhach". The story begins with an apparent reminiscence of the Queen of Pride episode of the MS: the king of France's daughter falls in love with Murchadh after hearing his name at a feast and appears to him "in Riochd" at the bottom of a well; the servant explains who she is and helps Murchadh to carry her off with much fighting. This could well be closer to the original form of the story than the present text, where the queen sends Murchadh treasures of courtship (séada suirighe) and then disappears from the story. Hyde suggests that she and her gifts are an invention of the gillie's, but it seems an excessively complicated artifice to send Murchadh magic hounds and

horn merely in order to make him hunt.[1] At any rate the Uist version again seems to borrow part of BCL, but the servant's opponent in the race is "Gruagach na Tiobart", a character borrowed from DGP. The tale of the loss of the axe, the cauldron and the three splinters of wood that would boil it is told much as in the MS; so also is the Beowulf-like incident of the blood staining the loch. Campbell's summary ends with the recovery of the axe.

It seems to me possible that this version represents the substance of a lost earlier manuscript. If so, the opening with the Queen of Pride will have been corrupted and all or much of Murchadh's adventures under the lake will have been added in oral tradition: these last as they stand are for the most part the sort of conventional adventures - killing a hag and a giant, rescuing a maiden - which might be tacked on to any folktale. The word fiugh(a) itself, which is not known to occur anywhere else, suggests an obscure origin in an old manuscript. In the Galway versions and one from Kerry the word has been replaced in the body of the story by variants of the English word "ferrule"[2]; in three Kerry versions and those from Scotland the servant demands a shank (cos) for his axe, though by the rest of the story it seems that what is

1. The modern MS version may have left out this first courtship because it added another at the end: See below.

2. The versions which use "ferrule" are mostly rather close to the written version, and it looks rather as if Hyde's edition might be their source; but "ferral" is also the word used in Mícheál Mac Donnchadha's version, which combines GF with Leigheas Coise Céin and another story in a curious amalgam, and seems most unlikely to have reached this form since 1899. It seems either that the interpretation as "ferrule" was current in oral tradition, and Hyde came across it, or that Hyde and the storytellers both came to the same natural, but in my view wrong, conclusion.

required is an axe-blade for the shank; and in one Kerry version the title is changed to buachaill na bianna, which looks like a re-translation of "the Lad of the Ferrule". Only Seán Ó Conaill in Kerry uses fiugh[1] throughout the tale and not only in the servant's name. In the Waterford version the word has become fich[2]. The RIA Contributions suggest a derivation from iodh, a withy, later an iron band; but the large number of versions which mention an axe, and not a ferrule at all, suggests to me that this is an older traditional explanation, and that the word is really fiodhbha, a bill-hook. If this is so and the spelling is phonetic, it would point to a Scottish origin: in Scotland the similar word fiodhbhadh has become fiùghaidh. The word for the staff is almost as corrupt: Hyde's two MSS write it usually as saghfaig and samhach respectively. This must be from an oblique case of sabh, gen. sabhadh, giving Scottish Gaelic samhach, gen. samhaich, which can mean either a stave or a haft.

Giolla an Fhiugha, then, is a written tale probably of oral origin: we may reasonably suspect an earlier MS, possibly a Scottish MS, behind the folktale, but what makes this story quite unique among the Romantic tales is its racy folk-teller's style.

1. An fiugh, nom. and gen., suggesting a word not properly assimilated: the gender is variable in the MSS.

2. Nom. an fhich, gen. an fhicí.

As Bodach an Chóta Lachtna has been mentioned above, its folk versions may be dealt with here. Though there are many MSS of the story in Ireland, the earliest dating from 1744, it seems to be rare in Irish oral tradition, at least as a complete tale. Of the four Scottish versions I know, three use it as introduction to a tale about Murchadh: the two versions of GF above, and the version of DGP in JFC II. The only independent version, "Fear a' Chòta Shlibhistich Liathghlais" in MWHT II, p. 68, is probably from Islay like two of the others, and seems to be influenced by GF, for when the bodach first appears he offers his services to carry home the game that the Fenians have killed. On the other hand both this opening and the race with Caoilte or, as here, with Conan, occur in oral Fenian tales of the Céadach type (see below), and this version is a tale about Fionn, like the MS version. By the late date of the Irish MSS, the story may have been written down too late to have existed in Scottish MSS: it is certainly later than 1543, as O'Grady points out, because of the mention of the Baron of Inchiquin's house, and probably borrows the motif of the head put back back to front from the early sixteenth-century CCR. But there is no certainty when between 1550 and 1700 it may have been written. The Scottish oral versions contain many details exactly as in the MS: but a short anecdote like this might, I feel, be preserved with some accuracy over a long period in oral tradition. It is conceivable that the tale may represent an episode of the older MS version of GF which became associated with the Fenians because of a resemblance to episodes in Fenian "helper-tales"; more probably the

version of the MS is the original, and the motif became associated with Murchadh in Scotland, perhaps because the bodach's long coat was like the hermit's habit in DGP. Or possibly we have to do with a floating oral anecdote which happened to be written down in Ireland as a Fenian tale. The fact that the villain's name is Caol an Iarainn, a popular villain-name in Ireland which can hardly have come into oral tradition from this tale alone, suggests oral origin or at least strong oral influence on the MS story.

Apart from GF and DGP, there is one other equally puzzling Romantic tale set in the reign of Brian Bóraimhe: Leigheas Coise Céin. The MSS of this are much earlier, and there are only two of them - Egerton 1781, written in Co. Cavan about 1484, and RIA BivI, written in Co. Mayo in 1671. The texts are identical but for very minor points of wording, and their close relationship is shown by the fact that the same three articles follow the story in each MS. The text contains obvious cuts which can to some extent be supplied from Scottish oral versions. The whole story reads like a summary, and there is often no clear logical sequence between the events; this makes it a poor story to read, and Dáibhidh Ó Duibhgeannáin, the scribe of BivI, commented under the title after copying the story: "This is certainly a poor tasteless tale". ("Sgēl dona mībhlasda an gan Amhrus").

For all that, it was one of the most famous of Scottish Gaelic folktales in the nineteenth century, and the versions collected by Campbell are not by any means bad reading. O'Rahilly (Gadelica I, p. 282) has pointed out that the Scottish oral versions[1] make clear one point which is not stated in the MS: that the catastrophe of the disappearance of Ó Crónagáin's fairy wife and the breaking of Cian's leg is precipitated by Ó Crónagáin disregarding the geasa which his wife imposed on him when she accepted him. The single Irish oral version which I have been able to find, from Mícheál Mac Donnchadha, Cárna,[2] also makes this point more clearly than the MS, which merely says that she was reluctant to have him: "'Ní phósfad!, adeir sí, 'mar dá bpósainn-se thú ba gearr go maslá mé.' 'Tuige sin?' adeir sé. 'Tá mar dá dtagadh tada eadrainn coidhche, ba é an chéad rud a casadh liom go mba mhaith fuair tú sin, agus mé go do thógáil idir dhá choileáin mada 'sa sliabh.'" ("'Iwon't marry you! said she, 'for if I married you, you would soon shame me.' 'Why?' said he. 'Because if anything ever came between us, the first thing I'd hear would be that this was a fine thing to get, when you picked me up between two puppy-dogs on the moor'"). This exchange is referred to as maragáinteacht, bargaining; and eventually the husband does reproach her in this way. Compare the very similar words in the Islay version: "Dh'fhoighneachd e de'n

1. TGSI XXV p. 179 (long version from an Islay teller), 262, 264 (frame story only, from Tiree and Gairloch); XIV p. 78 (Tiree.) All these are from JFC MS XVII: the Islay version is also published separately by K.C. Craig (Mackay, Stirling, 1950) and the Gairloch version is in MWHT I p. 68. MacInnes, Waifs and Strays II p. 206 (from a Mull teller)

2. IFC 61 p. 85, introduced with "An Bheóir Lochlannach" and ending as GF.

cumhnant a bhiodh i 'g iarraidh. 'Tha,' ars'ise, 'nach tilg thu orm gu bràth gur h-ann fo chasaibh do chona beaga 'fhuair thu mi'". ("He asked her what condition she would want. She said: 'That you should never throw it in my face that it was under the feet of your little dogs that you found me'"). In the other Scottish versions, except that from Gairloch, Ó Crónagáin has to keep three conditions, and one of them is not to say that he found his wife in the shape of a hare. Evidently there is a common source for all the oral versions, which cannot be the existing MS version.

The in-tale of this story is obviously abbreviated in the MS: it reads like a summary. There are no runs, and the narration is carried on in a series of short sentences connected by agus. Most of the dialogue is reported as indirect speech, which is totally untypical of stories of this kind. Among the oral versions, the Irish one and the two short Scottish ones omit the in-tale, which in any form is less striking than the introduction; similarly the oral versions of DGP often shorten the in-tale while giving full details in the introduction. The three remaining versions have clearly a common source, which omits some incidents of the MS account, mostly, as would be expected with oral transmission, the later ones, and expands others. They all agree, for instance, in calling the teller of the in-tale the son of the king of Lochlann; in replacing fer in bruit lachtna of the MS by ridire (or mac rígh) na Sgéithe Deirge; and having the teller thrust into the ground instead of

being bound for a year as in the MS.[1] But this common source could be later than the MS version.

All the oral versions also contain in some form a formula which introduces and punctuates the in-tale, like that in DGP (B). There is no trace of this in the MS, though Cian keeps asking for more information there, as in the oral versions. The formula from the short Tiree version is a good example: the visitor begins: "Sìn do chas, a Chéin, gus an cuir mise bile luis agus leighis rithe, ceirein agus tàdh-lus, am plàsd a' fuarachadh, a' chnuimh a' borbadh, agus deifir orm a dhol adh' éisdeachd aifrinn do'n Eaglais mhóir 'san Roimhe". ("Stretch out your leg, Cian, till I put leaves of herb and healing to it, poultice and healing herb; the plaster(is) cooling, the worm inflaming, and I (am) in a hurry to go to the great church in Rome[2] to hear Mass"). Cian replies: "Na 'na cas dòmhs' i, 's na 'na cas do Chian i, 's na 'na cas a rithist 'na dhèigh i, 's na na mac Maol-ua mise, ma shìneas mise mo chas no ma théid bile luis no leighis rithe (gus an innis thu-sa dhomhsa..." ("May it not be (?) my leg, or Cian's leg, or anyone else's leg, and may I not be Maolmhuadh's son, if I stretch out my leg or leaf of herb or healing touch it (until you tell me..."). He asks a question prompted by what the visitor has already said. The visitor bursts out:

1. The thrusting into the ground is paralleled in the later text of Aided Con Roí (Heldensage p. 441), which also seems to be the source of fer in bruit lachtna: so again the oral versions may preserve the original form.

2. Or more probably, pronounced reimhe, from Remais, Rheims, of the MS.

"Sgleò uile agus urfhaidh ort, b'olc an còmhdhalaiche riamh thu, 's bu mhiosa 'n còmhdalaiche dhòmhs' thu". 4/ ("Misery of evil and destruction upon you, you were always a bad man to meet, and you have been a worse for me to meet"). But he tells more of his story as asked. This is typical of the Scottish versions; and the words in the Irish version are clearly related. Cian ("Cána") is lying wounded after the catastrophe and the rest of the party are going home. "Níl aon duine dá dteidheadh thairis nach n-abruigheadh le Cána a chos a shíneadh amach go leigheasfeadh sé dhí. 'Sé an freagra a thugadh Cána orabh; 'Nár ba leigheas dom mo leigheas agus nár ba cos do(m) mo chos nó go n-innsighthe sib dom cá ndeachaidh an bhean a bhí annseo'". ("There was not one of the people who went past who did not say to Cána to stretch out his leg and he would cure it. The answer Cána gave was: "May my cure be no cure to me and my leg no leg to me until you tell me where the woman who was here has gone" - i.e. Ó Crónagáin's wife whom he had attempted to rape).

The evidence for a common oral tradition fuller than the MS is overwhelming; and as the MS reads like a summary of something, it seems fair to assume that this "something", whether it was a still earlier MS version or, as seems in this case quite likely, an oral version known to the professional storytellers, was older than the MS or at least as old. The oral tradition, to exist both in Scotland and in Connacht, with verbal resemblances, can hardly be younger than the late seventeenth century. This still leaves quite a large gap to the fifteenth-century source of

the MS version, but it is easier to believe that one fuller version derived from the other than that it derived from the unattractive MS summary. If so, we have confirmation of the theory often advanced about the more baldly told Old Irish tales: that they are summaries which could be expanded by a professional storyteller with additional incidents and runs which he had memorised from oral tradition. But it must be emphasised that this is an isolated instance among the Romantic tales, and need not be in the least typical.

The three tales of what might be called the Dalcassian Cycle (LCC, DGP, GF) have a number of points in common apart from their greater popularity in oral tradition than in MS. All of them open with a hunt which leads to a meeting with a supernatural character. LCC shares with DGP a very long in-tale, mostly concerned with the pursuit of an abducted wife, and the important part played by an unwelcome guest who takes too much interest in his host's wife, and as a result of this is told the in-tale. GF shares with DGP the descent in pursuit of a supernatural into a land under the water. Unlike most of the earlier Romantic tales, none of these three contains poems, nor are their titles of the conventional type, beginning with Eachtra.. or Tóraigheacht...[1] Their closest affinities are with the Fenian tales. I would be inclined to ascribe them, in spite of their widely differing histories, to a single author or school at the end of the Middle Ages. In spite of their Munster heroes none of them shows close knowledge of Munster place-names,

1. DGP in the Edinburgh MS is headed "Murchadh mac Brian 7 an dírioch".

except for a run in GF which belongs to the latest stratum,[1] but DGP seems to show some knowledge of the Sligo region: beside the fact that the few early MSS are Northern, and the late Munster ones may be based on a single corrupt version of each story, this suggests an origin in Leath Cuinn or perhaps in Scotland, where the oral versions are best known - though these are not the only stories to be best preserved in Scottish Gaelic tradition.

The last important story which seems to have been written down from oral tradition is Eachtra Chéadaigh Mhóir. This is the title given by O'Grady[2], and I have adopted it because it shows the relationship of the written story to the folktales of "Céatach" more clearly than the usual MS title Teacht mac Ríogh na Sorach (Gorac) go hÉirinn.[3] But notice that this, like GF, is never actually called Eachtra. There are four nineteenth-century MSS, probably all from Co. Cork; the earliest dateable one is RIA 23G41, part II, written by Edmund Morton at Swinehill in 1818.

Before discussing the relationship of this story to the oral tales of Céatach, it is worth mentioning two short anecdotes which occur alongside it in some MSS. In

1. See p. 122-123.
2. TDG p. 21.
3. In one MS it is Sgéal Chéadaig.

NLI G86 (1831) there is a story immediately following ECM, with a heading just like the chapter-headings which occur throughout the latter in this MS: "ag seo tuairisg air choire do fuair Fionn 7 Fiana Éireann ó Ríogh an domhain tsiar". ("Here is an account of a cauldron which Fionn and the Fenians obtained from the king of the Western World"). This is simply a short variant of the Bruidhean Caorthuinn story: the Fenians are invited to a feast by Rí fá Thuinn, and wake next morning to find themselves bound to the earth they slept on. Diarmaid, who cannot be enchanted, and Faolán mac Fhinn, who stayed at home until summoned by the barra-buaidh, kill the three sons of the king of the Western World and their men, and use their blood to release the Fenians. This is evidently a folk version, though it omits the usual comic incident of Conán losing the skin of his head and haunches, and is closer to the literary BC than most folk versions of the motif. The scribe continues with another story, beginning with a dream by Fionn, but writes Críoch before the dream has time to come true. However, this story is found in full in three late Munster MSS in the RIA, under the title Teacht mac Ridire an Ghlais-Uaithne go hÉirinn. It tells how Oscar defeated a warrior who could neither be wounded, bound, burnt or drowned, by breaking his bones with a club made of a whole tree. It is very briefly told and looks like a summary of a folktale or perhaps a lay. One of the MSS is 23G41, where it immediately follows ECM, and begins at about the point where G86 left off. This, and the very similar titles, suggests strongly that all these three tales were once in a single MS, and were very possibly taken down from the same

teller, though ECM has been more elaborately worked up than the others and is even embellished with poems. In all three stories the Fenians are associated with Cathair Con Roí, which is a late feature and suggests that the original teller was from Kerry.

Céadach as a character has a long history. In The Chase of Síd na mBan Fionn[1] from Eg. 1782, written in 1517, possibly from an original of 1419, there is a mention of "Cétach Cithach mac ri g Lochlann", who came to avenge his brothers on the Fenians (cf. MRE), but fell in love with the huntsmen and hounds and joined Fionn instead. The anonymous poem Sgéal ar dhiamhair na suirghe (Dánta Grádha, 2nd ed., No.7) refers to "Céadach mac Rí na dTolach,

fear nár throdach i dtigh óla,
is leis do croitheadh an t-uisge
ar mhnáibh cnisgheala Fódla".

("Céadach son of the king of the Hillocks, a man who was not riotous in a drinking-house; it was by him that water was sprinkled on the white-skinned women of Ireland"). The verses are apparently a list of famous lovers, though many of the stories referred to are lost. In the late Ulster tale Eachtra na gCuradh (earliest MS 1743) an important character is "an Céadach mhac Rígh na tTulach"; when he first appears he is allied with Manannán, and one of his opponents is Manannán's brother "an Dubhláoch". In one of Hyde's MSS of GF a run compares the speed of Murchadh riding to "Céadach mac rígh na Sorrach ag dul a' díspóireacht re

1. K. Meyer, Fianaigecht (Dublin 1910) p. 76.

rígh-mhac Choillte mhic Rónáin i n-uathaibh mic Aireacht uí Chonchubhair, i gcómhgar Éire 7 Alban". (Céadach son of the king of Sorrach going to dispute with the royal youth Caoilte mac Rónáin (sic lege) among the solitudes (? or horrors? omit mic) of Iraghticonnor, where Ireland meets Scotland". (in fact in Co. Kerry). This refers to an episode common in oral versions of the story. Finally there are the lines in the Barántus of Denis Buckley, 1803:[1]

"Céadach Mór, an curadh ba chródha gaisgeadh 7 laochas,
Thug ainnear an ór-fhuilt mar nuachar d'Osgar na mbéimeann".

("Great Céadach, the warrior who was mighty in feats of arms and heroism, who gave the golden-haired maiden as a bride to Oscar of the blows"). This, which refers to a story in one of the books which Buckley had lost, is the first evidence for the surviving MS tale, which ends with Oscar's marriage to Céadach's daughter.

The Céatach story is one of the most popular of all Irish folktales, and far and away the most popular of those studied in this thesis. There are 140 versions and related stories catalogued in the IFC, and I know of at least 28 Irish versions in print. Allowing for the fact that international tale-types have been much more thoroughly indexed - over half these 140 are in the first 300 volumes of the 1200 or so covered by Ó Súilleabháin and Christiansen's Types of the Irish Folktale - this will bear comparison with any but the half dozen most popular international "Tales of Magic" in Ireland. A thorough study of all these versions would be a year's work in

1. Gaelic Journal IX p.323.

itself, and the conclusions below are drawn from sources readily available to me in Edinburgh: 13 Irish versions, of which only 3 each are from Munster (Kerry) and Ulster (S.W. Donegal) and all eight Scottish versions known to me, including tapes in the SSS. Consequently the Irish results are at best a random sample, and may be actually misleading owing to the lack of versions from Cork, Clare or N. Donegal.[1]

Most of these versions call the hero Céadach or a recognisable variant of this name. In versions from Scotland and Donegal he is also, or alternatively, known as Gille nan Cochull Craicionn (Giolla na gCochall Craicionn). He is mac ríogh na dTulach in Donegal (as in some of the earliest references), na Sorach in Munster (as in GF and ECM), and na Collach, once na Sirriach, in Scotland. Connacht versions vary: mac ríogh Caoilte, na gCor, na Solus. Rí na dTulach, na gCollach, na gCaolach, na gCaoltaoi, na gCurach, are all names which occur in MSS, and their original country may well be the tír na Colach, the land of the Colchians, of Togail Troí and other classical translations. The MSS of ECM show what may be the origin of the variants with Sorach, which is of course a recent Munster form of Sorcha: in the text of 23G41 and G86, Céadach actually introduces himself as "mac Ríogh na cCorach", but in the title of G86 this is written phonetically "na Gorac". The resemblance of Irish capital G to capital S, and the familiarity of Sorac(h) as a name could do the rest.

1. Curtin, Folk-Tales p.146, which may well be a Cork version, (see ibid. p. 179) has a plot much like Kerry versions, but calls the hero Seachránuidhe Sál Fhada.

Céadach's killer in Ulster and Connacht is often called Londubh; this may be a corruption of something like the Dubhláoch of ENC, but more likely a folk-motif has been woven into the hero-tale, from the first or by later confusion. Céadach and Londubh kill each other in most versions fighting in the air above Fionn's ship, sometimes in the form of birds, and it seems possible that the original story concerned the rivalry of the londubh and céirseach, blackbird and (?) thrush,[1] two birds closely associated in folk poetry. Thus in the version taken down by Curtin in Donegal Londubh is "mac Smóla" (son of thrush) and the teller called Céadach "Césa" which he explained as "a small dark-gray bird". In Munster, however, the opponent's name is Bodhbh Dearg, or another name containing ... Dearg.

Ulster and Connacht versions again agree in calling the hero's tutor, whose daughter he marries, Manannán (cf. ENC); the daughter's name is Deirdre in Connemara, Pampóg in Mayo, Scaith Shíoda in Donegal. This part of the story, before the hero joins the Fenians, is omitted in the MS: but 11/13 of the Irish versions and three of the Scottish agree that Céadach quarrelled with his foster-brother(s) or fellow-pupil(s) over his foster-father's or master's daughter, and she chose him. The majority of the Ulster and Connacht versions agree on a scene where Londubh allows Céadach to nail his hand to an anvil in return for a free blow at him when next they meet, (or has his hand nailed to an anvil and lets Céadach have the girl on the condition of the free blow), and traces of such an agreement and the scene in the

1. Or female blackbird: the word is poetic rather than ornithological.

smithy are in nearly all the Irish versions.

After this, Céadach joins the Fenians; his motive is seldom convincingly explained, and may originally have been that mentioned in The Chase of Síd na mBan Fionn, which is not the sort of motif to appeal to a folk-teller, with its exaggerated emphasis, typical of early Fenian tales, on the delights of the hunt. In the MS he simply appears, like the usual supernatural "helper". The Fenians set him tasks, usually, as in the MS, because they are jealous or afraid of him and hope he will be killed.[1] The most usual are to fetch a magic cup from the giants, or from Lochlann, which occurs later in the MS, and to run a race with Caoilte, which seems to be the source of the reference in GF. Then Fionn is bespelled by a hag to visit the Eastern world (MS and oral) and asks Céadach to go with him. He is sent to ask leave of Céadach's wife, whom he often finds combing her hair - a seemingly unnecessary detail which might come from a MS - and she grants permission on condition that he will hoist black sails on his return if Céadach is dead, and white if he is alive.[2] Céadach performs various tasks for Fionn in the Eastern World, including often killing a bull (in the MS, as one of the earlier tasks) and clearing a house full of amhuis (in the MS).[3]

1. Cf. AT 650

2. In the MS, they visit Céadach's home island on their way, and meet his wife who asks this as a boon of Fionn.

3. This motif is discussed in detail below, p. 143 ff)

The folk versions agree that Céadach was caught by his old enemy on the return voyage (15/21) and the battle that follows usually takes place in the sky, with shape-changing. Both fall dead, or in northern Scottish versions Céadach kills his opponent and is then killed by descending on to the spear-points of the Fenians. All this seems to have been too extravagant for the compiler of the MS, and as he had not previously introduced the opponent he merely says that a little boy shot Céadach with an arrow out of a wood. The Fenians deliberately do not put up the black sails, so that Céadach's wife does not kill herself - a reversal of the usual motif (Z.140.1); sometimes this is done at Céadach's own request.

Now follows Céadach's resurrection: the MS is again very brief. As this abbreviation occurs towards the end of the story, it may be that the teller's memory was responsible. Céadach's wife is told by a voice in the night to dip him in a well in her courtyard. Munster versions say that the Fenians themselves fetched a magic cure;[1] but in other oral versions this is done by the wife, or in Northern Scottish versions by Céadach's mother, who takes her place throughout the story, the wooing being replaced by the hero's magic birth to a fairy mother and the opponent by a step-brother. There are various accounts in Ulster and Scottish versions of how the wife copied the actions of some birds or two men she saw and brought Céadach to life; in 6/7 Connacht versions and one each from Ulster and Scotland Céadach is

1. E.g. The blood of a certain pig: cf. OCT?

resurrected by three men in a castle in order to help them in the "Everlasting Fight", which is then told as usual with its various sequels.[1] Two versions from Mayo include both methods of resurrection, and Céadach is killed and resurrected once already before he joins the Fenians. At the end in some versions from all regions Céadach resurrects his opponent also; but in a few others he has not killed him before and goes to kill him now.

The range of variation in the actual versions of the story - not including those numerous Fenian tales which are related to the extent that they include a "helper" who is set tasks by the Fenians, dies on an expedition and is resurrected - suggests that it has been in existence for a long time, and certainly too long for all the versions to derive from the existing nineteenth-century MSS. The reference in GF shows that in the early nineteenth century or before there was a version known in Munster, probably Kerry from the place-name Aireacht uí Chonchubhair, which called Céadach "mac ríogh na Sorach" like the MS and modern Kerry versions, but included the episode of the race with Caoilte, which is not in the MS or indeed in any version I have seen from further south than Mayo. The general character of the MS version and its language suggest an edited folktale in the manner of DGP, and the associated tales support this. But the consistency of the names, especially in Ulster and Connacht, and the obscurity of the introduction, give some reason for thinking that an earlier MS version may have helped to fix the form of the story. There are Irish versions of international folktales where the hero, like Céadach, has a particular

1. See p. 157ff.

name, but such versions never approach even half of the versions in Irish collected of their type. Native folk-tales with named heroes are either of MS origin or of very local currency. It may be that ECM was standardised in the oral literary tradition of the court storytellers without ever being written down: certainly it is surprising that a tale so popular in folk versions has left no early MS representatives if early MSS did exist. But as the best versions come from Donegal and Connacht, where few post-mediaeval MSS have survived at all, it is not impossible that all the MSS have perished.

Eachtra Chonaill Gulban

A few other hero-tales extant only in oral versions, but which seem to me to warrant the conclusion that they are based on written originals, are discussed in an appendix to this chapter. The stories whose development is analysed in the next section are mostly well known in MSS and correspondingly common in oral versions: I see no reason in any case to doubt that the MS is the basis of all the oral versions. Five of these are known to me in more than twenty oral versions and three of them can be grouped together. These are Eachtra Chonaill Gulban, Eachtra Iollainn Airmdheirg, and Eachtra Chloinne Ríogh na hIoruaidhe. All of them seem to have been composed about the sixteenth century, CG and CRI at least in

Leath Cuinn.[1] They all contain many incidents of a folk-tale character, mingled with conventional battle-scenes. The villain in all three is An Macaomh Mór mac Ríogh na Sorcha; this character appears in five other Romantic tales, but in none demonstrably earlier.[2] Iollann Airmdhearg appears in CG as well as EIA, and Iollann Órarmach in CRI: these names too were imitated by later writers. All three stories have a colophon in some of the earlier MSS stating, in the manner of sixteenth-century Spanish romances, that the story was originally written down by a contemporary of the characters, and has since been translated into Irish: such colophons are not known in other Irish tales.

The most popular of the three, and possibly the prototype of the others, is CG. I have made a more detailed study of this than of any other Romantic tale: the conclusions drawn here and later in the chapter are mostly rearranged from my article in Béaloideas XXX. This detailed study means that the figures for both MSS and oral versions are slightly higher than they might otherwise have been; but it is still easily the most popular tale of the three in both forms, which is of course my reason for choosing to study it. Apart from versions which follow the MS closely, a number of local variants have become standardised into what may be

1. The choice of hero suggests that CG was written in Donegal; the fact that the two MSS closest to the archetype are from Ulster and Scotland, and a few linguistic forms in all MSS, support this. A quite unusually high proportion of the 18th - 19th century MSS of CRI are Northern.

2. An Macaomh Mór alone appears in MRE; mac Ríogh na Sorcha alone in LCC, both of which are earlier: but the combination seems new.

called "oecotypes", using Von Sydow's term for local standard types of international tales, and there are also Irish folktales too unlike CG to be classed as variants of it, which nevertheless draw much of their content from CG.

The story may be briefly summarised: Conall Gulban is left by his father Niall of the Nine Hostages to guard Ireland against invasion while Niall is away helping the German emperor against the Turks who have invaded his dominions. Conall takes the opportunity to carry off his beloved, Eithne Uchtsholus, daughter of the king of Leinster; but when he falls asleep, exhausted by fighting, on the hill of Howth, she is carried off by Macaomh Mór in a boat. When Conall wakes and sails in pursuit, he is driven by the wind to Lochlann, where he succeeds in conquering the kingdom single-handed with the help of an Irish-trained druid, Dúnadhach, and the king's daughter Doireann, whom the druid tells that Conall is fighting for her hand. As he celebrates the victory, another would-be conqueror, Ridire an Ghaisge, attacks the king and is beaten and tied up by Conall. Asked if he was ever in a worse case, he tells his adventures after being thrown over a cliff by Macaomh Mór. Conall realises that the woman who was with Macaomh Mór must have been Eithne, and sails to Sorcha for her, with Ridire an Ghaisge and the Lochlann champion Amhus Órarmach. On the way they defeat and enlist Iollann Airmdhearg, son of the king of Crete. After all his companions have failed, Conall himself defeats Macaomh Mór in single combat, and wins back Eithne; but Macaomh Mór then demands a wife in return for losing Eithne, and

Conall and his companions help him to woo the king of Calidonia's daughter, who because of a prophecy that she would cause her father's death is defended with all the magic and military powers at his command. Meanwhile Eithne, left in Sorcha, is abducted again by the king of Greece, and won back in an immense set battle. Finally Conall and his companions help the German Emperor to defeat the Turks.

Few of the oral versions reproduce anything like the whole of this: most of them round off the story neatly by letting Macaomh Mór be killed, and Conall then sails home with his bride. Some versions, however, have noticed and even state explicitly that Conall always let his defeated enemies live to help him, and this becomes a formula, so that Conall chases Eithne to A, but when he defeats A discovers that Eithne has been carried off from him by B, so Conall and A go on to fight B and make the same discovery. Two versions develop this at great length, one from Uist and one from Clare, so presumably quite independent: and there is also an independent folktale of "Cathal" which may derive from such a version of CG.[1]

Discussion of the oecotypes and related folktales may be deferred until the principal motifs which survive into the folk versions have been considered. About half the versions follow the opening of the MS fairly closely: the scene where Conall's two elder brothers refuse to stay and

1. See Handbook p. 601 No.7, from Curtin, Hero-Tales p. 223; IFC 200 p. 108 (both from Connemara). For the formula treatment cf. the search for the balsam in CRI, below, p. 174.

guard Ireland and Conall himself accepts is fully in accordance with the principles of international folktale. The MS in fact does not state that Conall was the youngest, for pseudo-historical accounts conflict on the point, but folk versions naturally assume this, as he was asked last. Some versions in fact make his father leave him behind simply because he is too young to go to war; in some Scottish versions because he is illegitimate. Often he is credited with some more mercenary motive than filial piety - he asks to inherit the kingdom as a reward for staying, and even asks his father for a written promise "féd' lámh stampála".[1]

The episode in which Conall abducts Eithne is an elaborate example of a motif extremely popular in the written Romantic tales: it appears in AM, EAC, ECL, ELG, MI, MRE, TNE. The lady is in a grianán - literally a solar, always conceived as being at the top of a tower - and the only way for the hero to reach her is by a prodigious leap with the help, according to the conventional description, of his two spears, which takes him into the window of the room, to the top of the tower, or through a high door (dorus árd), presumably one like those in the Irish round towers of the Viking period, designed to be reached by a removable ladder. Then if necessary he puts his arms round her and jumps out again with her over his shoulder. It seems possible that the motif is of folk origin and represents the original Irish version of the central incident of AT 530, The Princess

1. In the MS he is offered the kingdom but stays, so he says, for his father's blessing.

on the Glass Mountain:[1] the Eastern European type of this tale is in fact very similar, with a tower instead of the glass mountain. The motif occurs in EAC, a story known in the Middle Irish period, where Art finds Delbchaem in a "grianán... arna shuigudh ar énchois" (set on a single pedestal). It is not actually stated how he got in, but the story is little more than a summary, and it may fairly be assumed that he had to jump. In MRE and TNE the situation is complicated by the presence of a crowd of rival suitors. To illustrate the popularity of the motif an incident may be quoted from ECM (c.1800): Céadach wants to get into a ruined castle, so he leaps on to the highest tower and so inside the curtain wall. The highest tower is called "árd-ghrianán na cúirte": evidently grianán is assumed to be a synonym for tower. A Donegal folk version of TDG[2] shows a similar generalisation of the other feature, that a grianán is a place where women are found: "Tháinig mná an toigh amach as a ngrianán 's aca féin". (The women of the household came out of their own grianán(s?)).

In CG the episode is dressed out with rather unusually naturalistic dialogue. Eithne refuses Conall as she has refused his brothers before him, and her maid mocks him, thinking that he cannot pass the guarded walls. Conall scares her out of her wits by alighting on the top of the

1. Only 42 versions of this are listed in OS&C (excluding "cf."), which makes it one of the less popular international tales; it would be quite reasonable to suggest that this conventional West European type is a recent importation through English, and the grianán motif, of which hundreds of oral versions could be found, represents the native oecotype.

2. IFC S1051 p. 305.

tower, and jumps down again with Eithne over his shoulder, after offering her time to change her clothes. Eithne accuses him of cowardice in running off without waiting to fight it out with her guards; Conall, who wanted to avoid bloodshed, turns back and kills them, but tells her that she is responsible for their death and that, as a punishment, he will carry her no further: she must walk. All this dialogue is reproduced with some accuracy by some of the folk versions, and examples of the last part will be given in Ch. IV. This sort of repartee is enjoyed by tellers of hero-tales as well as by those of local anecdotes. Conall's strength tends to be exaggerated: he usually carries off Eithne under his armpit, as Midir takes Étaín in the Old Irish Tochmarc Étaíne, rather than over his shoulder as in the more realistic MS version. The pursuing company of soldiers which Conall kills is often triplicated: in the MS he has escaped before the second band comes up. An amusing Kerry variant makes Conall politely jump up to the grianán with a letter for Eithne, jump up again to get her reply, and only then carry her off.

A minority of versions, apart from the few Connacht versions which include a crowd of rival suitors as in MRE, contain various substitutes for the grianán. The most usual, in some twelve versions from Cork and Kerry, is a series of walls - usually seven - which Conall has to jump on horseback. It would be rash to claim that this is in any way related to the task of leaping a palisade which, according to Von Sydow, is the centre of the Indian oecotype of AT 530, but it is worth noticing that wall-

leaping and tower-leaping interchange easily in both the international and the Irish type. Two other Kerry versions combine the grianán with the common Irish motif of the revolving castle.[1]

The abduction of Eithne while Conall is asleep is the most distinctive episode of CG, and the mainspring of the plot. Only three unusually confused versions of the story omit it. The motif as it stands in the MS is not very satisfactory: Conall is apparently so exhausted - reasonably enough after travelling on foot thirty miles from Howth to Naas and thirty miles back, apart from some jumping, and killing fifty men! - that Eithne cannot wake him, and Macaomh Mór is enough impressed by the sight of him to refuse when she asks him to wake Conall. Folk tellers have set about improving this. First of all, more than half the versions make Conall sleep for seven days on end, or some such period.[2] It is often explained that this is a codladh gaisgidhigh, the sleep slept by all heroes in those days after feats of valour, though no such thing is mentioned in any other story. In the Clare version it is the result of a fairy curse in his childhood. Other versions

1. Cúirt imeacht tiompall ar aon chois amháin; rotha neimhe ar an tríomhadh stóirí. The revolving court is found in ECL (original MS c. 1772) and an early version is the description of Cú Roí's fort in Fled Bricrenn; it is supposed to be of Oriental origin.

2. 7 days in 23 versions; 3 in 2; 9 in 2; 10 in 1; a year and a day in 2. None of these are Scottish.

more prosaically explain that he had lost seven nights' sleep in winning Eithne and had to make up for them.

But not only is Conall's sleep unusually long; it is also unusually sound. In the majority of versions from Connacht and Munster[1] Macaomh Mór answers Eithne's request to wake Conall by giving him three violent kicks; but Conall sleeps on, though he spits blood. This is an addition of long standing: some 15 MSS of the short recension of CG incorporate it in the text.[2] This presumably oral elaboration of the story must therefore have been well enough known in the eighteenth century for a scribe to include it in his MS, either because he believed it to have dropped out of his exemplar or because his audience at a reading demanded it. He may have been from Kerry, where the motif is usual. No doubt its inclusion in MSS helped the spread of the motif, but it seems too widespread to be solely the invention of an eighteenth-century scribe.

Obviously since Conall's sleep was unusually long and unusually sound it must have been magic, and explanations for this have already been noticed. It also follows by folk logic that a magic method of waking must have existed, and it was failure to use this that left him asleep. The details of this were borrowed, it seems, from an international folktale, AT 300/303. Generally in Irish versions of this story the hero goes to sleep with his head in the princess's

1. 28 out of 44, apart from versions of Loinnir mac Leabhair.

2. These are all Munster MSS: the earliest, Murphy 54, dates from 1775.

lap while waiting for the dragon to appear from the sea; she cuts off a lock of hair, steals one of his shoes, or takes some other object to ensure that she can recognise him later in the story as the true dragon-slayer. But a more primitive form is noted in the Aarne-Thompson index, and may be assumed to be well-known in Europe: she cuts or bites off one of his fingers, by whose absence he is later recognised. Two versions of this occur among the six versions of AT 303 printed by Campbell of Islay, and here the form is exactly that in which the motif appears in CG: the princess asks the hero "what is waking for you?" ("Dé's dùsgadh duit?") and is told in turn on each of three days to bite a joint off his finger, take off a piece of his ear and cut some flesh from his forehead. It seems possible that this motif was once more widespread in Ireland and Scotland in AT 300/303, but has been replaced by other forms in the international tale because it became primarily associated with CG, just as I suggested above may have happened with the grianán motif, AT 530 and the Romantic tales in general.

In any case it has become associated with CG, at least in Scotland and Connacht, where nearly all versions contain it;[1] and it is easy enough to see why it has been borrowed. The situation is almost identical - hero, asleep with his head in princess's lap on shore, must be woken when monster approaches from sea - and it will be argued later that this sort of identity of the scene visualised is one of the most

1. There are no versions of CG from Ulster known to me; among Munster versions only one in four contains this motif.

important conditions, if not actually a cause, for borrowing motifs in oral tradition. There are often three methods of waking listed: in the international tale there is a point to this, as the scene is repeated on three successive days, but in CG one is just to be used if the other fails. The most usual include the first two mentioned in Campbell's tale and, as a third, a blow in the chest with a boulder. The main difference from the international tale is that the directions have to fail; this is sometimes explained as a result of Eithne's squeamishness about cutting off a finger or the like, but sometimes the instructions are carried out and fail; most often they are given by Conall and never mentioned again. Quite a number of versions, especially those which come from the meeting-place of Northern and Southern traditions in Connemara, and those from the Blaskets, combine the directions for waking with Macaomh Mór kicking Conall. The kicking (or throwing down, or throwing against a cliff, which may be considered as variants of the same motif) is not in accordance with the directions, so naturally it fails to wake Conall.

At this point again in the MS there is a notable dialogue in which Eithne tries to persuade Macaomh Mór, who has come to Ireland to carry off Eithne herself, that he should go on to Naas to find her. Oral versions preserve the essentials of this, and where in the MS Eithne merely says that the king of Leinster's daughter is more

beautiful than any other woman, the folk rendering makes her give a direct comparison between herself and her imaginary self, saying that she is not worthy to clean her shoes: this cliché appears in both Scottish and Irish versions. In two Scottish versions Macaomh Mór succeeds in identifying her by a magic mirror, or a portrait: while he fetches this from the ship she tries in vain to wake Conall. In some Connacht versions Eithne foresees what is going to happen and changes clothes with a shepherdess, or with an old woman who runs away hastily in case she wants to change back; but as Macaomh Mór in these versions is looking simply for the most beautiful woman in the world, the change is not enough to deceive him. Nearly half the oral versions explicitly state, like the MS, that Eithne put Macaomh Mór under geasa not to take her as his wife for a year - this is of course standard practice in Romantic tales of the tóraigheacht type, which would lose much of their point without it.

When Conall wakes up, he hears shepherds laughing at him; one of them tells him what has happened. This necessary plot device, together with the superfluous detail of the laughter, is preserved by most oral versions. Eleven versions, mostly from Kerry, also make Eithne, or Macaomh Mór at her request, leave a message, which the shepherds can point out as proof. The shepherds then tell Conall where he can find a ship. In oral versions this feature is made much of: the ship is sometimes the Breac-Chuach of Fionn mac Cumhaill himself, and it is often dilapidated and has to be repaired. In eight Kerry versions Conall

buys cattle from the shepherds at twice the market price, slaughters them, and mends the ship with their hides: it sounds as if the tellers are thinking of a curach rather than a wooden ship. Almost as common in oral versions is the conventional account of a ship made by magic from a shaving of wood. One MS[1] brings in a tradition also found in MSS of GD and other tales, that a ship would always be found at Howth if a true Irishman was in need of it. Some oral versions have similar motifs: it is the magic of the harbour (buaidh ag an gcuan), not that of Conall or his helper, which in some Kerry versions makes a ship of a shaving, and in a pair of Connacht versions a magic ship rises from the sea every day at eleven o'clock which only a king's son can use.

Conall's adventures in Lochlann, which follow, are not in the least essential to the plot of the story, and it is not surprising that some ten versions omit them entirely, and most of the others omit parts. It is more surprising that over thirty versions preserve the opening episode, an unremarkable account of a hurling game in which Conall, like Cú Chulainn as a boy, defeats all his opponents single-handed. Munster versions especially give detailed descriptions of the play, and one teller, Tomás 'ac Gearailt, even told another, invented story about a hurling match which Conall won on another occasion. The only point of interest is the way in which Conall gets a camán to play with. In the MS he seizes one from one of the players, but

1. 24.B.29 (1787).

many oral versions prefer a more interesting account: he uproots a tree and trims it into shape, implying great strength, or is given it by a mysterious helper - a cross between the shepherd in the MS who meets Conall when he lands and the druid who appears later - implying magic. In two S. Kerry versions his opponents are all giants, to make the odds against him worse.

One point which must be noticed is the result of corruption which can be seen in the MS. The oldest MSS describe the players in the game as macraidh Lochlann. The archaic collective for boys, macraidh, was not in common use by the eighteenth century; hence many later MSS replace these words with mac (mic, meic) ríogh Lochlann, the king of Lochlann's son(s). The sound is almost the same, which suggests that the mistake originated with a scribe writing, as Prof. Delargy has suggested to me was common, from dictation. The mistake could equally well be made by a hearer, who did not understand macraidh, learning the tale from a teller or reader who did: and this, rather than the corrupt MSS, may be the origin of mic ríogh in most folk versions, for the majority of late MSS simply omit macraidh or have a corruption of visual origin such as marcshluagh (cavalry).[1]

In any case the king's son or sons are normally present in folk versions, and take the place of the members of the macraidh who speak to Conall in the older MSS. The only exception is a Cork version where Gasra(dh) óg

1. Macraidh would be abbreviated macr$^{\dot{}}$; marcshluagh could appear as marcsl$^{\dot{}}$. R and S being alike in the Irish hand, it is possible to imagine how the corruption arose.

an Dúna (the young lads of the fort) appear, and even here the collective seems to be understood as if it were a man's name. Since the king's sons are there, Kerry versions explain that they are playing against each other to decide which shall inherit the kingdom. Conall must offer a stake to get into the game; he tries to offer an island that belongs to one of the others, but is finally forced to stake his head. The wager by which the losing party must give a free blow to the winner is in the MS: there Conall only kills one of his opponents who mocks him, but in oral versions he often kills all of them but one who begs for mercy. In Kerry versions the king comes to ask that his sons should be spared, and Conall is then asked to dinner.

In these last versions it is then an easy matter to go on to the feast scene at which the in-tale is told. However, a great deal happens before that in the MS, and half the oral versions reproduce all or most of this. The next episode is a very common one in folktales; the only early MS tale to include it is CG. If it is of literary origin, as seems likely, it is reasonable to assume that it came into oral tradition from CG. The fact that only twenty versions of CG itself contain it will then result from the motif having become principally associated with other tales, such as ECM, where it appears in the nineteenth-century MSS, and Fionn and Lorcán. It is a more important part of these shorter tales than it is of CG, which is long enough and rich enough in interesting episodes without it; moreover the oral form found in Fenian helper-tales has been enriched, presumably in oral tradition, with new comic details, and is preferable

to the plain form in CG; in some cases the later form has been used by oral versions of CG, but it is not easy to adapt entirely to a tale where the hero has no helper. I do not find it necessary to doubt that the motif originated in CG because it is not now found in many oral versions of that story.

The motif is known as teach na n-amhus, the house of the mercenaries. The word amhus originally meant a hired soldier or retainer, and had no pejorative overtones, to judge by early instances. Thus an early poem describes the god Lugh as a good amhus. In modern Irish and Scottish Gaelic, however, it suggests savagery, stupidity, gluttony and even cannibalism. This combination evidently derives largely from the picture given of the amhuis in this motif, which was the only place where the word continued in general use. In Scotland the word became confused with one meaning "ghost", and the resulting form tamhasg, which is usual in the motif in Scottish versions, implies a supernatural character; in Ireland too they have become ogres. The author of CG credited them with nothing but savagery, wishing perhaps to satirise the gallóglaigh (Hebridean mercenaries) of Ulster in his day;[1] it is the folk development which has made ogres of them.

To show the course of this development, the episode will be summarised here from CG, with additions from the later form in ECM in brackets; "C" denotes Conall, the hero, or Céadach, the helper-hero, as appropriate.

1. Compare CCR, a story from about the same date and region where the gallóglaigh are the main butt of the Ceithearnach's jokes.

C is directed to teach na n-amhus as a place where he can spend the night. (His guide is afraid to enter with him, but C drives him in. The amhuis laugh for joy to see him, opening their mouths so wide that their hearts can be seen inside!) They bar the doors; C double-bars them. They explain that they were afraid of his escaping alive; he explains that he was afraid that they would escape alive. Thereupon he seizes the nearest amhus by the ankles and uses him as a flail to knock down the rest. (In the MS they are merely tied up, though they do not appear again in the story: in oral versions they are killed, and at the end there is nothing left of the man who was used as a flail but his shins). One is left to take the news to the king (in oral versions, to clear out the bodies of the rest. He hid up the chimney or in the peat-stack and begged for mercy, but is usually killed when he has done his work. Now in ECM Fionn is brought into the house. C goes to the king to ask for food; he is told to get it for himself and does so by force. In many oral versions this becomes a long episode in three parallel parts where C visits, say, the butcher, brewer and baker in turn; when they refuse what he asks, he pushes the baker into his own oven, the brewer into his own vat, and so forth, and goes off with all their stock. Finally Fionn feels a desire for a woman, and C fetches the king's daughter for him).

The last detail would hardly be appropriate in CG,

1. Possibly this has been imitated from the onomastic tale of Fionn's fostermother and Loch Lurgan, where similarly only the shins remain of her; though it is a reasonable enough result of C's action.

where Conall has later to refuse the king's daughter when she offers herself to him - indeed it may be a sort of parody of that episode - but the search for food and drink appear in four oral versions of CG from different parts of Ireland, and there is something similar in Scottish versions, where Conall kills the servants bringing food for the amhuis and takes it himself. At least half the versions of CG with the episode contain both the detail of the amhuis laughing and the barring of the doors, which is often comically exaggerated into the stopping up of the smallest holes and crannies in the house, as chinks in drystone walls used to be stopped with moss. They explain that they laughed with joy at the prospect of eating him, or contempt at the small amount of meat on him; or sometimes because they think he is shutting himself in, not them. The amhus left to clear out the corpses appears in eight versions, but he is often confused with the Amhus Órarmach or the druid.

The series of battles which follow in the MS are not the stuff of which folktales are made. The most important of them, however, the three-day combat with the Lochlann champion Amhus Órarmach, is punctuated by a motif memorable enough to survive in some twenty versions. This is where Dúnadhach the druid, friendly to Conall because he learned his art in Ireland, introduces him to his own employer, the king's daughter, as a suitor for her hand who is being made

by her father to fight for her. The princess, flattered, invites him to spend the night in her grianán and, more important, to have his wounds cured by her vat of magic balcam (íocshláinte). Her motives are clear enough; but folk tellers are not often satisfied with the MS explanation of Dúnadhach's interest in Conall. He tends to become an Irishman himself. His presence in Lochlann is explained in one account by making him the sole survivor of Conall's father's army which landed in Lochlann and was destroyed. Other accounts less confusing to the plot are that he was carried off from Ireland by a griffin - drawing on a later episode of the story - or in Curtin's English, perhaps based on a misunderstanding, that he "was taken out on the wild arm of the wind and was thrown in on this island". In three Cork versions he is an Irish priest instructing the princess in religion: in one of them she seems to be a secret convert, for the instruction takes place in a lonely wood, and they pass Conall lying wounded by the roadside on their way home from it, so evidently the king is a pagan or Protestant; but in another version Dúnadhach is the Chaplain kept "to say grace" (ag beanhughadh an bhídh) for the king. A Kerry version identifies him with the helpful shepherd of the MS, but he is an Irish shepherd.

The fact that this princess also lives in a grianán has naturally led to confusion. Four versions from Kerry and Clare which omit this episode in its proper place transfer all the details to the earlier grianán scene where Conall abducts Eithne. Thus Eithne is willing to let

Conall in and puts down a rope - in one version a bucket! - to pull him up, but he refuses, in spite of his wounds, and jumps. He is bathed in the balsam, clothed and fed, and put in Eithne's bed, where she comes presently to join him. All these details belong to the scene in Lochlann, and are found there in the MS and most oral versions. So do the three days' fighting, which are also transferred to the earlier scene in these four versions, for Conall's wounds must be explained: and it is possible that this confusion accounts for long battles and the presence of Eithne's father in other versions of the earlier scene.

Naturally these versions do not include the detail which follows: when Conall discovers that the princess has come to bed with him, he draws his sword and places it between them. The motif (T.351) may have been borrowed by the author of CG from AT 303, where the second twin places a sword between himself and the first twin's wife, who takes him for his brother.[1] Here, where it simply serves to show Conall's fidelity to Eithne, it sometimes drops out in oral versions. The unfortunate druid is left to explain it to the princess next morning, so that Conall can be invited in again that night. In the MS he explains that Irishmen never start the wooing until the fighting is over. Two Scottish oral versions have more ingenious explanations: Conall does not want the princess to lose her good name when he may yet be killed in the battle; or he is afraid to beget a son more powerful than himself!

1. Christiansen, ISFT p. 74, notes that some Irish tellers gloss over the episode.

Still other versions transfer the motif to a later point in the story, where Macaomh Mór himself is Conall's opponent. The version from Barra where this occurs is simply confused: but the four versions from the Carraroe area which constitute a well-defined Connemara oecotype have turned what started as confusion into a fine new comic episode. The princess is changed into Macaomh Mór's elderly spinster sister, and the two servants, formerly employed by Conall's father, who replace the druid, introduce him to her as a suitor. His real aim is to get the magic apple (ubhall braith) which alone will kill her brother, and only if he gets it within three days. The first two nights he falls asleep from exhaustion, but the third night he keeps awake over a game of cards and succeeds in charming the apple out of her. After Macaomh Mór has been killed, one of the servants changes himself into Conall's shape and marries the sister, who no douht inherits the kingdom. The misplaced episode has been combined with the motif of the invulnerable giant, which occurs there in many versions of CG, in a way which must surely be deliberate, and gives great opportunities for comic dialogue.

What follows in the proper sequence of the story is the defeat of Amhus Órarmach, who in folk versions is usually a fairly conventional giant, sometimes with the power of escaping each day in the form of a bird. Three Cork versions

1. This motif is old in Irish folktales: it appears in EAF (1718), and may derive from the carrying off of Macaomh Mór by his tutor in magic in CRI, which in its turn could be imitated from the carrying off of Paris by Aphrodite in the Iliad.

let him be killed by the druid, with an iron flail which he has fetched from Hell - though he is a priest! There may be a reminiscence of the sword given by the smith of Hell to Cod in CRI. Usually, however, he is spared to help Conall as in the MS.

The next episode is important to the plot, but tends to survive even in versions where its importance to the plot has been obscured: its central adventure is an important part of two other Irish tale-types, Loinnir mac Leabhair and Dordán. In CG it has vanished, though not always without trace, in the versions mentioned above where the princess's grianán scene is transferred to Sorcha, so that the plot is generally telescoped; in versions where the central part of the story has been reduced to a formula of battles with successive abductors, whose names sometimes include one or more based on the name of the principal character of this episode; and in one or two other short or confused versions. Hence it hardly ever occurs in a Connacht version. Otherwise it is preserved, though with many small variations in detail.

Ridire an Ghaisge attacks the king. In the MS he is making an attempt to conquer the kingdom single-handed, a perfectly possible task in the Romantic tales, and indeed one which Conall has just accomplished. Oral versions, however, at least in Munster, tend to look for a more probable reason for his attack. Cork versions make him

pick a fight with Conall himself who is out walking. Elsewhere he attacks the king: in Kerry versions, where he has been drifting in the sea for some days previously, he is impelled by sheer hunger, or he wants to get at the fire, or he is angry because he has not been welcomed. He may be wanting to carry off the king's daughter. In two versions such attacks are a daily occurrence.

The episode is made more picturesque with various details. The thunderous knock of the MS becomes a blow which shatters the door into a dozen pieces. Conall, as a stranger, waits for the others to avenge the insult to their king; only when he has remarked upon it three times, without any action being taken, does he attack the intruder himself. Other details are added from Romantic tales which contain similar attacks on a king: from EIA the knocking out of the king's teeth, which appears in eight versions; from BC the theft of the dish standing in front of the king, in seven versions - two have both details.[1]

The motif that follows, when Conall asks Ridire an Ghaisge, tied under the drips of a great candle (rí-choinneal) and awaiting execution, whether he was ever in a worse situation, and is told the in-tale in reply, must have been borrowed by the author of CG from AT 953 or from its literary form in the Dolopathos. It is in fact used in a similar way in relation to the story as a whole: in AT 953

1. The theft of the dish could perhaps be independently deduced from Ridire an Ghaisge's hunger in the versions where it occurs: on the other hand the borrowing from BC could be older, and the hunger-motive originally inserted to explain it.

the story reveals to the king's mother that the narrator himself must be the man who saved the king's life when he was a baby, and in CG the telling of the tale leads eventually to the reunion of Conall and his wife. AT 953 is still a popular tale in Gaelic; in Irish versions the old robber who tells the in-tale is usually simply the Black Thief, but at least three Scottish versions call him Conall or even Conall Gulban,[1] showing that the motif was better known as part of CG.

Now comes the episode with the griffin, which has been borrowed extensively by other folktales. In the MS, Ridire an Ghaisge tells how he met Macaomh Mór, challenged him to fight or hand over Eithne, and was defeated and thrown over a cliff. He fell into a griffin's nest. The young griffins pecked him and wounded him, but also bit through the ropes with which Macaomh Mór had bound him. So he was able to pull out his sword and kill them. When the mother griffin came back and saw this she carried him off, playing with him by dropping him until he was almost in the sea and then catching him again, but when she alighted on an island he was able to kill her with his sword.

It is hardly necessary to list all the minor variations which affect this motif, especially in Munster - how Ridire an Ghaisge kills the young birds by rolling on them, or by pushing them into the sea with his tongue, the only part he can move, or because his shoes strike sparks from the cliff as he falls and set the nest on fire; how the mother griffin drops him into a whale's mouth, and he pricks it with his

1. See JFC I, p. 105 ff; Béal. XV p. 237.

dagger to drive it ashore, or how she and her mate throw him to each other until all his flesh drops off, or how he throttles her in mid-air - these are some of the more picturesque variations. More important is the influence of an earlier story about a griffin, found in the Early Middle Irish Aided Muirchertaig meic Erca, telling how it took a shipwrecked sailor to its nest.[1] This is probably the cause of the change in about a quarter of the versions, which make Macaomh Mór throw Ridire an Ghaisge directly into the sea, where he drifts about until picked up by the griffin and taken to her nest. There all follows as usual. In some versions the griffin also drops him back into the sea.

From this, perhaps, has developed the variation in the main Kerry oecotype, where the griffin and her nest have often dropped out entirely. Macaomh Mór is here explicitly a giant, so large that he is able to walk through the sea carrying Eithne in a basket on his back. Ridire an Ghaisge passes him aboard a ship, sees Eithne and sets the ship to steer between the giant's legs while he climbs the mast to steal her out of the basket. Meanwhile Macaomh Mór is catching fish between his toes and throwing them over his shoulder into the basket: he asks Eithne what she thinks of a particularly fine trout, and she fails to reply. Looking round, he sees the ship, catches it up and takes her back. He ties Ridire an Ghaisge to the broken-off mast of

1. This may be related to the twelfth-century travellers' tale of the griffin carrying sailors sewn in animal skins to land: "Peter Lum", Fabulous Beasts (London (1952)) p. 54, source not named. (The text is not quite accurate: Muirchertach himself is carried off from a sinking ship.)

his ship and throws him into the sea. Sometimes the griffin then picks him up, but usually he just drifts about until cast ashore, or rescued by Conall himself and brought ashore, in Lochlann. This development is largely a result of the description of Macaomh Mór as a giant which must at some time have been added to a folk version, together with the change which makes Ridire an Ghaisge be thrown into the sea. The rest follows logically - the mast from the fact that Ridire an Ghaisge must be kept afloat, (though some versions attribute this to a magic ring) the ship from the mast, the method of stealing Eithne from the other circumstances. But the whole episode has very probably been "edited" into a coherent shape by passing through the hands of an expert storyteller. By what must be coincidence rather than migration, a version heard by Campbell of Islay in Mull seems to have been rather similar: according to Campbell's rather confused English summary, which is all we have, (Macaomh Mór) "takes (Ridire an Ghaisge) in one hand and ship in the other. He had a chair cathair dà ghriffin, that would spout fire three mibs from the castle".[1] Evidently there was at least a reminiscence of the griffin.

The two stories which borrow this episode from CG either follow the MS version or the modification where Ridire an Ghaisge is dropped into the sea. Loinnir mac Leabhair consists largely of motifs borrowed from CG, in a different order, with some motifs from other Romantic and international tales interspersed, and is not unlike a Kerry oecotype of CG

1. JFC MS XVI, p. 88 ff. Cf. Gadelica p. 189, 308, on cathair griobháin, a labyrinth?

which has been assimilated to AT 650.[1] Dordán also seems to derive the motif from CG, for the hero's name in three of the thirteen versions is Ridire an Ghaisge: in others usually son of some king or another, in the conventional way. In both cases the motif is introduced by that of the hero's covetous host, who desires his wife and makes him drunk; then he is pushed over the cliff. The whole of this could be an independent motif, used with suitable modifications by the author of CG, but I doubt it. Apart from the name in Dordán and the other borrowings from CG in Loinnir mac Leabhair, there are versions of the latter where the hero is tied under the rí-choinneal, before being thrown over the cliff: a pointless and time-wasting cruelty in this story, which has come over with the rest from CG, where Ridire an Ghaisge is tied there after his assault on the king and asked if he was ever in a harder case. The distribution is also significant. Dordán is found only in Co. Galway, Loinnir mac Leabhair only in Connacht and N. Clare. Only one or two versions of CG from this area include the in-tale. Once again it seems that a motif has become associated with another story and has been lost to the story to which it originally belonged.

In most oral versions this is the end of the in-tale, but in the MS and a dozen oral versions it continues with a further adventure of Ridire an Ghaisge, in which he is trapped in the house of two giants. Some oral versions follow the MS closely; three from Co. Cork include the motif of the pursuer's head cut off as he enters the door

1. See below, p. 162.

(Cf. AT 956), three others introduce the Polyphemus episode, where the hero blinds the giant and escapes dressed in the hide of a goat (AT 1137).

By this stage oral versions of the story are beginning to get rather ragged as the end approaches. No oral version includes the battle with Iollann Airmdhearg, which is totally unnecessary except to provide Conall with another helper, and merely delays the dénouement of the recapture of Eithne. As in most versions this is the end of the story, Macaomh Mór is killed off with one of the methods which round off well-known international tales, or Irish native types. The most popular of these are the motif of the external soul from AT 302, with animal helpers replacing Conall's human helpers of the MS, and similar motifs of the defeat of the near-invulnerable giant; some, such as Stiofán Ó Helaoire's Clare version, interpolate a long series of episodes, not all well-known. Others merely have a short conventional description of a battle.

Some sixteen versions follow the MS in making Macaomh Mór yield after a battle, sometimes without a battle or after a trial of strength, and continuing the story. None of them give anything like the full MS account of what follows, though MacNair's version, printed by Campbell, goes into almost as much detail with new incidents. The MS details of Macaomh Mór's rough wooing include the defeat of three

venomous dogs[1] which occurs at various points of the story in six versions of CG. The other important motif in this part of the story is the well-known "everlasting fight", which is worth considering for a moment: it appears in nine oral versions, again more often than not in a different part of the story from that in which it occurs in the MS. One Kerry teller seems to have thought it the most important part of the story, for his title for the whole story is Conall Óg ameasg na Marbh (Young Conall among the dead men).

CG is the first literary tale to contain this very popular folk motif. Healing wells appear in the older text of Cath Muighe Tuireadh, which may go back to the twelfth century or before, and in the fifteenth-century Cath Fionntrágha. In the latter the well can only heal two people repeatedly; in the first it is sufficient for a whole army, but in both cases it is used on the behalf of the side with which the reader is expected to sympathise. This is not so in the folk motif. Healing wells do appear in modern folktales, but generally as objects of a quest, not as properties of a battlefield.

The episode in CG begins dramatically when Conall notices that he is killing the same men whom he killed the day before. He waits that night on the battlefield among the bodies until he sees a hag coming with a lantern in one hand, weapons in the other and a bottle of liquid balsam (linn íce) around her neck. When he has watched her resurrect two or three of the dead he runs after her,

1. Cf. above, Ch.I, p.22-23.

cuts her head off, takes the balsam, and kills the men she has cured.

The situation is typical of the conventions of the Romantic tales, for it implies that all the five hundred dead on the battlefield belong to the enemy, all killed by Conall and his four friends. Nothing else here is without a parallel among the earlier Romantic tales - hags and resurrections with balsam are stock features. It would be rash, however, to claim that a motif which is perhaps the best known of all native Irish folk motifs was the invention of the author of CG, especially when it appears in a part of the story which is seldom preserved in folk versions.[1] It is a very simple form of the motif which appears in CG, at any rate, and most folk versions of it at least add to the dramatic interest by making Conall pretend to be a wounded man among the dead: thus the hag accepts him as an assistant and he has no trouble in getting close to her. Sometimes the motif is triplicated and the hag is preceded, as in many Gaelic tales of giant-slaying, by her two or three giant sons, each of whom Conall kills and then lies down again among the dead men. Many Irish versions of the motif have a sequel, in which the hero is bespelled by the hag with her dying breath to take the news of her death to some magic

1. Four of the 55 MSS of CG break off at about this point, apparently independently, and very possibly because the scribes wearied, rather than because a great part was missing from all their different exemplars. It is likely too that readings from other MSS did not reach the end of the story, and that this is part of the reason why folk versions usually end with the death of Macaomh Mór.

animal, which sends him on similarly to another. The series usually ends with a cat which, as it dies, wounds the hero to the heart with a poisonous nail in the tip of its tail: helpers who follow resurrect the hero with the balsam which he took from the hag, but at first put the cat's heart in his breast instead of his own, until they see him chase a mouse. This complex sequel is only found in one version of CG, but it is extremely common in other native folktale types and compilations. This is the strongest argument against its origin in CG - such a complex might be expected to take more than 300 years both to be added to the original motif and then to spread in its extended form throughout Ireland; though the absence of the extended form in Scotland suggests that this is later than the early seventeenth century, when contacts between the two countries were still frequent. We can at least say that CG must have helped to popularise the motif.

The second abduction of Eithne by the king of Greece, which follows in the MS, is mentioned in something like its original form by five oral versions: some others, from Co. Cork and Scotland, replace it by her abduction by one of Conall's own helpers, Ridire an Ghaisge or the druid. In these she is found after a briefly described pursuit and the abductor killed. But there is nothing about the long battle scenes of the original episode to appeal to folk tellers. Similarly the final scene of the defeat of the Turks is usually little more than a mention, though it appears in more versions than other episodes following the Eithne's first recovery. Only three or four of these have

a reminiscence of the striking scene where Conall and his helpers venture into the enemy camp and kill the emperor while he feasts; others merely mention a battle. More stress is placed, by 25 of the 28 versions which include this part of the story, on the meeting between Conall and his father and brothers; though only two Cork versions follow the dramatic account of the MS where Conall's brothers come in turn, by night, to find out who he and his men are, and are involved in fights with his helpers until Conall recognises an Irish voice. In seven versions the brothers and/or the father are already dead and are resurrected with the balsam which Conall took from the hag; this gives an extra significance to the "everlasting fight" episode above and helps to bind the story together. The main Kerry oecotype and two versions from S.Uist have made great changes in the meeting with the brother. It seems likely that they have incorporated a motif or an independent "dite" from another source, and they will be discussed below when this form of change is being considered in general.

The preservation, alteration or replacement of proper names in oral versions will be dealt with more fully in the next chapter. Here it is sufficient to note that the hero is called Conall in all but eight of the 55 versions known to me; in two of the eight his name is a recognisable variant (Domhnall, Connan) and in another it has been

deliberately changed. Admittedly most of these versions have only been recognised by the indexers because they contained the name - as have stories containing the name which are not really versions of CG - and three of the versions where it is not recognisable are ones which I have come across more or less by chance in IFC MSS, so there are probably more versions where the hero is not called Conall than would appear from the figures given. Nevertheless he is Conall Gulban or a recognisable variant in nearly half the versions; his wife and his four principal helpers each appear in from twelve to twenty versions by a recognisable form of one of their MS names, though often these are replaced by other names from the Irish folktale stock; and even such minor characters as his brothers are correctly named in half a dozen versions. This seems to me sufficient indication that the literary story is the common original of the oral versions.

The oecotypes need not be discussed at length here. The most widespread of them is the Kerry type mentioned above where Macaomh Mór walks through the sea: I know of twelve versions now, ten of them from West Kerry. The end, and in some cases the beginning, owe nothing to the MS, and most of the less popular episodes have dropped out without trace. We will see presently that CRI has been even more thoroughly edited in the same area. An interesting feature is the use of a local landmark such as Dunmore Head in place of Howth as the scene of Eithne's abduction. The Carraroe oecotype has been mentioned also; it is similarly shortened and changed mainly at the beginning and end, and is notable for

its elements of farce. The treatment of the story in another Connacht type will be discussed later.[1]

Two variants of the story are partly assimilated to international tales. Four versions from S. Kerry combine the abduction of Eithne with motifs from AT 530, 531 and 329, tales which in Ireland include a helpful horse. This is a natural enough development from other Kerry versions, in most of which Conall carries off Eithne on horseback, not on his own back: the international convention has replaced the archaic convention of the Romantic tales. After Macaomh Mór has taken away Eithne the horse drops out of the story: the obvious reason for this would be that Conall then goes overseas, but as in one of the borrowed motifs it has already ridden through the sea, this is not enough and Macaomh Mór is made to lame it.

Two other versions from the same area assimilate the beginning of the story to AT 650. Here the starting point is probably the feat of strength performed by Conall at the beginning of many oral versions, replacing the story of how he won his name by running up Beann Gulban in the MS. As in AT 650, his employer is terrified of him, and continually tries to get him killed: this role is filled first by his father, who is terrified when Conall lifts a great boulder and breaks it into pieces. His father runs and shuts himself up in his palace, and sends Conall off to Greece, to carry off Eithne as another test of his prowess. There it is the king of Greece who involves him in tasks to

1. See p. 226-227.

get him killed: the tasks are taken from the episodes of CG which take place in Lochlann. Then, as in Loinnir mac Leabhair, the king himself arranges to have Conall thrown over a cliff, and adventures drawn from the in-tale follow. Only then does Conall win Eithne in battle, bring her home to Howth to admire the boulder he first broke, fall asleep and lose her to Macaomh Mór. The end of the story, as in several other versions of CG, follows AT 302, with the giant's external soul captured by helpful animals.

Loinnir mac Leabhair, which is almost as close a variant of CG as the last, will be described in the appendix to this chapter as an example of those Irish tale-types which are composed almost entirely of motifs drawn from other stories, and need not, as a whole, be of either MS or international origin. The story of Cathal, mentioned above, is much less popular: I only know of two versions. Both these stories are confined to Connacht.

Eachtra Chloinne Ríogh na hIoruaidhe

My analysis of the other tales must be shorter, both because I have found fewer versions and because there has been no time for a full study of them.

There are less than half as many versions of Eachtra Chloinne Ríogh na hIoruaidhe as of CG to be found from the indexes in the IFC, in spite of the fact that in some areas it was considered the best story of all. The distribution is also strikingly different: I have not succeeded in

finding a Scottish version of CRI, but there are many versions from Donegal - a third of the total - whereas a fifth of the versions of CG are from Scotland and none from Donegal. This may partly be explained by the MS distribution: one of the early MSS of CG was written in Scotland, one (probably) in Ulster, and nearly all the other MSS are from Munster or Dublin. Against this, nearly half the MSS of CRI are certainly Northern, but there are none from Scotland. However, it is probable that oral versions could be found, or could have been found a hundred years ago, of each story, in the area from which I have none. This is demonstrable for CRI in Scotland. To begin with, there was a MS in Mull before 1700, when Beaton told Lhuyd that he had had the story in his library, but had since lost it. Moreover names from CRI appear in Scottish versions of other tales. Cod, Cead and Míchead are in one of Campbell's versions of CG. Curaire Camchosach, their druid, replaces Dúnadhach in the modern Barra version of CG, and appears in a version of ECM.[1] A reminiscence of the story was taken down by Campbell from Mór Fletcher in Mull: "Cead as Còid as Michead were three sons of the king of Morven". (She has just explained that Ioruaidh means Morvern.) "They built a ship. Cead said (a verse). Còid said (a verse). Then Michead said (a verse). Dewar wrote all these. Trog am Troga were the last words".[2] Probably more of the story could have

1. JFC III p. 260 - 261; IFC 1031 p. 7 ; SSS RL 990.

2. JFC MS XVI, p. 129 (174). The first poem in CRI has three verses, and the last word is tógbháil.

been collected from her or one of her neighbours. Set this evidence against the fact that half the Donegal versions of CRI are from the one village of Rann na Féirste, and it is clear that chance has played a large part in the distribution of oral versions.

CRI is a much worse constructed story than CG. In CG everything follows logically, though not inevitably, from Macaomh Mór's abduction of Eithne and the invasion of the Empire by the Turks. At the beginning of CRI Feithlinn puts Cod under geasa to find her. He sets out with his brothers in search of her, and has some magic adventures; then they free Feithlinn's sister from a giant, and she explains, not very clearly, that it was Feithlinn who appeared as a cat and an otter in their previous adventures. Then, however, the story goes off on another tack: they are attacked by Macaomh Mór, who has a blood-feud with their father. He escapes alive, and they go home for reinforcements to make war on him. In the battle which follows, Cod's brothers are killed. This is all to the good, for as they are not his rivals, or later his rescuers, like brothers in most international tales, they are more hindrance than help to the plot. The next part of the story is mostly concerned with Cod's search for a balsam to resurrect them. Finally Feithlinn herself, no doubt feeling neglected, comes and gives him the balsam; he sleeps with her to release her from her spells, and promptly deserts her in order to disenchant two other people whom he had met on his travels. Finally he has to fight a campaign to save his brothers who are imprisoned by the

daughter of the king of Asia, and incidentally is elected to the kingship of the world. The opening of a delightful English version from Donegal puts the construction of the story in a nutshell: "The Norway people are great people for ramblin'". It is not surprising if in oral versions the story often consists of only two or three episodes of the original, and the connections between them are obscure or newly invented.

As usual the opening is liable to be changed, though it is a fairly conventional episode as it stands and has been borrowed without change by many versions of Loinnir mac Leabhair. Feithlinn lands from a boat, asks who Cod and his brothers are, steps back into the boat, and while pushing off bespells Cod to find her: this both ensures that he cannot pursue her at once, and that the geasa are imposed over water, which, as is stressed in oral versions of this story and TS, makes them more effective. The fact that the woman takes the initiative is typical of Irish literary tales. In oral versions, however, it tends to be played down: In a Connemara version, for instance,[1] Cod finds her asleep in a boat and takes her aboard his own ship; when she wakes she insists that he should put her back and search for her later. In most of the Kerry versions the episode has been assimilated to the most common oral motif where a woman imposes geasa;[2] a hag, or the heroine, or the heroine in the form of a hag,

1. From Séán Ó Briain, LML p. 120.

2. A few of many examples are listed in OS&C under AT 556B

invites Cod to play cards (or hurling) with her and imposes her geasa by way of a prize when she wins. This is an old motif, found in EAC and parallelled in the Old Irish Tochmarc Étaíne, though in those texts the game is of course not cards but fidchell. In the typical Kerry type of CRI the quest imposed on Cod is not for the woman herself, but for the Ring of Youth, Fáinne na hÓige, which seems to replace the balsam of the original. Similarly a Donegal version opens with Cod's stepmother sending him directly for the balsam.[1] The latter is parallelled in a common Irish variant of AT 590, interwoven with AT 551: see for example Curtin, Folk-Tales p. 1, where it is introduced with a native Irish motif.

The early episodes of the MS story draw extensively upon the Old Irish Immrama, as noted above: they are bound into the story, however, by making the cat which is the sole inhabitant of an island a transformation of Feithlinn herself, and having the rider in the sea pull the heroes about behind his horse until he is driven away by Feithlinn in her transformation as a venomous otter. These, together with the rescue of Feithlinn's sister from a giant, and the encounter with Macaomh Mór, who apparently lifts their boat up to the mast-head of his own with a grappling hook,[2] are the main incidents of the

1. S. MacManus, Donegal Fairy Stories (London 1902) p. 177.

2. The word used is corrán, which usually means a sickle, but may have preceded crúca in the sense of a large hook. The boat is not clearly stated in the MSS printed by Hyde to have been hoisted up the mast; this is what oral versions state, and seems implied, since it was hoisted out of the sea and fell back when the mast of the big ship was cut.

first part of the story. All four occur in Pádraig 'ac Aodhain's version from Mayo[1]; three in a Cork version[2]; and two or one in all the Donegal versions and Seán Ó Briain's one from Connemara. These eleven versions may be considered as a group of those which follow the MS reasonably closely. The Donegal versions at least show an understanding of the significance of Feithlinn's enchantment: they make her, when in the form of a cat, come to Cod's bedside in her castle and try to join him, but he kicks her away. This is not necessarily an example of something handed down from a literary oral tradition as old as the MS: it could be an improvement by folk-tellers, who prefer a concrete action like this to the mere statement that the cat could be disenchanted by a night with Cod, as in the MS.

Of these four incidents, the meeting with Feithlinn's sister is the most important to the plot, for she explains Feithlinn's enchantments. The majority of these ten versions, however, omit it, for it is not a particularly striking incident: women rescued from giants are decidedly commonplace in tales of this sort, and she is not even the heroine. The explanation of Feithlinn's transformations is therefore either given by Feithlinn herself at the beginning - which makes Cod's failure to recognise her as a cat rather strange - or left out. Pádraig 'ac Aodhain's version combines the sister's abductor with Macaomh Mór, who

1. Béal. XII p. 106.
2. Curtin, Folk-Tales p. 93.

escapes by magic as in the MS, and makes her prison a grianán, which Cod reaches by a rope.

The battle in which Cod's brothers are killed is an essential part of the story, and is always included. The way in which the battle begins, with the treacherous sons of the king of Orkney enticing Cod's men to shore and killing them, is better preserved in Munster versions than in most Donegal ones, though in Munster this is often the first adventure of the heroes and it is seldom very clear why the battle has to be fought. The druid Curaire Camchosach appears just before the battle and dies, throwing himself into the grave of Cod's brothers, just after: it is hardly surprising that only four versions, all among the ten close ones, bother to mention him. Nevertheless the name has passed into the oral stock as a name for a druid or messenger.

The story continues with Cod's encounter with the hag Bé Thuinne, whose name can be recognised in some versions. Most versions outside the Kerry oecotype include this: she is of importance to the plot, for she tells him of the balsam which would resurrect his brothers, but which has been stolen from her. The detail of the meeting which is most often remembered is the transformation of her fifty companions - in oral versions usually twelve - from hags into beautiful women. Cod's disgust at the hags and delight at the maidens is exploited in versions from Leath Cuinn, which make a comic incident out of one which was perfectly serious in the original. The motif has been borrowed into other stories, for instance the Donegal versions of DGP (KL).

The following episodes of the story are more clearly unified by the theme of Cod's search for the balsam in oral versions than they are in the MS, and as with CG, the story tends to be brought to an end at the logical stopping-place, where Cod's brothers are resurrected and Feithlinn disenchanted. In the Kerry oecotype the Ring of Youth has replaced the balsam, but the quest theme is the same. Most of the closer versions include the giants whom Cod overcomes first; the beautiful incident of the girl in the lake whittling a stick, whose shavings turn into birds and fly up through the water, is preserved by seven of them. It tends to be rationalised: the house under the water becomes a house on an island, the birds usually fly up the chimney, and some versions give this decorative motif a sadly practical turn: the girl's lover Ciabhán has been enchanted, as in the MS, in the form of a hawk, and she is making the birds for him to catch and eat!

The most memorable part of Cod's rather confused adventures in the Forest of Wonders, which follow, is obviously the first: the encounter with the headless corpse of Iollann Órarmach, which retains enough life and self-respect to give Cod a kick when he tries to steal its shoe, and tells how Iollann was killed by the wiles of a fairy harper, who set him and his companions to behead one another. At least eleven versions include the kick from the corpse, though not always the explanation of how it was killed: three others include only Cod's own encounter with the harper after a warning to beware of him.

Both parts of the incident are found in other oral tales. The rest of the adventures in the forest tend to be reduced to the fight with a bull, which is parallelled in the better-known ECM, and even this only occurs in nine versions, including some of the Kerry oecotype.[1] The details of the fight are nothing like the MS in Kerry versions, where the bull sticks its horn into a tree and is thus easily despatched: the account must be borrowed from another source, but the presence of the tree may owe something to a memory of Bile na mBuadh, the tree of magic qualities, which is mentioned by name in some Connacht versions, in Mayo in the form Bile na mBuan, the tree of the ever-living, presumably by association with the balsam theme.

The disenchantment of Feithlinn, as I have said, is the obvious point at which to end the story, and in fact nearly all oral versions, except the Kerry type where she does not appear, do end the story with her disenchantment: but as there is never any very good reason for it to take place at one point in the story rather than another, eight versions from Leath Cuinn include the episode which follows it in the MS, the freeing of Ciabhán from his enchantment

1. The bull-fight is presumably derived from the paragraph of the MS where Cod wounds a damh: Hyde translates this as "ox", which is a possible interpretation and could lead to the bull (tarbh) of oral versions, but as one MS reads damh... allata the original meaning may have been "stag".

as a hawk, before Feithlinn appears and announces that she is restored to her own form. Only 'ac Aodhain's version retains the MS sequence of events. One Donegal teller has not surprisingly confused the two disenchantments, which follow each other immediately in other Donegal versions, and the bird turns into Feithlinn herself. As in the other four Donegal versions which include the episode, the details are taken from another motif whose source I cannot identify: Ciabhán is in the form of a pigeon, and the means of disenchantment are three grains of corn from a well at the world's end.

The only other episode of the story which has survived in more than one or two versions is the inconsequential paragraph in which Cod is given a sword by the Smith of Hell: this is preserved in some form in several of the Kerry versions, perhaps because of its resemblance to a motif well-known in versions of AT 300/303. Some Northern versions include further stylised battles and motifs such as <u>teach na n-amhus</u>, but only in 'ac Aodhain's version do they have any recognisable relationship to the MS. This, and the other version printed in <u>Béaloideas</u>, from W. Kerry but not much like the local oecotype, preserve the final episode where Cod rescues his imprisoned brothers. In both these versions the enchanted city surrounded by a fiery stream has been assimilated to the traditional revolving castle; 'ac Aodhain keeps the magic stone which in the MS dries up the fiery stream, but uses it to kill the King of the World. Elsewhere the story ends with the

appearance of Feithlinn, the resurrection of all the characters who need to be resurrected, and marriages all round. One version provides a convincing explanation of Feithlinn's eventual appearance: Cod has been on his search for her three years, and a three-year search by a king's son was one of the ways laid down for her to be freed. In Connacht the disenchantment seems to be a result of the destruction of Bile na mBuan.

It may be worth noticing the way in which the names in this part of the story have been changed by oral tradition. The name of Iollann Órarmach is too like other well-known characters, Iollann Airmdhearg in EIA and Amhus Órarmach in CG, and never appears. In some versions he is called Bútais Óir, from his golden boot which Cod tries to steal. However, there are two other principal characters in the latter part of the MS story: Ciabhán Glún-gheal mac ríogh na hÉanlaithe, who is enchanted in the form of a bird, and Buinne Borb-thréan. Now the latter has no part to play in most oral versions; so his name is available for another character. The result is that in Mayo versions the man with the gold boot is "Buinne Borb", and in 'ac Aodhain's version, which preserves the original role of Buinne, the two characters are combined. In Donegal, however, the two available names are differently distributed between the two surviving characters, with the result that the name of Ciabhán (Cliamhain) may be given to the character who in the MS is Iollann, and that of Buinne (Buille, Bile) to the original Ciabhán! Cod himself may be replaced by one of his brothers, Cead or Mí-chead, as the hero.

The Kerry oecotype is different from beginning to end. It may include in the middle the encounter with Iollann, (a corpse on a magic hill), the fight with a bull, and the sword given by the Smith of Hell, as well as stock episodes such as Ridire gan Ghâire: but the basis is a simple pursuit formula from one giant to another. The giants' names are standard ones which appear in other formula tales: Liam Buidhe na Sisile, Hamraoí Drom-leathan, Rudaire na Spannlaí (Yellow Bill of Sicily, Broad-backed Harry, Sir Longshanks). Finally Cod reaches the hag who bespelled him at first, and with the help of her daughter kills her and obtains the Ring of Youth, which is contained like the external soul of international tales in an egg in a duck inside a ram, and so forth. The hag's daughter usually proves to be hostile and is killed also. Then the ring is used to resurrect Cod's brothers, and for lack of a heroine the story ends here, though in some versions another princess appears who marries Cod. Thie oecotype looks like a combination of CRI with some pre-existing native tale. It is widely enough known to have influenced a W. Cork version.

Eachtra Iollainn Airmdheirg

Eachtra Iollainn Airmdheirg is a difficult story to study, because of its close relationship with AT 301: versions of each story are liable to be catalogued as the other. What the author of EIA has borrowed from the

international tale is in effect no more than a single motif-complex, but it is of central importance to the story: Iollann descends to the underground kingdom in a basket lowered down a cliff, after his brothers have given up the descent in terror, and later comes back with a princess and treasures. When the latter have been brought up in the basket by the brothers, they leave Iollann marooned underground. The other details of the two stories are quite different, though the incident at the end where the hero takes service with a fuller in his father's capital seems to be imitated from the part of the international tale where the hero takes service with a smith: it has a good deal more point in the international tale, where the hero is usually a commoner who needs to be recognised by the princess whom he has rescued, than in EIA, where he is at his own father's court.

Prof. Christiansen's statement that versions of EIA, have largely replaced AT 301 in Ireland[1] was a first impression which he would certainly now admit to have been false. On the other hand, 23[2] of the 198 versions of AT 301A and 301B listed in OS&C are known to me to be clear versions of EIA, and there must be more such among the 198. The true proportion is probably something like two versions of AT 301 to each one of EIA. In addition there are many related stories which cannot certainly be assigned to one

1. Béal. VIII p. 97 - 8.

2. 17 excluding duplicates from the same teller not noted as such.

type or the other. I have seen some 19 of these, mostly catalogued as EIA in the IFC card-index; five of them also appear as AT 301 in OS&C.

The connection between EIA and these related stories is usually only the opening motif: a mysterious stranger, who in the MS later turns out to be Macaomh Mór, attacks the king of Greece and knocks out one (two, three) of his teeth. The king's sons go in pursuit of the stranger and recover the tooth, which in folk versions is often put back into the king's mouth and grows there: but Iollann's treacherous brothers are sometimes made to put in a horse's tooth, as Iollann has remained underground with the real one, so that the king is in agony until Iollann returns. In the MS there is also another stolen object to be recovered, sometimes as in Moath MSS a horn (corn), sometimes what is spelt corrán in Munster MSS, probably the crown (coróin) rather than a sickle. In oral versions of EIA the horn appears three times, the crown twice, and corrán once: the last is from Mayo, and the horn and crown appear in a Scottish and a Mayo version respectively as well as Munster ones, so it seems unlikely that the variation is based on a difference between Northern and Southern MSS. But usually only the teeth are remembered.

The motif of the pursuit of the king's teeth is used to introduce and unify many tales. One of them, Cú mac an Ghabha, is a Connacht adaptation of EIA which reduces it to a formula of pursuit from one giant to another, just as CG is treated in the Cathal tale and CRI in the Kerry type, though it also includes the stock motif of the Everlasting Fight, and sometimes elements from AT 400. There are

similar compilations to be found in all areas, including one from Kerry and one from Scotland where the injured king is Fionn mac Cumhaill.[1] A popular combination of motifs from international types, Éan an Cheóil Bhinn, mostly found in Kerry, uses the pursuit of the magic bird and the helpful horse of AT 531, the underground setting of AT 301, and the hiding contest of AT 329: but it also may open with the theft of the king's tooth (and eye) by the magic bird itself. Here the motif has presumably been brought in along with the underground setting: though the fact that a magic horse features in EIA may have made it particularly liable to confusion with stories of the helpful horse. I have not found any versions of AT 301 which open with the tooth-motif and borrow nothing else from EIA. There are, on the other hand, 7 versions of EIA which do not open with the tooth-motif.[2] They quite logically make the action follow from the theft of Iollann's betrothed, as in the eighteenth century oral version in Eg. 171; in the older MS version the heroine is in love with Iollann although she has never seen him, and Macaomh Mór, who has carried her off, is jealous of him and hence attacks his father. This complicated piece of motivation is seldom accurately reported in oral versions.

1. Waifs & Strays, IV. p. 239; IFC 24 p. 424.

2. Those in print are LSIC p. 27 = Béal V p. 189; M. Ó Tiománaidhe, An Lampa Draoidheachta p. 90; JEC III p. 9, where the opening is AT 301 but the sequel is largely derived from EIA.

The majority of oral versions, however, have some reminiscence of the heroine's sister, who in the MS reveals all this to Iollann. Often she is no more than the helpful old woman of many international tales, but some versions retain her warm greeting to Iollann rather than his brothers, and the name of the magic basket, Cliabhán Cuir, in which he is let down the cliff. In what follows, the fight with the giant is usually assimilated to one of the conventional patterns such as the end of AT 302, and only a few versions follow the elaborate and repetitive account of the MS at all closely; though one detail of this part of the story, the shaking of a chain to command silence in a hall, has become something of a commonplace in Gaelic hero-tales. (It also becomes a signal for battle, as in JFC III p.12.) The main difference in this part of the story from AT 301 is that only one giant is fought and not three. The versions collected by Campbell where an island surrounded by a fire replaces the underground kingdom are interesting: possibly the aim is to dissimilate the Romantic tale from the international one, but is the ring of fire related to the early Norse motif associated with Sigurd and Brynhild or Frey and Gerd?

In the MS his brothers leave Iollann at the bottom of the cliff and apparently go off with the basket, for the friendly queen at the top of the cliff can do no more than drop a letter down to explain the situation. Oral versions generally borrow from versions of AT 301: he has a premonition of his brothers' treachery, and sends up a stone in the basket: half-way up they let go of the rope,

and the stone is smashed to pieces. In the international tale the hero usually reaches the upper earth on the back of an eagle: in EIA he uses a magic horse which belonged to Macaomh Mór, which leaps the chasm, and Macaomh Mór's wonderful basket (Cliabhán Aifrice) serves both to haul up the treasure and friends that he has meanwhile acquired, and as a boat in which they sail back to Greece. Before this, however, he has another adventure in the underground kingdom. He defeats and, in the manner of Conall Gulban, enlists in his service the son of the king of Lochlann, Breas Tinne.[1] Breas goes to find them a lodging for the night, and fights first a cat and then an aged warrior in a cave, but falls into a well of poison and loses his legs from the knee down. The last motif is obviously a borrowing from the lay of the Great Fool. Iollann discovers from the aged warrior and his companions that the only cure for Breas is a magic well in an island guarded by Amazons. They defeat the Amazons, cure Breas and rejuvenate the old man, and go on to kill the invulnerable Gruagach of the Tents whose wife Breas loves: Iollann manages this by crushing his hand and taking his own sword to behead him.

Seventeen oral versions have either the escape on horseback or the cure of the legless helper, seven of them both. Some of these, and many others, also include well-known motifs at this point. The Everlasting Fight is common, and can be easily explained as a substitution for the healing

1. This is a typical Lochlann combination of names, and so probably the original form: Northern MSS call him Brat Uaine, Eg. 171 Gruagach na mBeirribh.

well. In Connemara the Ridire gan Ghâire motif is sometimes found, possibly because it resembles the rejuvenation of the old man in the island where he was first enchanted; more common there, and less easy to explain, is a fight with a dragon, usually with the hero mounted on the magic horse. Other versions go on to the hiding contest of AT 329, as in the related tale noticed above.

The final episode, where Iollann serves a fuller in Athens, and sends Macaomh Mór's treasures to the palace as if from his master to prepare for his own appearance, can be recognised in fourteen versions from all areas, though the fuller may be replaced by a weaver, a miller or a smith. In a few other versions Iollann is identified because he brings his father's teeth, or is recognised without more ado as in Eg. 171. The commonest alternative, however, is the King Horn motif (H. 94. 4) where the hero appears at the princess' wedding - here, to his eldest brother - dressed as a beggar, and drops a ring in her cup by which she recognises him. This is popular in other Irish folktales such as Loinnir mac Leabhair, and is fairly like the end of EIA in the MS, where Iollann appears at the wedding in the dress of skins which he assumed when serving as a fuller, and, as in some folktales which do not follow the King Horn motif exactly but may imitate EIA,[1] takes all the food and

1. Cf. the last episode of DGP, above p.99.

drink for himself and his companions and attacks the bridegroom when the latter comes to remonstrate.

Few folk versions make Iollann plead for the life of his brothers as in Eg. 171: usually they are killed as in the other MSS, or at least degraded. The majority of versions from all areas include here a motif which is also common in other Gaelic folktales where the hero has weak or treacherous brothers, but is perhaps most closely associated with EIA. The princess gives a magic ring or girdle to Iollann's mother: at a word of command from the princess it tightens, and the queen is forced to confess that her two eldest sons were fathered by menials in the king's household, and only Iollann, the youngest, is the king's true son and rightful heir. The motif resembles the chastity tests of mediaeval romance, and may be of literary origin: but there is no basis for it in the MSS of EIA which have been edited.

This motif appears in a Scottish version of CG and in two Kerry tales where the hero's name at least is from CRI. Before leaving the three very popular tales which we have been considering, it may be worth noticing some other cases in which they borrow from each other in oral versions. As many as six versions of CG borrow the names of the hero's brothers from EIA: Artúr (Art) and Úr (Niúr, or Neart, to rhyme with Art).[1] Three are from Kerry, but the others are from Cork, Connemara and Mayo - it seems that the same

1. Originally of course imitated from King Arthur and his father Uther (in Irish Iubhar or Úr).

borrowing must have occurred to several tellers. Three of them are among the eight versions of CG which also borrow the motif of the knocking out of the king's teeth, (though without the subsequent pursuit) where Ridire an Ghaisge enters the story. A Mayo version of CG borrows the name of Cliabhán Aifrice for a magic ship, though despite the name it is not originally a basket as in EIA, but is made out of an old shirt! The names of Cod and his brothers and of Curaire Camchosach have been borrowed from CRI by Scottish versions of CG, those of Curaire Camchosach and Ciabhán Glún-gheal by the Connemara oecotype. A Cork version of EIA calls the hero "Conall Giolabunach".

More striking than these borrowings of names are the two Kerry tales mentioned above, which begin with Cod and his brothers but use motifs from all three tales. In one from Valentia Island[1] the opening is that of the Kerry oecotype of CRI, but the search for Fáinne na hÓige is replaced by motifs from CG: teach na n-amhus, the hurling game, the hero's sleep - here on board a ship, where his brothers throw him overboard, as in versions of Loinnir mac Leabhair. The end is as in oral versions of EIA. It is only fair to add that the teller admitted that his memory of the story was beginning to fail. But a longer tale whose teller learnt it from his mother in Cahirciveen, near Valentia[2] is similarly constructed. Again the opening conforms

1. IFC 239 p. 125.
2. IFC 771 p. 431.

to the Kerry type of CRI: but the heroine is found in a castle, whose walls Cod has to leap like Conall in Kerry versions of CG. She is asleep and has to be thrown up and down to wake her, again like Conall. Cod then goes off on a number of adventures in order to release her from her spells. He defeats and enlists her two brothers, again an imitation of CG: but the following battles are not exactly like anything in the Romantic tales. Presently, however, Cod is given a key to take the spells off the heroine, uses it to unlock a stone which is now where her castle stood, and finds himself in an underground kingdom; the plot continues with the Irish version of AT 329 with a helpful horse, and ends with Cod as a tailor's apprentice, following the pattern of Iollann as a fuller's apprentice, and the oral motif from the end of EIA where the queen has to admit that his brothers are illegitimate. Such mixtures of motifs are common enough among Irish folktales: but it is significant that the tales of literary origin drawn on are here - as in Loinnir mac Leabhair - the three that are best-known of their type.

The "Three Sorrows"

The only story, outside the Fenian tales, which can compare with these three for popularity is Oidheadh Chloinne Uisneach, and in fact the comparison is misleading. OCU has been more thoroughly sought out and indexed in IFC than the other three: and a dozen of the 35 versions which

I have seen are short summaries in Irish or English which could derive, say, from Keating. This includes three of the four versions from Munster. In fact nearly all the good versions seem to come from Connacht, with the exception of three (out of five) from Donegal and the one collected by Carmichael in Barra.[1] As I have not had time to study these in detail, there is no more to be said, except that as with other Ulster tales the oral versions clearly follow the late MSS, which include more magic, rather than the Old Irish Longes mac nUislenn.[2] It seems that Connacht versions concentrate on Deirdre, who is often made the daughter of Manannán as in ECM, whereas in Ulster the character whose name is remembered, and to whom most sympathy is given, is Naoise.

Of the other "Sorrows", Oidheadh Chloinne Tuireann is only known to me in two versions, and those may derive from printed texts such as that in the Gaelic Journal. Oidheadh Chloinne Lir has a similar distribution to that of OCU: the majority of the versions indexed in IFC are short English summaries collected by schoolteachers, and there are none from Munster. The story is particularly well remembered in N.W. Mayo, where the ending is set: not only short versions in the form of a local anecdote, telling how the

1. Alexander Carmichael, Deirdire (Edinburgh 1905).

2. They generally give a brief account of Deirdre's birth and elopement with Naoise, which are not mentioned in the original form of the later tale: but many eighteenth-century MSS add Keating's account of these, which may be the source in Irish versions.

heroes came to be buried in Inishglora, but longer ones have survived there. One of them, like the version summarised by Campbell in S. Uist, contains verses. The poems in the story are in fact the most interesting part of it, and it is not particularly surprising if versions without them have little capacity for survival.

Fenian Tales

It is impossible to deal fully here with the Fenian tales: ECM has been dismissed with a mere sketch of its development because of the mass of material, and An Bhruidhean Chaorthuinn will have to be ignored almost entirely because it would be six months' work to sort out versions of the story itself from versions of the motif alone indexed in IFC, and examine them. Some printed versions will be referred to at the end of the chapter. Three other Fenian tales (MRE, GD, EBD) are seldom found in oral versions except English ones printed by Curtin and Kennedy which seem to be almost word-for-word retellings of the MS. Cath Fionntrágha is particularly popular in Connemara in a fairly standardised short form, similar to that of OCU found in the same region: I have not studied it in detail, but there seems to be little in the way of new material added to the story, except perhaps the curious detail that Conán could kill an army by looking at them between his fingers, which occurs elsewhere.[1]

1. See p. 244.

The Fenian tales which can best be studied in oral versions are Tóraigheacht Dhiarmada agus Ghráinne and Tóraigheacht Shaidhbhe. TDG is one of the most popular Romantic tales in folk tradition, though like OCU and OCL it is often found as little more than a summary. Though the author is thought, from his knowledge of local place-names, to have been a Kerryman, or at least a Munsterman,[1] there are few versions from Kerry known to me: in this it again resembles OCU and OCL. Possibly these tales were known in Kerry from MSS, but were thought too literary for folk tellers to attempt unless they learned them by heart, as Seán Ó Conaill did. A story such as CG or CRI which consists mainly of magic and fighting, with little attempt at realistic characterisation, is obviously easier to assimilate to the international tales which form the greater part of most tellers' repertory than the saga-like plot of TDG.

Stories about Diarmaid and Gráinne have been in existence in one form or another since the Old Irish period, as the tale-lists and some extant fragments show. Consequently details of the story have survived in oral tradition which are contradicted or omitted by the fifteenth- or sixteenth-century written romance. Most oral versions follow the outline of the latter but add a few of these more fanciful traditional details. Scottish versions, however, follow the prose text, which does not appear in Scottish MSS,

1. Flower, Catalogue II p. 387.

little if at all, and include possibly ancient motifs which do not appear in Ireland: Gráinne's unfaithfulness to Diarmaid with the "Giuthach", and the recognition of shavings in a stream as Diarmaid's work.[1] Another detail appears in a Scottish Gaelic ballad in the sixteenth-century Book of the Dean of Lismore, in all Scottish oral versions and a minority of Irish ones, mostly from Co. Cork:[2] Diarmaid's death from a bristle on the boar's back which he is measuring with his feet. Most Irish versions follow the prose MS, where he is killed after riding on the boar's back: he falls off and is gored to death, but kills it with the hilt of his broken sword. On the other hand half of the Irish versions, including two from Cork, one from Connemara and all seven from Donegal, but no Scottish ones, add the anecdote of how the lovers deceived Fionn in spite of his thumb of knowledge by sleeping on a bag of sand on the moors and on a bag of heather on the beach. Otherwise Irish versions tend to follow the MS account fairly closely, though naturally with omissions: all the main episodes of the written story are reproduced in at least one oral version each, except for the killing of the Searbhán Lochlannach - just another giant-killing, complicated by the fact that he is Diarmaid's host - and the final scene

1. The latter is parallelled in Middle Irish Fenian lore: see D. Finn III p. lviii.

2. The ballad does not seem to have existed in Ireland. This suggests that the frequent resemblances between Scottish and Cork versions of tales may be due, not only to a greater respect for MS tradition in both areas, but to a greater respect for all ancient tradition, including that orally preserved.

where Gráinne calls her sons to avenge their father, which has dropped out in many, if not most, of the MSS.

As well as the ballads, there are local onomastic traditions about the couple. Any dolmen in Ireland is liable to be called the bed of Diarmaid and Gráinne. In Scotland Macpherson's localisation of the Fenians on his own side of the Irish channel had some basis in the oral tradition of his time, and Diarmaid was claimed as an ancestor by the Campbells. For reasons such as these nearly all the oral versions of TDG are wholly or partly localised in the teller's own area: Sutherland, Lorne, Donegal, Cork, or with more justification Galway and Kerry. Diarmaid's death is often correctly associated with the name of Beann Gulban (Ben Bulben) or with an unnamed hill in the correct area: so that a Connacht version places it in Ulster and an Ulster version in Connacht, since it is on the border of the two provinces. Sometimes, however, the scene is set on another mountain: Ben Loyal in Sutherland, Mangerton in Kerry, or for onomastic reasons, at Kanturk (Ceann Tuirc, Boar's Head) in Co. Cork. The wood Doire Dá Bhoth where the lovers first hide is also usually placed by the oral versions which mention it somewhere near Clanricarde, where the MS locates it: Kerry versions set the incident in Co. Clare and, in a more devolved account, Co. Limerick, and Galway versions (wrongly) in N. Leinster and (rightly) on the Galway-Clare border. The two versions which make this last identification give the present name of the wood, "Chevy Chase", and may preserve a genuine tradition of its

exact location.[1] There are also two versions of a story from Co. Cork which is almost entirely onomastic, apart from mentioning the sand and heather trick and the splash of water up Gráinne's leg which was "more plucky than Diarmaid". They tell how four mountains in Co. Cork were named from incidents on the lovers' flight. One of these is Douce, and the story may have become associated with Diarmaid and Gráinne because in the MS Diarmaid is given triucha céud Beinne Damhais, the cantred of Douce Mountain, though as glossed in the MS printed by O'Grady (.i.Dubhcharn a Laighnibh) it seems to refer to the other Douce in Co. Wicklow. Possibly the Cork tradition is old enough to have led the author of the MS to bring in the name, and the gloss is late and wrong.

The most interesting feature of the oral development of TDG is the way in which many tellers do their utmost to stress that the lovers, or at least Diarmaid, was in no way to blame. The long Cork version printed in Gadelica, p. 83 ff., is the best example, but many other versions state, for instance, that Diarmaid had a love spot (ball searc) and Gráinne only fell in love with him because she saw it.

1. One version is from near by, but the other, though fairly similar, was collected fifty miles away at the north end of L. Corrib. Chevy Chase is hardly in the centre (ceartlár) of Clanricarde, where the MS places Doire Dá Bhoth, but it is about mid-way across from East to West, as the lovers were fleeing.

This appears in versions from Scotland, Galway and Cork, and some narrators take pains to explain how Gráinne alone saw the spot. In Scotland it is covered with a helmet or cap, which Diarmaid raises by accident while preventing a dog-fight, or when he thinks nobody is watching. In Gadelica, however, he is not to blame either, and an ingenious explanation is concocted. The basis of this is a detail of the version of TS told by the same teller, Amhlaoibh Ó Loingsigh. In the MS the wives of the Fenians go to bathe in the sea, and on the way pass an Fhéile .i. áit (later MSS: an sruth...) inar báthadh Féile inghean Luigheach. The onomastic anecdote of the MS becomes an actual incident in the folktale, and it is told how, as the women were bathing, Féile Ní Ghuaire was drowned.[1] This little episode was transferred by the teller to TDG, probably deliberately, for he admitted to Gertrude Schoepperle that he had "considerably elaborated" upon the several oral sources which he used for the tale, though later, writing to Joseph Lloyd, he denied this. In the new setting the woman drowned is the heroine of the source-tale, Saidhbhín Óin Óin (Sadhbh inghín Eoghain Óig). Diarmaid comes, at the cry of the other women, and has to strip to fetch the body out of the water: thus Gráinne sees the love-spot on his breast.

1. Guaire, a king renowned in Irish tradition for his generosity, is an appropriate substitute for the father of Féile (Generosity).

Gráinne is thus exonerated: but Diarmaid is not to blame either, for usually, as in the MS, she puts him under geasa to elope with her.[1] A Scottish version makes him yield after the Potiphar's-wife threat that she will accuse him of trying to rape her, and another makes her overcome his unwillingness by fulfilling apparently unfulfillable conditions.[2] Moreover in the Gadelica version Diarmaid always sleeps on the opposite side of the glen from Gráinne, and pays no attention to her provocative remark when the puddle splashes her. He only once kisses her, because he wants her to wash his shirt! The kiss is required to explain the incident later in the story, when a chastity-test is borrowed wholesale from the Fenian Laoidh an Bhruit, and Gráinne gives the answer which in the lay is given by Oisín's wife: her only fault is that Diarmaid once stole a kiss from her.

Versions from Cork and Waterford also exonerate Fionn. He is not to blame, obviously, for pursuing the lovers, but usually he entices Diarmaid to hunt the boar and be killed by it as was prophesied, and it is his failure to give Diarmaid the drink from his hands which would cure him that finally causes the hero's death. Often, however, oral versions leave out the connection between the hunt and the rest of the story, and make Diarmaid join in the hunt by accident, or meet the boar on his own. This is the account followed by the Cork and Waterford versions, and in what follows Conán is made the scapegoat for Fionn's failure to

1. Some Donegal versions make him go with her willingly: and a Galway version even makes him deliberately show her his love spot.

2. See the discussion of this motif in K.H. Jackson, The International Popular Tale and Early Welsh Tradition (Cardiff 1961) p.108 - 9, and sources mentioned there.

cure Diarmaid: Conán (who does not play any significant part in the MS tale) acts as usual to encourage strife between his companions, and reminds Fionn each time as he is about to give Diarmaid the water how Diarmaid had injured him. In the Cork versions, where Diarmaid is killed by a venomous spine in the foot while measuring the boar, it is Conán - not Fionn as in the Scottish lays - who suggests that he should measure it both ways. In Gadelica Conán is punished when the chastity-test incident occurs, for his own wife proves unfaithful - another deliberate piece of editing by the teller, no doubt, though the incident is again borrowed, from the lay, and not invented.

Donegal versions, more faithful to the MS, spare neither Fionn nor Gráinne: they marry after Diarmaid's death, but lead a miserable life. In one version the Fenians desert Fionn because he is a bigamist: he marries Gráinne although he has already taken Cormac's other daughter, Ailbhe of the MS tradition, who is ignored by the author of TDG. The versions from Galway and Waterford which include the account of the origin of the boar, in which Aonghus an Bhrogha, Diarmaid's fairy foster-father in the MS, appears as his "schoolmaster", also mention at the end how Aonghus put a soul in his body so that he should be able to talk to him from time to time: in Waterford Diarmaid and the boy who was in the form of a boar are both sent home to their fathers to be ag fiannuigheacht to them by the fire until Doomsday.

Tóraigheacht Shaidhbhe is a much easier story to study, for there are fewer oral versions - though it is commoner than TDG in manuscript - and they all adhere fairly closely to the outline of the written story, without influence from ballads and local traditions. It is a simple story: Sadhbh, wife of Glas mac Aoinchearda Béarra, is carried off while the wives of the Fenians are bathing by Ciotach Cruadh-armach, king of Dreólainn; the Fenians go to Dreólainn, rescue Sadhbh and kill their opponents; Ciotach, who was away when they landed, pursues them to Ireland and nearly defeats them all, but is finally killed by Oscar.

Sadhbh herself is often represented as a mere servant, and her husband as another, perhaps because they do not appear normally in other oral Fenian tales. Fionn's first wife Maghnuis, who speaks for the other women in the story, is replaced by the better-known Gráinne in Amhlaoibh Ó Loingsigh's version, already mentioned: elsewhere she may be called "Mainléis" or "Mailse", but she is as often described as Sadhbh's mother or mother-in-law, or housekeeper to all the Fenians, as she is called Fionn's or Oscar's wife. Some part of her dialogue with Ciotach, at least where she puts geasa on him not to marry Sadhbh for a year, which is essential to the plot, is usually preserved. In one version she is made to play and win a game of cards with him before imposing her geasa, so closely have card games and geasa become associated in folktales.

Several passages of the story are easily turned into strings of words reminiscent of runs: for instance the list

of various kinds of swimming done by the women, the provisioning of the Fenians' ship, and the list of heroes who went on it. In one version from Mayo, the ship Breac-Pháirceach has to be repaired first, as in versions of CG. Two visits are paid to islands on the way to Dreólainn: these are reduced to one by nearly all versions, though a Kerry version turns the name of the king of the missing island, Toirceall an Trom-theaghlaigh, into the name of the villain, An Fairceallach Talmaidhe. No oral version follows the alternative version mentioned in MRE, where Gormshuileach, king of the other island, is killed by the Fenians instead of receiving them amicably and sending his son with them.[1]

The recapture of Sadhbh is in two stages: first she is twice taken from the bruidhean in which the enemy are feasting, twice she is recaptured by the enemy: the second time they take her to another stronghold, but Diarmaid rescues her and a battle follows in which the enemy are all killed. The first stage tends to be assimilated to the inevitable grianán: Sadhbh is found in a tower and stolen through the window, or brought down "ó step go step" from the top to the bottom, where she disappears and is found at the top once more. The latter version must be designed to make the incident more exciting: in another Galway version it is made more comic,

1. See Ch. II, p.88.

when Sadhbh is lifted each time from her abductor's knee and set down on her husband's, or vice versa.[1]

Two versions end after the utter defeat of the enemy, but all the Connacht versions but one introduce a character who does not appear in the MS. He is deduced from the conventional description in the MS which tells how the survivors of the battle ran to hide in distant valleys and holes in rocks and trees (i gcuasaibh cairgreacha 7 crann). Accordingly the Cork version makes the single survivor a swineherd (buicí muc) who has hidden i bpluais cairrge; he tells Ciotach what has happened (as the group of survivors do in the MS), and comes to Ireland in his boat. In Connacht versions there is a further complication: the survivor is a smith's apprentice (ughdar gaibhnín) who has hidden fantastically in his own bellows, or in a sheaf of thatch, and helps Ciotach to make an iron club before coming on with him. These versions also include an ingenious deduction from the facts of the MS: Ciotach was collecting tribute while the Fenians attacked his kingdom, and came straight on after them: so his ship is still full of gold when he is killed in Ireland, and the Fenians take it away in cartloads.

Ciotach, when he reaches Ireland, is helped on his way by the high king Cormac, who as usual is represented as hostile to his over-powerful subject Fionn: he comes to Allen, defeats the Fenians one by one and ties them up, until only Fionn and Oscar, who finally kills him, are left.

1. Perhaps this is not an intentional improvement, but merely results from the easy confusion of ar ghualainn, "beside", of the MS with ar ghlúin.

This convention of binding is normal in the Romantic tales, though it is never made clear how a warrior managed to carry about a supply of rope sufficient to tie up hundreds of men. In oral versions, the episode tends to be partly assimilated to the better-known Bruidhean Chaorthuinn motif. In Kerry Ciotach binds the Fenians with a handful of poisonous withes (dorn do ghadraí nimhe) and Fionn has to send for his seven-year-old son from the Eastern World - Oscar, Fionn's grandson, is very young in the MS - to kill him. The bound men are released when Ciotach's blood is applied to the withes. In the versions from the North of Co. Galway the part of BC which has been borrowed is the invitation to a feast. Fionn's stewart (maor) who is explicitly called Cormac in one version[1] is promised the kingship of Ireland by Ciotach if he will invite the Fenians to dinner: Ciotach stands inside the door and ties them up as they enter one by one, until Oscar becomes suspicious and makes Fionn use his power of divination to find what is happening to the men. In the fight which follows much is made of the difference in size between the two combatants: as usual the big man of the MS has become a fifteen-foot giant in oral versions.

Tóraigheacht Shaidhbhe is a good example of the sort of story which can survive in a fairly complete form in oral tradition, without losing its identity. Its plot is compact and logical, and only one episode is normally lost - the superfluous visit to an island where the details are all

1. This again is influenced by MRE, where Cormac pretends to be Fionn's steward to avoid having to fight the foreigner.

the same as those at the other island visited. At the same time there are enough memorable details to distinguish it from any other story about the abduction of somebody's wife; the abduction from a swimming-party, the island visit on the pursuit, the series of captures and recaptures, the pursuit back to Ireland by the main villain who makes prisoners of most of his opponents. Hence it is still recognisable when, as in the Kerry versions, the names of none of the characters except Fionn and Diarmaid, who might come into any Fenian tale, are preserved in their original form or anything like it; or one of the battles takes place on board ship; or an incident is assimilated to a stock motif. On the other hand it is not so interesting that it has become one of the most popular tales of its kind.

Less Popular Romantic Tales.

A few other stories which are known in one or two oral versions remain to be considered. The most difficult of these to deal with properly is Eachtra an Amadáin Mhóir (The Adventures of the Great Fool). There has been much speculative discussion of the relationship between this story, the related lay, the opening of the story of Perceval in Chrétien de Troyes and later writers, and folk-tales about the Great Fool. The arguments involved are well summarised in a review by Gerard Murphy in Studies XXXVII (1948) p. 368 of a thesis by Sheila J. McHugh, Sir Percyvelle: Its Irish Connections (Ann Arbor, 1946).

The relationship between prose tale and lay is obvious: the author, or an early scribe, of the prose tale has simply incorporated a prose version of the lay at the end. In the prose the hero is usually treated as a comic character; in the lay he is a simple but honourable man who refuses to break his word in circumstances which recall the Middle English Sir Gawain and the Green Knight. The lay does not fit in well with what has gone before, except that as required the Great Fool and a lady are in a wilderness together at the opening: and the story in all the surviving MSS ends abruptly at the end of the lay, without telling whether the hero got home, avenged his father, married the lady, or lived happily ever after. Either a scribe has edited the prose by adding the lay and then failed to include the end of the story, or this is the author's own work and his scheme has come down to us incomplete.

The opening of AM tells how the hero was brought up in the forest by foster-parents, because his brothers had been killed in an attempt to take the kingdom from King Arthur, and his father, who had been pardoned, feared that the boy's mother might urge him to take vengeance. This is actually the reverse of the story of Perceval, whose father had been crippled and his brothers killed in battle, and whose mother brought him up in the forest, far from other men, lest he should become a warrior and be killed in the same way. In point of time it is possible that Chrétien's or later versions of the story influenced AM, where after all the hero, like Perceval, soon finds

himself at Arthur's court. His adventures before that, however, are quite different, and probably derive from an Irish variant of the international tale about a strong simpleton, AT 650. The simpleton in this is often a widow's son, who like Perceval and the Great Fool does not recognise well-known objects, but, unlike similar characters in comic international tales, defeats his mockers by his superior strength. It is not impossible that the common source of the two literary variants is some Welsh or Irish literary development of the international tale. The opening of the eighteenth-century Eachtra Éuchtaigh is similar: the hero is the son of a murdered king living with his mother in the wilderness, and does not realise for years that his mother is dead, not asleep: he goes out to hunt secretly, because she has forbidden him to use his sword. This seems to be another variant of the same motif which has presumably arisen in oral tradition.

What matters here, however, is the relationship between the prose AM and the folktales of the Great Fool. There seems no reason to doubt that the Romantic tale is the origin of the folktales. The Kerry version collected by Curtin[1] ends with a re-telling of the lay, and has re-assimilated much of the introductory story to AT 650, as Murphy notes,[2] or to tales which derive from it, though keeping the hostility between the hero's father and the king, who in this version has killed him.

1. Hero-Tales p. 140.
2. Loc. cit.

All the other oral versions of anything other than the lay which I know are from Scotland. The only one that has been mentioned in earlier discussions of the subject is that printed by Campbell of Islay from S. Uist.[1] It is quite clearly a version of the first part of the prose tale: the main incidents are the same - his brothers (and father) are killed fighting against their uncle the king, his foster-mother (as in MS not his own mother) brings him up in hiding, he catches deer by running them down, he wounds (and kills) his foster-brother, he catches a horse and rides it to the palace, he is insulted by the king's son (in the MS, by Sir Gawain), kills him, and says he will be like the nurse's son,[2] and goes in his skin dress to make fools of the whole world, beginning by killing a giant (MS, knight) who is expected by the king to kill him. This version has no names in common with the MS, the only names characters being the foster-mother and her son, who are nameless in the MS; but the other Scottish versions preserve names from the literary tale, and it is difficult to doubt that this was known, probably in a written version, in Scotland.

Unfortunately Campbell made no notes of the version of the story which he heard from William Robertson at Tobermory in 1870: it was a very long story, with runs,

1. JFC III p. 160, Notice that the teller got the story from his mother, apparently, though the lay came from an Angus Macdonald from N. Uist.

2. Here the oral version keeps the words but misses the joke - in the MS the nurse's son recovered after six weeks in bed, but Gawain is dead.

and would have been better than any version we now have.[1] A fragment collected by Carmichael[2] shows that the MS tale was known in Scotland, for it gives a quite different part of the story from those so far mentioned. It tells how a king's son, enchanted as a monster whose shape kept changing, killed all those sent by his father to "Gleann-a-chait-chāothaich", until Amadan Mór came there and disenchanted him by spending three days and nights in his company. This is an episode of the MS confused and given a new motivation, though it fails to provide a reason for making the ballad, as its title, (an t-aobhar ma'n rinneadh Laoi an Amadain Mhóir) suggests, unless the monster is to be identified with the Gruagach of the ballad, who can indeed change his human shape. The original episode tells how the Great Fool met a huge cat among other monsters in Gleann an Chait Chaoich: he showed no fear of it, and it revealed itself to be Eochaidh Donnmharach, one of the exiled Tuatha Dé Danann, told him his own history, gave him presents, and entertained him for three days and nights before he continued his journey to Athens.

The only other version of the story known to me is a sort of attempt at a Gaelic novel by an unknown writer of about 1820, now National Library of Scotland Gaelic MS CXXIII.[3] In the manner of the day it is adorned with long

1. JFC MS XVI p. 143 (188).

2. JFC MS XVIII p. 278, from Donald Maclellan, S. Hacleit, Creagorry, Benbecula.

3. There is also an English translation in the same hand, NLS CXXIV. See Mackinnon p. 278 - 9, items 6 and 7.

philosophic and moralising reflections, and with descriptive purple passages more reminiscent of the re-translations of Macpherson's Ossian into Gaelic than of genuine Ossianic poetry. Its basis, however, must be a folktale, whose telling the author describes in the introduction to his English translation. He apparently chose to base his novel on this particular tale because of the saying..."gach laoidh gu laoidh an Amadain Mhóir", which is quoted on his title-page. The plot is difficult to follow, as it is partly carried on by quoting ballads which are not inserted in the rough text but only referred to - "Vide MS poetry"; or "as the original of this piece is to be found in Turner's Collection - it would be unnecessary to insert it here". The last seems to refer to the usual Lay of the Great Fool, though it is not easy to fit into the course of the story. The introduction is recognisably derived from that of the MS. Rígh an Fhearuinn Áluinn (Ridire an Fhearainn Áluinn of the MS) is forced to give up his title to his brother Rígh an Domhain Mhóir (a common title for Arthur in Irish tales). His son is sent away to the forest to save him from his uncle: there he kills his foster-brother by accident while hunting. The author makes his remorse for the killing his motive for leaving the forest. The folktale seems to have continued with his rescuing a woman from a giant[1] and attacking his uncle, who has imprisoned her husband. His uncle, however, persuades him to go on a dangerous

1. Cf. the last paragraph in JFC: but the giant also has a magic horse like the knight in the corresponding episode of the MS.

expedition, as in the MS: in a magic island he loses his legs, is cured, not as in the lay, but by a magic balsam, and returns to defeat his uncle. Most of the MS tale is lost, and some commonplace folk motifs have been added: the plot is made to turn more convincingly on the hero's enmity to Arthur, though this may be the work of the novelist rather than the folk teller. On the other hand, as the extant Irish MSS of AM seem to be incomplete, the story may indeed originally have ended as in this version, with the hero's discovery of his parentage, which rounds it off well.

Two other mentions of the story are known to me. Someone in S. Uist told Campbell that "the great fool was mac righ na foraise fiadhaiche".[1] This must be a garbled recollection of his upbringing in the forest - in the novel, uaimh na forais fiadhaich. Scéal an Amadáin Mhóir was in the repertoire of a Donegal teller, Séarlaí Mac Anna of Teilionn,[2] and has, I hope, been recorded, but I have not traced it. It might only be a version of the lay.

Tóraigheacht Gruaidhe Griansholus is a story which has only survived in one MS, TCD H.5.28 (1679), but has been collected in at least three oral versions. These are too like the MS in the plot and the names of characters to make

1. JFC MS XVIII p. 166, possibly from Hector Macleod.
2. Béal. XXVIII, p. 17.

it probable that we have to do with a Romantic tale based on a folktale. The preservation of the incident, mentioned by Miss O'Rahilly,[1] where in a folk version Cú Chulainn throws his only holly-spit at the giant, whereas in the MS the statement that he had only one spit is never followed up, need only mean that the source of the folk version was a MS which had this incident, though the surviving MS has lost it. Or indeed, the unused spit in the MS is just the sort of loose end which a folk teller might notice and proceed to tidy up, even if the author forgot about it in the slower process of writing. Evidently the oral versions have a common source, and could all derive from a single MS: thus they all rename one of the giants An Dragún Teinntidhe (The Fiery Dragon); they all include a comic episode at the beginning, where Cú Chulainn, instead of going mad with pique at being wounded by the giant without avenging himself, as in the MS, takes to his bed to die of wounded vanity; two of them also share a change in the order of the episodes and the throwing of the holly spit as mentioned above. In the third version the story is further from the MS. The legendary boat An Bhreac-Bháirc (the Speckled Barque) becomes the boat of the hen-wife (cailleach na gceare), and the invulnerable giant of the MS becomes the heartless giant of AT 302.

The most notable feature of these oral versions is their appreciation of the mocking attitude of the original author towards his hero Cú Chulainn, who is made a huge lumbering

1. ITS XXIV p. xviii.
2. IFC S1075 p. 214.

pompous creature with a boatload of mechanical aids to battle, more notable for his truly Quixotic chivalry than for any sign of intelligence. This accords well with the spirit of Irish folktale, and has been retained and extended in folk versions, which add such details as Cú Chulainn's attempt to die of pique and the explanation of his <u>torann-chleas</u> (thunder-feat) as the result of his jumping and landing on his two feet! The general outlines follow the MS closely, and the best version hardly omits an episode, including even such details as the cause of the giant's invulnerability - that he had been dipped, like Achilles, in the Styx: this is rendered as <u>uisge na draoid-heachta</u> (magic water). The episodes are however knit together rather more closely by making the three giants whom Cú Chulainn kills all brothers and all invulnerable, and, in one version, all abductors of the three daughters of the same king, two of whom represent characters from the MS.

<u>Eachtra an Mhadra Mhaoil</u>, though one of the most popular stories in MS, is only known to me in a single oral version from Co. Clare.[1] The collector, Tadhg Ó Murchú, mentions it elsewhere among tales told in S. Kerry in his youth. The Clare version deserves to be published if only for the fine vein of Irish English in which it was told: but it is also a good example of the conversion of an episodic Romantic

1. IFC 961 p. 135, from Michíl Breathnach, Dún Beag.

tale into a compact folktale.

As often happens in folk versions, the content of the in-tale of the MS is told first, because it happened first. As this resembles, and probably draws on, the well-known folktale of the werewolf,[1] it has been partially reassimilated to this in the folk version: the episode of the stolen child appears, though it has no relevance to the rest of EMM. On the other hand the teller does not follow the usual Irish version of the werewolf's tale, where the hero is turned into a wolf by his wife, but the version given in the MS, where his stepmother is the enchantress. He adds the incident where the wolf's ears and tail are cut off by the stepmother's sister, as in the MS, to give him his name Madra Maol (Earless Wolf), though the mutilation is not done with a knife as the wolf sleeps, but with an implausible device of a spear fixed over a door, which falls as he comes through.

The transition to the next episode is awkward. In the MS the wolf - or dog: the Irish word is ambiguous and seems here to be used of a creature which could be taken for either - appears under a tree by the well to which Sir Gawain (Balbhuaidh) comes to fetch a drink for his foster-father King Arthur, who has been bound, along with all his knights but the boy Gawain, by Ridire an Lóchrainn (the Knight of the Lantern). It is not explained why he is there. He wears a chain, not explicitly to attach him to the tree, but probably because in Irish literature an animal or bird wearing a chain is always an enchanted human. In the folk

1. See Appendix, p. 266 ff.

version it is assumed that he is tied to the tree with it, and the explanation is invented that he allowed himself to be tied up to watch the well by its owner. The well itself, a wonderful one in the MS (Tiobraid na mBuadh) becomes the conventional healing well, and it is explained that Arthur (a nameless king without followers) has been left for dead by "Ridire an Lochlainn", after having his jaw broken - no doubt an assimilation to EIA. Gawain (Saor Meala Mhuar - Sir Big Calves, or Big Buttocks?) is the king's son and goes to fetch the healing water. When the dog hears that the attacker was his stepmother's brother - not son as in the MS - he pulls up the tree by the roots until he can get his chain cut away in a forge: he is eager for vengeance: - "If I catches that bleddy man, well a bite he'll never agin ate, I'll cut him to ashes!"

The following half-dozen episodes of the MS are reduced to two, set in the West and East Indies respectively, perhaps representing the Western and Eastern Worlds of the Irish folktale. Gawain and the dog are directed there by the villain's deserted wife (who appears in the MS) by means of her magic power to know where he is (which does not). In this the folk version adds magic; in the episode which follows it takes it away, for instead of escaping out of the window in the form of a fly, the villain dodges Gawain on the landing as the latter rushes upstairs. The second time, however, they catch him "sparkin' with the king's daughter" in the East Indies, and take away the magic "Lochlann" which gives him his power. In the MS the lóchrann serves to heal wounds: here, apart from being assimilated to the name of

the country Lochlann,[1] it is explained as a "cover", which grows and perhaps serves as invulnerable armour, or as a cloak of darkness.

The rest of the story diverges from the MS. The dog is left on guard and found dead, but Ridire an Lochlainn is forced to raise him ("he ruz him"). This is probably a garbled memory of how in the MS the dog is stolen from Gawain by magic, but succeeds in escaping and captures the villain himself. Then Ridire an Lóchrainn is made to restore the dog to his human form. In the folk version this task is given to the stepmother herself who is caught at her children's wedding and forced to confess her crime with a magic belt, as in EIA. There is a long sequel of Gawain's further adventures, a picturesque mixture of Irish and international motifs, including the abduction of his bride by Macaomh Mór, but nothing which seems to resemble the lost episodes of EMM.

The only other Romantic tale of any importance which may be represented by oral versions is Eachtra Ridire na Leomhan. May be, because the one distinctive episode which RL certainly shares with oral tradition is an extremely common part of Irish tales, and is more likely to have been borrowed by this little-known seventeenth-century[2] MS tale than to

1. It seems strange that the word lóchrann should be misunderstood; possibly in this part of the country it died out when the old-fashioned dish-shaped lamps which the word originally indicated were replaced by paraffin lamps, which would be called lampa?

2. The giant in this episode of the MS tale comes from the West of America, which seems a seventeenth-century conception: so is the use of generál for an army commander, first English example 1576: the earliest MS is 1715. For indications of a Spanish or French origin see above, Ch. I p. 38.

derive from it. This is the Ridire gan Ghâire motif: the knight and his sons chase a magic hare or deer, which leads them to a giant's cave, where the giant and his sons kill the knight's sons and make him suffer various indignities before releasing him: years later, the hero arrives to discover the cause of the knight's misery, kills the giant's sons, and forces the giant to submit to the indignities he imposed on the knight, and to resurrect the knight's sons. The MS version sophisticates this a little: it gives the knight another name than the almost invariable folk Ridire gan Ghâire, and makes the cause of his telling his story that the hero's companions have themselves been decoyed away by the magic deer. He was accompanied by his twelve foster-brothers, not sons, who were killed by the giant with a golden apple: this occurs in oral versions, but more usually there is a gruesome competition where the two groups of sons put iron collars round their necks which are joined to each other by chains, and the giant's sons pull off the heads of the knight's sons. In the MS the knight is tied under the conventional ríogh-choinneal like Ridire an Ghaisge in CG, and made to yield his kingdom to the giant; oral versions usually again have more gruesome torments - he is made to eat his son's hearts, or, instead of being merely placed under the drippings of a candle, he has his eye knocked out and a lighted candle placed in the empty socket. In the MS the foster-brothers, like the hero's companions later, are turned to stone. This may be a trace of the motif in the original which has been replaced by the Irish one: perhaps something like the "Medusa-witch" final episode of AT 303.

Three folktales from W. Kerry are known to me which

seem to be versions of the whole of RL; all the MSS now surviving were written, and remained, in Dublin, but the story could possibly have been composed in Munster. The most striking coincidence is that the hero is called Séarlus, comes from France, and is miraculously cured by a mysterious helper - of idiocy in the MS, blindness in the folktale - who brings him up as a hero. The only other episodes which coincide with the MS are the Ridire gan Ghâire motif, (one of a number of tasks which the hero is set) and the abduction of the hero's wife. In the Blasket version the last is represented by a telling of nearly the whole of CG, from which indeed the MS borrows names in this part of the story, while the introduction has been influenced by AT 325. The other versions[1] make a simple quest-formula tale out of it. It is tempting to suggest that the Kerry folktale was the basis of RL, which was just worked up by the author by the addition of foreign names and battles with Saracens imitated from Continental romances. But the name Séarlus (Charles) is not a likely one for the hero of a folktale in the seventeenth century. The story probably spread from the MS, though only some strange accident could have brought it to Kerry.[2]

1. Béal. II p. 122, from Seán Michilín Grumail; IFC 411 p. 63, from Micí Groiméil. Possibly these are the same man.

2. I can see no grounds for the claim by Áine Ní Chróinín in her edition of RL that the story in MWHT I p. 228 is a version of RL. It includes the Ridire gan Ghâire motif and the hero is the son of the king of France: but both these features are commonplace in Gaelic folktales.

Types of Change Affecting Motifs

The first part of this chapter has been a consideration of individual tales, designed to show chiefly how an entire story may be told in various forms in different regions, how it may interact with the stock of folk motifs, and where possible how the telling has changed throughout the centuries. What follows is an attempt to outline the types of change which may affect any folktale or part of a folktale in individual versions, and deduce what the main factors may be which influence the development of stories in Gaelic oral tradition. This sort of study in the work of folklorists of the Finnish school seems too often to be little more than a by-product of comparisons whose main aim is to establish the original form and provenance of a story. In the case of most Romantic tales, as I hope I have shown, it is reasonable to assume that the standard manuscript form of the story is the archetype of the story as a whole, if not of its component motifs. Hence it is possible to compare folk versions with the MS and to deduce with some certainty how, if not why, they have changed.

Before considering the effects of oral transmission on a story as a whole, let us see what they may be upon single motifs. Aarne's list of the ways in which a story or part of it may change[1] is a possible starting-point. It is perhaps unnecessary to elaborate upon his first type of change, that a detail may be forgotten. Obviously this is always happening to the long and episodic Romantic tales,

1. FFC No. 13, p. 23 ff.

and many examples have been mentioned above. As Aarne says,[1] this applies especially to details which are not logically linked with the rest of the story in such a way that their absence will affect it (ein Umstand ... der mit der übrigen Erzählung nicht in festeren Zusammenhang steht, und dessen Wegbleiben deswegen keine anderen bemerkenswerteren Veränderungen zur Folge hat). The loose construction of most Romantic tales means that such details abound: thus when Conall in CG has won back his bride, there is no need for him to placate Macaomh Mór with a substitute wife, and as we have seen, most oral versions leave out this episode, without doing any harm to the story as a whole. Again, there is no need in the plot for Conall to spend his nights in the princess of Lochlann's grianán, or to kill the amhuis: all that the plot requires is that there should be some fighting at this point which Conall wins in the end, and as Kerry versions show, even that can be adequately replaced by Conall's victory in the hurling game.

Details may be added, or substituted for a detail of the original: these are usually details from another story. Such changes are most usual at the beginning and end of the story. These types of change mentioned by Aarne are the most interesting, and often the most puzzling alterations which can affect a folktale. Why and in what conditions they occur will be discussed at length later.

Tales may be strung together. Aarne, of course, had worked largely on the short animal tales which come first in his catalogue of tale-types; these are often composed of a

1. Op. cit. p. 28.

single motif each, and have the same heroes and villains, or victims, so that it is easy for several stories to be joined into one. With long hero-tales it is unusual to find two complete stories combined. On the other hand Gaelic storytellers are extremely fond of combining motifs from one tale, international or native, with motifs from another. From OS&C it seems that such combinations are as common in Ireland as the longer international types in their standard forms. There are also a few examples of hero-tales being combined when they have the same heroes. We have seen how stories of various episodes in the life of Cú Chulainn, from different literary sources, are strung together.[1] Stories about the Fenians have been strung together since the Acallamh and FTC: in later MSS, the episode of the Finding of Bran from the latter is used as an irrelevant introduction to TS, and two other short tales appear as sequels to ECM.[2] There are occasional examples of this in folktales: for instance, a version of TDG from Donegal is introduced with a short tale of how Fionn was enchanted by a girl who asked him to fetch a ring out of a loch.[3] There is a tenuous link between the two: Fionn has grey hair after his enchantment, and it is this which makes Gráinne refuse him. A local legend of a king betrayed in Ráth Mhorgáin by his wife is combined with a summary of the literary Táin Bó Flidais

1. Above, Ch. II, p. 71-73.
2. See p. 44 and p. 120 above.
3. Handbook p. 590 No. 2.

by storytellers in Mayo: whether the king in the legend was always called Domhnall Dualbhuidhe, or whether he was re-named after the father of the hero of the literary tale by some local seanchaidh, cannot be determined on the present evidence.[1]

A detail may be triplicated, or an incident repeated. There are instances of this affecting the names of characters, and quite lengthy incidents associated with them. In DGP(D) the first of the four abductors is triplicated, to balance the other three? In CG either an tAmhus Órarmach or Ridire an Ghaisge may be split into two or three characters: "an t-amhasg, an t-amhasg órdha, agus an t-amhas ógarmach mac do Sgiathán Sgiathghlas nó do Ridire na gaisge" for the first, but incorporating the name of the second who does not appear in this version; "Luth-Eadtrom, Sgiathán Dúghlas agus Sgiathán Sgiath-ghlas" for the second (but beginning with a name associated with AT 513.) Conall fights with each amhus, and hears from each ridire how he had abducted Conall's wife. Mícheál mac Donnchadha of Cárna told a version which carried this further: Conall lands in three successive kingdoms, and in each the whole teach na n-amhus episode, in the extended form including fetching food and drink, follows each time, ending with the defeat of the king and his "amhus sheóram" and their enlistment as Conall's helpers. In compensation for this elephantiasis of a single episode, much of the rest of the

1. See above, Ch. II p. 74.

story is dropped. Also in versions of CG, the pursuing band of soldiers whom Conall has to fight after carrying off Eithne is often triplicated. But against this there are cases where incidents repeated in the written stories - e.g. the two islands visited by the Fenians in TS - are told only once in oral versions; and some tellers like to dissimilate the repetitions of a triplicated motif.

Motifs repeated by analogy with another part of the same story, of which Aarne gives examples, occasionally appear in Romantic tales. What seems to be an instance occurs in the oral versions of the Bruidhean Chaorthuinn motif where the Fenians reach the otherworld mansion in which they stick to the floor by following a cart with a coffin, to which they stick. Here the analogy rather spoils the story, for originally the Fenians are freely invited to the feast and have no suspicion that they will be enchanted. Another instance may be the versions of ECM where Céadach is killed and resurrected in different ways at the beginning and the end of the story. Sometimes both motifs are there already, but the analogy is new. Thus in TDG Diarmaid rides a barrel down a hill, and his enemies are killed in trying to emulate his feat. Later in the story he is astride the back of the wild boar of Beann Gulban, which has rushed between his legs and carries him down the hill until he falls off and is gored to death. In a short Cork version it is explained that Fionn made him try the trick with the barrel, which he survived, but then he tried the same trick with the boar and was killed. This type of change, like the last, also has its converse: where two similar episodes occur in different parts of a story, like the two grianán

scenes in CG, there is a tendency for one of them to drop out or become confused with the other.

The replacement of animals by humans and similar substitutions mentioned by Aarne are mostly more applicable to animal fables and the like than to hero-tales. Sometimes a mysterious or powerful human in a Romantic tale may be explicitly shown as a supernatural in folk versions. Macaomh Mór in CG becomes a real giant from being just a big man with a certain amount of magic about him. The mysterious hermit in DGP is described as having one arm, one leg and one eye in the middle of his forehead. Animals may be replaced by other kinds of animals: the boar of TDG is a wolf in some Donegal versions, and the griffin of CG may be called a roc, a dragon, an eagle or just a big bird. In one Donegal version of CRI the creatures whose form the heroine takes in turn are all changed, from cat, swan and otter to crow, horse, bracken plant (gas roithnigh) and pigeon.[1]

On occasion a confused teller can lapse into near-nonsense. Thus in one version of CRI from Co. Mayo the wonderful tree is apparently alive, for it turns itself into a bull: "Rinní Mille na Mún (Bile na mBuadh) tarú de héin". Originally they are two separate features of the same episode.[2]

1. She appears as a pigeon in the story, by confusion with Ciabhán. In Cú na gCleas the story includes a poem from the MS, which is entirely spoilt here by trying to include some of these extra enchantments.

2. Compare the instance given by Krohn, Arbeitsmethode p. 83, where the teller turns birds heard talking in the trees into talking trees.

In Scottish versions of DGP two of the subsidiary characters have often changed sex. This has happened because they belong to the class gruagach: the word, literally apparently meaning "hairy", is used for a class of minor male supernaturals in the Romantic tales, but in modern Scottish Gaelic it is a poetic word for a maiden, and so tends to be thought of as feminine. In Scottish versions of DGP it may be masculine, feminine, or inflected as a feminine but referred to with a masculine pronoun (E). The two gruagachs may be shown fighting each other, though they are women: but in the latest version (G) they are both conflated with a character who is originally the wife of one of them.

In most of these instances little is involved but a change of words: there is no alteration in concept which changes the plot. The same applies to the exchange of names between characters, which is very common in the Romantic tales. Subsidiary characters often change names with each other: we have noticed how the two more memorable names are shared among the two more memorable roles in a version of CRI, and versions of CG similarly share names between Macaomh Mór, Ridire an Ghaisge and Amhus Óarmach - each of the latter is called Macaomh Mór, or some name derived from his other title Séadna Saorbhéasach, in several versions. A similar borrowing within a story occurs in a version of TDG from Co. Waterford where Diarmaid's father, in the MS Donn, is called "Dallach Mórna", a name apparently borrowed from the subsidiary character Andala mac Mórna, who does not appear in oral versions. Names are also borrowed between Romantic tales in oral versions, as they were in MS:

we have noticed how this happens with CG, CRI and EIA, and another example would be the version of CG which calls Amhus Órarmach "Toirceallach a' Teaghlach", from Toirceall an Trom-theaghlaigh, a king in TS - again a character who does not usually appear in oral versions. There is moreover a large stock of names for folktale heroes, heroines and villains, which may appear in any Gaelic tale, and some of them, like Macaomh Mór, derive from the Romantic tales. These will be considered in the next chapter. The Fenian heroes likewise may appear in tales with which they have no connection, such as CRI.[1] It is often assumed that a great hero such as Conall Gulban or Murchadh mac Briain was "one of the Fenians", and in a Waterford version of GF where Murchadh is their leader, Conán, in his usual character as trouble-maker, Goll, Diarmaid and others play an important part in the dialogue, though not the action, of the story.

Stories told in the first person, as if the narrator were a character, which are mentioned by Aarne, do occur in Ireland, but only so far as I know when they concern encounters with the fairies. In Romantic tales, on the contrary, folk tellers are often troubled by the passages originally told in the first person, that is, the in-tales. In at least three versions of DGP (F,J,M) the teller was uneasy in telling the in-tale, and kept changing from the first to the third person and back again. In devolved versions of CG the difficulty is solved by making the adventures of the in-tale happen to Conall himself, so that they are told in the third person like the rest of the story.

1. See Handbook, p. 593 No. 21.

Other instances of in-tales told as part of the general narration will be given later. On the other hand, experienced tellers often enjoy letting their characters make long speeches and re-tell their experiences: but this is most typical of those who prefer novellen and stories which have come through English to Romantic tales, like Pádraig 'ac Aodhain or Angus Macmillan.

After changes in order to be consistent with other changes, which can best be discussed with the development of whole stories below, Aarne lists adaptation to a new environment of telling and modernisation. With Gaelic tales, which have hardly ever travelled across linguistic frontiers, but have suffered from the encroachment of English culture, these are virtually identical. There may be an element of rationalisation of magic, as when Ridire an Lóchrainn in EMM dodges Gawain on the landing instead of flying out of the window, or an element of reducing the grandeur of the original to a peasant level, as when the visit of the German Emperor's legate to the great assembly of Aonach Tailteann, which opens CG, is reduced to a "postboy" bursting into a meeting-house (teach cruinnithe) full of kings and flinging down a letter on the table. But the effect is the same: the unfamiliar and incomprehensible is made familiar and comprehensible. Any teller might be guilty of such a modernisation as turning the cantreds given to Diarmaid in TDG into counties. Some of the more noticeable modernisations, however, appear in

versions told by people less likely to respect tradition - women, not traditionally tellers of hero-tales, and tinkers. A Galway woman's version of OCU ends with Deirdre shooting herself with a revolver. In a version of ECM told by a Sutherland tinker woman Fionn is sent a telegram to come to the Eastern World instead of being put under geasa. That might be an intentional joke, but a relative of hers, the famous storyteller "Ali Dall" Stewart, completely rationalises the usual folk ending to EIA: instead of forcing the hero's mother to confess that his brothers are illegitimate by means of a magic tightening belt, the princess from the underground kingdom puts a strait-waistcoat on her and pulls it tight with her own hands.

Some other instances of modernisation are more subtle. In one Scottish version of CG (LCC) the enemy are the Germans rather than the Turks: Campbell suggests that this was inspired by the Franco-Prussian war, which had just ended when the story was collected, though it may merely derive from the fact that in the MS the German Emperor was the Turks' main target. In some Irish versions it seems as though Conall wins the hurling game by carrying the ball from one end of the field to another on his hurley, a feat which, I am told, could only be performed with the broad flat hurley introduced when the rules for Gaelic sports were standardised in the last century. In a Cork version of CG Ridire an Ghaisge, trapped by giants in their house, retreats with their herd of goats down some stairs into a cellar. This is evidently a misunderstanding of íochtar an tighe (the lower part of the house) in the MS, which

really implies only the end of the old Gaelic type of house which was used as a byre, and might for drainage reasons be at the bottom of a slight slope.[1] With the disappearance of such houses in the past hundred years this meaning of íochtar has been forgotten, and the teller interpreted it as best he could.

What is changed may be a convention of the Romantic tales rather than a description of something that has actually changed since they were composed. Mostly such coventions as that which allows one man to defeat an army are accepted by folk tellers: they are convenient to the plot, for they allow the hero to dominate the story alone. But there are exceptions. We have seen that Ridire an Ghaisge's attempt to conquer Lochlann single-handed by holding the king to ransom in his own hall is always given a different explanation by folk tellers. Similarly in a Donegal version of BC,[2] where Diarmaid attacks the King of the World in his tent and takes his dinner for Conán, he does not do this openly as in the MS, but gets up to the king by disguising himself as a scullion: and later in the story he again succeeds in killing the kings of Thule (Inis Tuile) only by stalking them stealthily. This detracts from the heroic stature of Diarmaid: but it makes the story both more probable, and, because of the added suspense, more interesting.

1. In recent Scottish Gaelic ceann sìos.
2. Fearghus Mac Róigh, Bruidhean Chaorthuinn (Dublin 1911).

The conventions of the Romantic tales may also be assimilated to those of international folktale. This sort of standardisation is noticeable, for instance, in Munster versions of CG which make the hero ride about on horseback, and may even add motifs from international tales of the helpful horse.[1] It is obvious for anyone familiar with folktales that Conall must be younger than his two brothers, though this is not stated in the MS. The wicked wife is replaced by the more usual wicked stepmother in Scottish versions of the "werewolf's tale" discussed in the appendix: in this case the change must be an early one, if indeed the version with the stepmother is not equally old, for the stepmother appears in EMM (fifteenth century) and the wife in Arthur and Gorlagon (fourteenth century). Similarly it is impossible to prove that the helpful wife in Irish versions of ECM is closer to the original than the helpful fairy mother in Scottish versions, but the latter has closer parallels in Gaelic oecotypes of international tales.

Another way in which the story is made to conform to the teller's preconceptions is archaisation. Aarne does not mention this in international tales, but Krohn[2] gives an instance from Finnish oral poetry. The concepts reflected may be those introduced through English, rather than descriptions in the written Romantic tales. Thus in a Scottish version of DGP (J), Murchadh is evidently thought

1. In most tales of MS origin, however, the heroes continue to go about on foot or by boat: there is probably some other reason why Conall Gulban is given a horse, perhaps that the carrying off of Eithne on the hero's own back was incredible to the tellers.

2. Op. cit. p. 75.

of as wearing full armour, for he has to raise his helmet to drink in the hermit's hall.[1] On the other hand when Peig Sayers' son, telling a version of CG, makes Eithne leave a message for Conall written in ogham (uaim chraobh) on a flagstone, he is drawing on a knowledge of purely Irish antiquities. A rather similar phenomenon occurs in the Eriskay version of DGP (E): the opening list of Brian's sons and relations ends in a Uist version (D) with "Ceanaduidh féin còmhla riutha". (Kennedy himself along with them). This agrees precisely with the MS (A), which also lists Brian's father Cennetig along with his sons.[2] In E, however, the list ends "agus Mac Uaraig fhéin còmhla riutha". The name of Mac Uaraig is usually translated as Kennedy, as the founder of the family was one of the Carrick Kennedies, and it seems that the too-learned teller substituted it as the Gaelic equivalent of what he considered a Lowland name.

A story may be adapted to a new environment, again, by localisation in the teller's neighbourhood. This is fairly common with Romantic tales. We have seen that most versions of TDG are wholly or partly localised in the teller's own area, and other tales about the Fenians, like CF, were linked with places in Scotland rather than Ireland before Macpherson. Traditions in the Highlands identified Dreollainn as Mull, Sorcha as Ardnamurchan, Tír fo Thuinn as Tiree, Ioruaidh as Morvern, Tiree or Lewis. The Donegal

1. This is admittedly part of a plot device borrowed from a version of TDG, for when Murchadh raises the helmet it reveals the sugh seirc on his forehead, and the hermit's wife at once falls in love with him.

2. See Ch. IV, p. 303.

version of BC quoted above opens in Donegal, and substitutes the Boyne for the Shannon. A Connemara version of GF makes Murchadh's adventures - usually in a nameless lake - take place in Lough Corrib. Kerry versions of CG make Conall fall asleep on Dunmore Head or another W. Kerry promontory, rather than on the Hill of Howth. In fact any event may be localised in any teller's own area, provided that it was originally said to take place in Ireland. But far more of any story is likely to happen in the nameless country of international märchen, or in its Gaelic equivalents - Spain or Lochlann or the Eastern World. Local characters are not brought in except occasionally in a nonsense formula to begin or end a tale.[1]

Finally under the same general heading we may consider changes of ethos: brutalisation of the original or its reverse. It has been mentioned that in the later Romantic tales the heroes may kill a bound enemy, as the hero of a folktale may kill the giant after extorting the secret of his hidden treasures as the price of mercy. The latter detail and similar brutalities appear in folk versions: in a Kerry version of CG Conall tears the hag of the "everlasting fight" in half by the legs, after she has tried to hold him off by all the means in her power, including vomiting and breaking wind in his face.[2] In DGP (J) the

1. Cf. Krohn, op. cit. p. 78. I am told by Mr. Donald MacArthur that in Lewis it is the general practice to tell anecdotes and novellen, current elsewhere, as if they had happened to some local character of the recent past: but this may be a local development to avoid the Church's prohibition of "lying" stories.

2. There may be an element of confusion with the venomous hounds which follow in the MS, which are torn apart because they are invulnerable: Conall breaks his sword on the hag here.

hermit gags the mother of the supernaturals who have carried off his wife by thrusting the legs of her dead husband down her throat. This sort of detail is evidently intended as comedy of a rather crude kind, the victims being not quite human and visualised as obstacles to the hero, rather than people.

There are also, however, occasional examples where the original form of an episode seems to have offended a teller's sense of propriety and there has been bowdlerisation or softening. This may account for the omission of the naked-sword incident in some versions of CG and AT 303.[1] In Táin Bó Flidais there is an onomastic passage telling how Cainner Derg daughter of Medb was killed in Glenn Cainneire, by mistake for her mother. One of the Mayo folk versions reflects this, but in this case Caileir herself kills a man in Gleann Cailiri. This contradicts the usual principle of such lore, that the place-name commemorates the person who was killed there, and it looks very much as if a teller at some stage decided that it was more suitable for a girl to kill a man than for a man to kill a girl. Possibly a similar sense of what was fitting dictated that at the end of this story, in the version printed in Béaloideas, Fergus should kill Flidais because she betrayed her husband and might betray him in the same way, something of which there is no trace in the MS: but this may be taken from the folktale about another treacherous wife which has become attached to the end of other versions of the story. The underlying idea, that a hero should never do anything dishonourable, is the same

1. See above, p. 148.

which leads to all the efforts of tellers of TDG to remove blame from Diarmaid, Gráinne and even Fionn. Some versions of CG make Conall have merely a race or a trial of strength with Macaomh Mór instead of fighting him; the reason for this may be rather different - if there is a fight, the enemy is expected to be killed: Macaomh Mór is not killed, therefore there was no fight.

Causes and conditions of change in motifs.

Let us now go back and consider why and when a motif may be added to a story, brought in to replace another, or modified. Aarne has little to say on this question, but it has been thoroughly discussed by Krohn.[1] One of the most important reasons for such changes in Irish tales seems to be what he calls Motivierung: the desire of the teller to account for anything in the story which seems to him strange.[2] One folk type of CG shows Motivierung at its simplest:[3] everything that needs to be explained is explained by geasa. In this variant Conall has already killed all Eithne's guards before he reaches her, so there is no reason for him to carry her off. The story says he did carry her off, so it is

1. Arbeitsmethode p. 67 ff.

2. Something of this sort may be noticed even in MSS: the recension of CG represented by the oldest MS, 23. M. 26, is evidently not the oldest form of the text, but in some ways it seems more complete because it goes out of the way to clarify points which remain obscure in the oldest recension.

3. Hyde, Ocht Sgéalta p. 104; IFC 529 p. 326.

explained that her mother had put geasa on her not to be at home for six months after her marriage. Conall's sleep at Howth, which lasts for a year in this variant, is accounted for by geasa imposed on him by his mother to sleep for a year and a day if ever he should find himself at "Bancanna Binne Éadair", where he arrives by accident. Macaomh Mór carries off Eithne from him because he is under geasa to marry the first woman he meets at Bancanna Binne Éadair.

We have seen how other versions of CG account for Conall's long sleep:[1] some also explain how he came to be at Howth. He may be taking his new bride on a tour of Ireland, or showing her the fragments of the great stone he once broke there: he may be caught in the stock magic mist when out hunting - with his wife! In one case the episode is simply shifted to the green of Tara, a stock location where the king of Ireland's son might well rest, though the teller evidently did not realise that Macaomh Mór could hardly land from a boat there. Again, why did Conall want to carry off Eithne in the first place? Folk tellers are seldom satisfied with the MS explanation that she was his first love. He may be told of her by a druid, be sent for her by his father, or dream of her. Scottish versions use the ancient motif of the search for a woman as white as snow, as red as blood and as black as a raven: some Kerry versions more prosaically simply remark that he felt lonely. A very elaborate Mayo version makes him find her portrait among others in a locked room with an inscription that they are

1. P. 136-137.

fated to marry at the age of twenty-one. Some versions even go back to the very beginning and account for the war with the Turks, as in Curtin's version, where the young Sultan (Saudan Óg) invades Spain because the king's daughter has refused to marry him; or for the relationship between the Irish king and the king attacked by the Turks, as in MacNair's version printed by Campbell. Parallels to most of these explanations could of course be found from other stories, for instance the versions of TDG which give a reason for Gráinne falling in love with Diarmaid, or the version of DGP (E) where the hermit is made to visit the island where his wife's uncle lives, because his wife wants to have a wedding feast (banais) where her mother and grandmother had theirs.

The teller need not be trying to account for something which is already obscure in the MS, or has become obscure because of changes in the folk version: what puzzles him may be a convention of the Romantic tales, or an archaic phrase. Rather than replace the archaism by a more familiar concept, as in the examples above, he may try to account for it. Hence, for instance, Ridire an Ghaisge's single-handed attack on the king has not been turned into an attack with an army, but has been explained as due to hunger or wounded pride. When poets normally offered their services to the highest bidder it was quite understandable for the foreign druid Dúnadhach to offer his services to the Irish Conall, but to modern tellers the only possible explanation is that he was an Irishman himself. A sixteenth-century audience would probably have realised that the Madra Maol wore a chain

to show that he was not a natural wolf, but the folk version invents a purpose for the chain: to tie him to a tree. Even the poetic invention of the rod whose shavings turn into birds is given a practical twist when the birds are made as food for the hawk who is really the owner's lover.

Krohn, who uses examples from Finnish oral poetry as well as folktales, also mentions the possibility of misunderstandings of archaic words in a source.[1] We have seen how the change in the meaning of gruagach in Scottish Gaelic leads to confusion. There is a good example of a misunderstanding of this sort in Curtin's version of MRE, whose teller for the most part repeated the MS almost word for word.[2] Curtin's English makes the hero say: "When I brought the lady all the Kings' sons who had lost by going to her came to me and I made good all they had lost". The corresponding passage in the MS reads "ar chlos d'aos gráidh 7 d'aos dána go dtugas-sa inghean ríogh...táinig gach neach aca d'iarraidh a dhualgas féin, 7 dofuair gach neach aca mar ba chóir dó". (When the household officials and poets heard that I had married a king's daughter, each of them came to ask for his due reward, and each of them got what he deserved). The teller has clearly taken aos gráidh, an antiquated term for the officials of a chief's household, for aos grádha, lovers: but to make sense of this, he has had to invent the unlikely supposition that the hero paid the expenses of all his wife's disappointed suitors!

1. Arbeitsmethode p. 72.

2. Folk-Tales p. 163. The misunderstanding could perhaps be the fault of Curtin's translator, if he was different from the teller.

Another example where the misunderstanding of an archaic word seems to have made a difference throughout a story is in the Uist story of Màmus described in the appendix. MacPhie's version, the older though not in all cases the most accurate, makes Mànus' companions his twelve foster-brothers, dà chomh-dhalta dheug Mhànuis. In Duncan Macdonald's version they are a mysterious Clann an Dà Chomhairleach Dhaig, the sons of the Twelve Counsellors, apparently identical with "dà stàta dhiag uallach na rìoghachd", the twelve haughty nobles of the kingdom, who form a council of regency for the hero's father at the beginning: MacPhie's equivalent for these is simply a' phàrlamaid, the parliament. Evidently the twelve counsellors' sons have replaced the twelve foster-brothers by misunderstanding.[1] But it is a beautiful economy in the later version to combine the counsellors' sons of the corruption with the parliament of the original.

I have suggested tentatively in my article on CG that an episode in a pair of Cork versions, where Conall suddenly decides to burn two hillocks on an island, may be derived from the corruption of the MS title of the episode at this point, Tochmarc Aillionn, to something like doghadh cnoc an oileáin, the burning of the island hillocks. But this does

1. Compare DGP (E) where Murchadh calls himself "c'olas (sic) dhearbh dhìleas Mhurchaidh 'ic Brian", presumably replacing an earlier dearbh-chomhalta... It is unlikely, however, that Duncan Macdonald himself did not understand the word comhalta; for one small section of his story actually tells how Mànus played shinty against his cousin and each of them had six foster-brothers (seiseir chomhdhaltan) on his side. This agrees precisely with MacPhie, who makes the twelve the sons of the six ladies-in-waiting of Mànus' mother and the six of his aunt. But this is the only vestige of the older account.

not account for the hills clashing together (ag rith ar a' chéile), a motif known in Greek tales back to the legend of the Argonauts, but not so far as I know elsewhere in Gaelic tradition. It is difficult to account for the introduction of an episode to explain a verbal corruption when the corruption itself is no longer recognisably present. But that this is a possible form of change should not be doubted.

An episode may also be introduced to replace or account for a vestige of a lost episode. Such a vestige appears, for instance, in the Islay version of CG (LCC) where Macaomh Mór after his defeat tells Conall that he needs him in three days' time: evidently all that remains of the episode where he is helped by Conall to win a wife. There are two possible instances in CG of major changes in the story being brought in as a replacement for such a lost detail. One is the series of instructions given to Eithne to wake Conall. This may have been attracted by the detail, mentioned only at a later stage in the original recension, that Conall took a ring from Eithne's finger and put it on his own. This is recalled later when Conall sends the ring to her to prove that it is indeed he who has come to rescue her. Now something similar occurs in versions of AT 300/303, such as the first printed by Campbell, where the princess wakens the hero by putting a ring on his finger: later he is identified by the ring. This, together with the resemblance in situation noted before, may have led to the borrowing of another version of the motif from AT 300: though neither the ring nor the waking by cutting

off a finger is usual in Irish.

The other case of such a replacement in CG comes at the beginning. The original motif is the anecdote told in some MSS to account for Conall's epithet Gulban. He was so called because his foster-father used to make him run up to the top of Beann Gulban every day. Half a dozen oral versions describe something of the sort, though two of them confuse it with Diarmaid's feat of riding a barrel down the hill. A number of others, however, replace this with some other stock motif of a test imposed on the young hero: he has to lift a heavy stone, or a helmet, or in the type with all the geasa he is taught "Cleas an Bhuilg" which seems to be his feat of leaping with the help of his spear.

Motifs added to account for something strange may be inventions, but the longer ones seem as a rule to be borrowed from other stories. We should next consider what other conditions may lead to such borrowings.

As Aarne noted, the beginnings and ends of stories are most liable to alteration. Not only may details drop out, but they may be added on. At the beginning the desire for completeness often leads to accounts of the hero's birth and upbringing being added. Half the versions of CG contain some sort of account of the hero's early history, apart from those which add details of the war which made his father leave Ireland, or of the reasons which made him carry off Eithne. Some of these accounts are of early

feats of strength, based perhaps on the detail of the MS mentioned above: others make Conall choose the best sword from his father's armoury, or the ugly foal which will become a magic horse; others make him the lazy son who sits by the fire until he is fully grown. These are all found in international tales such as AT 300, 531 or 650. The Connemara oecotype gives a curiously simple account, which is difficult either to parallel elsewhere or explain from the MS: at the age of twelve Conall tries to follow his father who is going away from home, but his father strikes him and sends him back; when this has happened three times Conall vows never to follow anyone else again but to act for himself, and promptly goes off for Eithne.

Nearly all the Scottish versions of CG give some account of his upbringing: either as in the MS he has a foster-father, generally a magical one, or he actually has a fairy mother. The latter motif appears in five Scottish versions of CG and also often in other tales such as ECM: the king is lost in a mist when hunting, shelters in a magic brugh, and sleeps with one of his host's daughters. He spends a year there, thinking it only one night, and so is able to name his son before he leaves. Later, when his legitimate sons fail him, he calls for the son from the brugh.[1] In CG this

1. The Irish parallel to this motif, which differs in some respects - e.g. the hero's mother is found alone on an island - is usually associated with one tale, a form of AT 551: see for instance Curtin, Folk-Tales p. 1. Possibly the solitary queen at the beginning has been assimilated to the solitary queen at the end of this story, and the Scottish form of the motif is the original: but both forms are partly paralleled in the written LCC in the fifteenth century.

introduction affects the whole course of the story, for the fairy grandfather appears to help Conall when he is in difficulties, providing a ship to take him to Lochlann, a shinty-stick when he gets there, and help against a magician at the end.

Kerry versions of CRI may begin with either or both of two added motifs: in the first, the king is childless until his subjects pray that he should have children, and three sons are born to him. What follows is quite unconnected: each son takes it in turn to tell his father a story when he comes home from school each day. Except that they may meet the hag who bespells God to find the Ring of Youth when coming home from school, there is no apparent connection between either motif and the rest of the story, and no basis in the MS from which they might have arisen.

One introduction added to various versions of tales has literary parallels and is probably of literary origin: that where somebody tempts fate by boasting. In the form where one of those present praises a feast, as king where a better one could be found, and another says that a better one could be found at a court which he names, (or that one thing is lacking here) and thereby provokes a quest, it opens two of the oldest Romantic tales, CIL and OCU. It is used in this form to open the Donegal version of BC already quoted, and the Uist version of GF, though in the latter case it may conceivably represent the account of a lost MS version. A similar boast at an outdoor assembly provokes the knocking out of the king's teeth at the beginning of several of the

Scottish versions of EIA collected by Campbell.

The end of a story may similarly be extended simply by a fuller version of "they all lived happily ever after". The motif associated especially with EIA, where the elder brothers are proved illegitimate and the hero becomes heir to the kingdom, is a satisfactory ending for any story where the hero is the youngest of three, and is often used. If the hero has helpers, as in CG and CRI, the kingdoms and sometimes the women that he has won are distributed among them in oral versions. Thus in CG Sorcha and Lochlann, which in the MS are made tributary to Conall, are given in oral versions to Ridire an Ghaisge and the druid, or other helpers: and the slighted princess of Lochlann, left unmarried in the MS, is given in six versions variously to Amhus Órarmach, Ridire an Ghaisge or the druid. In CRI Cod's brothers are already provided with kingdoms in the MS, but oral versions also give them wives, for instance the rejuvenated hag Bé Thuinne and Feithlinn's sister, both of whom drop out of the original story when they have played their parts.

The most usual change which may affect the end of a story is the addition of borrowed motifs to make it longer. In this case, of course, the original end is no longer the actual end: but when the actual end is reached, there is only a limited number of ways of ending. "Hero kills giant and marries heroine" is such a favourite that it becomes standard for stories which originally ended quite differently, such as CG. The ways of killing the giant, though various, appear in many different stories and add

to the impression of standardisation. Stories with tragic ends, OCU and TDG, continue to be told, but often in a way which implies that they are admired as fragments of ancient tradition, not as good stories which are worth stretching out and embroidering. In DGP the ending of the later MS, in which Murchadh wakes to find the hermit, his wife and palace all vanished, is followed by good oral versions and is probably the ending of the original MS: but half the versions change the hermit's wife into his daughter, or someone whom he has abducted, so that he can give her to Murchadh at the end. This seems to have happened independently in Scotland and Ireland, suggesting that the urge to provide a satisfactory ending with a wedding was general. Some tellers even soften the punishment of the wicked at the end, and the elder brothers in EIA are spared at the hero's request, as in Eg. 171.[1]

Motifs are added and substituted, however, in all parts of a story, and not only at the beginning and end. This may be done to explain something, or to tidy up a loose end - for there may be loose ends left after any episode: an example would be where Conall, set to guard Ireland, deserts his charge for Eithne, and oral versions make him leave someone else on guard.[2] Very often it seems that two stories have

1. Cf. Krohn, op. cit. p. 83.

2. He leaves soldiers, a counsellor or a coachman in charge in several Kerry versions: a shepherd in versions from Scotland and Mayo: and uses a wand to enchant the castle to stay as it is until his return, in a Connacht type.

simply become confused. Whether the borrowing is accidental or serves a purpose, it is almost always true that there is a similarity in situation between the original scene and the scene which is drawn on. I use the word "scene" advisedly: for it is my impression that tellers, unless they learn a story word for word, tend to remember it in the form of a series of tableaux which they describe in their own words. This may be illustrated in several ways. Thus a striking picture is usually remembered: nearly all versions of DGP retain the detail that Murchadh met the hermit when he was cutting wood, though many of them omit the more conventional details of the hunt which leads up to the meeting. The load of firewood serves to illustrate the hermit's strength in an oblique but concrete way: Murchadh cannot lift it, but the hermit does with ease; sometimes it is said to be a bundle of young trees: in the Donegal versions it has given rise to a little incident of the plot, where Murchadh is able to catch up the hermit by going towards the thunderous noise made when the load hits the ground. Obviously the tellers had the picture clearly before them. In the same way the bare mention in CG of the ship found at Howth has led to the deduction that it was an old abandoned one, and from that to the deduction that it needed repair, and from that to the story of how it was repaired with the only material imagined to be there - the hides of the shepherds' cattle.

There is a tendency to express abstract ideas in as concrete a way as possible. In TDG, whatever the Tristan scholars may want us to believe, there is no naked sword between the lovers in the written tale: this is the folk

tellers' use of a borrowed motif to make clear what the MS merely states, that Diarmaid kept himself from Gráinne. Amhlaoibh Ó Loingsigh makes it even clearer by having them sleep one on either side of a valley. Similarly at the end of his version it is not Fionn's own thoughts about Gráinne which make him drop the water which would cure Diarmaid, but Conán's words. A still more concrete form of this is in the Donegal version which says that Gráinne herself was present, and the sight of her caused Fionn to drop the water. Again, the Donegal versions of CRI express the statement of the MS, that Feithlinn would have been disenchanted if she had spent a night with Cod when she was in the form of a cat, in a concrete way, when they tell how the cat came to Cod's bedside, but he kicked it away. It is a similar preference for visible signs which makes some versions of DGP turn the hermit into an evident supernatural with one arm, one leg and the rest.[1]

The action which links the memorable scenes is not an important part of what is remembered, and the details are liable to vary. In the MS tradition it is of no importance whether Melóra crosses the Channel on a boat or on horseback, because her travels are not reported (ní haithristear a himtheachta), as the traditional phrase would put it. So it is of no importance whether Conall reaches Howth on foot, on horseback or by boat, and all three appear in oral versions. A teller will remember the tableau of Macaomh Mór throwing Ridire an Ghaisge over a sea-cliff, and the

1. From other fairy traditions it seems that the fact that Céadach's wife is found combing her hair (see p. 126 above) may also be a visible indication that she is no ordinary human.

tableau of Ridire an Ghaisge in the griffin's nest, but forget what happens in between: the obvious deduction is that the man who was last seen falling towards the sea fell into it: then the griffin must have picked him out again - and this is how the story is told in many cases, though it is not the original version.[1]

The importance of what can be visualised means that the surroundings of any scene are the most important factor in oral borrowings. Even in late MSS the kicking of the sleeping Conall by Macaomh Mór could be a borrowing from the kicking of the waking Cú Chulainn by a giant in TGG: the situation - hero and lady beside the sea, giant comes from sea and carries off lady - is identical, and it has been noticed above how it resembles a scene in AT 300 from which oral versions also borrow details. Hero-tales may borrow from quite different kinds of story in these circumstances. In two versions of CG, when Ridire an Ghaisge finds himself on a desert island, his first warning that there are cannibal giants there is the sight of a giant footprint on the beach - probably a borrowing from Robinson Crusoe on his desert island, though there are other parallels. When the giants appear, they drive a herd of goats into their house and Ridire an Ghaisge is trapped there. The combination of the goats and the hero unable to escape has naturally led tellers in different areas to introduce the Polyphemus motif - the classic way of getting out of a giant's house with goats in it! Conall, asleep and being inspected by Macaomh Mór seems

1. The change may however have been influenced by the other traditions about griffins mentioned above, p. 153.

to have been confused in three versions with the brave tailor of the popular international tale AT 1640, for he too is equipped with a boasting message written on his sword. The situation is exactly that of the international tale, where the giant inspects the sleeping hero's sword and is terrified by what he sees, as Macaomh Mór is afraid to wake Conall.

Many examples could be given of borrowing between Romantic tales when the scene is similar. In CG a king is attacked in his own hall, among his men, by a stranger: the same happens in BC and EIA (reading "tent" and "outdoor assembly" respectively for "hall") and versions of CG borrow from both.[1] In DGP the hermit has a lot of trouble in winning his wife: so a Donegal version (L) makes him punish her on the way home as Conall punished Eithne, by making her walk. He has just killed a lot of men at her wedding: apparently because this is a description of one man killing all those in a house, both Scottish and Irish versions (JKL) borrow the method of killing, the use of one man as a club, from teach na n-amhus, ultimately probably from CG.

1. See p. 151.

Another result of the tellers' love of a vivid scene is the frequent addition of picturesque details which are not in the original. An example has been given of a MS tale, AM, embroidering a detail of the French romance on which it is in some way based: the same type of embroidery can often be found in folk versions. The ship in CG becomes a magic ship, the well in EMM a healing well. In a Scottish version of DGP (H) the hermit does not merely pursue his wife's abductors in a boat: he puts on his "water head-dress" (ceannbheart uisge) and swims after them, perhaps to a land under the waves, like Murchadh in GF. In the Donegal versions the hermit does not merely take Murchadh into his castle, but shows him a miserable hovel and then transforms it into a palace. In Donegal versions of TDG the postern (dorus éaluighthe, escaping-door) through which Diarmaid refuses to go with Gráinne becomes a magic gate (geafta draoidheachta). In CG Amhus Órarmach does not simply ask for a truce each day, but escapes like a folktale giant in the form of a bird. Conall's father and brothers are not only being defeated by the Turks, they have actually been killed by them and have to be resurrected.

Not all such changes involve the addition of magic: they may be dramatic or melodramatic extensions of the original description. The scene where the dying Conall lies by the roadside and begs for a drink from the druid when he passes is an example of this. It is considerably more pathetic than the original where Conall, though wounded, is in a lighted house and the druid has come on purpose to see him: nor is he neglected by everyone, for a hundred men

have been sent to kill him! A melodramatic touch is added to the abduction of Eithne in several versions which make her leave a message for Conall written in blood: generally his own blood, which has gushed out of his mouth when Macaomh Mór kicked him.

Simple exaggeration is also common. Sometimes it serves a purpose: when Conall wins a hurling match against giants rather than ordinary men it is a greater achievement. At other times, as when Conall sleeps for seven days or even a year rather than one afternoon, it seems purely a result of some convention which demands that everything in a hero-tale should be on a heroic scale. The same unrealistic use of time is found already in written Romantic tales such as LCC and CRI, where each of the hero's trials may last for a year.

The most extensive examples of added details can be found in the development of such motifs as teach na n-amhus and the "Everlasting Fight." Both of these have been built up principally by the invention of some rather commonplace sequel - the king tells the hero to fetch his own food; the hag tells the hero to take the news of her death to someone else - which can then be repeated three or four times with slight variations in the name of the character met, and perhaps in the dialogue and details of the ensuing fight. There is more interest in the treatment of the original episode. Some details add to the dramatic interest: the fearful reputation of the amhuis is shown in a concrete way by the guide's refusal to enter their house; the suspense of the vigil on the battlefield is increased when the hero

is pretending to be a corpse. Matter-of-fact details show that the scene has been visualised: somebody has to clear out the corpses; the hag has both hands full, so she holds her sword in her teeth. There is humorous exaggeration: the amhuis stop up every chink and not only the doors. Motifs from literary sources are incorporated: the grinning amhuis show their hearts at the bottom of their gullets; the hero is given the heart of a cat and chases a mouse.

The cat in the "Everlasting Fight" sequel, with a poisonous nail in its tail, is an example of another sort of tradition which may be incorporated in a story. This is the brief floating tradition, von Sydow's "dite": a sentence or two of descriptive or explanatory tradition, or an epigrammatic remark. Among descriptive dites added to stories we may reckon the description of the giant in the main Kerry oecotype of CG.[1] Very large giants who live by catching fish appear in a number of Gaelic folktales, including the Tiree version of LCC, and a version of CG from Co. Cork where a pair of such giants find Ridire an Ghaisge on the shore and treat him as just another shellfish.[2] A description of such a giant, with a basket over his shoulders, walking through the sea and catching fish between his toes, has simply been applied to Macaomh Mór. The end of the same story seems to incorporate another dite about a magician who turns those who come ashore in turn from a

1. In my article I suggested how the details of this could be derived from no more than a description of the giant as very large: but the influence of general tradition about giants seems more likely.

2. TGSI XIV p. 78; IFC 1129 p. 209.

ship - here, Conall's helpers - to stone. In the Kerry type Conall wrestles with him and is recognised as his brother by his wrestling, a common folk-motif:[1] but exactly the same incident occurs at the end of the Uist type of CG, and there the magician is indeed hostile and is killed by Conall's fairy grandfather. Apparently whatever fragment of tradition is represented here was added independently to two variants of CG because the story included the hero and helpers required.

Dites of this sort are associated with particular characters. Conall Gulban is described by some tellers, deducing from the story itself, as the hero who would always forgive an enemy: to others he is the hero who would fight five hundred in front, five hundred behind, and five hundred on either side, though this is said of many heroes. The Fenians are said to have various characteristics, and Conán's gift of destroying an army by looking at it between his fingers plays a large part in versions of CF: in the Donegal version of BC mentioned before the same way of looking seems to give him power to dispel magic illusions; but basically the tradition seems to be a separate dite, not part of any one story. Some phrases which are probably also floating traditions come into CG. Versions from different areas mention Conall's willingness to release Ridire an Ghaisge "because it is no harder for me to loose you than to bind you again". In MacNair's version, when the druid promises to kill with his tongue those whom Conall cannot kill with his sword, we may suspect that the saying was invented when the

1. E.g. in the first part of Maonus na Luinge Luaithe, see appendix p. 269.

poets' power of satire was still remembered, if not really feared.

On the other hand a dite may be invented, as if it were a known tradition, to explain or add conviction to some odd fact in a story. This is akin to the way in which an author of a Romantic tale might invent a place-name like Magh na dTrí bhFeart in CRI, and also invent the incident from which it was named. The frequent explanation of Conall's long sleep as a codladh gaisgi~dhigh, the sleep slept by all heroes after great deeds, is such an invention: the dite never appears except in connection with the motif from CG. Because in the version of BC already mentioned two incidents happen in a magic mist seven years apart, the teller explains that in those days magic mists came every seven years. A Galway teller of TDG even invents a law of nature to give an aetiological twist to his story: since the water which Fionn was bringing to Diarmaid slipped through his fingers, no man can carry a drop of water any distance, but a woman can carry it as far as she likes!

Series of changes: changes affecting whole stories.

Examples have already been given of one change leading to another: for instance the developments which arise from Ridire an Ghaisge being thrown into the sea in CG, or from Conall carrying off Eithne on horseback.[1] The omission of an episode may mean that other parts of the story have to be

1. Above, p. 153, 162.

adjusted: so the loss of the in-tale in the Connemara LCC, while the formula which belongs to it survives, means that the formula has to be re-interpreted: a serious offer to cure Cian's leg becomes a half-serious threat to do the opposite - "I'll cure it for you!" Single changes may affect the list of characters, and so the whole of the story: such are the happy ending to DGP, the twelve counsellors' sons in Mànus, the change of sex of the gruagachs in DGP, and the brugh introduction to CG, which adds the fairy grandfather to the cast list.

One more example may be given of a series of changes, to show how an insignificant detail may grow into one of the most striking episodes of a story. It is part of the Carraroe type of CG, and also occurs in the versions from Inishbofin and Inishark. When Macaomh Mór has carried off Eithne, Conall remains asleep in the open for the rest of his seven days. Peat-cutters or building labourers pass by and throw sods on him until he is completely covered. Finally Conall awakes and sits up: the workmen roar with laughter to see a pile of sods fly in all directions and a startled head look out of the middle of them. The only justification for this in the MS is the detail of the laughter. The first accretion is the seven days' sleep, which, as it appears in an early nineteenth-century MS, must go back before 1800. Other Connacht versions, such as that printed by Hyde, add the detail that Conall was covered with moss and leaves by Eithne, for warmth, or lest birds should pick his eyes out! This is a detail added for completeness and showing the teller's realistic

visualisation of the unrealistic situation of the week's (or year's) sleep. The change from leaves deliberately spread to sods accidentally thrown onto Conall's unnoticed body is a comic exaggeration, and may have been deliberately invented to provide a convincing motive for the shepherds' laughter at Conall: for it is reasonable that the shepherds should be laughing at Conall for letting his wife be stolen a few hours afterwards, but hardly credible that they should still be laughing after a week. It is possible too that the teller felt that a hero should not be laughed at by lesser mortals, or for something that (if all heroes were liable to sleep for a week) was not his own fault: for in this version the onlookers laugh at the pile of turf coming to life, not at Conall himself. The invented episode has become a fairly important part of the story, and was evidently popular in Co. Galway, where six out of eight versions include it.

We have seen that motifs may be assimilated to motifs in international tales, or to well-known native motifs like the grianán or the revolving castle, or simply extended by picturesque additions. All these changes apply also to whole stories. The picturesque additions will probably not be entirely new inventions, but borrowings to extend such details as the fight with the giant. The numerous additions to the killing of Macaomh Mór in the Clare version of CG told by Stíofán Ó Helaoire[1] are a good example of this.

1. Béal. XII p.139.

There is no basis for any of them in the MS, and they are simply put in to improve the story. Though they are no doubt borrowings, they are improved borrowings: thus the keeping awake of Macaomh Mór every night during the fight may be imitated from MRE, but the method, by rattling old tin cans, is a comic addition which can hardly go back beyond the teller's source, who heard the story about 1830.[1] The witch helping Macaomh Mór behind the scenes is parallelled in the final episode of Uist versions, and the fight in mid-air in ECM, but such details as icicles growing on the hair of the spectator who looks up at the battle and binding him to the ground are surely pure Irish extravagance.

We have seen how tales like CG and EIA can become partly assimilated to international types, and how motifs from Romantic tales can be recombined to form new types: but it may be worth giving a clear example of one Romantic tale which has been partly assimilated to another. This is the story of "Cucúlin" in Curtin's Myths, p.304. We are not concerned here with the end of the story, which is a version of Oidheadh Chonlaoich, but with the earlier part, which is evidently based on TGG. This is shown by the hero's name and that of his boat, the "speckled boat" (Breac-Bháire); and by the incidents of the freeing of the heroine's sister who is enchanted in the form of a sea-serpent, and the combat with an invulnerable warrior, only overcome when somebody comes to Cú Chulainn's tent by night and tells him what to do. However, as Miss O'Rahilly points out in the introduction to her edition, TGG closely resembles CRI

1. GST p.23

in some respects, notably the opening where a woman arrives by sea and begs the hero to rescue her: and this version has been so closely assimilated to CRI that the outline of the plot strongly resembles that of Munster versions of the latter. The heroine, like Feithlinn, is enchanted in the form of a cat; the central part of the story is a quest for the Ring of Youth, pursued from one thief who has just lost it to the next; and the later episodes include a bull-fight, a magic sword got from a smith, and the killing of a hag in a revolving castle. The character "Hung-up-Naked" is not hostile, and seems to represent the speaking corpse of Iollann Órarmach in CRI, rather than the usual folktale character Crochaire Tárnochta. It seems possible that this version of ~~CG~~ was assimilated to CRI unconsciously: a teller who half-remembered his original would naturally tend to add motifs from the better-known tale following motifs which were common to both, and to fill in gaps where he had forgotten what came next. The same process of supplying gaps from a better-known tale could account for the assimilation of variants of CG to international tales.

It can be argued that the unconscious editing of a story through the processes of oral tradition tends at first to improve it. A written romance is like a jagged fragment of natural rock: it falls into the sea of oral tradition and is gradually worn away to a rounded pebble, aesthetically far more satisfying than the original. Ultimately, however,

the same processes will wear it away to nothing. To use a less fanciful metaphor, there is a process of natural selection among motifs: those which are striking and easy to visualise, and those which are essential parts of the plot, will be likely to survive because they are easy to remember: the rest will drop out in time.

One can see motifs in the act of dropping out. In a version of TDG from Co. Galway[1] the episode where Diarmaid rides on a barrel still appears: but he is represented as doing this just as an amusement, not to tempt his enemies to imitate the trick and be killed. In the variant of CG represented by Hyde's version, six wonderful helpers like those in AT 513 enter the story at the point where Ridire an Ghaisge appears in the MS. They evidently correspond to Conall's original helpers: but they play no further part in the story, for Macaomh Mór is killed as in AT 302, with the help of three grateful animals which catch his "external soul". These are obviously motifs which, though still in the story at the time when it was collected, because they were picturesque enough to have some survival value in themselves, were due to drop out at any moment because their importance to the plot had been forgotten. Motifs are not kept because they are like other folk motifs, or even because they are picturesque: the loss of such incidents as the sheep which change colour from all but one version of CRI, the hag who flies on a millstone from all versions of TDG, or the fifty invulnerable giants in Calidonia from all versions of CG, show that. Those motifs

1. IFC 443 p.166

which survive regularly are essential to the plot, and those few which tend to survive because they are intrinsically interesting are usually ones which are told at some length in the MS, unlike those just mentioned.[1]

Among the changes mentioned above, triplication and the addition of picturesque details tend to lengthen a story. Nearly always, however, they are cancelled out by - or are only brought in to compensate for - the loss of other episodes. The triplication of an episode is probably less common than the disappearance of an episode duplicated in the original: it is normal for only one to survive of the two islands visited in TS, or the two grianán episodes in CG. Often also a single episode triplicated is a more easily remembered substitute for a series of similar episodes such as the conquest of various heroes and kingdoms in CG, so that it does not really lengthen the story.

The tendency for a story to end at its logical end, with the death of the villain and the marriage of the hero, also helps to make it more compact. CG is arguably a better story when it ends with the death of Macaomh Mór and the recovery of Eithne, as it does in most Irish versions. CRI is never a well-constructed story, but it is improved by ending with the disenchantment of Feithlinn, or in the Kerry type the death of the hag who caused all the trouble. The loss of the final episodes gives the teller a chance to

1. One exception is the incident of the sword given by the smith in CRI, a single paragraph in the MS kept in a sixth of the oral versions: but the survival of this is certainly not typical, and may be due to its close resemblance to a motif popular in tales like AT 300.

remember more of the central part of the story, and on the whole it might be reasonable to claim that good Gaelic folk tellers prefer to tell a few episodes in detail, rather than many episodes briefly. Hence each stock motif tends to be associated with one particular tale in which it can be told in full.

There seems to be something like an optimum length to a hero-tale, to which all such tales approximate on the average; though a poor teller will leave out details, and a good one add new ones, they will both tell the same half-dozen basic episodes. The basic CG is: Conall wins Eithne; loses her while asleep; plays a hurling game; hears or is involved in the adventure with a griffin; wins back Eithne. The basic CRI is: Cod is bespelled to go on a quest; fights a battle where his brothers are killed; follows a cure for them from person to person; meets a speaking corpse; finds the cure and succeeds in the initial quest. The basic TS is: Sadhbh is abducted from a bathing-party; the Fenians go after her and enlist an ally at an island; Sadhbh is rescued and her captives killed; the original abductor comes in pursuit and is killed by Oscar. Fewer than half the oral versions include any major episode apart from these: one or two may omit one of these - the hurling game in CG, the speaking corpse in CRI, the island visit ~~if more were omitted the story would become~~ or the abductor's pursuit in TS - but not more. The minimum plot is a logical series of events, none of which could be omitted without either disturbing the logic or rendering the story unrecognisable. CRI without the brothers would be "man pursues wonderful object and gets it" -

a stock basis of plots but not enough to make a distinct story.

There are certain other factors which tend to make oral versions of a story more compact - or should one say that because a compact story is easier to remember, these factors can be illustrated from versions which have survived? Not only incidents but characters tend to drop out if they are unnecessary. Battles are reduced to duels: often in Romantic tales the hero fights alone or with a few helpers against an army, and oral versions may complete the process by omitting the runs which describe the destruction of the army and coming straight to the fight between the hero and the giant, as the main opponent is usually called. Two of Conall's helpers who play quite a large part in the written CG, Iollann Airmdhearg and Titus, son of the king of Calidonia, appear in none of the oral versions, and any or all of the other helpers may also be lost. The story is equally logical if Conall kills all his opponents rather than sparing them and taking them with him. Similarly we have seen that Cod's helpers at the end of CRI are reduced to two or more. In the Clare version of EMM, not only are the six episodes of the MS quest reduced to two contrasted ones - failure in West Indies, success in East - but the characters are cut down to half a dozen by the elimination of all Arthur's knights and Ridire an Lóchrainn's helpers. This reduces the whole plot to a dispute between individuals. A similar reduction of the affairs of kings to personal problems is shown in two versions of CG, from Barra and Mayo, in which Conall is left behind by his father, not to look after Ireland, but to look after his mother. This sort of

simplification, like the tendency to represent ideas in a concrete way, means that folk versions of a story are treated in exactly the way in which a novel, say, is treated in adapting it for the stage, though of course the adaptation is unconscious. The result is that the story is easier to understand and more dramatic, and for both these reasons more memorable.

There is even a tendency for something like the theatrical unities to be observed. In one Kerry version of CG Macaomh Mór brings Eithne home to the same kingdom where Conall has already landed, corresponding to Lochlann of the MS, so that there is no need for the story to be broken up by another voyage. I cannot give an example of the unity of time, but there is a general tendency for the events of a story to be told in the order in which they happened, disregarding the "flash-back" technique of the MS in-tales. We have seen this happen in the version of EMM. Similarly all the versions of TDG which include the account of the origin of the boar which killed Diarmaid, told in the MS by Fionn just before Diarmaid goes to hunt the boar, put it at the beginning of the story. This is the correct chronological position, for the incident happened when Diarmaid was a child. There is no link at all with what follows in these versions; but the damage to the form of the story may be made up for by the added tension caused by the hearer's knowledge throughout the body of the tale that the boar is waiting for Diarmaid at the end. Other instances of the ironing out of an in-tale occur in a version of GF, where the story of the loss of the billhook

and cauldron is told at the beginning of the story, with Murchadh taking part, rather than being described to Murchadh by his servant later: and in a version of DGP (H) where the story begins with the first part of the in-tale (the hermit wins a bride) then the frame-story is told (he meets Murchadh and gives the woman to him) and finally the end of the in-tale (she is abducted, but as in the original it is not Murchadh but the hermit who rescues her.) In Kerry versions of CG the in-tale is told in the third person at the point where it happened, while Conall is still asleep, and then once more in the first person by Ridire an Ghaisge when Conall meets him. In other versions it is told at the point in the story where it is told in the MS, but in the third person and about Conall himself.

The last unconscious process of editing which tends to make a story more compact is the tendency to reduce its centre to a formula, which has been noticed when considering versions of CG and instances of triplication. Formula tales like the Kerry CRI, Cathal and Cú mac an Ghabha are very popular at least locally in Ireland, presumably because they are easy to remember. The better two versions of TGG have far more unity than the MS, where the only connection between the various episodes is that the three giants involved are two brothers and their foster-father. There is a totally unconnected episode where Cú Chulainn disenchants a princess in the form of a dragon, and a battle with the king of Almayn's son which is only connected by the fact that the latter tells Cú

Chulainn where to find one of the giants. The oral versions bind all these together by making the last, Cú Chulainn's informant, into a king who is the father of three princesses: these represent the original heroine, the princess rescued from the first giant in the MS, and the princess in the form of a dragon. All three have been carried off or enchanted by the three giants, who are all brothers and all, as one is in the MS, invulnerable. What the oral versions lose in variety, they gain in unity.

Most of the changes mentioned so far may be taken as due to the unconscious processes of faulty memory and the desire of conscientious tellers to compensate for faults of memory. There can be little doubt, however, that the more ambitious Gaelic tellers, especially in regions like Kerry and Connemara where lively telling seems to be preferred to accurate passing on of tradition, do deliberately add picturesque details and borrowed motifs to stories, and even combine motifs to form new stories.[1] I cannot quote an admission of this from a Gaelic teller, but here is a statement from Hungary, where exuberant embroidery and free motif-combination seem to be

1. Examples quoted by scholars such as Murphy of conscientious tellers have tended to be from Co. Cork or Scotland, where tradition appears from the stories themselves to be more respected. It would beinteresting to hear more of the point of view of tellers from other parts of Ireland.

common, as in Ireland:[1] "Mihály Fedics... says on one occasion, "If somebody with the appropriate talent knows but a few - say ten - tales, he can easily make a hundred stories out of them".... We are acquainted with many statements of Fedics's revealing his conscious creativeness; he has affirmed repeatedly that he has adapted tale-motifs rather freely, maintaining at the same time that the introduction of variations only serves to increase the value of his tales. The same practice is followed by many a good raconteur in this country, as is confirmed by text-analyses of old collections as well".[2] It is doubtful whether an Irish teller would vary his stories consciously from one telling to another: but compilations of motifs from CG, CRI, EIA, and half a dozen popular international types are so common that one could easily speak of a hundred tales having been made out of ten.

Two of the versions of Leigheas Coise Céin have certainly been edited deliberately at some time in their history. The version taken down for Campbell of Islay from Lachlann MacNeill, an Islayman in Paisley, has been edited by the addition of versions of the "werewolf's tale"[3], CG, GF, Fionn agus Lorcán and an episode not known to me elsewhere, to make the intale up to the traditional "twenty-four stories". The teller

1. "Our best raconteurs revel in small incidents, readily enlarging the plot-structure by introducing new motifs." Gyula Ortutay, Hungarian Folk-Tales (Budapest 1961) p.61. One of them, Ferenc Czapár, is quoted, ibid. p.62. as saying that he could begin a tale from anything, and had taken a week to tell a single story.

2. Ibid. p. 62; 57.

3. Described below, p. 266ff.

claimed on different occasions to have heard the story from his father and from a carter in Islay, which suggests that, in spite of Campbell's opinion that he was merely "a register", he himself compiled the long version out of stories told from these two sources: he knew that Campbell was looking for a very long story, and took some time supposedly to collect his memories of the story. Whether he or someone earlier fitted the story together, it is consistently told, with the names of Conall and Murchadh always replaced by An Calpach and Gormshùil, characters who belong to his folk version of LCC.[1]

The Irish version of LCC which I have found has similarly been stitched together with two stories, the story of the secret of heather-beer and GF. The first is told of Brian Bóroimhe and the inhabitants of Aran: at the end Brian finds a character called "Mac Sonaidhe", whom he brings up with his son Murchadh. The frame-story of LCC is then told, with Mac Sonaidhe replacing Ó Crónagáin: after the disappearance of his fairy wife GF follows, with Mac Sonaidhe accompanying Murchadh and finally marrying one of the women they find in the lake - possibly the lost fairy wife, though this is not made clear. Here the editing is probably not the teller's work, for this is a poorly told tale and he was a fine teller who could have made more of it: but there must have been deliberate editing to introduce the invented Mac Sonaidhe into all three tales, including GF where there is

1. It is of course possible that the transcriber, Hector MacLean, was in the plot and helped with this.

no proper place for such an extraneous character.

Apart from the combination of different tales, there are also examples of the combination of different versions of the same tale. Amhlaoibh Ó Loingsigh himself seems to have admitted that he did this with his version of TDG. Another example may be seen by comparing the versions of the story Maonus na Luinge Luaithe, described in the appendix, which were collected from the Kerry storyteller Pádraig Ó Loingsigh. The first is in Curtin's Hero-Tales, and may have been told by Pádraig himself or his father Muirís Ó Loingsigh.[1] The second, IFC 5 p. 150, includes a long irrelevant episode, not in Curtin, in which the hero fights two giants. The third, IFC 2 p. 194, also includes this episode, and the second half of the story, though based on the same motif of the search for the missing brother, is very different in detail. Moreover in this version the heroes are not called Maonus and Maolchlae, but Jack and Geamut. The teller said that his father had the story, but also that his source for the second version was one Seán Biornach. It seems therefore that he knew two widely differing versions of the same story, or perhaps two different stories with some points in common, and was able to combine the two as his fancy dictated.

Stories actually invented by folk tellers are, I am sure, rare: but there are three rather undistinguished stories, one about "Conall Óg" and two about the heroes of CRI, which may be the work of their teller, Tomás 'ac Gæraílt.[2]

1. Pádraig himself said that he told the stories to Curtin while his father translated.

2. IFC 358 p.183; 17 p. 169, 213 p. 103, 506 p. 265; 587 p. 540.

The collector of one of them, Seósamh Ó Dálaigh, noted that though 'ac Gearailt claimed to have heard the story from his mother, it was his own opinion that 'ac Gearailt had composed it himself, and I agree: the stories are totally undistinguished accounts of battles and hurling matches, yet 'ac Gearailt was so proud of one of them that he told it three times to collectors, though he never told CRI on which it is based. This suggests the pride of authorship. It is most unlikely that such stories would survive for any length of time in oral tradition, and I have found no others like them.

Conclusions.

In summing up, it may be worth while to go back and pick out one or two more general conclusions about these stories. First let us consider their distribution. It is difficult to find versions even of the best-known tales from every Gaelic-speaking area today: but there is reason to suppose that stories like CG and CRI were told all over Gaelic Ireland and Scotland a hundred years ago, as EIA was more recently. Versions can still be found from most areas which follow the MS fairly closely in the plot and the names of characters. It is not very likely that such versions could travel far without being changed, so we can reasonably conclude that the stories were separately derived from MSS in different areas at some period: at least from one MS in Scotland, one in Ulster, and one in

Munster, and probably from far more. Some slightly less popular stories are more localised: TS and CF in Munster and Connacht, DGP and LCC in Scotland and Leath Cuinn, with the best versions in Scotland. The first group may indicate the sphere of influence of late Munster MSS, the second that of rather earlier MSS from Scotland or Ulster. DGP and GF may be instances of stories from the latter group being collected by Munster scribes, and in the case of GF recirculated from their MSS in their sphere of influence.

The fact that many of the versions which follow MSS most closely come from Scotland or Co. Cork may indicate that more MSS were in circulation in these regions, but it probably also points to a greater respect for ancient tradition there. The storytelling tradition of Kerry and Connemara, the most lively tradition in recent years, seems to have allowed more freedom in embroidering the original version and incorporating motifs from other sources. The existence of oecotypes in these areas which have strayed a long way from the MS version, but which sometimes are widely known and have been known for many years[1] shows that a purely oral tradition of storytelling there goes back a long way - probably well before 1800, unless the mutation rate of stories there is exceptionally fast.

It seems to me probable that most motifs which appear in Romantic tales and are also popular in oral tradition originated in the written tales or at least in the literary

1. E.g. the main Kerry type of CG, of which I now know some 14 versions, mostly from W. Kerry but some from S. Kerry: the earliest is in Curtin's Hero-Tales, published in 1894.

tradition. Some of them, such as teach na n-amhus and the "Everlasting Fight", have however been considerably amplified in oral tradition. Motifs from Romantic tales, along with those from international märchen, have gone to form a common stock which can be drawn on to add to any ancient story or new compilation among oral hero-tales.

The amplification of older motifs, the borrowing of motifs because of chance resemblances or to fill gaps in a story, and the way in which some motifs are generally remembered and others generally forgotten, are all aspects of a single feature of oral tradition: the fact that tellers prefer and tend to remember a detail which is striking. I would suggest, moreover, that the plot details which are most favoured are those which make a striking picture in the mind's eye. The addition of picturesque details is, and always has been, particularly characteristic of Gaelic storytelling; but it is worth suggesting that the memorisation of plot details in the form of tableaux may be a universal tendency, and one which would repay further study. Gaelic tellers seem to memorise their stories as a series of such tableaux, to be described in their own words, accompanied by a varying number of names and verbal formulae such as details of dialogue. Some tellers will remember many of the latter, while others will omit them or supply them from a general stock which may be used in any story. This stock of names and runs, which is used to some extent by all Gaelic tellers of hero-tales, and will be examined in the next chapter, seems, unlike the stock of motifs, to be almost entirely of native origin,

and largely derived from the Romantic tales.

Finally, we have seen that the romances undergo a process of simplification in oral tradition which up to a point is actually an improvement. What is lost in subtlety is gained in drama and cohesion. Taken together with the embroidery of the motifs which remain, and the tendency to add well-tried favourite details from the stock, this means that a good teller's version of a Romantic tale may be an excellent story made out of a pretentious rigmarole. But as nearly all the main details of such a story will be derived from the Romantic tales, it is not fair to dismiss the latter as a set of pretentious rigmaroles.

That oral variants of Romantic tales can actually be better constructed than their originals raises another point. It has generally been assumed by members of the Finnish school of folklorists that international tales can be traced to a single original form, which can usually be identified as the most logically constructed form generally current. Walter Anderson was ready to admit that the modern norm (Normalform) could differ from the original norm (Urform), when a chance variation had become generally accepted.[1] But it is still generally accepted, as far as I know, that the Urform must itself be a well-constructed story, though De Vries has drawn attention to the existence in India and the Near East of märchen of a much more loosely constructed type than is normal in Western Europe. The development of the Romantic tales over a comparatively short period in a

1. FFC No.42, p.403-4.

small area suggests that the logical Urform could well have arisen in oral tradition from the wearing-down of a much more diffuse original. It also provides parallels for the existence of several local oecotypes side-by-side which differ so fundamentally that they could hardly be derived from one well-constructed Urform, and even for the existence of stories in early forms, for instance the Greek myths, which are obviously related to modern märchen but seem as if they cannot be their sources. This problem has usually ~~be~~ been explained by saying that the myths are literary re-workings of the märchen: but the development of CRI over a couple of centuries into the very different Kerry type suggests that, in suitable circumstances, stories can undergo the most radical changes. The suggestion that international tales go back to originals which may be quite illogical and impossible to reconstruct will not make the folklorist's task any easier: but it should be made.

APPENDIX

Folktales from lost MSS, and a compilation

It has always been assumed, on the basis of the tale-lists, that far more stories existed, in oral or written form, in the twelfth century, than are known to us today. We have no tale-lists for the Romantic tales, but we have catalogues of some individual libraries, which list stories which cannot now be identified. Thus the catalogue of Colgán's library[1] names Imtheachta Nuadha Neachtmhair and Eachtra Neachtain Mhic Nuadhat, which seem to be lost historical or Romantic tales, and "a sgēul fabuil" by one or other of two named authors. John Beaton's library in Mull[2] had once included a Romantic tale called Tóraidheacht an Chuill(?) Chorcaire. I have seen fragments of tales of this type, otherwise unknown to me, in MSS from Maynooth and Belfast.[3] It is possible that some lost tales have survived in oral tradition; for although most stories which are popular as folktales are also plentiful in MS, there are instances of stories which survive now in a single MS or even a fragment, but are known in a number of folk versions (DGP, TGG). I propose here to consider a few folktales which are not mere compilations of borrowed motifs, but have striking

1. Historical MSS Commission 4th Report p.611. Colgán died about 1657.
2. Lhuyd p. 37ff.
3. O'Curry MS 59; Queen's University MS 6 (1712).

features of their own, and may well be derived from lost literary tales.

The best known of these is the "werewolf's tale" studied by Kittredge and others.[1] It consists of a frame-tale and an equally long in-tale - a typically Irish structure - the latter telling how the teller was enchanted in the form of a wolf, and regained his own shape after saving the child of a king. Kittredge's detailed analysis of the story in relationship to the Latin Arthur and Gorlagon in Rawlinson B149 (c.1400) and the Old French lays of Melion and Bisclavret omits one important factor, brought out in versions which he had not seen: that there are two quite distinct oecotypes of the tale. One is the Irish type which he studies, where the werewolf is enchanted, as in Arthur and Gorlagon, by his faithless wife. The other includes all the Scottish folk versions, and in it the enchantress is the werewolf's stepmother. This is, of course, a commonplace of international folktale, and indeed the whole motif in Scottish versions is closely related to the opening of the Scottish form of AT 451. But if we suppose the stepmother to have replaced the wife in the course of oral transmission of the story, this must have happened before 1500, for the Scottish form of the story is the one used in Eachtra an Mhadra Mhaoil, first found in Egerton 1782 (c.1517).

1. G.L. Kittredge, Arthur and Gorlagon, Harvard Studies and Notes in Philology and Literature, vol. VIII (Boston, 1903), W.J. Gruffydd, Math vab Mathonwy, (Cardiff, 1928), passim. J.G. Mackay, An Tuairisgeal, in TGSI vol. XXXIV (1935, for 1928) p.1. To the bibliography of 25 versions and related tales in the last may be added: Curtin, Hero-Tales p.356; Béal. IV p.155; An Stoc, Samhain 1929, p.11; Sg. D. p.59. Others could certainly be found.

EMM only copies a small part of the folktale, but it agrees with the Scottish versions in other particulars: that several brothers were enchanted together, but only one survived, after committing some frightful sin - in folk versions, usually eating his brothers, in EMM, begetting children on his brothers who had been turned into she-wolves.[1]

There are other differences between Scottish and Irish oral versions: e.g. in Scotland the midwives accuse the wolf of eating the king's new-born child, and this happens three times running; in Ireland it only happens once, though children had disappeared before the wolf's arrival, and it is the werewolf's own wife who accuses him and hides the giant's arm which he had torn off, and sometimes the child itself which he had rescued. The frame-stories in the two types are almost entirely different, and have in common only that the hero is set to discover the werewolf's story after losing a game with a supernatural, from whom he has previously won the wife who instructs him and the horse which helps him. In Scotland the supernatural asks for the tale of the death of his father "An Tuairisgeal Mór": this is the giant who had his arm torn off and was later killed by the werewolf. In Ireland the search is for the sword of light and its owner's history, or "An t-Aon-Scéal", perhaps meaning the "truth about women" which is the object of the search in Arthur and Gorlagon. In Scotland the hero sells his horse for the werewolf himself, an aged man whom he buys

1. This feature supports Gruffydd's contention that the story is somehow connected with the Mabinogi of Math, in which a similar incident occurs.

from his son. By refusing all the old man's requests, he escapes his magic power, extorts the tale with threats, and leaves the teller to die; meanwhile the horse returns to him, because he has refused to sell its bridle (cf.AT 325). In Ireland he rides twice to steal the sword, and would have been caught but for the speed of his horse; the third time, the ex-werewolf is so tired out with watching that the hero finds him asleep, steals the sword, and extorts its owner's story by threatening him with it.

Clearly neither type can be directly derived from the Latin Arthur and Gorlagon, written probably in Wales, nor from the mere fragment in EMM. Was their common source a native Gaelic folktale, or a literary work? It is not easy to imagine a pure folktale having such a complex plot, particularly one with the literary in-tale structure. Moreover, it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that parts of this story were borrowed into Welsh in the Mabinogion and into Breton before being used in the French lays: this could more easily have happened if they were in writing. It is hard to explain how mere fragments of an Irish folktale could have travelled so far, and even harder to explain how fragments of Welsh mythological tales and Breton folk-tales could have been combined into a well-constructed Irish tale without literary intervention; but the plundering of written material was a common mediaeval practice. This literary version can hardly have been written after the Middle Irish period, since it developed two widely divergent oecotypes by the fifteenth century. Compare Kittredge's opinion: "This Irish archetype ... was a pretty definite

piece of literary work (oral or written), composed at a time considerably antecedent to the earliest French versions of Arthurian romances".[1] The oral versions of the frame-story, which differ more widely from each other and from Arthur and Gorlagon than the versions of the in-tale, may have been modified later: this might explain the prominence of the helpful horse, rare in literary Irish tales but often added to oral versions, which may have evolved from something like Arthur's unwillingness to dismount in Arthur and Gorlagon.[2]

Several folktales are associated with the name of Maghnus (Maonus, Mànus). The historical king of Norway, Magnus Barelegs, is supposed to be the model for the invader of Ireland who appears in a popular Fenian lay. In the folktales, as in the lay and the Romantic tale TCS, Maghnus is always of the royal house of Lochlann.

The most popular of these stories may be called Maonus na Luinge Luaithe, which is the hero's full name in two Kerry versions. The name appears with this epithet in the eighteenth-century Eachtra an Deirg, though not apparently in the lay. There are in effect five versions known to me: Béal. XII p. 92, from Pádraig 'ac Aodhain, Co. Mayo; Larminie p. 35, from Terence Davis, Co. Galway; and three

1. Op.cit. p.196. As the hero of the frame-story in Arthur and Gorlagon is Arthur, and in three of the six oral versions which give him a personal name he is Arthur, Art and Neart respectively, it is tempting to suggest that the hypothetical literary original was the Aigidecht Artúir named in the Book of Leinster tale-list.

2. "Arture, descende et comede", in the formula which punctuates the in-tale. This formula is another feature which confirms the story's Gaelic origin; cf. the formulae in LCC and DGP, above, p.98, 117-8.

from West Kerry: Curtin, Hero-Tales p. 114, from either Pádraig or Muirís Ó Loingsigh - the former's Irish is in IFC 2 p. 194 and 5 p. 150; Béal. I p. 357, from Seán Grumaill - an incomplete copy of what seems to be the same version is in IFC 357 p. 372; and IFC 359 p. 463, from Peatson Ruairc. It is worth pointing out that all but the last of these were notable tellers of hero-tales.

The plot is briefly that Maonus insists upon marrying a princess whose previous husbands have both vanished on their wedding night. Despite guards surrounding the bridal chamber, Maonus also vanishes, but is traced and rescued by his elder brother with the help of a mysterious ragged man. The name of the brother, the real hero, varies from Maolchlae (Malla Claomhanach) in Kerry, through Maoltach in Mayo, to Bealtach (? - phonetically spelt by Larminie Bioultach) in Galway: the original form is impossible to guess, but may well have been a compound of Maol in one sense or another. There are considerable differences in detail between the versions, but many of these could be explained by the loss of different episodes of a long written original in each case. Thus two Kerry versions agree with the Galway one in including an episode where Maolchlae is killed by three jugglers (cleasadóirithe) while the third shares with the Mayo version an episode where Maolchlae must collect certain magic objects to make a sword. Other motifs included in more than one version are: a water-monster killed with a brass apple; what sounds very like the Muir Teacht of the next story; Maonus bound under the Ríogh-choinneal; and a helpful hag.

In most versions Maolchlae has several encounters with his enemy, who escapes each time. Certain versions borrow motifs from CRI: in Galway, the hags who later become beautiful women; in Mayo, Bile na mBuadh; in Ruairc's version, a bull-fight. But the opening, though rather shortened in the two last-named versions, is pretty consistently told, and so is the end with the problem which of the three husbands takes the wife. There are place-names which suggest MS origin: the Galway version takes place in Ireland, Spain, Greece, Sorcha and Inis Tuile ("Island of the Torrent"). The basis of the story is of course the international "Asmodeus" motif used in AT 507, but its development seems to be an Irish literary one.

Another long story of "Mànus" was known in S. Uist.[1] It may have been a story peculiar to the island, composed perhaps by one of the MacMhuirich family, but it is surely literary. It was evidently celebrated in the island, judging by the S. Uist saying quoted above: "Gach eachdraidh gu eachdraidh Mhànuis". It is the only case I know from Scotland of the use of the modern form of eachtra in the title of a long folktale. The motivation of the first half of the story seems far too subtle for pure folktale: Mànus' uncle's wife persecutes him because his father had abdicated in favour of her husband, and she fears that Mànus will reclaim his inheritance and displace her son. In a folktale she would simply be a stepmother.

1. JFC III p. 367, Sg. D. p.1.

Other literary features include Balcan gobha, the king of Lochlann's garbh-theaghlach, his capital Beirbh, a sword from Antuaidh,[1] the caoraich chorcra (chorcnaich, chorrachar - crimson sheep) borrowed from Stair Earcuil, and particularly a sort of Sargasso Sea called muir-tiachd, whose description coincides exactly with that of the Muir Teacht in TTT: at first sight it seems like a wood growing in the sea, so thick is it with the masts of trapped ships. Some other details have literary parallels outside the Romantic tales: Mànus has a helping lion like Yvain, and the gruagach whose life-principle is in three trout in a stream is parallelled in the curious Scottish Gaelic lay about Murchadh mac Briain and the daughter of the Heir of Dublin.[2] But hardly any of the other incidents - Mànus' early marriage to a mere earl's daughter to handicap him, the taming of the lion with a magic mantle, the blind doorkeeper who kills his own men, the heirs whose fathers are forced to yield their rights, the monster which contains the emperor's life and whose blood cures the gruagach, and the resurrection of Mànus by hammering him out on an anvil! - has a parallel in Gaelic folklore, though the last sounds almost too strange to be literary. It is still a fascinating story; it is a pity the original cannot be found.

1. So read Craig's Abhainn Tuaidh, and compare MRE.
2. LNF p. 209.

A further Scottish tale[1] is associated with the name of Mànus. At first sight this looks like another literary tale, particularly in Duncan Macdonald's version, which contains a number of names of literary origin. However, all these names are found in Scottish Gaelic folktales, and most of them in Duncan's own tales, and it seems clear that the basis of the story is the international AT 650, though very much elaborated. The emphasis on the suckling of the hero is common in AT 650, and there is a clear trace of the international tale in the killing of a monster which swallows ploughs and horses, though the sequel where the monster is harnessed to the plough and terrifies the hero's employer is left out, as the hero has no employer to terrify, and instead a motif from Fenian folktale is used: the hero is swallowed and cuts his way out. The story has been edited in this way, apparently deliberately, throughout, and motifs have been added from native and international tradition: the Everlasting Fight, a witch who lures the hero to her house in the form of a beautiful woman. A quest theme has been superimposed: the search for the hero's nurse. Some curious details appear: Mànus' nurse vanishes after throwing the boy over a cliff, but he is found safe at the bottom, playing like the children in the story of the finding of Bran, with a golden ball and a silver shinty-stick. Mànus' uncle comes to look for him on the battlefield in the shape of a griffin, and Mànus

1. Waifs & Strays II p. 338; Sg.D. p.30 - the hero in the latter is simply called Mac Rìgh Lochlainn, perhaps intentionally to avoid confusion with the tale above.

nearly attacks him. With EIA in mind, it might be possible to suggest that the story was a literary one based on an international type: but in that case, would such a curious vestige as the horses and ploughs associated with the monster have been allowed to remain? It seems rather more likely that the story is an elaborate compilation by some folk-teller, probably a good while back, as the story was known both in Argyll and Uist.[1]

There may well be a MS basis for the story of "Kil Arthur" or "Caoin Ártur".[2] This seems to belong to Aran:[3] the hero's name is certainly derived from the literary English borrowing Cing Artúr, and there are at least two episodes which seem too unusual to belong to an ordinary folktale. The first is where Kil Arthur's sister refuses to praise the banquet given by her husband, and a mysterious dark horseman (Kil Arthur himself) fetches the husband and shows him the much better fare and music at her home. This extension of a favourite literary introduction[4] is exactly parallelled in the Mull version of LCC, where the wife is admittedly a fairy woman, and the motif is therefore more

1. Another Scottish tale of Màrus, in Henderson, The Norse Influence on Celtic Scotland, (Glasgow 1910) p. 294, is merely an adaptation of the popular Third Calender's Tale from the Arabian Nights. The tale of Màrus in J.F. Campbell, Sia Sgialachdan (Edinburgh, privately printed, 1939) p.39, is curious and may be derived from a Romantic tale.

2. Handbook p.624, No.9, from Curtin, Myths, p. 175; Aodhmain Mac Gríogóir, Fréamhacha na hÉireann (Belfast, 1906) p. 5.

3. Mac Gríogóir's version and the parallel quoted below are from Aran: Curtin could have heard tellers from Aran when he was in Galway.

4. See above, p. 234.

appropriate. The other unusual episode is the game of cards between Kil Arthur and the head of a giant whom he has just killed - the head tries to cheat! This, with the end of the story, appears in another Aran tale.[1] Possibly the story is a local compilation using literary motifs: but it could just as well be a local survival of a written tale. Another lost Arthurian tale may be represented by Sir Uallaibh O'Còrn from Tiree.[2]

A story whose origins are bound up with literature, if not with an actual written tale, is that of Cian, the Glas Gaibhleann, Balor and the birth of Lugh.[3] Incidental references seem to show that it was known to the author of OCT, about the fifteenth century, and there is an unexplained reference in the Middle Irish version of Cath Muighe Tuireadh to a magic heifer demanded as payment by the Dagda which sounds very like the Glas Gaibhleann, though Cian is there said to have married Balor's daughter openly. Even as late as 1803 Denis Buckley[4] refers to Cian mac Cáinte as if he were the hero of a story - so the reference is not to OCT - and that story had been in the MS which Buckley lost.

Other stories of possibly literary origin could be picked out and some among the Fenian tales have already been mentioned.[5] But it is more useful to give an example of a

1. Béal. XIV p. 248
2. TGSI XIII p. 69.
3. Handbook p. 607, No. 25; several versions summarised by Gruffydd, op. cit. p. 65 - 76.
4. In the poem quoted above, p.123.
5. Above, p. 88.

popular compilation for contrast. After each episode the probable source is given in brackets.

Loinnir mac Leabhair is known to me in twenty versions: seven from Mayo, one from Clare, and the rest from Co. Galway. In seventeen of these the hero's name is Loinnir mac Leabhair or something similar; the other names may be borrowed from CG. The heroine is Lasair Fhíon-dhearg, the usual Connacht name for the heroine of CG, in five versions, Gruaig Dhearg or Lacha Dhearg in others: the hero's companion is Drúcht Uaine, Druac Dún (cf. Dúnadhach Draoi) in five versions, or Caol an Iarainn; the villain is three times Macaomh Mór, or sometimes Amadán Mór, Rí Mór.

The printed version in the book of the same name begins with a long description of the meeting of Loinnir and Drúcht Uaine, their building a boat and so on. Little of this is in other versions, and it seems to be an example of a good teller expanding his source with rather pedestrian details. After vowing friendship, they are put under geasa by a girl in a boat to find her. (CRI). They find her, liberate her father (Ridire gan Ghâire: cf. p. 209 ff.) and Drúcht Uaine marries her. Loinnir then goes off to find his own bride to whom he has been betrothed from birth; he carries her off (much as in CG). Loinnir falls asleep and she is carried off by a giant. (CG). Loinnir pursues and kills the giant (as in dozens of tales). On the way home they land at a kingdom where the prince - or on a more plebeian level, an innkeeper - makes Loinnir drunk and throws him over a cliff where he lands in a griffin's nest, or floats about in the sea, kept alive by a magic ring

(variants of the in-tale in CG). He is rescued by a captain sent to look for him, or who finds him by chance: in either case he then helps in the "Everlasting Fight". (CG or stock folktale episode). Then he arrives at the prince's wedding to his own wife and rescues her. (Cf. end of EIA or of DGP). Sometimes he then sleeps again and his wife is stolen again; or at the end he is killed in a fight with the Fenians and resurrected (cf. ECM).

This is not a typical compilation: it is comparatively well constructed, possibly on the basis of a devolved version of CG, and so has become known over an area of more than one county. Few compilations are so successful, and only a score of them have a hero with an invented name, which implies some degree of conscious editing. But this, and the examples quoted on pp. 182-3, will give some idea of the way in which the borrowed motifs are rearranged in the hundreds of stories of this type which must exist. Oral versions of lost MS tales are unlikely to be anything like as numerous: and the number of lost tales represented by oral versions will probably not be as great as the number of MS tales which have survived only in their written form. There <u>are</u> unique fragments of ancient tradition preserved only in folktales, but they are buried in a mass of stuff which any teller knows.

CHAPTER FOUR.

Verbal formulae in oral tradition.

Although I have devoted the greater part of this study to examining the development of the plots and motifs of the Romantic tales, since plots and motifs are the main interest of most students of the folktale, it is difficult to pass over entirely their most characteristic feature: the language. The style of storytelling which was sketched in the first chapter[1] has had a considerable influence upon almost all the longer folktales told in Gaelic in the past century, and folk versions of Romantic tales often quote parts of their originals almost word for word. Unfortunately I have not space here to illustrate this, as could easily be done, with extensive quotations, still less to prove any point conclusively by quotation. What follows, therefore, is a mere sketch of some aspects of the tradition, and especially of the runs, without any more quotations than are needed to show what I am talking about. I hope to have an opportunity to write a fuller study of the style of these tales in the future.

Runs and other floating traditional formulae.

The "runs", as they appear in written tales, have been described in Ch. I.[2] They use a fairly standardised framework, which lays down the aspects of a scene which must be described, and deck this out with sonorous allit-

1. Pp. 24-30.
2. See p. 26.

erative verbiage, which no doubt served to display the virtuosity of the reciter as well as the vocabulary of the author. Runs in folktales are certainly used to show off the teller's ability to reel off strings of long and often incomprehensible words at breakneck speed, for they are always spoken faster than the rest of the story: but they are said also to serve as interludes where the teller can rest his conscious memory, or use it to make sure that he knows what comes next in the narrative.[1] This means that the run must be learned absolutely by heart, and the practice of most folk tellers is to have only one run for each type of situation, which they use at any point in any tale where a description of a fight, or a sea voyage, or a feast, as the case may be, is required. Consequently folk runs in general adhere more closely to a stereotyped form of words than the runs of the written romances.

The subject, as Delargy says,[1] deserves treatment in a separate monograph. Some indication of the complex way in which written and oral runs are inter-related may be given here by a brief analysis of one of the most common and most highly developed types, the sailing run.

In MSS and folktales alike, runs describing sea voyages are second only to those describing battles in popularity and elaboration. There is normally some description of the ship putting out to sea and of the scenes of the voyage: the arrival is usually barely mentioned. In the long runs in such early tales as CF and CML, the ships are

1. Cf. GST p.35 (209).

rowed out to sea, and the voyage is diversified by a storm. In later texts and in folktales the voyage almost always begins with the hoisting of sails, and details which seem to have belonged originally to the storm are introduced as accompaniments to an untroubled journey. Some of the standard phrases which occur both in MS and folk versions can be quoted:

Preliminaries. Some MSS describe the fitting out of the ship in detail, but more often it is condensed into a triad which appears in as early a story as EMM: "do chuir trí tionnchaire luinge innte, eadhón biadh i n-ionad a chaithmhe, agus ór i n-ionad a phronnta, agus arm i n-ionad a dhíbeartha."[1] This sometimes appears in oral versions, slightly mangled, e.g: "gur bhuaileadar uirthí na trí seóltaí a b'fhearr a chuaidh ar luing ariamh. Mur bhí: Bias - 'ionad a chaithte; ór - 'ionad a bhrontaí; 7 arm a' ionad Uí Úraidh."[2] Then the heroes board the ship - sometimes with a leap, as in MS and oral versions of CRI[3] - and in many MS tales, most Scottish and a few Irish versions, do thugadar tosach do mhuir 7 deireadh do thír.[4]

Setting sail. Though this does not occur in CF or CML, the description can be traced in a simple form to as early a story as Togail Bruidne Da Derga:[5] "Ar(r)o-tógaibseat íarum na seóla for na crundu", and the basic

1. EMM, ed. Macalister, p.18. Similarly in CRI, GD, EIA (Eg. 171) and Sgéalta Rómánsuíochta.
2. IFC 112 p.7 (Co. Galway); cf. IFC 237 p.143; GJ XII p.86.
3. Ed. Hyde p.56; LML p.120.
4. MS: CRI, GD, TS, Sgéalta Rómánsuíochta. Irish oral: IFC 1263 p.214.
5. Ed. Knott l. 476.

form of the phrase has been the same ever since, with the addition of various adjectives qualifying the sails and masts. In Scottish oral versions siùil bhreaca bhaidealacha are usual, in Irish seólta bocóideacha bán-dearga; in Scotland the masts are fada fulangach, in Ireland cómh-fhada cómh-dhíreach. Only the last of these descriptions is at all common in MS versions of the run, which prefer adjectives that alliterate with the noun. In MSS the description continues with the wind filling the sails, and this may be the source of a passage in Scottish runs which describes the wind at length in a rather contradictory way: "soirbheas beag,ciùin, lag, laghach... a bheireadh duilleach a craoibh, fraoch a beinn, agus seileach òg as a fhriamhaichean."[1] Then in MSS the ship takes a swift swoop (sidhe sárluath) into the high seas (dromchladh na díleann). This is not reflected in any oral version I have seen: as soon as the sails are hoisted the ship is at sea, except in the Kerry versions where the hero kicks it seven leagues into the sea and jumps after it!

The voyage. The hero is ploughing the sea (ag treabhadh na fairrge) in most Irish oral runs and some MSS.[2] Nearly every oral run describes the sea as (fairrge) folcanta falcanta in Irish, fulcanaich falcanaich in Scottish Gaelic.[3] The oldest MS in which I have seen anything of the sort is Eg.171 (1790): "a mbar na tunna fálcuir fíor-

1. TGSI XIII p.69, slightly changed to correspond to the more usual word order (e.g. JFC II p.456, IFC 1030.)
2. E.g. CRI, ed. Hyde p.56. In Scottish Gaelic a' caitheamh na fairrge (a' chuain) occurs (e.g. Waifs & Strays II p.348)
3. Folcarnaigh falcarnaigh in an Ulster version, GJ X p.542.

doimhine." The adjective here seems to be Dinneen's falcmhar, "stormy (of waves)", and probably the other forms are more fanciful derivatives of the root seen in Old Irish folcud, washing, and folc, a downpour. We are dealing, then, with a reasonable poetic derivative from an Irish stem, not with sheer nonsense or the loan from Old Norse suggested by Bugge;[1] but, as Eg.171 belongs to the folk as much as the written tradition, it seems to be an independently developed folk phrase, not based on any MS, which has become almost universal. One might contrast the phrase which follows in some Scottish versions: "leobhar ghuirme, leobhar dheirge, Lochlannaich,"[2] which may be a simple corruption from something like "an lear...leabharthonnach na lán-bhochna" in the MSS of CG, by way of "an lear dearg 's an lear uaine lachannach."[3]

The sea-creatures. In the earliest texts the description of the creatures and their cries belongs to the storm: "co nach cualadar-san énní acht nuall...na murdhúc(h)ann 7 gotha imda éccunnla na n-én...ós gluair glastonn agá crothad."[4] But the tradition of delight in Nature which belongs especially to the Fenian tales seems to have

1. Bugge's theory and J. H. Lloyd's championship of it are discussed by Christiansen, ISFT pp.14-15, who dismisses it, with the backing of Marstrander. In any case the theory requires that the adjectives should apply to the ship, and in every version known to me they apply to the sea (fairrge) with which they alliterate. Norse nautical loanwords do, on the other hand, occur in literary runs in CF and CML, as the editors of the M&M editions point out.
2. Waifs & Strays II p.348. The adjectives are still genitive feminine, depending on na fairrge.
3. JFC II p.472.
4. CF, ed. O'Rahilly, l. 50. Compare EAC, ed. Bergin, para.9.

transmuted this scene of horror. In as early a text as ETC the birds are objects of delight: "atchualadar impaib... coicedal na n-én n-iomda n-anaithnid...cur ba aenach do na h-ócaib beith acá mídemain 7 acá m(óirdhécsin)".[1] Folk runs make even the monsters sing lullabies: "Is e bu cheòl cànranaich cadail dhà, lubartaich easgann, screadardaich fhaoileann, beuchdaich ròn is bhèisdean mòra" in Scotland, "míolta móra a' déanamh ceóil-sí 7 seirbhíse dhóibh," in Connacht.[2]

The monsters of MS runs are not usual in folktales: the mermaids of CF and the sea-monks and Leviathans of EAC[3] do not appear, and of the rest there is usually only one sort: whales (míolta móra) in Ireland, sea-monsters in Scotland in a fine evocation of the law of the jungle: "a' bhèisd bu mhò ag ithidh na bèisd' bu lugha, 's a' bhèisd bu lugh' a' dèanamh mar a dh' fhaodadh i."[4] The favourite creatures in oral runs, and in later MSS, are seals, eels and seagulls. A run in Sgéalta Rómánsuíochta gives a good example of the sober basis for more exuberant oral runs: "...ag ēisdeacht le mīlibh mōra, le gotha rón, le sgartach na bhfaoileann, le dīsgearnnach na n-eascon..."[5] The latter

1. SG I p.344. As elsewhere in ETC, there is no doubt an echo of the immrama, in which wonderful singing birds are common: but they are on land, and these are evidently sea birds.
2. TGSI XIII p.69; D. Ó Fotharta, Siamsa a' Gheimhrí (2nd ed., Dublin 1947) p.7. For the lullaby motif cf. GD, SG I p.265: "ba cheól codalta...d' Fhionn...beith ac éistecht re coicetal na mara."
3. Loc. cit: "gur ēirgheadar fon curach rōin 7 lifidhna 7 toilgind..."
4. TGSI XIII p.69. I quote this source constantly because, though ill-spelt, it is the fullest folk-run I know.
5. ECC, l. 3814.

part of this is parallelled in folk runs from Scotland like that quoted at the end of the last paragraph, and from Ulster: "ag éisdeacht le muca, rónta, sgairteach na bhfaoileannán, lúbarnach na n-easgann..."[1] In Connacht seagulls and eels each have their own phrase: "scluig, sclaig ag a' bhfaoile binn ó thosach na luingeo deire na luinge...eascoin in ascallaí a chéile."[2] These are probably folk developments, and the eels arm-in-arm are probably manifestations of the same love of nonsense which may have led the author of TTT to write about "gáir na rón 7 na rionnach."[3] In Kerry the MS lists of monsters develop into near-nonsensical rigmaroles: "bíodh lupadáin, lapadáin, ceárnáin is márnáin, rínnte, róinte, míolta móra, éisgíní iangiala, an bradán 'san tarragheal ag teacht ar buis is ar bais is ar slait maidí rámha chuige."[4] Here the lupadáin may be libheadáin, Leviathans; from other versions it seems that éisgíní iangiala should really be péistíní éigciallaighe, a phrase found in MS runs; and the last couple seem to have developed from noun and adjective, as in ETC:[5] "na bradáin taidlecha táirrghela." The division of everything into assonating or rhyming pairs of words, of which one may be pure nonsense, is a typical folk way of making such a half-remembered MS survival into a memorable formula.

1. GJ X p.542.
2. Siamsa a' Gheimrí, loc. cit.
3. Ed. M. Ní Mhuirgheasa, l.2433 ff.
4. From the W. Kerry version of CG in IFC 215 p.424 & 15 p.187.
5. Loc. cit.

The storm. Another detail which seems to belong originally to the storm is the rising sand: "an gaineamh mín ag dul i n-uachtar, an gaineamh garbh ag dul i n-íochtar le neart treabhadh 7 tiomáint"[1] in Connacht; slightly different words are used in Kerry: "cuireadh sé grean na fairrge i n-uachtar 7 cubhar na fairrge i n-íochtar."[2] This is not found in Scottish versions or in most MS runs: but it has a long history. The rising sand accompanies the fight of Fergus with a monster in Aided Fergusa (meic Leti):[3] "do bí gainem fionntrachta in locha ar a uachtar," and also appears in the death-tale of Fergus mac Roígh when the hero enters the loch. It is used as part of a sea-run in CML:[4] "gurbo lēibenn grānna gerānach ar aillib 7 ar im-doimnib an aigēin a gainemh 7 a grian-turrscur ō īc(h)tar go (h)-uachtar." In this case it is certainly a result of the storm; in Aided Fergusa probably of the monster and Fergus himself lashing the waves; and in folk versions it is often explained as a result of the speed with which the ship sails. This explanation may have been developed after the storm dropped out of most folk versions of the run. Once again, oral tradition adds a contrasting phrase, and apparently the addition was made independently in Kerry, where the foam sinks, and Connacht, where it is coarse sand - in the Connacht tradition of preferring sound to sense.

1. LML p. 148.
2. IFC 1263 p. 215.
3. SG I p.
4. Ed. Jackson, 1.700.

A great deal of the description of the storm in early tales is taken up with describing the damage done to the ships: "co nār f(h)āguib in ghaoth aca clār gan crithnugad nā tairrnge gan tēgadh"[1] and so on, and so forth, at great length. Oral versions usually select two of these alliterative phrases, in accordance with their usual pattern: "nach bhfágadh téad-tíre gan tarraing, ná maide-rámha gan ró-bhrise" or "cha robh crann gun lùbadh no seòl gun reubadh," with near-rhyme replacing alliteration.[2]

The arrival. Various descriptions of sighting land can be found in individual MS and oral tales, but there seem to be no phrases common to both traditions. There is some MS basis for the description of climbing the mast in versions of EIA, but it is very brief: "Adubhairt Úr le hIollann Arm-Dhearg dul 'san gcrannóig, & do chuaidh Iollann suas 7 do chonnaic sé tír thaobh-áluinn uaidh."[3] This has been expanded in Campbell's Colonsay version[4] into a whole page of description by the typical folktale device of making first the eldest brother and then the second try to climb the mast and fail, and finally the youngest (Iollann) succeed.

MSS hardly ever describe how the ship came to land, and oral descriptions may reflect local conditions in the recent past, for Kerry stories make the hero anchor his ship: "Bhí sé istig 'sa chuan & theich sé isteach go maith

1. CML, ed. Jackson, l.703; similarly CF, ed. O'Rahilly, l.59.
2. Siamsa a' Gheimhrí, loc. cit.; Waifs & Strays II p.348.
3. Cl. Soluis edition.
4. JFC II p.473.

ar fad a snámhfadh an t-árthach dó,"[1] while Scottish ones make him pull it up on the beach: "Nuair a chaidh e air tìr, chuir e a làmh ann an sgròban na luingeadh agus thug e a seachd fad fhéin i air talamh glas, far nach sgobadh gaoth i's far nach sgréibeadh grian i 's far nach ruigeadh beadagan beag' baile mhóir oirre gos a bhith magadh no ballachd bùird oirre."[2] Fairly large boats had to be beached on Hebridean islands such as Mingulay until recently; but this may reflect the tradition of a much earlier period.[3] The end of this Scottish run has MS affinities: thus in EIA, "d'fhāgbhadar an long a n-ionadh nach ttiucfadh rē tuin a tarraing nō le gaoith a h-inghreim."[4] The usual Irish words at this point are different and probably purely oral, though they appear in GF:[5] "Do thug sé ceangal lae 7 lán bliana ar 'árthach (chuir i) gcás ná beach sé bhuaithe ach uair a' chluig."[6]

This is far from exhausting the list of phrases which may be found in this run, but most others, including some of the most striking, are confined to a single MS tale, or the oral tradition of a single province. Such are the

1. IFC 13 p.265. For ar fad, read an fhaid?
2. Sg. D. p.51.
3. In the MSS that mention this at all, however, the ship is moored: "Tēd a ttír, 7 do cheangail a long." (CG, 23M10.)
4. Ed. Ní Cléirigh, p.33 (IFC 581 p.66.)
5. Ed. Hyde, p.24.
6. IFC 981 p.135, from W. Kerry. In this particular version something much like the MS end follows: "...téud i muir 7 dhá théud i dtír in áit ná raibh gaoth á luasca, grian á sgolta nó éunlaithe an aer á sailiú air." That last phrase would hardly be likely to appear in a MS!

description of the sailors at work in CML, or the curiously anthropomorphic treatment of the wind in CF:[1] "ó nach bhfuair immorro in gaeth sin laigi arna laechaibh ná tlás arna trénferaib, do éirig uaithib..." or the description of the effects of a long sea-journey on the steersman in CG: "ba lán a bhél 7 a shrōn do bhrēntas 7 do mhorgadh."[2] Many phrases usual in Scottish runs have no parallel elsewhere: "Dhéanadh e fhéin stiùir 'na deireadh, iùl 'na toiseach, beairt 'na buillsgein; 's gun sgoilteadh i coinnlein cruaidh coirce roimh a toiseach le ro-fheabhas a stiuraidh."[3] "An fhaochag chrom chiar a bha seachd bliadhna air an aigeal, bheireadh i fead air a beul-mór is cnag air a h-ùrlar."[4] Kerry runs have long descriptions of rowing, different from the usual MS form, in which the hero manages twelve oars at once! "Nuair a théigheadh as a chuid seóla 7 seóltóireachta thairigheadh sé chuige dhá cheann déag do maidí (rámha) caoine, righne, míne, buana, bána, bas-leathana, don fhuinnseóg dhíreach nó don draigheann craorac do d' fhásach i mbun 's a mbárr 's a lár na beithile."[5] And so forth. I think I have quoted enough to show something of the diversity which is possible within the relatively constant framework of a single

1. Ed. O'Rahilly, l.69. Cf. CRI, ed. Hyde, p.78; CML, ed. Jackson, l.711, where the sea too is personified.
2. 23M10, p.23.
3. TGSI XIII p.69. The first part has Irish parallels.
4. Waifs & Strays II p.348. The winkles whistling over the gunwale have presumably been dislodged by the speed of the boat's passing!
5. IFC215 (see p.284 note 4.)

run-type.

This, then, gives an idea of the different histories which may lie behind different runs or parts of runs. Some remain confined to a single story and are not accepted into the general stock. Others are accepted and become common property in MSS. A few of these become equally well-known in oral tradition, like the hoisting of the sails above; but more often only the general outline, rather than the actual wording usual in MS versions, can be found in folk-tales. The list of sea-creatures in the sailing run, or of clothes and weapons in the arming run are examples of this. Even in MS there is room for variation in these, and the folk versions tend to crystallise into differing local oecotypes. Again, many runs and phrases which are common in MS may be found in folktales, but only occasionally, because they are too obscure to survive in folk tradition for long, except among the most careful tellers: trí tionnchaire luinge;[1] seacht dteallaigh déag na Gréige;[2] biadha saora, so-chaithmhe...7 deocha míne, meisgeamhla, garga, gabhálta;[3] gur éirigh buidhe forsan ngréin;[4] "an i gcuasaibh cairgreacha, i bpollaibh talmhan, nó i maidhmnibh iargcúla sléibhe do rugadh tú?"[5]

1. Above, p.280.
2. Mentioned in EIA and AM: cf. muinntir na Gréige Bige 7 na Gréige Muaire 7 seacht teallaí puirt na Gréige, Béal.XIV p.156.
3. Ceisneamh Inghine Guile, GGG, l.578. Cf. deochanna mìne, meisgeach, 's deochanna garga, gachannach, beathanna saora, socharach, JFC II p.477.
4. CG, 23M10 p.19: the phrase is used in several oral versions of CG, including those in An Stoc and SM.
5. MRE, GGG, l.303. Cf. JFC MS IV p.53 "a bhiasd...dam bu chòir a bhi ann an talamh toll...na'n sgeilpibh chreag na'n càrn bhiasta dugha leagail."

On the other hand many runs popular in folktales can be found in MS, but only occasionally. Often a run may be found in eighteenth-century stories which is recognisably the same as a common folk run: "ionnus go ndeurnadar trī trian don aoidhche sin, eadhōn trian le hōl, trian le ceōl, agus trian le trom-cheann suain agus sāimh-chodlata;" "air dteacht chuige an chuailleach comhrac dhō, bualais bēidhm neartmhur ro-thrēun fair...ionnus nach ar fhāg sē searrach a gcapoll, uan a gcaora, gamhain a mart, leanabh anna mnaoi, nō piseān anna gcat...nach ar chur sē as;"[1] "is iongantach nár mhúch sé le pógaibh é agus nár bhádhaigh sé le deóraibh é, agus thiormaigh sé le brataibh fíor-uaisle síoda agus sróil é;" "éirigheas de ló agus de lán-tsoillse ar na mhárach agus do choisrigh é féin, do chiar a cheann agus d'ionnlaigh a lámha agus 'aghaidh, agus do chaith a phroin."[2] All these are to be found nearly word for word in almost any Irish folktale, and the first in Scotland too; but they do not seem to appear in the classic written tales. Considering the popular language of the stories in which they appear, it seems likely that they are really folk runs which have got written down. On the other hand the first two are almost as common in seventeenth- and eighteenth-century written tales as they are in oral tradition, and we cannot discount the possibility that these runs are of MS origin, but were only invented by a writer about 1600 or later. The kitten in the second sounds like a folk-

1. Sgéalta Rómánsuíochta l. 2996; 5900.
2. GF, ed. Hyde, p.44; 30.

teller's burlesque addition, but it is not usual in MS.

In a few cases, however, a common folk run can be traced back to something not known in the classic Romantic tales, but found in even earlier MSS. We have seen that this is the case with the rising sand in the sailing run.[1] Another example is the formula used in imposing geasa. This may be quoted from another eighteenth-century tale, EE; this combines the main elements of the long formula most often found in Scottish folktales with the phrase díombáidh (?) na bliadhna, which is typical of one Irish form.[2] "Masedh, air Righ na cCennchat, curimsi fa ghesa 7 fa dīombhuidhe na bliana thusa gan catha nō cruadh-chomhrac nō nert na mnā seōil da bheith unad, laoich as mesa & as meta nō thū fēin da chenn & do choimhēid beatha da bhuan dhīot mar ttugadh tū na 3 hubhaill atā ag an cCrochair Tārnochtaigce...thugamsa." This is not easy to parallel in earlier Romantic tales,[3] but an older and different formula found in CCC[4] shares at least the reference to labour pains: "troigh mhnā troghuin foruibh." The conditions of the geasa - not to sleep two nights in one bed, and so forth - which are usually more prominent than the imposition-formula in Irish folktales, have

1. P.285.
2. Cuirim-se thusa faoi gheasa 7 faoi thromdhiombadh na bliana, Béal. IV p.155 (Mayo). The other phrase usual in Ireland can be quoted from Sgéalta Rómánsuíochta, l. 2130: "curtham-sa thusa...fō gheasa droma draoigheachta..."
3. Part of it, however, appears in GD, SG I p.262: "mac mogad nó ladrainn na fola anuaisle bud mhesa iná thu féin do mhac athar is máthar do bhuain do chinn is do choiméta bethad dhíot, muna..."
4. Ed. MacSweeney, p.112. The editor refers to a similar passage in Cath Ruis na Ríg which I have not seen.

several parallels in Middle Irish sources: Fled Bricrenn 7 Loinges mac nDūil Dermait: "Nīt raib sāim suidi nā laigi a Chūchulaind co fesar cid ruc trī maccu Dūil Dermait asa tīr"[1], and Echtra Neraí, where Medb swears: "nā tairinnfit 7 nā coitelfat for cluim nā colccuid 7 nī bom blathcha 7 nī caīnfuirim mo taeib 7 nī caīnairbiur dergflatha na finn 7 nīconn-airbiur biuth, conamrabat na dā tharb sin ar mo vhēlaib a comracc;"[2] more briefly in EAC: "geis fort...i. dā caithe tú biadh Eirind nogo fhaghbha..."[3]

Apart from all these, there remains a sizeable body of run material which cannot be assigned to any MS source. Part of it consists of parody runs and compilations, which like compiled stories do not usually have a wide currency: some of these will be quoted later. But there are also well-known runs which seem to be of purely folk origin. Some are nonsense formulae for beginning and ending a story: a relationship could certainly be established between some of these and similar formulae used with international tales in other languages. Others might prove to have relatives abroad: these are the fairly realistic descriptions of morning and evening, or travelling. Others again are alternatives to the usual MS form of run; some of the descriptions of battles, for instance, never appear in MS. There is need for caution

1. Irische Texte, Serie II, Heft 1, p.177.
2. RC X p.226: a Middle Irish accretion to an older text?
3. Ed. Bergin, para. 8.

before claiming these as purely oral, however, for runs which appear in Scottish Gaelic folktales and are not usual in Romantic tales may be parallelled in Fenian lays.[1]

Verses and other quotations from MSS.

It must be admitted that the runs do not entirely bear out the contention that the Romantic tales, and to a lesser extent other Irish literature, are the principal, if not the only, native source for Irish folk hero-tales. Before going on to discuss the folk treatment of those runs whose origin probably is from MS, it will be as well to redress the balance by giving examples of some other forms of words which certainly have reached oral tradition from individual Romantic tales.[2] For instance, parts of the decorative verses of written tales survive in some folk versions, though they do not carry forward the plot in any way and could just as well be left out.

There is a poem in CG at the point where the druid finds Conall heavily wounded after his third day's fighting with the Amhus Órarmach: in prose and then in verse the druid asks Conall to tell his real name, and Conall does so and asks the druid to bury him. Part of it is as follows:[3]

1. E.g. "bhuail iad beum sgéithe" replacing the cuaille cómhraic, (but cf. also CRI, ed. Hyde p.152) and trí ditheannan (cithean) in battle-runs, e.g. JFC II p.480: cf. Christiansen, The Vikings and the Viking-wars in Irish and Gaelic Tradition, (Oslo 1931) p.259, from an 18th-century Irish MS.
2. Cf. also the mast-climbing from EIA and buidhe air a' ghréin in CG, which only occur in versions of these tales, p. 286 and p.289 above.
3. Text from 23M10, with some readings from 23M26, 24B29 & NLS XXXVI.

(v.4) Do ghearr an Dolbh na ttreas ttenn
Mo chorp go crēchtach comhthenn,
Agus do leig mo chrú ndearg
(I)na srothaibh fōn ccaoimhleirg.

(5) Adhluic mē 'san tulaigh thinn,
A fhile fhéta fhoiltfhinn,
Is scrīobh m' ainm oghuim go beacht,
Is fear mo chluithe caointeach.

(6) Is mē Conall degh-mhac Nēill:
Iomdha laoch do bhī dom réir,
Gē táim anocht go tuirseach trom
Am'aonar a ccrīoch Lochlann.

(8) Beir leat mo sgiath dhonn dhuallach
Is mo lúireach lānbhuadhach,
Mo chloidhemh is mo dhā shleigh:
Am' luing go hEirinn imthigh.

A Connacht version of CG[1] gives a rather prosaic version of the beginning of verse 6, followed by garbled fragments of v.8 and v.5 and tailing off into prose as the teller apparently abandoned quotation and paraphrased what he thought the poem meant: "Mise Conall bu(i)dhe mac Néill," adubhairt sé, "is iomadh ceard le a bhfuil mo thriall. Sgríobh thusa go beacht beacht in mo luing 7 in mo bhád mar shúil is go dtiocfadh duine éigin as mo threibh a bhainfeadh sásamh den Deilbh Ormasach.".(i.e. Amhus Órarmach, an Dolbh of the poem.)
A Cork version reads more like verse:[2]

Mise Conall deigh-mhic Néill
Is mó Rí do bhí fém' réir
Cé gur ghearr an t-amhas mo chaol-chorp seang
Is d'fhág-san mise gan lúth gan rith gan léim.

As mó is the local pronunciation of iomdha, this is very close

1. An Stoc, 1923, from Inishbofin.
2. IFC 219 p.115.

tc v.6, with reminiscences of v.4. Another Cork version includes the end of v.6: "Mise Conaill, mac Rí Éireann, an rí dob' fhearr gníomh, gaisce 7 gcáil, gídh go bhfuilim anois i gcríocha Lochlannaig go fann am' aonair."[1] Campbell's Colonsay version has a quatrain elsewhere in the story which must be a distant reminiscence of the same verse:[2]

Conall Gulbairneach gum b'e m'ainm-se
Mac rìgh Éireann bu mhór ainm:
A chéile còmhraig fo leòn:
A shleaghan cha d'fhuair an t-ath-bheò.

Two Kerry versions contain a prose version of the request in v.5 for burial, which is not in the MS prose,[3] and prose echoes of two other poems in CG can be found in oral versions: that where Conall vows to follow the abducted Eithne, and that in which the druid exhorts Conall before his final combat with Macaomh Mór.

The verse in a poem from CRI which gives a convenient summary of the heroine's enchantments[4] has influenced the wording of many of the better oral versions, which at least use epithets from it, and may quote it as a verse:

Mé an eala ó'n chaomh-innse
Is mé dobhrán an easa,
Is mé cat na Saor-Innse
Ní mé de mhnáibh ba mheasa.

This is closely reproduced in Pádraig 'ac Aodhain's Mayo version:[5]

1. IFC 46 p.11.
2. JFC MS IV.
3. IFC 981 p.106; 1263 p. 218.
4. Ed. Hyde, p.100, v.2.
5. Béal. XII p.106.

Mise eala an chaoin-chuain,
Is mé dobhrán an fheasa,
Is mé cat na saoir-innsce,
Agus ní de na mrá is measa.

The use of cuan for the repetitive inis in the first line may have some MS basis - in late MSS of tales lines which fail to rhyme and scan are quite common - for it occurs in an oral version from Donegal, printed in Cú na gCleas. Here the shape of the verse has been spoiled by an attempt to include the other transformations which the heroine has to go through in Donegal:

Bím seal m' eala caol cuain,
Seal mo dhobhrán i n-easaibh,
Seal m' each (sic) na saor-innsí,
(Seal 'mo ghas raithnighe,
Seal'mo chnaipín ceó,
Seal 'mo shean-chailligh,)
Agus ní de na mnáibh is measa mé.

The Mayo version, the only one to include the adventures of Buinne Borbthréan at the end of CRI, also gives part of the poem in which he reports upon them.

Faoi chomhthúisg an droichid is goire dhuit,
Coirp aduain gan aon cheann,
(Agus an buinne le n-a dtaobh,)
Sluaighte an domhain bun ar bhun,
A thuit liom i bhfus 's tall.

The bracketed line corresponds to verse 2, line 2:

Mór-bhuidhne 's droichead re taobh...

and the rest to verse 3:

Atá fa'n droichead, truagh liom,
Cuirp sheanga i n-easbaidh a gceann,
Na slóigh uile bonn ar bonn
Re húir na dtonn thoir a's thall.

As this poem is virtually the only account of Buinne's adventures in the oral version, it is not surprising that the sense is a little confused, and Buinne himself becomes the killer, not the avenger, of the corpses in the poem. Two lines each are given to the rest of his adventures:

> Chuaidh mé isteach ins an ngleann,
> 's bhain mé an ceann de'n phéist ruaidh.
>
> Bhris mé Tor na dTrí mBeann
> 's thugas liom an chloch charmhogail.

These derive from v.9:

> 'San gcathraigh atá fo'n gleann
> Rugas a ceann de'n phéist ruaidh...

and v.10, l.3:

> Iar mbriseadh tuir na dtrí mbeann
> Thugas liom an chloch ar gcúl.

The important part of the poem for the plot is the last line, for the magic stone is needed to kill the invulnerable giant - in the MS, to dry up the fiery stream round the besieged city - and the rest seems to consist of a few of the more picturesque lines which have clung to it, more or less by chance.

Other examples of poems surviving in oral tradition could be given,[1] but it is hardly necessary here to do more than note the phenomenon. It is worth pointing out that the folk versions from which these verses have been quoted are not anything like word-for-word repetitions of the written

1. E.g. from the summaries of OCL and the death-tale of Cú Chulainn in JFC MS XVIII (from S. Uist.) Folk-tellers often introduce quotations from ballads into related stories, as in many versions of Oidheadh Chonlaoich, or the versions of TDG in Gadelica and SSS RL 759.

text, such as Curtin collected of some Fenian tales, but have clearly been in oral tradition for some time: the Connacht and Kerry versions of CG which contain poems or traces of them are also strongly influenced by the local oecotypes of the story. (and Carmichael's Derivative?)

It should also be mentioned that verses can be found in oral versions of Romantic tales which have no MS authority. Apart from the quatrain added to two Kerry versions of CG,[1] which may be derived from a scribe's praise of his story in a colophon, there is a poem in two Donegal versions of TDG, warning Fionn not to marry Gráinne:[2]

> Pill, pill, a Fhinn mhic Chumhaill,
> Ná deán an siubhal go toigh mhic Airt,
> Gráinne nighean óg an Ríogh,
> Má gheibh tú í ní fearrde duit.
>
> Thug tú mionna a bhí mór
> Nach bpósfá aríst go lá na gcreach.
> Ná tabhair do bhriathar ar do mhian;
> An té a rinne ariamh ní theachaidh leis!

This makes sense, and the rhymes and stress metre are evidently modern, so it is unlikely to be from a MS, though the metre looks like an imitation of rannaigheacht mhór, by somebody who had heard or read poems in that metre. The poem is said to have been recited by a fairy who appeared to Fionn

1. An tú (or sin í) an rígh-bhean ó Bhinn glais Éadair/ Do thug Coragéar leis 'na bhárc lé fonn/ Is d'fhág Conall Gulban i na dtriúchaibh aonair/ Faoi thuirse a h-éileamh ar fuaid an domhain. IFC 15 p.187; 1115 p.225. Cf. the verse in the colophon to ECL in 24C28: Éacht na Fēinne agus Choñall Ceárnaigh/ Nā Céasars bhúaig-réim is gach tug Dáire/ Nīor bhféiseacht a lēir-sgrios ar chorpaibh námhuidibh/ Seóchus trēan-chummus, laochus is neárt Conn Láidir. A similar verse in praise of GD follows the folk-version in IFC 981 p.105. But the verse in CG could be part of an aisling poem, from the beginning An tú..?
2. Béal. VII p.125; IFC 1538 p.99 (v.1 only.)

on the way to his wedding. The ballads about Diarmaid do not cover this part of the story at all; but it is possible that a much humbler model inspired a Donegal story-teller to add these lines to the hero-tale. Gaelic versions of the Cinderella story (AT 510A or B) sometimes, like versions in other languages, include a rhyme sung by a little bird - really the heroine's dead mother - to persuade the prince, riding to his wedding with the false bride, to turn back and look for the heroine.[1] The situation - prince riding to marry a woman he would be better to avoid - is basically the same as that in TDG, and though the verse is attributed to a fairy the series of I sounds in the first line suggests an imitation of a bird.[2] The existence of verse passages in Gaelic tales which are inspired by international models rather than native written tales is undeniable, and in a case like this it is probably safer to look for an international model than a hypothetical lost literary poem. I can suggest no such model for the second quatrain which appears in one of these versions,[3] but the metre seems to be slightly different, and it may have been added later in imitation of the first:

(Gráinne:) (Bhail,) a Dhiarmaid chaoin na nduall donn,
Is áilne gré ó chorp go cionn,
Ealoigh liom go bruach na dtonn,
Is tú mo rogha 7 ní hé Fionn.

1. E.g. JFC I p.231; Béal. VI p.296. These are both Scottish versions, but hardly any Donegal versions of AT 510 are accessible to me at the time of writing.

2 Cf. in JFC: Big, big, cha'n ann duit a thig... and in Béal. Cas a' chriomaidh, cas a' bhìdidh...

3. IFC 1538 - from Micí (Sheáin Néill) Ó Baoíll, Rann na Féirste: I have heard this told myself.

× A Dhiarmaid chaoin na nduall nodonn
is áilne gré [ó] chorp go cionn,
Ealaigh liom go bruach na dtonn,
's tú mo rogha's ní hé Fionn

Generally speaking, folk versions of Romantic tales reproduce the dialogue in their originals if it is sufficiently interesting to warrant it. Hence it would be difficult to find examples from stories such as CRI and EIA, which consist almost entirely of conventional mārchen or heroic episodes, leaving little scope for dialogue, but several passages could be quoted from stories like CG and TDG where there is some interplay of character. I will give only one: the passage in CG where Eithne reproaches Conall with the way in which he has carried her off:

"As mōr an bārr donais 7 dochma damh", ar sí, "... meatach, 7 mí-óglach gan lúth gán lámhach gan lánchōmhlann, gan ghaisge gan ghnāthoirgail do theagmhāil oram, 7 gurab do thoradh a reatha 7 a rinnluais dob āil leis mo bhreith ó fearaibh Laighean."[1]

Some twenty oral versions give the substance of this: "Ná tuig, a Chonaill," doráidh an bhean, "gur le méid do lúth' ná do ghaisce ataoi am' breith-se leat, ach 'mháin le méid do luais is do reatha."[2] Dubhairt sí gur shaoil sí nach de thoradh cos a bhéarfadh éinne chum siubhail go deó í.[3] And so forth.

As usual, one must reckon with oral improvements alongside survivals from the written tradition. Often pithy sayings applicable to a fairly common situation are put into the mouth of a character, as in CG where Conall

1. 23M10 p.15.
2. SM (p.112.)
3. F&L (p.11)

releases Ridire an Ghaisge with the remark that it is as easy to bind him again (if necessary) as to loose him (or as it was the first time.) This remark appears in versions of CG from all areas, though it has no MS basis, and in similar passages in other tales: it may be reckoned part of the stock of traditional sayings available to storytellers. Dialogue, properly speaking, is not usually invented in folk versions: a conversation may be given in full which in the MS is merely mentioned or assumed, but this is simply a way of carrying on the plot, and throws no light on the characters. A preference for direct speech rather than oratio obliqua is simply another aspect of the folk teller's preference for a concrete image rather than an abstract idea. At times the result is slightly ridiculous:

"Rachaidh mise," ar Oisín.

"Rachaidh mise," ar Oscar.

"Rachaidh mise," ar Diarmaid (and so on, with six different names, instead of saying that six of them agreed to go.)[1] What with this tendency to formalise and expand, and the addition of run-like passages - greetings, blessings and curses - and the fondness for gross exaggeration, all of which can be seen in GF, folktale dialogue is quite different in form from that of the written tales, and often better: but the substance is rarely new.

Apart from runs and poems, there are some miscellaneous forms of words of MS origin which have become part of the tradition. Three very different ones may be mentioned, all

1. BC, Donegal version, ed. "Fearghus mac Róigh."

connected with the Dalcassian cycle. The first is the genealogy of Murchadh which opens GF: it is reproduced in a Kerry oral version,[1] though not at the very beginning but at the mention of the name of Donnchadh mac Briain, who here replaces Murchadh, soon after the opening. The existing MS text is no doubt the source: nine names are given instead of the twenty printed by Hyde, the order is sometimes changed, and there are changes like Coineall na Muarchluas for Conall Eachluaith and Lorcáń mac Luirc for Lorcán mac Cuirc,[2] but for so long a genealogy only remembered as part of a story it is not badly preserved.

A more complex problem is presented by the arming run on pp.30-32 of Hyde's edition of GF. This contains features found in Irish folk-runs: the inscribed sword and the long list of the qualities of the horse. But it also seems to have been known in Scotland. Campbell mentions hearing versions of what he calls "Murchadh mac Brian's riding dress", and quotes an eighteenth-century one from the MacNicol collection.[3] This is only an arming run, but "riding dress" implies a horse, and in the parody of the same run which Campbell also prints,[4] a description of the points of the hero's horse is given which is clearly the same as that in

1. IFC 255 p.204, printed in Béal. XIV p.156.
2. The first may be pure mishearing, or may contain an element of deliberate parody: the second could be alliteration, but Lorcán mac Luirc is also the name of the hero of the composite folktale Fionn 7 Lorcán (F&L) - though perhaps he derives from the misheard genealogy.
3. LNF p.210. Dewar took down a version in 1869 which may be extant, and Campbell heard "Murchadh Mc Brian a dol 'na eidibh" from Sarah Fletcher in Mull in 1870 (JFC MS XVI.)
4. LNF p.211, collected by J.G. Campbell in Struan, Perthshire, in 1859, from a man who claimed that only one other knew it.

GF. Bearing in mind that descriptions and even the mention of horses are rare in Romantic tales,[1] it seems certain that there is some connection between the Scottish description of Murchadh's armour and horse and that in GF. If GF is based ultimately on a folk version of a tale from Scotland,[2] the run may have formed part of the folk version before it came south, but the very elaborate series of comparisons in which the horse is described might even belong to the wholly hypothetical early Scottish MS original:[3] the spread of this part of the run to oral tradition in Ireland is no doubt due to the MSS of GF.

A similar, but still more complicated case is that of the opening of DGP as it appears in the Edinburgh MS. The first sentence there is a corrupt version of a run describing the places where a hunt was held, which can also be found in Fenian tales from the fifteenth century on: then follows:

"7 as iad do bhī comoradh na seilge sin maille, clan rīogh Ēirionn, mur atā: Donnchu mac Brian 7 Murchadh mac Brian, Taodhg 7 Toirdhealbhach, Cenaidhti 7 Lorcān, 7 maithibh Dāl-Chais 7 laochraidh Luimneach 7 fir Mhaighe ŌdTōrna[4] 7 fir mōr-dhearga Mumhan 7 laochraidh lāmh-dhearg Laighen 7 fir ordhearca Uladh ar gach taobh do rī Ēirionn."

1. See Ch. I, p.20; an exception is the description of Iubhdán's horse in Aided Fergusa (SG I p.242,) and this is quite different from that in GF.
2. See argument above, p.111-112.
3. The idea of comparing a horse to a fox, a hare and a woman has comic possibilities which are developed in folk versions, but its artificiality seems more typical of the MS tradition.
4. MS: "Odorl-": read "Ō Dōrno", and cf. Hogan, articles on Uí tTórna Éigeas and Mainistir Ó dTórna.

This is recognisable as the basis of the beginning of some Scottish versions of DGP, e.g: "An cuala sibh an latha bu mhath do Mhurchadh mac Brian agus do Dhunnchadh mac Brian agus do Hig Sionna mac Brian agus Brian Borghaidh mac Cionadaidh agus Cionadaidh fhéin cuide riutha a bhith air taobh Beinn Gulban ann an Eirinn a' sealg?"[1] This follows the MS even in having Brian's father present (though not his grandfather Lorcán.) It seems possible that it is also the basis of the list at the beginning of DGF,[2] for some Kerry folk versions of the latter include an echo of "fir mór-dhearga Mumhan" which is not in the MS of GF;[3] "Lá dá raibh Brian 7 Donncha mhac Bhriain, Donncha, Diúilín 7 Diúilín, Tadhg Ó Cealla na gClog, fir chrios-leathana Chúige Mumhan 7 na huaisle ar aon láthair.".

The best-preserved example of it, however, is not in a story about Murchadh at all, but at the end of MacNair's Argyll version of CG.[4] Campbell wastes a couple of pages etymologising over it, but it is simply a bit of another story treated as an independent run: "...bha an sin a' chuir fàilte orra, Donacha Mac Bhrian, Muracha Mc-Bhrian, Taoig a's Tarragheal, fir dherag ò Mhuile, fir chronaig ea Latharna, buidheann chròdhalanda a' Righ Eirinn; agus mór mhaithean na rìoghachd gu mheud a's a bha leis diubh 'san am." Some adjectives have changed, one apparently to

1. Sg.D. p.17. This teller's stories normally begin; "Chuala mise siod a bh' ann..." This suggests another link with GF: that "An cuala sibh" here echoes something like "An gcualabhar an mór-chlú...do bhí ar Mhurchadh" the opening of the MS.
2. Ed. Hyde p.4: the variant in note 9 is more like DGP.
3. IFC 255 p.204, same as Béal. XIV p.156. Very similar in IFC 272 p. 439.
4. JFC III p.293: here from JFC MS IV, as Dewar wrote it.

nonsense, and Mull and Lorne have been substituted for the less familiar Munster and Leinster, but there can be little doubt that the DGP passage is the source.[1] It must have been quite famous among storytellers to be borrowed in this way.

There is also one whole story which seems to have been equally famous, Eachtra an Cheithearnaigh Chaoilriabhaigh. This satire on sixteenth-century Irish princelings can have had no interest for the Scottish Gaelic storytellers who told it except in its language, and in fact the versions collected by Campbell often reflect the written text amazingly closely, though the MSS from which it was learnt are hardly likely to have been in use less than a hundred years before these versions were taken down. It is impossible here to consider the versions of CCR in detail, but they will be used to illustrate one or two points below.

Names.

The contribution of the Romantic tales to Irish and Scottish Gaelic storytelling in general is difficult to assess where personal names are concerned. The usual pattern of names in both written and oral tales consists of a descriptive noun or stock fore-name followed by an adjective or qualifying noun: Gruagach an Oileáin, Iollann Airmdhearg, An t-Athach Dearg, Seáinín na Luaithe.

1. Compare also from the summary of a version of CG which Campbell heard in Mull (JFC MS XVI p.88): "When he got to Lochlann he found with the king: Connal Gulban Dual deireannach Leodich artairaich àrd Righ Eirinn agus cas sgialaich air an taobh cùl." This seems to end at least with an echo of "maithe Dáil-Chas...air gach taobh de rígh Éireann."

Even animals in Gaelic versions of stories like AT 302 have names like Seabhac na Faille Fuaire, constructed in the same way. Since names on the same pattern can be found in Old Irish tales, mediaeval romances in other languages, historical tradition and European folktales alike (Labraid Loingsech, Morgan le Fay, Richard Coeur de Lion, Tom Thumb) it is impossible to claim either a written or an oral origin for it: it is simply part of the Irish tradition. For the same reason it is impossible to be certain whether many names in modern folktales are corruptions of those in existing or lost Romantic tales. When Séadna Saor-bhéasach in CG can appear as Seán Féile-bhéasach or Aonghus Garbh-iasgach, and mac an díthreabhaich can be written as Mac Iain Dìreach,[1] can one be sure that Loinnir mac Leabhair or Seán Fuar-chosa are folk inventions, whatever they seem to mean?

But cf. Muygatch Cilgwri etc.

To give an idea of the extent of the influence of MSS on folktales, I might undertake - given space - to demonstrate that one in four of the random selection of folktale names given in Handbook pp.607-610 is of literary origin; one in three if historical names like Ball Dearg Ó Domhnaill and Lasair Fhíon-dhearg[2] were included. Moreover some names such as Macaomh Mór (mac Ríogh na Sorcha) and Caol an Iarainn are extremely common in hero-tales, whether of native or

1. See the version of AT 550 in JFC II p.344. Aon-mhac an Díthreabhaigh is a hero of Irish tales; Díthreabhach in DGP is often written Dìreach (e.g. JFC II p.228); and Iain with an adjective in Scottish Gaelic is usually unstressed, and could be confused with the article before a slender consonant.
2. Lasair Fhíona, mother of Domhnall Óg Ó Domhnaill, may be the original of this popular Irish folktale heroine.

international origin. On the other hand there are plenty of Gaelic versions of international tales which give no name or a mere description (mac na baintrigh, mac ríogh Éireann) even to the hero.

The ways in which names change may be considered briefly, for they illustrate well what may happen to any word or short phrase when passed down by word of mouth. Names like Conall or Diarmaid which are still in use generally survive unchanged in folk versions, while those which were already archaic when the MS tales were written, such as Iollann or Séadna, drop out or are changed to something more memorable. Similarly names like Ridire an Ghaisge, made up of elements which are still comprehensible (at least to storytellers), remain, but obscure or compound epithets do not.

Compound adjectives are often reduced to their first element: so Buinne Borb-thréan in CRI usually appears as Buinne, Builleor Bile Borb, and Curaire Cam-chosach may become Cruitire Cam. Taoise Taobh-gheal is re-divided into Taobh Gheal Tais, incidentally changing the meaning. How strange compound adjectives are to folk tellers can be shown by the fact that the name Amhus Ór-armach, made up of two comprehensible elements, does not once appear in its original form in 13 versions of CG, though the substituted epithets are as often nonsense (amhus óram, óra, sheóram, órmasach, órmanach) as sense (órdha, tórmaigh, òrannach - and even, once, óg-armach.)

When both name and epithet are difficult, one may drop

out or be replaced by a more familiar word, or both may be reduced. So Iollann Airm-dhearg becomes Giolla an Airm Dheirg, Ubhall an Airmuirt, Ollum Lom-dhearg, Iullar Óg Armailteach; with the loss of Iollann, Ailm Dhearg;[1] and with the reduction of both parts, Lán-dearg or Lámh Dhearg. It can be seen that nearly all of these mean something, and in fact, though apparently meaningless words do occur, by far the most usual type of change in folktale names is to something which does make sense in the modern language.[2] The obscure first element of Curaire Cam-chosach[3] becomes cruitire, conair(e) or corrán, Ciabhán Glún-gheal becomes cliamhain. Macaomh Mór is popular in its original form, but often the mediaeval macaomh becomes macán, bocán, bacach or fathach. Sometimes the new meaning is comic - An Turcalach Trom-chodlatach for Toirceall an Trom-theaghlaigh, Mealla Muar for Balbhuaidh, and most regrettably, Achlais for (Eithne) Uchd-sholus![4] The final result of such a name-change may be that the name dictates the actions of the character: thus Dúnadhach draoi becomes in Scottish versions Duanach Ó Draoth,[5] and somebody evidently remembered this as An Tuathanach Ó Draoth, and accordingly attached the name to an international tale about a foolish farmer.[6]

1. Cf. Corb Éachtach apparently replacing Séadna Saor-bhéasach.
2. Sense is of course easier to remember than nonsense. It must be remembered, however, that the tendency to make meaningful words out of a series of traditional sounds applies not only to folk-tellers but to the transcribers of folk-tales, who may thus misrepresent their source.
3. From courier?
4. JFC MS XVI (p.88).
5. Duanach may be a MS rationalisation of a name: it is in NLS XXXVI. Also Dewdney p.100.
6. MWHT II p.366 (AT 1381E + 1600.)

If the unfamiliar name does not sound like something with a meaning, it may be like enough to another name. So Séadna becomes Seán, Eithne Áine or Anna, Conall - in Scotland, where it is unusual as a fore-name - Conan or Goll. Murchadh mac Bhriain becomes Ailean Mac Bheathain, with the substitution of a familiar surname for an unfamiliar patronymic.[1] Glas mac Aoinchearda Béarra, always a puzzle for folk tellers, is attracted in one version to the name of Conall Cearnach, and becomes Glaisne Con Cheáirne.

In the last resort, if a meaning cannot be found, a jingle of some sort is introduced into the nonsense syllables. So, it seems, Finghín Fáith-liagh has come down as Fuidí Faidí in Donegal versions of TGG. So in Cork versions of TS and TDG Saidhbhín Óin Ŏin (Eóin Eóin) replaces Sadhbh inghean Eoghain Óig.

The same desire for the familiar or explicable applies to place-names. It is rather sad that a Galway teller of TDG should feel the necessity to appeal to Tom Moore to explain Tara in TDG - "áit a nglaodhann siad Tara's Hall air."[2] But his reasons are the same which make a Scottish teller of LCC turn Coireall to Coruisg and bring it nearer home, or turn Munster to Mull and Leinster to Lorne in the formula on p.304, or make Gleann Éide mhic Callain into Gleann Eitche mhic Cailein[3] (the Duke of Argyll's Glen

1. DGP (F). I cannot explain Ailean for Murchadh: and why is he so often replaced by his brother Donnchadh?
2. IFC 354 p.297.
3. DGP (H). The archaic Eitche for Eite suggests that the editor, Henderson, may be responsible for this interpretation.

Etive.) I have only one example of the replacement of a place-name with a phrase which has a meaning: the change of Doire Dhá Bhoth in the Galway version of TDG just quoted to (coill) 'dir dhá mhaide.

Change and persistence in verbal formulae.

Let us now return to the runs and consider the difference between their use in folktales and their use in MSS. In MSS a framework of description, whose origins we have seldom enough evidence to trace, is filled out with alliterative verbiage from the writer's own hand: "the writer" in this case includes the scribe as well as the author, for individual scribes often improve on their exemplar in runs, though not to the extent to which they do so in the narration. Only occasionally does an author add a short passage of description from his own imagination.[1] Oral runs have a framework quite as rigid as that of literary ones, in some cases the same framework: but if I may extend the metaphor, rather than being hung with a drapery of adjectives, the bare framework tends to be added to with pegs and cross-pieces of further description. These are not usually longer than one sentence: they may consist of new, vivid, often magical details, or fragments borrowed indiscriminately from other old runs, or sheer nonsense which might be a garbled archaism or intentional burlesque. It remains true, as in MS runs, that the sound is more important than the sense, but it is divided into shorter

1. Cf. pp.287-288 above, or the run in CG mentioned on p.27.

(and so more easily remembered) units.

Any future study of the runs should include some analysis of their rhythmic structure. Whereas MS runs are, sometimes clumsily, constructed of strings of adjectives depending on lists of nouns, oral runs tend to have a characteristic rhythm based on a parallelism reminiscent of the Psalms, which has already been mentioned.[1] This seems designed to build up tension by piling passage on passage, phrase on phrase, and capping each section with a climactic torrent of words.[2] "B' fhìor-choltach sin ri laige loireachain, ri suidhe corra-aimhleis, ri dubhadh a donn-chlàir, ri piceadh a seana-chlàir, 's i sgoltadh na fairge, ri caitheadh a' chuain mhòir, fhada, fhiadhaich, air 'fhiaradh 7 air a' tharsuing."[3] A sort of meaning can be extracted from most of that: Irish runs are more prodigal in the use of pure nonsense to achieve the same effect: "A chlaimhe dileach deaileach fóil in í, fóil in á, fóil in á 'sa na h-olgáin, thabhairt isteach 'na láimhe deise a thairringt amach 'na láimhe clé, mar a ngearrfadh dhe'n chéud iarra, go ngearrfadh is go mbearrfadh dhe'n dara iarra."[4]

It is instructive to compare the run-like passages in CCR, which Campbell often prints as verse, with their MS originals. I have tried to indicate the rhythm and parallelism by punctuation rather than lineation:

1. See p.284, bottom.
2. The teller, of the few whom I have heard, whose voice made this structure clearest was William Macdonald, Arisaig, the teller of DGP (F). Unfortunately his recording is almost impossible to transcribe because he got so excited that he thumped the table during the runs!
3. From the run in TGSI XIII p.69.
4. From Mícheál mac Donnchadha, Cárna, IFC 58 p.68.

"Thàinig mi o ghriobhaill o ghrabhaill: o bhun an tobair dhìlinn: oghleann àluinn ealaich. Oidhch' an Ìle 's oidhch' am Manainn: oidhch' air chàrna fuara faire. An aodann monaidh, am baile rìgh Alba, rugadh mi: ceàrnach suarach salach mi: gad thàrladh air a' bhaile seo mi."[1] This is the folk version of a sort of unifying formula in the MS, though in the Islay version quoted its unifying function has been usurped by a folk-run which, like the formula in LCC,[2] seems to be almost entirely an oral invention. The formula quoted has a MS basis: "I ndún monaidh, i mbaile ríg Alban do chodlas aréir: i nOilech na ríg do rugad mé: bím lá in Íle, lá i gcionn tíre, lá i Manainn, lá i Rachlainn, 7 lá eile ar fionncharn na foraire i Sliab Fuait: 7 is duine siublach suarach saobnósach mé, 7 agatsa atáim anois a Uí Dhomnaill."[3] The folk version has added a sort of nonsense jingle to start the rhythm going; shortened the middle section into a couplet[4]; telescoped the beginning less successfully, and made a triplet by shifting it to stand next to the final part, which is given end-rhyme by changing siubhlach to salach (:baile) and internal rhyme by changing ceathairneach, as it is in the rest of the story, to ceàrnach (:thàrladh.)

It may be worth quoting one more run from CCR, the next one in the Islay version. The basis in the MS is:

1. JFC I p.310.
2. See above, p.117 ff. This is another good example of the structure in parallel phrases.
3. Combined from the texts in SG I p.276 and p.281.
4. "Càrna fuara faire" has a good swinging rhythm and rhymes reasonably well with Manainn: but it is no doubt a natural development from Fionncharn na Foraire (cf. Taobh Gheal Tais on p.307.) The art is in the order of the phrases.

"do sheinnedar cuir 7 puirt 7 orgain mhenma...7 cuislena tēidbine...ceōil taigiure 7 dordān sīthe; fir ghonta 7 mnā re niodhnaibh 7 lucht fiabhras 7 treablaid an domhain, do choideoildais le foghur an cheōil chain-bhin do sheinneadh Dubhartān."[1] The result is worth dividing into lines:

"Sheinneadh eud puirt, agus uirt, agus orgain,
Nìtheanna tearmad, teudan tairteil;
Curaidhean, laoich, as aoig air an casan,
Aoig, as àinn, as galair, as fiabhrais,
Chuireadh eud 'nan sìon sioram suain an-saoghal mòr gu léir le binnead nam port shìogaidh a sheinneadh na clàrsairean."

Again the folk version is fairly firmly based on words which can be found in the MS, though the third line seems to be an impromptu expansion of fir ghonta: but the stressed, rhythmic, partly rhymed lines are a totally new arrangement of the words. It is doubtful whether this was brought about by any conscious literary effort; more probably the rhythmic form was simply easier to remember, but it is also more attractive to the listener. Again, oral processes have wrought an improvement in a literary original.[2]

It is possible to see runs borrowing short phrases, one from another, to fill in gaps, whether appropriately or not. Examples of this can be found in MS also: sidhe sanntach is used of ships putting out to sea, but more often of warriors attacking their enemies; in Sgéalta Rómánsuíochta the description bun-reamhar, bárr-chaol may be used for a ship's mast or a spear. Some phrases are

1. Again - less successfully - combined from two versions, here from NLS XXXVI. A similar run is in other MSS, e.g. BCF.
2. Cf. p.263 above.

worse misused in MS than anything in a folktale, as when the author of AM borrows a phrase from CG describing the extent of Africa: "ó shléibhtibh Riffe budh thuaidh go deisgeart Éigipte budh dheas," and applies it to the whole world; or when a character in EAF describes a captured curach as if it were a kingdom: "do ghabhas flaithios 7 forlāmhnus an churaigh."

So in folk runs bocóideach bacóideach is used of sails, shields and even birds;[1] masts and palaces are described as having aon cleite (cleithe?) amháin, whatever this may mean. The popular phrase from evening runs about an gearrán bán ag dul ar sgáth na copóige[2] may occur in the middle of a fighting run without suggesting the approach of evening. Individual tellers may compose their own runs, based partly on phrases from other runs, as stories are compiled from other stories.[3] Here is a fine run to which I know no parallel: "Bhí síneadh, suaith(t)e, sáthadh 7 sanntú aca, sliseáil, sleascadh 7 síor-scothadh. Bhí céim ar deisbheal, céim ar tuathal, céimeanna luascadh 's táin-rith, céim siar, céim aniar, 7 céimeanna a riaradh an áir aca. Bhí fúth fáth fuaidhim 's fothrom, béim inaghaidh béime 7 béimeanna marbhthach; níor fhain éun i gcrann, luch i bpoll, ná an fiadh fionn i bhfoscadh, nár eitil 's nár rith le crith ás le heagla seacht míle ón áit sin, mar gurbh' baoghalach

1. If "spotted" is the basic meaning, of course all these things could be spotted: but it is odd to use the phrase as the normal description of them.
2. Loth, I am told, explained this as the moon; whereas Micí Ó Baoíll told me that what he called caplaí bána were a sort of worms (sreangáin.) Reference?
3. See p.213 and p.276 above.

dóibh, le pléascadh carraigreacha 7 suaithte talmhan, ag neart duaidh 7 briseadh-croidhe na bhfathach 7 an Macáimh Mhóir a leigint fola go smior go smúsach le na chéile."[1] Here fúth fáth &c. is presumably taken from the Gaelic for the giant's fee fo fi fum; níor fhan éan i gcrann seems imitated from the cuaille cómhraic run;[2] and go smior go smúsach is usually associated either with Fionn chewing his thumb of knowledge or with the drips of the rí-choinneal penetrating the victim's flesh and bones. Perhaps the borrowings are the least important thing about this run, however: it is far more interesting that this is an original run, not at all like the usual fighting runs, which is both well-constructed and means something. The alliteration of the first sentence is interesting: it creates much the same effect as MS alliteration, but because the alliterating words are independent nouns and not adjectives, the meaning is far less confused. Níor fhan éan i gcrann may as I suggested be based on the sound-pattern of another run, but it represents an original and meaningful idea to express the terror inspired by the battle. This run is surely a work of art.

That was a reasonably serious run. Other runs, like it from Connacht, where the tradition seems to be most alive today, are intentionally comic and seem to mock their heroes. The hero dresses ina chulaith dhe chraiceann

1. IFC 200 p.24.
2. See p.290.

easgaine or ina chulaith ghearr india-rubber.[1] Instead of comparing the heroes to two lions in combat, in the literary phrase, a folk teller compares them to butcher's dogs and quarrelling grandmothers: "siúd fé chéile iad mar a bheadh dhá amhasg, dhá mháthair mhóire nó dhá mhadra bhúisteárd."[2] In the Scottish parody mentioned on p.302 there is little, since nonsense and exaggeration are normal, to show that it is not a serious exaltation of the hero, until he ends by going in his fine armour and on his fine horse on an expedition round the dunghill: " 's chaidh e trì uairean timchioll an òtraich, 's ghabh e eagal mòr, 's phill e." The tendency to laugh at the hero accords with the concern of some folk tellers to show that their stories are not true by means of nonsense beginnings and endings: it is an international peasant reaction rather than part of the literary tradition. But it all adds to the hearer's enjoyment, and indeed the burlesque style even crept into written tales: we have noticed it in TGG,[3] and it is even stronger in GF, where the high king quakes with fear at the mere description of the approaching stranger.[4]

I have been stressing the improvements which the best folk versions make upon the language of their sources. It may be appropriate, however,to end with one more example of

1. IFC 58 p.68 and another run, also I think from Mícheál mac Donnchadha.
2. I failed to note from which IFC MS of CG I took this down, but it is most likely a Cork one.
3. P.37, p.204-205.
4. Ed. Hyde p.18. GF contains some of the best examples of modern Irish runs that could be found.

the continuity of the tradition from written to oral tales. It comes from a sailing run which has been quoted already, in a version of CG written down by the IFC's collector Tadhg Ó Murchú from his memory of how his father in S. Kerry used to tell the story about the turn of the century:[1]

"A' trácht na fairrge falcanta fionna-ruadh dhó, fé mar éirigheadh sí 'na braonacha fliucha fuara, 'na díocacha dubha-ghorm', 'na sruthanna diana dásachtúla sainnséanacha..." At first sight this appears to be a variation on the usual ag treabhadh na fairrge. But the corresponding passage from the MS reads: "Éirghios an fhairge dhó iaromh, 'na cnocaibh druimneacha ciach-aidhbhle cubhar-anfadhacha, 7 'na sléibhte fliuch-áirde fuar-linnteacha fíor-dhoimhne, 7 'na glas-cholbhadhaibh gráineamhla..."[2] and so on, which is clearly the same pattern, but in different words. Now in most MSS this passage begins "do éirigh..." but the Old Irish form at-racht is occasionally found as an archaism in Romantic tales.[3] I am morally certain that this run derives from a MS which read "Atracht an fhairrge dhó", and the sound has been preserved, though the sense has been altered to that of treabhadh na fairrge (I have never seen trácht in this passage elsewhere) and the required part of éirghim inserted rather clumsily later. No better example of the influence of an archaic literary tradition on folk tellers could be found than this ninth-century verb in the mouth of a nineteenth-century storyteller.

1. IFC 1263 p.214.
2. CG, 23M10 p.23.
3. E.g. in ETC, SG I p.345: I have seen it in 17th-century MSS, if not 18th-century.

BIBLIOGRAPHIES.

Bibliography I: Romantic Tales.

(a) Introduction and list of MS collections.

This bibliography covers the principal Romantic tales dealt with in the thesis, as defined in the Introduction: so it excludes most Early Modern Irish stories which are mainly translations of foreign material, adaptations from Old or Middle Irish sources, supposedly historical (like the Battles), or allegorical, comic or satirical (like Ceisneamh Inghine Guile, Eachtra Chléirigh na gCroiceann, or Eachtra Chloinne Tomáis.) The stories are listed in order of their abbreviated titles, as used in the text: a key to the abbreviations is given at the end. Under each title the MSS are listed first according to the province in which they were written. The order of the provinces is from North to South: Scotland, Ulster, Connacht, Leinster, Munster. For convenience MSS written in the ancient province of Meath are listed with the related MSS of S.E. Ulster under "Ulster", and the same applies to MSS written in Dublin (mainly by Meath scribes.) In practice, therefore, there are very few "Leinster" MSS, mostly from Co. Kilkenny. When I cannot find sufficient evidence of the provenance of a MS, it is placed at the end under "Uncertain": the majority of MSS under this heading are probably from Munster. The date of the MS, and where possible of the pages containing the story concerned, is given in brackets after its number, if it is before 1800: undated MSS are nineteenth-century, except those marked (?) and MSS from

the Hyde collection, which may be eighteenth- or nineteenth-century.

The MS collections covered are as follows:

Belfast	The MacAdam and Bryson collections in Belfast Public Library. Catalogue by Breandán Ó Buachalla, Belfast 1962.
Bergin	MS catalogued in ZCP V, p. 535.
BM	Irish MSS in the British Museum, following the catalogue by S.H. O'Grady and R. Flower, London 1926-1953.
Coyle	MSS formerly belonging to James Coyle, catalogued in GJ XIV p. 808, 835.
CUL	Irish MSS in Cambridge University Library, catalogued in GJ XIV p. 755, 769, 797, 807, 855.
Ennis	MS of 1819 in Clare County Library, Ennis.
EUL	Gaelic MSS in Edinburgh University Library.
Ferriter	Patrick Ferriter's MS collection in the Library of University College, Dublin.
Franciscan	MSS in the library of the Franciscan convent, formerly at Merchant's Quay, Dublin, now at Killiney, Co. Dublin.
Giessen	MS in the Library of Giessen University, catalogued in RC XVI, p. 20.
Hyde	Douglas Hyde's MS collection, now in the Library of University College, Galway.
JFC MS	Two Irish MSS among the Campbell of Islay collection in NLS (NLS shelf-marks given.)
King's Inns.	Irish MSS in the library of King's Inns, Dublin.
Liverpool	Irish MSS in Liverpool City Museum, catalogued in Celtica IV, p. 217.
Lyons	Fr. Lyons' MS collection, in the library of the Presbytery, St. Mary's Cathedral, Cork, catalo-

gued in Journal of the Ivernian Society VII, p. 24, 103, 168.

MacFhachtna. MS in the possession of Liam MacFhachtna, catalogued in Éigse II, p. 278.

Morris — MSS formerly owned by Henry Morris, now in the Library of University College, Dublin. Nos. 1-17 (of 28) are catalogued in GJ XIV, p. 754, 765.

Murphy — Bishop Murphy's MS collection in the Library of St. Patrick's College, Maynooth.

NLI (G) — Gaelic MSS in the National Library of Ireland, Dublin: handlist in the Report of the Trustees for 1937, catalogue by Nessa Ní Shéaghdha in progress.

NLS — Gaelic MSS in the National Library of Scotland, Edinburgh (formerly the Advocates' Library.) Catalogue by Donald Mackinnon, Edinburgh 1912.

O'Curry — Eugene O'Curry's MS collection in the library of St. Patrick's College, Maynooth.

O'Laverty — Fr. O'Laverty's MS collection as catalogued in GJ XVI, p. 177, 193, 209, 225. Now in St. Malachy's College, Belfast, and renumbered.

O'Renehan — Gaelic MSS among the O'Renehan collection in St. Patrick's College, Maynooth.

Power — Canon Power's MS collection as catalogued in GJ XIV, p. 647, 692, 707, 728. Now in the Library of University College, Cork, and renumbered.

Queen's — Irish MSS in the Library of Queen's University, Belfast.

Rawl. — Rawlinson MSS in the Bodleian Library, Oxford.

RIA — Irish MSS in the Royal Irish Academy, Dublin. Catalogue by T. F. O'Rahilly, K. Mulchrone and others, Dublin 1926-1958.

Rossmore	Irish MSS in the library of Lord Rossmore at Monaghan, catalogued in GJ XII, p. 55.
Stonyhurst	MS Aii20 (two vols.) in the library of Stonyhurst College (S.J.), Whalley, Lancashire.
TCD	Gaelic MSS in the Library of Trinity College, Dublin. Catalogue by T.K. Abbott and E.J. Gwynn, Dublin 1921.
UCD	Gaelic MSS (Nos. I - XIX) in the Library of University College, Dublin, apart from the Ferriter and Morris collections.
WSJ	Irish MSS in the library of St. John's College, Waterford, catalogued in GJ XIV, p. 572, 584, 606, 632.

The principal omission in this list is the collection of some 150 Irish MSS in University College, Cork, of which, except for the Power collection, I have been unable to see a catalogue. Other omissions will no doubt be supplied eventually by the catalogue of all extant Irish MSS projected by the National Library of Ireland. My sources have been the catalogues mentioned above, MS catalogues at the libraries, microfilms of MSS and catalogues in the National Library of Ireland, and for Maynooth, personal search. I am very grateful to Fr. Pádraig Ó Fianachta for his help in this last.

After the MSS, printed versions of the romances are listed, with the MSS on which they are based, if known.

The oral versions, if any, are then listed by provinces in the same order as the MSS, and by counties under the provinces, or by districts and islands in Scotland. The following abbreviations are used for Irish counties:

(D) Co. Donegal

(M) Co. Mayo

(G) Co. Galway

(T) (Thomond) Co. Clare

(K) Co. Kerry

(C) Co. Cork

(W) Co. Waterford.

Under each county printed versions are listed first, followed by MSS in the Irish Folklore Commission, Dublin (IFC) and the Campbell of Islay collection in the National Library of Scotland, Edinburgh (JFC MS: for these Campbell's own volume and page numbers are given) and tape-recordings in the School of Scottish Studies, Edinburgh (SSS RL). For abbreviations of printed sources see Bibliography II. Versions are in Gaelic unless marked (Eng.)[1] As none of the collections of MSS and recordings has yet been fully indexed, this bibliography is necessarily incomplete.

1. All versions in the following collections are also in English only: Curtin (all three books), Larminie, LFIC, Maclellan. English translations are normally provided in JFC, MWHT, Quiggin, TGSI, Waifs & Strays: English summaries in Béal. and LSIC.

(b) MSS and folk versions.

AM Eachtra an Amadáin Mhóir.

MSS. Ulster. NLI G137 (1730), 145 (1766). RIA 24P16 (copy of G137). TCD H.2.6 (1715-16).

Printed by Hyde, Lia Fáil II p. 191, from RIA & TCD MSS.

Oral. See pp. 199-203.

BBA Bruidhean Bheag na hAlmhaine.

MSS. Scotland. NLS XXXIV (1603?), XXXVI (1690).
Ulster. Belfast VI. BM Eg.131 (1790); Add.18747. King's Inns 5 (1755). Morris 7 (1732), 8 (1733), 14. NLI G145 (1766). O'Laverty K, AG (1740-41). RIA 23.0.1; 24C25; 24I23 (1725); 24L31. TCD H.2.6 (1716.)
Connacht. RIA Bivl (1675).
Munster. BM Add.18946. Ennis. Murphy 19, 52 (1797). NLI G69, 93, 94 (1701), 136 (1756). O'Renehan 97. RIA 3B3, 13; 12F7; 23E15 (1798); 23N25; 24B35; 24C8; 24I9; 24M25; 24P6 (1768), 29; EviI. TCD H.5.4 (c.1700).
Uncertain. Hyde 20. NLI G161. TCD H.4.10.

Printed in SG I p. 336, from Add.18747; GGG p. 3, from the Maynooth MSS; Trí Bruidhne p.16, from NLS XXXIV.

Oral. See TDG, Leinster (Meath.)

BC An Bhruidhean Chaorthuinn.

MSS. Scotland. NLS XXXIV (1603?), XXXVIII (c.1600?), LXXXIX (copy of XXXIV.)
Ulster. Belfast XL. BM Eg.132 (1712), 164 (1726-27). NLI G 145.(1766). RIA 23A10 (before 1772); 24P10 (1799). TCD H.2.6 (1715); H.3.23 (1718).
Munster. BM Eg.140 (1766), 211 (1758); Add.18946, 31877 (1755-62). Ennis. Ferriter 29. Lyons V (1773). Murphy 18, 53 (1760). NLI G79 (1777), 80 (1737), 110, 123 (1779). O'Renehan 97. Power 9 (1780). RIA 12F7 (1749);

23B4, 15; 23C13, 15 (1775), 26 (1770), 30 (1733), 36; 23G21 (c.1796); 23H10; 23I39 (1770); 23K7 (1745); 23L2, 24 (1766), 39 (1775-78); 23M19 (1789), 43; 23N18 (1772), 25; 23O15, 52 (1799-1801); 24A20, 23, 29; 24B33 (1784), 35; 24C8; 24L23; 24M25; Ev4.
Uncertain. Hyde 21. King's Inns 7 (1778). NLI G199, 233 (1792), 308, 313. NLS LVIII (c. 1738?) O'Curry 48. RIA 23H36 (c.1730); 23O51 (frag., 1772-73). TCD H.4.10; H.6.10 (C18), 13 (1782), 21 (1774-81).
Printed by Pádraig Mac Piarais (Dublin 1908) from 23K7, 23L30 and a MS in his own possession.

Variant MS version: Munster RIA 23B24; 24L24.

Oral. Scotland.(Barra) JFC II p. 181. (S.Uist) JFC MS XVIII p. 193 (Eng. summary), Maclellan p. 27.
Ulster. (D) "Fearghus mac Róigh", Bruidhean Chaorthuinn (Dublin 1911).
Ireland, uncertain. Curtin, Folk-Tales p.124; Myths p.221. LFIC p. 206.

Hundreds of versions of tale or motif only in IFC and elsewhere, not mentioned here for the reasons given on p. 86.

BCC Bruidhean Chéise Corainn.

MSS. Scotland. NLS XXXVI (1690).
Ulster. BM Eg.133 (1711); Add.18747. Coyle 1,5. Morris 18. NLI G35 (1750), 82 (1744), 145 (1766), 200. O'Laverty F, AG (1740). RIA 23A10 (bef. 1772); 23I35 (1776); 24C25; 24I23 (1725); GviI (1787). TCD H.2.6 (1715).
Leinster. RIA 23D12.
Munster. BM Eg. 211(1758); Add.18951 (1799-1801). Ennis. Ferriter 25. Lyons V (1773). Murphy 21, 52 (1797.) NLI G63, 69, 70 (1788), 108 (1777), 152. O'Renehan 97. RIA 3B3, 13; 12F7 (1749); 23G21 (1796); 23H15 (1779); 23I47; 23K3; 23L28 (1785); 23O46, 52; 24B29 (1788), 33(1784), 35; 24C8, 55; 24L22; 24M25; 24P29; FivI. TCD H.5.4 (1699-1702).

Uncertain. Hyde 21, 30. King's Inns 7 (1778). Murphy 86 (1775). NLI G134. RIA 12F20 (1773); 23D23 (1788); 23.0.15; 24A16; 24C44.

Printed in SG I p. 306 from Add. 18747; GGG p. 69 from Maynooth MSS; Trí Bruidhne p. 3 from NLS XXXVI.

Oral. Ulster. (D) S. Laoide, Cruach Chonaill (Dublin 1913) p.94; IFC S1051 p. 295.
Munster. (C) R. Ó Foghludha, Scéalta Triúir (Dublin (1919)) p. 7; Béal. II p. 26. (I heard two versions from story-tellers from Cúil Aodha at the Oireachtas in 1962.)
Uncertain. Cl. Soluis, May 1906.

BCF Bás Cearbhaill agus Farbhlaidhe; Tochmarc Farbhlaidhe; Eachtra Abhlaighe.

MSS. Ulster. Belfast XV. BM Eg.170 (1724). NLI G130 (1725-27), 144 (1767). RIA 3B39; 24B13; 24P12 (bef. 1648), 21, 31. Rossmore II (c. 1712). TCD H.3.23 (1718), H.6.8 (1777).
Munster. Murphy 19. RIA 23D26; 23E16 (c. 1800); 23K7 (1700-02); 23M25 (1684); 24A23; 24P6 (1768); Ev2.
Uncertain. TCD H.4.25 (c. 1630?)

Printed by E. Ó Neachtain, in Ériu IV p. 49, from 24P12.

BCL Bodach an Chóta Lachtna.

MSS. Ulster. BM Eg. 154, 161 (1778-88). NLI G82 (1744). RIA Fv2 (1788); 23A32 (1758).
Connacht. RIA 23.0.35 (1774); 23Q18 (c.1789).
Munster. BM Add. 31877 (two copies: 1762 and 1800). Ennis. Ferriter 25. JFC MS50.3.13. Murphy 18, 53 (1760). NLI G122. O'Curry 44 (frag.) O'Renehan 97. RIA 3B26; 23A29; 23B34; 23D40 (aceph. 1796); 23G10; 23M47; 24A13, 21; 24B22 (c.1772); 24C47, 56 (?); 24L22, 26. TCD H.6.9 (1777-81). WSJ VII.
Uncertain. Hyde 12, 19 (frag.), 22, 40, 67. King's Inns 7 (1778). RIA 23A49 (1766 or 1776); 23L40; 23M19 (1789), 23. TCD H.6.21 (1774-81).

Printed in SG I p. 289, from Eg. 154; by Pádraig mac Piarais, (Dublin 1906), from 23M19 & 23A49; by P. Ó Canainn (1939).

Oral. Scotland. See p. 113.
Munster. (Limerick) IFC S482 p. 272 (Eng.) (K) Béal. XXIX p. 49.

CCC Caithréim Chonghail Chláiringnigh.

MSS. Scotland. NLS XXXI (vellum fragment).
Ulster. RIA 23H20 (C17?)
Munster. RIA 23K28 (copy of 23H20).

Printed by P. MacSweeney, London 1904 (ITS vol. V), from RIA MSS.

CCR Eachtra (Imtheachta) an Cheithearnaigh Chaoilriabhaigh; Ceithearnach Uí Dhomhnaill.

MSS. Scotland. NLS XXXVI (1690).
Ulster. Belfast XXXIII C (frag.) BM Eg.156 (1727), 164 (1716), 166 (1740 - copy of 156); Add.18747. CUL Add. 3085 (1744). EUL (Mackinnon p. 292.) Morris 8 (1733). NLI G130 (1725-27), 147 (1776). NLS LV (1738). Queen's 18. RIA 23A45 (1745); 23M39; 24L34; GviI (1787).
Munster. Bergin (1705). Ferriter 25. Murphy 53 (1786). NLI G 123 (1779). O'Renehan 97. RIA 12F7 (1749); 23D35; 23G41(ii); 23I7 (1705); 23M47(e), 51 (1767); 23N18 (1773), 25; 24A13; 24B9, 22 (c.1772); 24L4 (C18), 26; 24P19. TCD H.5.4 (1699).
Uncertain. Hyde 20, 30. Liverpool 12095M (frag.) NLI G35 (1750). RIA 3B44 (C18?); 23I35 (C18?); 23L31 (1787); 23M19 (1789); 24B28 (1728). Queen's 2 (?) TCD H.4.13 (1710).

Printed in SG I p. 276, from Add.18747; by Enrí Ua Muirgheasa, (Dublin 1912), from Morris 8.

Oral. Scotland. (Gairloch) JFC I p. 318; (Islay) JFC I p. 297. Donald MacPhie in S. Uist had a version "nearly same as I have it" (JFC MS XIII p. 410.)

CF Cath Fionntrágha.

Printed by Cecile O'Rahilly, (Dublin 1962, M&M vol. XX), from Rawl. B 487 (c. 1460-70); earlier by Kuno Meyer, Anecdota Oxoniensia, Mediaeval and Modern Series, vol. I, part IV (Oxford 1885).

MSS. To the 47 MSS listed by Miss O'Rahilly (op. cit. pp. xxv-xxix) may be added: Hyde 13, 21. Ferriter 29, 31. Murphy 23. NLI G232 (frag., misbound). O'Renehan 97. Like all others except Rawl., these are probably late Munster MSS.

Oral. Connacht. (G) An Stoc, Aibreán 1929, p.6. IFC 61 p. 227; 157 p. 279, p.348; 237 p. 80; 281 p.226. Munster. (K) Curtin, Hero-Tales p.530. IFC 12 p.291; 34 p.203; 293 p.250; 782 p.336. Cf. Béal. VI p.4, p.13.

CG Eachtra(Imtheacht, Tóraigheacht) Chonaill Gulban.

b MSS. Scotland. NLS XXXVI (1691), LXXXIX (copy of last). Ulster. NLI G20, 171 (both c. 1760, copies of next.) RIA 23M10 (1706); 24C28.(frag.) TCD H.1.10 (1747, copy of 23M10).
Munster. BM Eg.140 (1766), 150 (1774?), 210; Add.18945. Hyde 12, 46. Murphy 18, 51, 54 (1775), 102 (frag.) NLI G63 (copy of 23H15), 79 (1777, copy of next), 80 (1737), 86, 92, 185, 230, 232 (1794). O'Curry 5 (1781). O'Laverty P. O'Renehan 97. Power 19. RIA 3B13; 12K8; 23C24 (1778); 23H15 (1773); 23K2, 43 (1789); 23M26 (1684); 23N23 (1778); 23.0.52 (1800); 24A10, 26; 24B23 (1773), 29 (1787); 24C8, 36, 49 (?); 24L24, 39 (frag., 1778); 24P18, 19; Fi4 & FiiI (half in each). WSJ VI.
Uncertain. Stonyhurst vol.I (1733). TCD H.3.8.(bef. 1792), H.6.7 (1737). MacFhachtna.

Oral. Scotland. JFC III p.199 (Eng. synthesis of five versions: Gaelic originals in JFC MS IV, and one Eng. summary in JFC MS XIII). Part of Campbell's LCC (q.v.) JFC MS XVI p. 88; XVIII p. 42 (Eng. summaries from Mull & Tiree).

Sg. D. p.45. SSS RL 1476-77. IFC 1031 p.7.
Connacht. (M) Hyde, Ocht Sgéalta p.104. IFC 191 p.400; S131 p.718. (G) An Stoc, Iúl-Lughnasa 1923. Béal. VI p.116. IFC 58 p.38; 69 p.8; 79 p.55, p.415; 237 p.142; 529 p.326; 530 p.448; S1 p.373; 432 p.457 (same as 69 p.8).
Munster. (T) Béal. XII p.139; cf. IFC 497 p.301.
(K) Curtin, Hero-Tales p.58. Cl. Soluis January 1911. SM p. 112. LSIC p.221. Béal. VI p.21. IFC 12 p.16; 13 p.259; 15 p.187; 22 p.568; 25 p.422; 34 p.265; 218 p.282; 215 p. 424 (same as 15 p.187); 242 p.226; 267 p.38; 269 p.294; 357 p.388; 411 p. 29; 698 p.331; 715 p.99; 733 p.173; 859 p.1; 981 p.106; 1115 p.225; 1263 p.218. (C) F&L p.11. IFC 46 p.11, p.271; 93 p.240, p.323; 219 p.115; 1129 p.209.

CIL Céilidhe Iosgaide Léithe.

MSS. Ulster. King's Inns 5 (1755).
Uncertain. Rawl. B 477 (c.1678).
Printed by M. Mhac an tSaoí, Dhá Sgéal Artúraíochta, (Dublin 1946), p.42, from King's Inns 5. See also M. Draak in Celtica III p.232.

CML Cath (Ionnsaighe) Muighe Léana; Cogadh Chuinn agus Eoghain Mhóir.

Printed by K.H. Jackson, (Dublin 1938, M&M vol. IX); earlier by E. O'Curry (Dublin, for the Celtic Society, 1855).

MSS. To the 26 MSS listed by Jackson, op. cit., may be added: Ferriter 29. Hyde 13, 21, 40. Liverpool 12029M. Murphy 20, 55 (1762), 67. NLI G109 (1780), 155, 156. NLS LXXIX. O'Renehan 70, 79 (1781). Rossmore VI. Stonyhurst vol. II (1703). Most of these are Munster MSS of the "Short Recension."

CNC Coimheasgar na gCuradh.

MSS. Ulster. RIA 24P7 (1761). O'Laverty F.
Munster. NLI G108 (1777), 123 (1779).
Uncertain. Hyde 39 (part I).

Printed by M. Ní Chléirigh, Dublin 194², from 24P7, (LSS No.VI).

CRI Eachtra Chloinne (Thriúir Mhac) Ríogh na hIoruaidhe.

MSS. Scotland. NLS LXXIX (transcript in Roman hand of an Irish MS of 1740).
Ulster. BM Eg.106 (1715); Add.18747. Franciscan ? (used by Hyde: not apparently in catalogue). Hyde 34 (poss. a frag. of Morris 7). King's Inns 5 (1775). Morris 7 (1732). NLI G145 (1766). O'Laverty D, G (1740). RIA 23A32 (1758); 23K5 (1714); 23M4 (after 1725); 23L7 (1783); 24M10. TCD H.2.6 (1715-16), H.4.14 (1685-86).
Munster. Murphy 19. O'Renehan 97. Power 9 (1780). RIA 23D26; 23G24; 23H15 (1773); 23L27 (1738); 39 (1778); 24A13; 24C8; 24L26.
Uncertain. Murphy 103 (1762). NLI G149 (1765). O'Renehan 79 (1778). RIA 23A25 (1770); 23K36 (1704).

Printed by D. Hyde (London 1899: ITS vol. I)., from 23K5, 23L39, H.2.6, Franciscan & others.

Variant MS, with sequel: Munster. RIA 24B24 (c.1772).

(D)/ Oral. Ulster./ Cú na gCleas p.37. S. MacManus, Donegal Fairy Stories (London 1902), p.177 (Eng.) IFC 336 p.46 (Eng.); 338 p.114; 410 p.35; 664 p.737; 666 p.215; S1062 p.379. Connacht: (M) Béal. XII p.106. IFC 83 p.148, 662 p. 313 (same); 523 p.412; 836 p.652. (G) LML p.120; Curtin, Hero-Tales p.198 (same, Eng.); IFC 58 p.89 (same); 61 p.11.

(K)/ Munster./ Béal. III p.381. IFC 4 p.176; 7 p.78; 9 p.86 (same); 25 p.173; 304 p.290; 316 p.297; 430 p.265; 480 p.345; cf. 239 p. 125; 771 p.431. (C) Curtin, Folk-Tales p.93. IFC 573 p.485.

Cú Chulainn in oral tradition.

Since many folktales about Cú Chulainn are compendia compiled from several literary or oral sources (see p. 71 ff.) it is convenient to list them all under this heading, apart from TGG, which as an original Romantic tale is treated separately. The tales which make up each oral compendium are listed after it under the following letters:

A Compert Con Culainn
B How Cú Chulainn got his name (from Táin Bó Cuailnge.)
C How he killed the sons of Nechtan Scéne (" " " .)
D Oileamuin Con Culainn
E Aided Chonlaoich
F Elements of Táin Bó Cuailnge other than B, C and G.
G Aided Fhir Dead
H Fled Bricrenn
J Aided Con Roí
K Echtra Machae
L Brislech Mór Maige Muirtheimne
M Dergruathar Chonaill Chernaig
N Cú na hAdhairce (folktale.)
P Variant of the folktale about Fionn in the cradle (see p. 89.)

Some account of the MS tradition of A - M is given in Heldensage. For folk versions of E, N and P on their own in Irish, see OS&C under AT 873, AT 1376A* and AT 1149 respectively.

Oral. Scotland. (S. Uist) TGSI II p.25 (BDFGPN); JFC MS XVIII p.163 (Eng. summary: FGLM); Arv XV p.160 (BP(N)G(confused with E & L)). (Eigg) Celtic Mag. XIII p.512 (FLM). (Mull) JFC MS XVI p.165 (Eng. summary: FGL;BD;E). (Islay) JFC III p.198 (Eng. summary: PNE); LNF p.18 (M). (Uncertain) JFC III p.194 (Eng: BN); LNF p.10, 13, 15 (E).
Ulster. Cú na gCleas p.55 (cfAB cfCDEL). N. Ó Domhnaill, Scéalta Johnny Sheimisín (Belfast 1948) p.46 (cfAB cfC). Micí Ó Baoighill, Gael Linn record (much as Cú na gCleas). Quiggin p.237 (An Ghlas Ghaibhleann & N). IFC 186 p.464

(H); S1075 p.212 (H & TGG). (Tyrone) Sg. Mh. Luinigh p.101 (H). (Louth) IFC S657 p.166 (Eng: F). Connacht. (Leitrim) IFC S964 p.294 (Eng: F). (Sligo) IFC S178 p.141 (Eng: F). (Mayo) New Ireland Review XXV p.181 (BDE). (Galway) LML p.37 (KBDEN). Munster. (Limerick) JRSAI LVII p.62 (Eng: J). (Kerry) "Tadhg Meith", Cathair Con Roí 7 Sgéalta Eile (Dublin 1903) p.1 (J). Cl. Soluis 20/1/1906 & 27/1/1906 (J). IFC 1066 p.179 (J); p.653 (J).

Some miscellaneous folktales about Cú Chulainn may be found as follows:

Ulster. (D) GJ XI p.3. IFC 67 p.106; 140 p.276; 207 p.224.
Connacht. (G) D. Hyde, An Sgéaluidhe Gaedhealach (Dublin 1933) p.168.
Munster. (K) SM p.136.

DGP Díthreabhach Glinne an Phéice; Murchadh mac Briain 7 an Díthreabhach.

MSS. Scotland. NLS XXXVI (1690). Early text, incomplete.
Munster. Murphy 18 (1817). RIA 24B35 (1841). Late text.

Printed in GGG p.83 from Murphy 18.

Oral. See pp.92-93.

DMD Teagmhála Duibh mhic Deaghla 7 a Chloinne.

MSS. Ulster. Belfast XV (part). O'Laverty M. RIA 24P31.

EAC Eachtra Airt meic Cuind 7 Tochmarc Delbchaíme ingine Morgáin.

Printed by Bergin, Ériu III p.149, from the Book of Fermoy (the only MS: c.1457.)

EAM Eachtra Alcamenus 7 Menalope.

There is a MS of this story in the collection of Fr. L. Donnellan of Crossmaglen, Co. Armagh: see Irish Book Lover XIX, p.74. It is mentioned by D. Hyde, Literary History of Ireland, p. 572 n. I have not seen it.

EAF Eachtra Aonghusa meic Fhirdiach.

MS. Ulster. TCD H.3.23 (1718). Acephalous.

EBD Bruidhean Eochaidh Bhig Dheirg (Bhéildheirg.)

MSS. Ulster. Coyle 1, 5. Morris 1. TCD H.5.28 (1679).
Leinster. (?) NLS LVI (before 1782).
Munster. BM Eg.140 (1766). Murphy 21, 52. NLI G69, 123 (1779). O'Renehan 97. RIA 3B13; 12F7 (1749); 23B15; 23C10; 23E16 (1799); 23N25; 23.0.46; 24A13, 23; 24B33, 35; 24C8; 24I9; 24L24; FivI. WSJ III.
Uncertain. Hyde 19. RIA 23L16. TCD H.4.10. UCD IX (1732).

Printed by P. Ó Briain, Bláithfhleasg de Mhílseáinibh na Gaoidheilge (Dublin 1893); Trí Bruidhne p.40, from H.5.28.

Oral. Scotland. LNF p.89. JFC II p.85. Waifs & Strays IV p.192.
Ireland (provenance uncertain) Curtin, Folk-Tales p.137 (Eng.)
There are many oral versions of the associated Laoidh na gCon.

ECC Eachtra Chonaill Cheithearnaigh agus an Fhir Dia, Lughaidh mhac Nōs, Bhricin, agus Chū Chuilin go hOileān an Ār a Rīgheachta Rīgh Innse Toirc.

Printed by M.Ní Mhuirgheasa and S. Ó Ceithearnaigh, Sgéalta Rómánsuíochta, LSS No. XVI (Dublin 1952), from a nineteenth-century Ulster MS in the possession of Fr. L. O'Donnellan of Crossmaglen, Co. Armagh, copied from an original of 1729.

ECG Eachtra (better Gabháltus) Chonaill Gulban.

Printed by Fr. G. Lehmacher, ZCP XIV p.212, from Brussels MS 6131 - 3 (17th century.) Possibly a copy of NLI G131 (hand of Cú Coigríche Ó Cléirigh (?)).

ECL Eachtra Chuinn Láidir mhic Bhacaigh Bhinne Gulban.

MSS. Munster. RIA 24B22 (c.1772); 24C28. I have seen another MS, unbound and probably incomplete, in IFC.

ECM Eachtra Chéadaigh Mhóir; Sgéal Chéadaigh; Teacht mac Ríogh na gCorach (Sorach) go hÉirinn.

MSS. Munster. NLI G86 (1831). RIA 23G41 (1818); 24C2, 47.

Oral. Scotland. Waifs & Strays II p. 376; III p.27; IV p. 225, 260, 275. JFC MS XI p.133 (printed by K.C. Craig, Gille nan Cochull Chraicinn, XIII p. 65; XVI p.107. SSS RL66; 859. (SSS recordings and JFC MS XIII from Sutherland; the rest from Argyll.)
Ulster. (D) Quiggin p.215. Curtin, Myths p.244. N.Ó Domhnaill, Scéalta Johnny Sheimisín (Belfast 1948) p.14. Béal. VI p.270; VII p.197.
Connacht. (Sligo) Béal. III p.304. (M) Béal. I p.141, 329. Larminie p.64. (G) D. Ó Fotharta, Siamsa a' Gheimhridh p.3. LML p.147. RC XXXII p.184. Cl.Soluis IX p.29. E. Ó Neachtain, Céadach mac Fhinn as Éirinn (Dublin 1907.) Béal. VI p.61. Lampa Draoidheachta p.139.
Munster. (K) Curtin, Hero-Tales p.463. Béal. III p.387; VII p.121. (C) Curtin, Folk-Tales p.146.

There are also 140 versions or related tales in IFC MSS according to the index there; of those whose provenance is given on the index cards, 9 are from Donegal, 1 Mayo, 12 Galway, 19 Kerry, 2 Cork.

ECT Eachtra (Thriúir) Chloinne Thoroilbh (Thoirdhealbhaigh.)

MSS. This is a sequel by the same author to ETS (q.v.) and follows it in most MSS and the edition by Ó Briain. It occurs independently in the following MSS:
Munster. RIA 23A27; 24A6; 24M25.
Uncertain. Hyde 53. RIA 23L26.

EE Eachtra 7 Áirdsgéul Éuchtach mac Rígh (na) mBan Fionn.

MS. Ulster. BM Eg.171 (1790).

EF Eachtra Foirbe mac Chonchubhair mhic Neasa Rígh Uladh.

Sgéalta Rómánsuíochta p.184. Details as for ECC.

EG (Eachtra Ghruagaigh na creige 7 na cruite 7 an tiompáin.)

MS. Ulster. Queen's 6 (1712). Acephalous and untitled.

EIA Eachtra Iollainn Airmdheirg; Tóraigheacht Fhiacail Ríogh Ghréag; Sgéal Ucaire na Seachtmhaine.

MSS. Ulster. BM Eg.128 (1748). NLI G147 (1776). RIA 23A25 (1778), 32 (1758).
Munster. BM Eg.140 (1766), 150 (1773-4?); Add.18947, 31877 (1756). Murphy 19, 52 (1799), 94 (frag.) NLI G93, 94 (1701), 185. O'Renehan 97. RIA 23C24 (1771), 32 (frag.); 23D34; 23E15; 23K20; 23L24, 39 (1775); 24B26 (1762); EvI. Stonyhurst vol. II (1702). WSJ VII.
Uncertain. Hyde 19, 22. Murphy 103 (1762). NLI G109 (1780). O'Curry 58 (frag., C18?). Rossmore VIII.

Printed by E. Ó Neachtain and P. Mac Piarais in Cl. Soluis 9/7/1904 to 3/12/1904, from RIA 23D34, 23E15 & 23L39. Unpublished typescript edition as MA thesis for UCD by M. Ní Chleírigh (IFC 581) from 23A25 & 23A32.

Variant MSS: Ulster. BM Eg.171 (1790). See p.103 ff.
Munster. RIA 24B25 (1772). Normal text with new sequel.

Oral. Scotland. JFC II p.451 (version from Colonsay with Eng. summaries of 5 others, originals in JFC MS IX.) JFC III p.9. J. Macdougall, Folktales and Fairy Lore (Edinburgh 1910) p.40. SSS RL 864-865. (Mostly Argyll except the last, which is from Sutherland.)
Ulster. (D) IFC 56 p.265; 88 p.129; 142 p.1602; 180 p.274; 310 p.412.
Connacht. (M) Lampa Draoidheachta p.90. Béal. XII p.86. cf. IFC 195 p.295. (G) LML p.90. IFC 63 p.77; 65 p.174 (same); 75 p.381; 110 p.26; 157 p.312; 164 p.91; 257 p.258; 271 p.201; 378 p.432. cf.IFC 305 p.492; 615 p.258 &279.
Munster. (K) LSIC p.27. Béal. V p.189 (same.) IFC 277 p.299; S429 p.58. cf.IFC 8 p.373; 9 p.349 (same);

386 p.74. (C) P. Ó Súilleabháin, An Gréasaidhe Mór Ó Éirinn (Dublin 1932) p.13. C. Ó Muimhneacháin, Béal-oideas Béal Átha an Ghaorthaidh (Dublin 1934) p.109. F&L p.18. IFC 47 p.164; 650 p.693 (same as Ó Muimhneacháin.)

ELG Eachtra Luigheach Ghuilchleasach.

MSS. Munster. Murphy 18 (1817). RIA 24B35 (1841). Both break off probably well before the end.

EMM Eachtra an Mhadra Mhaoil.

MSS. Ulster. BM Eg.128 (1749), 132 (1712), 157 (copy of 662), 188 (1730), 662 (1770); Add.18747. Coyle 1, 5, 7. Morris 7 (1732). NLI G137 (1730), 145 (1766). RIA 23D22 (1788); 24M10; 24P16 (copy of NLI G137); Aii5 (1699). TCD H.5.28 (1679); H.1.6 (1758).
Connacht. BM Eg.1782 (1517).
Munster. BM Eg.150 (1773), 211 (1758); Add.18946. Ferriter 4, 34. Lyons IX. Murphy 18. NLI G93, 122, 218. O'Renehan 97. RIA 12F7 (1749-50); 23C4, 30 (1733), 36; 23E15 (1797); 23H10; 23L15, 39 (1775-78); 23M26 (1684); 24A10, 19, 21; 24B16 (1767-68); 24C36, 49; 24M40; 24P18, 29; Ev3; FvI (1796).
Uncertain. Hyde 15 (3 copies), 18, 22. King's Inns 29 (1780). Murphy 103 (1762). NLI G116, 308 (C18). RIA 23A25 (1770-80?); 23C9; 23D24 (1776); 23H36 (c.1730); 23K22; 24C27.

Printed by R.A.S. Macalister, Two Irish Arthurian Romances (London 1908; ITS vol.X.)

Oral. Munster. (T) IFC 961 p.135 (Eng.)

EMO Eachtra Mhelóra agus Orlando.

MSS. Ulster. BM Eg.106 (c.1700?) TCD H.3.16 (1696-97); H.5.28 (1679). The first two are copies of the last.

Printed from H.5.28 by M. Mhac antSaoi, Dhá Sgéal Artúraíochta (Dublin 1946) p.1; by M. Draak, Béal. XVI p.3.

ENC Eachtra na gCuradh.

MSS. Ulster. BM Add.18746 (1796). O'Laverty F. RIA 23L7 (1783); 24P7 (1761).
Uncertain. Hyde 34, 39. O'Renehan 79 (1780). RIA 23L18 (1743). UCD IV.

Printed by M. Ní Chléirigh (Dublin 1941 ; LSS No. 1.) from RIA 24P7.

ETC Eachtra Thaidhg mhic Chéin.

Printed in SG I p.342 from the Book of Lismore (c.1500), the only MS.

ETS Eachtra Thoroilbh (Thoirdhealbhaigh, Doilbh) mhic Stáirn.
by Mícheál Coimín.(1)

MSS. Dublin. RIA 23E11.
Connacht. RIA 23Q18 (1789?-1818.)
Munster. BM Add.18945, 18948 (frag.) Ennis. Murphy 22, 111 (1749). NLI G93, 185, 193, 211. O'Curry 44. O'Renehan 97. RIA 23C24 (1778); 23G21 (1795-97); 23K35; 23L6, 11 (1780), 28 (1783), 39 (1775-78); 23.0.52 (1799-1801); 24A7, 29; 24B14, 25 (c.1772); 24C8; 24L8 (1784-86), 22, 32; Evi3.
Uncertain. Hyde 16, 21. MacFhachtna. NLI G161. O'Curry 36. RIA 23L31.

Printed by P. Ó Briain, Bláithfhleasg de Mhílseáinibh na Gaoidheilge (Dublin 1893); by E. Ó Neachtain, Torolbh mhac Stáirn (Dublin 1922).

(1) The ascription is traditional; it is supported by the fact that at least a third of the MSS were written in Coimín's own County Clare, and by some early colophons (e.g. in G185 and 24L8) which say that the story was copied from Coimín's Leabhar na Fáistine.

FTC Feis Tighe Chonáin Chinn tSléibhe.

MSS. Ulster. Belfast V (1770). BM Eg.106 (1715), 133 (1711), 145 (copy of 106). NLI G146 (1770). O'Laverty G (1740). RIA 23E11; GviI. TCD H.4.14 (1686).
Connacht. RIA EiiI (frag., early C18).
Munster. BM Eg.140 (frag., 1766?) Murphy 22. NLI G90, 120. O'Curry 45. Power IX (1780). RIA 3B12, 26; 12F7 (1750), 20 (1733); 23B2, 15; 23C7 (1789), 13, 36; 23G20 (1786-91); 23K46; 23L39 (1777); 23M25 (1684); 23N19 (1766); 23 (1778); 24A3; 24B22 (c.1772); 24C8, 55; 24L24; 24M25; Ev4. TCD H.5.4 (1700). WSJ VII.
Uncertain. Hyde 12, 30, 31. NLI G85, 113 & 114 (1703), 148 (1722), 161, 308. O'Curry 45. RIA 23D29; 23K7 (1745); 23M19 (1789); 24B28 (1728). TCD H.3.18 (frag., vellum: C16?)

Printed by N. O'Kearney,(Dublin 1855: Ossianic Society publications vol. II) from Power IX; by M. Joynt (Dublin 1935: M&M vol. VII) from H.4.14 and others.

GD Eachtra (Teacht agus Imtheacht, Tóraigheacht) an Ghiolla Dheacair.

MSS. Ulster. BM Eg.106 (1717); Add.34119 (1765). NLI G145 (1766). RIA 23D22 (1788). TCD H.2.6 (1715); H.4.14 (1686).
Munster. Ferriter 21. Murphy 21, 52 (1797). NLI G79, 92 (1777), 152, 230. RIA 3B8, 43 (?); 23A21; 23B4, 15; 23C30 (1733, frag.), 36; 23G21; 23I45; 23L2, 39; 23M44; 23N12 (1763); 24A15 (1756), 21; 24B14, 16 (1767), 23 (1772), 26 (1760-62), 28 (1728); 24C55; 24L24; 24M25, 40; Ev4.
Uncertain. Hyde 18. NLI G148 (1722). Stonyhurst vol. I (1733).

Printed in SG I p.257, from Add.34119; by S. Laoide & E. Ua hÓgáin ((Dublin) 1905); by P. Ó Canainn (Dublin (1940)); by An Seabhac (Dublin 194) from a MS of 1728.

Oral. Munster. (K) Curtin, Hero-Tales p.514.

GF Giolla an Fhiugha.

MSS. Munster. Ferriter 25. Hyde 16, 21. Murphy 18 (1817). RIA 23M47; 24A13; 24C28.

Printed by D. Hyde, (London 1899: ITS vol.I) from two MSS - not necessarily those now in the Hyde collection.

Oral. Scotland. (S. Uist) JFC MS XVIII p.118 (Eng. summary). (Islay) TGSI XXV p.246 (part of LCC, q.v.)
Connacht. (G) Béal. VI p. 108. IFC 156 p.5 (same); 167 p.415; 795 p.416; (combined with LCC) 61 p.85.
Munster. (K) LSIC p.244. Béal. XIV p.156. IFC 255 p. 204 (same); 10 p.63; 272 p.439; 353 p.172; S427 p.108. (W) IFC 152 p.461 plus 153 P.15.

GG An Gleacaidhe Géuglonnach; Eachtra Ridire an Leomhain (Dheirg): by Seán Ó Neachtain.

MSS. Ulster. NLI G197 (1716). RIA 24A1 (C18); 24P2 (c.1710).

LCC Leigheas Coise Céin.

MSS. Ulster. BM Eg.1781 (c.1484).
Connacht. RIA BivI (1671).

Oral. See footnotes to p.115.

LSR Eachtra Lomnochtáin an tSléibhe Riffe.

MSS. Ulster. BM Eg.154, 155 (1790-96), 162 (1774), 164 (1726), 171 (1790), 208. RIA 24L34; 24P10 (1798), 20; BiIa (C18?). TCD H.6.7 (1737).
Connacht(?) RIA 23M6.
Munster. JFC MS 50.3.12 (1793). Murphy 52, 55 (1789). NLI G123 (1779), 155, 211, 230, 307. O'Renehan 97. Power 9.(1780). RIA 3B13; 3C9; 23B15; 23C36; 23E16 (1797); 23L15; 23M6; 23N23 (1779); 23.0.46, 51; 24A23; 24B26 (1763); 24C8, 57 (1796); 24P6 (1768), 19;

FivI; Fvi2.
Uncertain. Hyde 15, 19. Murphy 52 (C18?). NLI G161. RIA 23I11 (C18). Stonyhurst vol.I (1733).

Long version, MSS: Munster. RIA 23L39 (1775-78); 24L26. WSJ VII. Possibly one or two of those listed above may give the longer text.

Printed by O. Bergin and E. MacNeill (Dublin 1901, and in GJ VIII p.168 to IX p.339) from a MS of the long version.

MDD Eachtra Mhuireadaigh mhic Dhiain Dheirg.

MS. Ulster. RIA 23A10 (before 1772).

MI Eachtra Mhacaoimh (Mhic) an Iolair.

MSS. Ulster. BM Eg.128 (1748-49), 170 (1705-24); Add.34119 (1765). Morris 18. Rossmore XIII (1719). TCD H.1.6 (1758); H.3.23 (1718); H.6.7 (1737).
Connacht. RIA 24P9 (1651).
Munster. BM Add.18945. Murphy 22. RIA 12K8; 23A23; 23C30 (1733); 23G25; 23L27 (1736-38); 24A13; Ev3.

Printed by R.A.S. Macalister, Two Irish Arthurian Romances (London 1908: ITS vol.X) from Eg.128; by I. de Teiltiún & S. Laoide (Dublin 1912.)

Oral. Ulster. (D) cf.IFC 1489 p.423.

MOM Cuireadh Mhaoil Uí Mhananáin ar Fionn mac Cumhaill 7 Fianaibh Éirinn.

MSS. Munster. (Co. Clare?) RIA 23I48 (1831); 23K3 (1821?).

Printed from these two MSS by T. Ó Caomhánaigh, Lia Fáil III p.87.

MRE Bás (Oidheadh, Tuitim, Imtheacht) an Mhacaoimh Mhóir mhic Ríogh na hEaspáine; Eachtra Iollainn Iolchrothaigh mhic Ríogh na hEaspáine.

MSS. Ulster. BM Eg.133 (1720), 170(a) (1724); Add.34119 (1765). NLI G82 (1744), 145 (1766). RIA 24L34; 24P10 (1798); GviI (1787). TCD H.2.6 (1715-16); H.3.23 (1718); H.4.14 (1685).
Connacht. RIA BivI (c.1671). TCD H.2.17 (vellum, c.1500?)
Munster. BM Eg.150 (1773, copy of 211), 170(b) (1757), 211 (1758). Ennis. JFC MS 50.3.12 (1793). Lyons V (1773). Murphy 18, 21. NLI G80 (C18), 93, 136 (1756). O'Renehan 97. RIA 3B12; 12F7 (1749); 23A29; 23B15; 23C7, 9, 10, 24; 36; 23D35; 23E9, 15; 23G21; 23H10; 23K10; 23L16 (1772), 35 (1782); 23N18 (1772); 23.0.15, 46, 52; 24A7, 11, 19, 26; 24C8; 24L4 (C18); 24M53; 24P6 (1768); FivI.
Uncertain. Hyde 12, 22. Franciscan A36. King's Inns 7 (1778). Murphy 86 (1779). RIA 23I11, 23; 23M19 (1789). Stonyhurst vol.I (1733).

Variant MS with extended in-tale: O'Curry 50 (1819).

Printed in GGG p. 49, from Murphy 18; in An Gaodhal XIX (New York, 1900) p.139 & 203.

Oral. Ireland, uncertain. Curtin, Folk-Tales p.157. M. Sheehan Cnó Coilleadh Craobhaighe (Dublin 1907) p.32. Imtheachta an Oireachtais 1899 p. 70.

MRG Teacht mic Ridire an Ghlas-Uaithnè go hÉirinn.

MSS. Munster. RIA 23G41 (1818); 24A16; 24B27. See p.121.

MRU Eachtra mhic Ríogh Uladh.

MSS. Munster. Ferriter 25 (acephalous). Murphy 21 (1817). RIA 24B35 (1841).

Printed in Irisleabhar Muighe Nuadhat I (1906-07) p.10, from Murphy 21, omitting the last episode, and with slight bowdlerising changes.

NFF Stair Nuadat Find Femin.

MS. Munster. TCD H.2.7 (c.1480). Imperfect.

Printed by K. Müller-Lisowski, ZCP XIII p.195.

OCL Oidheadh Chloinne Lir.

MSS. Scotland. NLS XXXVIII (c.1600?)
Ulster. Belfast XL. BM Eg.128 (1748-49), 151, 157 (copy of 164), 164 (1726-27), 208; Add.34119 (1765). NLI G147 (1776), 200. O'Laverty F. RIA 23E11; 24A4 (1768). TCD H.1.6 (1758);H.4.14 (c.1685); H.6.7 (1737).
Munster. BM Eg.140 (1766), 150 (1773-74, copy of 211), 211 (1758); Add.18947. Murphy 19, 51 (1796), 54 (1775?) NLI G69, 110, 123 (1779), 307. RIA 3B11, 26, 43 (1765); 12F7 (1749-50); 12K8; 23B21; 23C26(b) (1770-71); 23G20 (1786-91); 23L15, 16, 27 (1737-38); 23N25; 24A7, 10, 13, 22; 24C24; 24M25; 24P6 (1768); Evi4.
Uncertain. Hyde 16. NLI G116. NLS LVI (bef.1782). RIA 12F20 (1773); 23L1 (?); 24A5 (?)

Printed by E. O'Curry, Atlantis IV (1863) p.113, from TCD H.1.6; new edition by R.J. O'Duffy (Dublin 1883 & 1897). Printed by S. Ua Ceallaigh (Dublin 1927).

Oral. Scotland. (S: Uist) JFC MS XVIII p.167 (Eng. summary with Gaelic verses.)
Ulster. (D) IFC 773 p.347.
Connacht. (M) IFC 380 p.60; S130 p.69, p.79; S135 p.120. (G) IFC 739 p.575 plus 775 p.3.

The following are mere summaries or mentions, mostly in English:
Ulster. (Cavan) IFC S991 p.22.
Connacht. (M) IFC 741 p.220; 1223 p.145 (Ordnance Survey Letters, 1838); 1244 p.336. (G) IFC S47 p.371; S53 p.199. (Leitrim) IFC S964 p.293.
Leinster. (Longford) IFC S753 p.160.

OCT Oidheadh Chloinne Tuireann.

MSS. Ulster. Belfast XXXVII, XL. BM Eg.106 (1716); 164 (1726-27), 208. NLI G200. RIA 23G10. TCD H.3.23 (1718); H.6.7 (1737).
Munster. Murphy 19. NLI G123 (1779). O'Renehan 97. RIA 3B11, 25; 12K8; 23B21; 23C22 (1767); 23E16 (1797); 23H15 (1768-79); 23M25 (1684); 47 (1734); 24A5 (1787-89), 23 (frag.), 26, 29; 24L24; 24M25; Evi4.
Uncertain. BM Eg.188. NLS LVI (bef.1782). RIA 12F20 (1773); 24A12. Rossmore I (frag.) UCD VI (?)

Printed by E. O'Curry, Atlantis IV (1863) p.157; reprinted in GJ II p. 33 (1884); new edition by R.J. O'Duffy (Dublin 1888). Printed by S. Ua Ceallaigh (Dublin 1927).

Fragment of a Latin translation: MS. BM Harley 5280 (c.1600). Printed by R.B. Breathnach, Éigse I p.249.

Oral. Connacht. (G) IFC 313 p.216; 739 p.162.

OCU Oidheadh Chloinne Uisneach.

MSS. Scotland. NLS LIII (C15-16?) (1)
Ulster. BM Eg.128 (1748-49), 164 (1726-27), 171 (1790), 662 (1770); Add.18747. Belfast VI. King's Inns 5 (1755). NLI G147 (1776), 200. O'Laverty F. RIA 3B39; 23A25 (1770), 32 (1758); 23B18 plus 23K45. TCD H.1.6 (1758); H.3.23 (1718).
Connacht. RIA BivI (1671).
Munster. BM Eg.140 (1766), 141 (frag., 1773), 150 (1773-74); Sloane 3154 (1715); Add.18947, 31877 (frag., 1755-62.) Ferriter 21 (copy of O'Flanagan's ed?) Murphy 23, 51, 53 (1760), 105. NLI G74, 79 (1777), 113 (1703), 120, 123 (1779). O'Renehan 70. RIA 3B3; 12F7 (1749-50);

(1) The "Glenmasan 1238" inscription is probably in the hand which signs elsewhere in the MS as the Rev. William Campbell. He flourished in the mid-eighteenth century (Highland Society Report p.297) and is unlikely to have had any basis for his ascription.

23A38; 23B2; 23C30 (frag., 1785), 36; 23D15 (1755); 23E9; 23G21 plus 24 (c.1795); 23H15 (1768-79), 16 (1776-81); 23N21 (1759); 23O52 (1799-1801); 24A22, 26; 24B17 (frag., 1777); 24C16; 24L24; 24M31, 40, 44 (1780?); Eiv3 (1727); Evi4.
Uncertain. BM Eg.213. King's Inns 29 (1780). Murphy 103 (1762). NLI G133. NLS LVI (bef.1782). RIA 23D20; 24A12.

There are numerous slight variations in the MSS, depending for the most part on whether they borrow an introduction from Keating and in what form: the following is perhaps unusually different from the standard text:
Ulster. Belfast XXXVII A.

Printed editions up to 1920 are listed by Thurneysen, Heldensage p.328; among subsequent ones are one by S. Ua Ceallaigh (Dublin 1927); and one by B. Ó Buachalla, ZCP XXIX p.114, from Belfast XXXVII A.

Oral. Scotland. (Barra) A. Carmichael, Deirdire (Edinburgh 1905). SSS RL 2187.
Ulster. (D) IFC 335 p.43; 348 p.256; 509 p.489; 561 p. 117; S1051 p.259. (Monaghan) S958 p.180 (Eng.)
Connacht. (M) IFC 210 p.292; 524 p.294; 711 p.107; p.277. (G) RC XVI p.421. IFC 61 p.210; 67 p.119; 75 p.276; 167 p.461; 207 p.224; 212 p.49; 373 p.136; 413 p.14; 414 p. 231; 530 p.185; 624 p.88; 785 p.61; 801 p.82; 851 p.242; 1227 p.462; 1275 p.267; S70 p.198; S72 p.42.
Munster. (T) IFC S624 p.588 (Eng.) (K) IFC 11 p.214; 359 p.58 (same?) (C) IFC S275 p.407 (Eng.)
Uncertain. IFC 850 p.121.

RL Eachtra Ridire na Leomhan.

MSS. Ulster. NLI G137 (1730), 171 (c.1760). RIA 24P16 (copy of G137). TCD H.2.6 (1715-16).

Printed by A. Ní Chróinín (Dublin 1952: LSS No. XVIII.) from TCD and RIA MSS.

Oral. Munster. (K) Béal. II p.122. IFC 411 p.63 (same?); 242 p. 226 (plus CG).

TBF Táin Bó Flidais.

MSS. See Heldensage p.334 ff.

Oral. Connacht. (M) Béal. XIII p.206. IFC 743 p.191; S130 p.404; S131 p.505; S133 p.14.

TCS Tóraigheacht an Chairthe Sgárlóide.

MSS. Munster. Murphy 18. NLI G69, 92. RIA 23K7 (1702); 23N13 (c.1760?); 24A13; 24B16 (1767-68); FiiL.

Printed (as Síoghra Dubh) by T. F. O'Rahilly, GJ XIX p.97, 158, 282, 306, from 23K7 and 23N13.

TDG Tóraigheacht Dhiarmada agus Ghráinne.

MSS. Ulster. BM Eg.151 (1788). RIA 23E11; 24P31. TCD H.3.23 (1718).
Connacht. RIA 24P9 (1651 or earlier.)
Munster. BM Eg.150 (1773, copy of 211), 211 (1758); Add.18946. Lyons V (1773). Murphy 22. NLI G63, 79 (1777), 193, 307. Power 9 (1780). RIA 3B8; 12F7 (1749); 23A23; 23C15 (1775), 30 (frag.), 36; 23D15 (1755); 23E9; 23G21 (c.1796); 23H10, 15 (1768); 23L27 (1737); 39 (1775-78); 23.0.17 (1781?), 52; 24A21; 24B24 (c.1772); 24C26; 24L24; 24M40; Evi3; FviL (1796).

Most MSS break off before the point where the story ends in O'Grady's edition.

Printed by S. H. O'Grady (Dublin 1857: Ossianic Society Transactions vol.III) and several times reprinted by the Society for the Preservation of the Irish Language; by P. Ó Canainn (1939); by N. Ní Shéaghdha (Dublin 1944) from RIA 24P9.

Oral. Scotland. (Argyll) JFC III p.49. Waifs & Strays IV p.52. Marquis of Lorne, Adventures in Legend (1898) p.20 (Eng.) SSS RL 759. (S. Uist) JFC III p.64 (Eng.) Maclellan p. 29. (Barra) JFC III p.90. (Sutherland) JFC III p.92 (Eng.)

Ulster. (D) Béal. VII p.125. IFC 399 p.266 (same); 311 p.322; 322 p.476; 410 p.429; 509 p.336; 1538 p.99; S1051 p.305. (Tyrone) cf. Sg. Mh. Luinigh p. 108. Connacht. (Roscommon) Béal. IV p.425. (G) LML p.47. IFC 58 p.263 (same). IFC 159 p.479; 354 p.297; 443 p. 166; 1016 p.85.
Leinster. (Meath) Cl. Soluis III p.518 (Deireadh Fhoghmhair 1907) - cf. BBA.
Munster. (C) Gadelica I p.83. IFC 44 p.228; 46 p.300. Onomastic tale only: IFC 203 p.54; 412 p.170. (K) IFC 12 p.61; 1151 p.8. (W) IFC 87 p.69.

TDL Tóraigheacht Duibhe Lacha.

MS. Munster (?) Hyde 13.

Printed by S. Ó Duilearga, ZCP XVII p.347. An earlier version is printed by K. Meyer, Voyage of Bran (London 1895) I p. 58, from the Book of Fermoy (c.1457).

TES Tóraigheacht Eileann Sgiamhach go Críochaibh Lochlann.

Printed in Sgéalta Rómánsuíochta p.63. For MS and other details see ECC.

TGG Tóraigheacht Ghruaidhe Griansholus.

MS. Ulster. TCD H.5.28 (1679).

Printed by C. O'Rahilly (London 1924: ITS vol. XXIV).

Oral. Ulster. (D) GJ XII p.83. S. Laoide, Leabharíní Gaedhilge an Aghaidh na Sluaighe No.XXV (same). Béal. II p.318. IFC S1075 p.214 (plus Fled Bricrenn.)

TMT Eachtra Thailc mhic Threóin go hÉirinn 7 Tóraigheacht na Caillighe as Innse Tuoirc.

Printed in Sgéalta Rómánsuíochta p.241. For MS and other details see ECC.

TNE Tóraigheacht na hEilite le Cú Chuilinn 7 Oillioll Fionn.

Printed in Sgéalta Rómánsuíochta p.1. For MS and other details see ECC.

TS Tóraigheacht Shaidhbhe inghine Eoghain Óig.

MSS. Ulster. BM Eg.128 (1748), 208. Giessen (1684). NLI G145 (1766). RIA 23D38 (1688); 23E11; Fv3 (1788). TCD H.1.17 (1757).
Connacht. RIA BivI (1671); 23E7 (1783).
Munster. BM Eg.150 (1774, copy of211), 211 (1758); Add. 18947. MacFhachtna. Murphy 19. NLI G108 (1777), 110. O'Curry 50. O'Renehan 97. Power 9 (1780). RIA 3B3, 13; 23A17; 23B15; 23C4, 30; 23E15 (1797); 23H12; 23I41 (1732); 23K17; 23L16 (1772); 24A26; 24B23 (1772-73), 26 (1760-63); 24C55, 56 (1756); 24L11 (frag., 1758), 22, 26; 24M40 (frag.); Ev3; Fvi2.
Uncertain. Hyde 15 (2 copies). King's Inns 7 (1778). Rossmore XIV. Stonyhurst vol. I (1733).

Printed in GGG p.15 from O'Renehan 97. Unpublished typescript edition as MA thesis for UCD by Richard Barron (IFC 1120) from BivI and Giessen.

Variant MSS with "Finding of Bran" (cf. FTC) as introduction include:
Munster. RIA 23L39 (1777).
Uncertain. RIA 23M19 (1789).

Oral. Connacht. (M) IFC 167 p.151. (G) Béal. II p.140. An Stoc, Meitheamh 1928, p.3. IFC 78 p.14; 112 p.7; 163 p.224; 314 p.369.
Munster. (K) J.H. LLoyd, Tonn Tóime (Dublin 1915) p.75. "An Connachtach Céasta," Scéaluidhe Éireann (Dublin 1913) p.11. IFC 11 p.85. (C) IFC 99 p.48.

TTT **Imtheacht an Dá Nónbhar 7 Tóraigheacht Taise Taoibhghile.**

MSS. Ulster. Vatican Library, "Borgianus Hibernicus" (1718).
Connacht. RIA BivI (1671).
Uncertain. Hyde 63. RIA Av2 plus EivI (c.1700).

Printed by M. Ní Mhuirgheasa (Dublin 1954: LSS No.XVI) from RIA and Vatican MSS (all fragmentary or unfinished.)

Addenda.

AM Printed by T. Ó Rabhartaigh (& D. Hyde) Lia Fáil II.

CCR MS. Ulster. Giessen (1684.)

CG Unpublished typescript edition as MA thesis for UCD by R. A. Scanlon (IFC 1121) from 23M10.

EIA Variant MS. Munster. 23L39 (1775) evidently includes the folk-motif of the tightening belt: see Béal. IV p.392.

GD Oral. Munster. (K.) IFC 981 p.95.

OCT MS. Scotland. NLS LXXXVI (1812, frag., copied from an Irish MS.)

Printed in An Camán (Dublin) 24/9/1932 to 19/11/1932.

OCU A printed version not listed by Thurneysen is in Irisleabhar Muighe Nuadhat, An Chaisg 1911.

(c) Titles and key to abbreviations.

Aided...	see Oidheadh
Bás Cearbhaill 7 Farbhlaidhe	BCF
Bás an Mhacaoimh Mhóir	MRE
Bodach an Chóta Lachtna	BCL
Brisleach Mhór Mhuighe Muirtheimhne	see Cú Chulainn
Bruidhean Bheag na hAlmhaine	BBA
Bruidhean Chaorthuinn	BC
Bruidhean Chéise Corainn	BCC
Bruidhean Eochaidh Bhig Dheirg	EBD
Cath Fionntrágha	CF
Cath Muighe Léana	CML
Caithréim Chonghail Chláiringnigh	CCC
Céilidhe Iosgaide Léithe	CIL
An Ceithearnach Caoilriabhach	CCR
Ceithearnach Uí Dhomhnaill	CCR
Cogadh Cuinn 7 Eoghain Mhóir	CML
Coimheasgar na gCuradh	CNC
Cómhrac Fir Diadh 7 Con Culainn	see Cú Chulainn.
Cuireadh Mhaoil Uí Mhanannáin ar Fionn...	MOM
Deargruathar Conaill Chearnaigh	see Cú Chulainn
Díthreabhach Glinne an Phéice	DGP
Eachtra Abhlaighe	BCF
Eachtra Airt mhic Chuinn	EAC
Eachtra Alcamenes 7 Menalope	EAM
Eachtra an Amadáin Mhóir	AM
Eachtra Bhodaigh an Chóta Lachtna	BCL
Eachtra Chéadaigh Mhóir	ECM
Eachtra an Cheithearnaigh Chaoilriabhaigh	CCR
Eachtra Chloinne Ríogh na hIoruaidhe	CRI
Eachtra Chloinne Thoroilbh	ECT
Eachtra Chonaill Chearnaigh	ECC
Eachtra Chonaill Gulban	CG;ECG
Eachtra Chuinn Láidir	ECL
Eachtra na gCuradh	ENC
Eachtra an Dheirg	ED
Eachtra Éuchtaigh	EE

Eachtra Fhoirbe	EF
Eachtra an Ghiolla Dheacair	GD
Eachtra Ghiolla an Fhiugha	GF
Eachtra Ghruagaigh na Creige 7 na Cruite 7 an Tiompáin	EG
Eachtra Iollainn Airmdheirg	EIA
Eachtra Iollainn Iolchrothaigh	MRE
Eachtra Lomnochtáin an tSléibhe Riffe	LSR
Eachtra Luigheach Ghoilchleasach	ELG
Eachtra Mhacaoimh an Iolair	MI
Eachtra an Mhacaoimh Mhóir	MRE
Eachtra an Mhadra Mhaoil	EMM
Eachtra Mhelóra 7 Orlando	EMO
Eachtra Mhic an Iolair	MI
Eachtra Mhic Ríogh Uladh	MRU
Eachtra Mhuireadhaigh mhic Dhiain Dheirg	MDD
Eachtra Orlando 7 Melóra	EMO
Eachtra Ridire an Leomhain	GG
Eachtra Ridire na Leomhan	RL
Eachtra Thaidhg mhic Chéin	ETC
Eachtra Thailc mhic Threóin	TMT
Eachtra Thoirdhealbhaigh mhic Stáirn	ETS
Eachtra Thoroilbh mhic Stáirn	ETS
Eachtra Thriúir Chloinne Thoroilbh	ECT
Eachtra Thriúir Mhac Ríogh na hIoruaidhe	CRI
Feis Tighe Chonáin	FTC
Fleadh Bhricreann	see Cú Chulainn
Gabháltus Conaill Gulban	ECG
Giolla an Fhiugha	GF
An Gleacaidhe Géuglonnach	GG
Imtheacht Chonaill Gulban	CG
Imtheacht an Mhacaoimh Mhóir	MRE
Ionnsaighe Muighe Léana	CML
Leigheas Coise Céin	LCC
Murchadh mac Briain 7 an Díthreabhach	DGP
Oidheadh Chloinne Lir	OCL
Oidheadh Chloinne Tuireann	OCT
Oidheadh Chloinne Uisneach	OCU
Oidheadh Chon Culainn	see Cú Chulainn

Oidheadh Chon Raoi	see Cú Chulainn
Oidheadh Fhir Diadh	" " "
Oidheadh an Mhacaoimh Mhóir	MRE
Oileamhuin Chon Culainn	see Cú Chulainn
Searc Dhuibhe Lacha do Mhongáin	TDL
Sgéal Chéadaigh	ECM
Sgéal Ucaire na Seachtmhaine	EIA
Síoghra Dubh	TCS
Stair Nuadhad Fhinn Fheimin	NFF
Teacht 7 Imtheacht an Ghiolla Dheacair	GD
Teacht mac Ridire an Ghlas-Uaithne go hÉirinn	MRG
Teacht mac Ríogh na gCorach (Sorach) go hÉirinn	ECM
Teagmhála Duibh mhic Dheaghla	DMD
Tochmharc Dealbhchaoimhe	EAC
Tochmharc Farbhlaidhe	BCF
Tóraigheacht an Chairthe Sgárlóide	TCS
Tóraigheacht Chonaill Gulban	CG
Tóraigheacht Dhiarmada 7 Ghráinne	TDG
Tóraigheacht Dhuibhe Lacha	TDL
Tóraigheacht Eilinn Sgiamhaighe	TES
Tóraigheacht na hEilite	TNE
Tóraigheacht Fhiacail Ríogh Ghréag	EIA
Tóraigheacht an Ghiolla Dheacair	GD
Tóraigheacht Ghruaidhe Griansholus	TGG
Tóraigheacht Shaidhbhe	TS
Tóraigheacht Taise Taoibhghile	TTT
Tuitim an Mhacaoimh Mhóir	MRE

Note: In compiling this index the definite article in all its forms has been disregarded, both at the beginning of a title and internally. An attempt has been made to standardise the spellings to literary Early Modern Irish forms here, more consistently than has been done in the body of the bibliography, where MS readings and Old or Middle Irish forms are used where appropriate.

Bibliography II: Books and Periodicals, with abbreviations.

This is not intended to be an exhaustive bibliography of all works consulted during the writing of this thesis. Most of the books listed here are referred to several times in the text or in Bibliography I. When a book or periodical is only once referred to, the date and place of publication has normally been given in the text or footnote.

Arbeitsmethode	See Krohn.
Arv	(Stockholm, & later Uppsala & Copenhagen, from 1945.)
AT	A. Aarne and S. Thompson, The Types of the Folktale, second revision, FFC No. 184 (Helsinki 1961.) The numbers quoted are those of tale-types in the catalogue, not of pages.
Béal.	Béaloideas, the Journal of the Folklore of Ireland Society (Dublin, from 1927.)
Campbell (of Islay)	See JFC; LNF; MWHT.
Celtic Mag.	The Celtic Magazine (Inverness 1876-88.)
Celtic Review, The	(Edinburgh 1904-1916.)
Chaytor	H. J. Chaytor, From Script to Print (Cambridge 1945.)
Christiansen, ISFT	R. Th. Christiansen, Studies in Irish and Scandinavian Folktales (Copenhagen 1959.)
Cl. Soluis	An Claidheamh Soluis (Dublin 1899-1917.)
Cú na gCleas	S. Ó Searcaigh, Cú na gCleas (Dundalk, 4th ed., 1915.)
Curtin, Folk-Tales	J. Curtin, Irish Folk-Tales (Dublin 1943; also as supplements to Béal. XI & XII.)

Curtin, Hero-Tales	J. Curtin, Hero-Tales of Ireland (London & Boston 1894.)
Curtin, Myths	J. Curtin, Myths and Folklore of Ireland (London & Boston 1890.)
Dánta Grádha	T. F. O'Rahilly, Dánta Grádha (Dublin 1916); introduction by R. Flower.
D. Finn	Duanaire Finn, vol. III, ed. by G. Murphy, ITS vol. XLIII (Dublin 1953.)
Éigse	(Dublin, from 1940.)
Ériu	(Dublin, from 1904.)
F&L	S. Laoide, Fionn agus Lorcán (Dublin 1903: Imtheachta an Oireachtais, 1901, Leabhar II, cuid 1.)
FFC	FF Communications, edited for the Folklore Fellows (Helsinki, from 1910.)
Flower, Catalogue	R. Flower, A Catalogue of Irish Manuscripts in the British Museum, vol. II (London 1926.)
Folk-Tales	See Curtin.
Gadelica	Gadelica, a Journal of Modern-Irish Studies, ed. T. F. O'Rahilly (Dublin 1912-13: vol. I only published.)
GGG	Gadaidhe Géar na Geamh-oidhche...I (only) ... Triúr Cómhdhalta do Chuallacht Chuilm Cille do sholáthruigh (i.e. Tomás Ó Gallchobhair, Pádraig Ua Cuain, Tadhg Mac Giolla-Fhionnáin.) (Dublin 1915.)
GJ	The Gaelic Journal (Irisleabhar na Gaedhilge.) (Dublin 1882-1909)
GST	J. H. Delargy, The Gaelic Story-Teller (London 1945: cf. p.61, note 1.)
Handbook	Seán Ó Súilleabháin, A Handbook of Irish Folklore (Dublin 1942.)

Heldensage	R. Thurneysen, Die Irische Helden- und Königsage, Teil I & II (Halle (Saale) 1921.)
Hero-Tales	See Curtin.
Highland Society Report	Report of the Committee of the Highland Society of Scotland, appointed to inquire into the nature and authenticity of the poems of Ossian... Drawn up by H. Mackenzie (Edinburgh 1805.)
Hogan	E. I. Hogan, Onomasticon Goedelicum... (Dublin 1910.)
Hyde, Ocht Sgéalta	D. Hyde, Ocht Sgéalta ó Choillte Mághach (Dublin 1936.)
IFC	Manuscript volumes of the Irish Folklore Commission, Dublin. (IFC S: MSS of the Schools collection.)
Irish Book Lover, The	(London, later Dublin, from 1910.)
ISFT	See Christiansen.
ITS	Irish Texts Society publications (London, from 1899; Dublin, from 1937.)
JFC	J. F. Campbell, Popular Tales of the West Highlands, second edition, in four volumes (Paisley and London 1890-93.)
JFC MS	The Campbell of Islay MSS in the National Library of Scotland, Edinburgh. (Cf. p.v.)
JRSAI	Journal of the Royal Society of Antiquaries of Ireland (Dublin, from 1890.)
Krohn, Arbeitsmethode	Kaarle Krohn, Die Folkloristische Arbeitsmethode (Oslo 1926.) Instituttet for Sammenlignende Kulturforskning, Serie B, V.

Lampa Draoidheachta	M. Ó Tiománaidhe, An Lampa Draoidheachta (Dublin 1935.)
Larminie	W. Larminie, West Irish Folk-Tales and Romances (London 1893.)
Lhuyd	J. L. Campbell & D. S. Thomson, Edward Lhuyd in the Scottish Highlands, 1699-1700 (Oxford 1963.)
Lia Fáil	(Dublin 1926-32: 3 vols. only.)
LML	Seán Mac Giollarnáth, Loinnir mac Leabhair (Dublin 1936.)
LNF	J. F. Campbell, Leabhar na Féinne, vol. I (only) (London 1872.)
LFIC	Patrick Kennedy, Legendary Fictions of the Irish Celts (London 1866.)
LSIC	S. Ó Duilearga, Leabhar Sheáin Í Chonaill (Dublin 1948.)
LSS	Leabhair ó Láimhsgríbhnibh, arna gcur i neagar fá stiúradh Ghearóid Í Mhurchadha 7 arna gcur ar fagháil ag oifig an tsoláthair (Dublin 1941-54.)
Mackinnon	D. Mackinnon, A Descriptive Catalogue of Gaelic Manuscripts in the Advocates' Library, Edinburgh, and elsewhere in Scotland (Edinburgh 1912.)
Maclellan	Angus Maclellan, Stories from South Uist, translated by J. L. Campbell (London 1961.)
M&M	Mediaeval and Modern Irish Series (Dublin, Stationery Office, & later Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies, from 1931.)
MWHT	More West Highland Tales, from the MS collections of the late J. F. Campbell... transcribed and translated by J. G. McKay (& others) (Edinburgh: vol. I, 1940; vol. II, 1960.)

Myths	See Curtin.
New Ireland Review, The	(Dublin 1894-1911.)
Ocht Sgéalta	See Hyde.
OS&C	Seán Ó Súilleabháin & R. Th. Christiansen, The Types of the Irish Folktale, FFC No. 188 (Helsinki 1963.)
Quiggin	E. C. Quiggin, A Dialect of Donegal (Cambridge 1906.)
RC	Revue Celtique (Paris, from 1870.)
RIA Contributions	Dictionary of the Irish Language; Contributions to a Dictionary of the Irish Language (Dublin, Royal Irish Academy, from 1913.)
Scottish Studies	(Edinburgh, from 1957.)
7 Centuries	Seven Centuries of Irish Learning, ed. Brian Ó Cuív (Dublin 1961.)
SG	S. H. O'Grady, Silva Gadelica (London 1892.)
Sg. D. Sgialachdan Dhunnchaidh)	K. C. Craig, Sgialachdan Dhunnchaidh (Glasgow, for the author, 1944.)
Sg. Mh. Luinigh	É. Ó Tuathail, Sgéalta Mhuintir Luinigh (Dublin 1933.)
Sgéalta Rómánsuíochta	M. Ní Mhuirgheasa 7 S. Ó Ceithearnaigh, Sgéalta Rómánsuíochta, LSS No. XVI (Dublin 1952.) See ECC, EF, TES, TMT, & TNE in Bibliography I.
SGS	Scottish Gaelic Studies, issued from the Celtic Department of the University of Aberdeen (Oxford, from 1935.)
SM	"An Seabhac" (P. Ó Siochfhradha), An Seanchaidhe Muimhneach (Dublin 1932.)
Speculum	(Cambridge, Massachusetts, Mediaeval Academy of America, from 1926.)

SSS RL	Tape recordings in the Sound Archive of the School of Scottish Studies, Edinburgh.
Stoc, An	(Galway, from 1917.)
Studies	Studies, an Irish quarterly review (Dublin, from 1912.)
TGSI	Transactions of the Gaelic Society of Inverness (Inverness, from 1871.)
Thomas	H. Thomas, Spanish and Portuguese Romances of Chivalry (Cambridge 1920.)
Thurneysen	See Heldensage.
Trí Bruidhne	N. Ní Shéaghdha 7 M. Ní Mhuirgheasa, Trí Bruidhne, LSS No. II (Dublin 1941.) See BBA, BCC & EBD in Bibliography I.
Waifs & Strays	Lord Archibald Campbell (general editor), Waifs and Strays of Celtic Tradition, Argyllshire Series (London 1889-95.) Including vol. II: D. MacInnes, Folk and Hero Tales (1890); III: J. MacDougall, Folk and Hero Tales (1891); IV: J. G. Campbell, The Fians (1891).
ZCP	Zeitschrift für Celtische Philologie (Halle (Saale), from 1899.)

Where the mention of a motif is followed by a series of figures headed by a single letter, in brackets and without further qualification, the reference is to the motif classification in Stith Thompson, Motif-Index of Folk-Literature, revised edition (Copenhagen 1955.)