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**Abbreviations** (other than those contained in DIL)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CRR-LL:</strong></td>
<td>The text of <em>Cath Ruis na Ríg</em> contained in the Book of Leinster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DIL:</strong></td>
<td>E.G. Quin et al. (eds.), <em>Dictionary of the Irish Language based mainly on Old and Middle Irish Materials</em> (Dublin, 1913-76)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Heldensage:</strong></td>
<td>Rudolf Thurneysen, <em>Die irische Helden- und Königsage bis zum siebzehten Jahrhundert</em> (Halle, 1921)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MU II:</strong></td>
<td>The Middle Irish second recension of <em>Mesca Ulad</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TBC I:</strong></td>
<td>Cecile O’Rahilly (ed. and trans.), <em>Táin Bó Cúailnge Recension I</em> (Dublin, 1976)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TBC-LL¹:</strong></td>
<td>Ernst Windisch (ed. and trans.), <em>Die altirische Heldensage Táin Bó Cúalnge, nach dem Buch von Leinster, in Text und Übersetzung mit einer Einleitung</em> (Leipzig, 1905)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TBC-LL²:</strong></td>
<td>Cecile O’Rahilly (ed. and trans.), <em>Táin Bó Cúalnge from the Book of Leinster</em> (Dublin, 1967)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TBC-LU:</strong></td>
<td>The text of <em>Táin Bó Cúailnge</em> contained in <em>Lebor na hUidre</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TBC Stowe:</strong></td>
<td>Cecile O’Rahilly (ed.), <em>The Stowe Version of Táin Bó Cúailnge</em> (Dublin, 1962)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
On the Date of the Middle Irish Recension II *Táin Bó Cúailnge*¹

Dr Uáitéar Mac Gearailt

In 1900, at the age of 20, E.C. Quiggin completed his doctoral dissertation at the University of Greifswald.² Written in German and dedicated to his teacher and friend Heinrich Zimmer, this 60-page work presents the first detailed linguistic analysis of an entire text of *Táin Bó Cúailnge* (TBC). His topic was the unusual representation of pretonic preverbs in the Book of Leinster (LL) text of the Middle Irish Recension II *Táin*, TBC II,³ and their possible significance as regards the development of Irish and the pronunciation of the language in the 12th century.⁴

The Orthography of the Book of Leinster versions of *Táin Bó Cúailnge* and *Cath Ruis na Ríg*

In the introduction to his dissertation, Quiggin makes a passing observation regarding the distribution of late spellings in TBC-LL which is of major importance to the matter which I wish to discuss here, the date of TBC II. He remarks that standard Middle Irish orthography predominates in the first part of the text and that from then on a later orthography, found sporadically in the first, preponderates.

¹ I am indebted to Máire Ni Mhaonaigh for her generous help during the process of preparing this lecture for publication, and for pointing out errors and making numerous suggestions for improvement.

² Edmund Crosby Quiggin, *Die lautliche Geltung der vortonigen Wörter und Silben in der Book of Leinster Version der Tāin bō Cualnge*. Inaugural-Dissertation zur Erlangung der Doktorwürde ... (Greifswald, 1900).


⁴ He argued that their representation in the LL *Tāin* reflects change in pronunciation and concludes that they were reduced to schwa (ə) in ordinary speech in the 12th century. This view received little support in subsequent research, for example, Rudolf Thurneysen, *Die irische Helden- und Königsage bis zum siebzehnten Jahrhundert* (Halle, 1921) [henceforth *Heldensage*], Máirín O Daly, ‘The verbal system of the LL Táin’, *Ériu* 14 (1943), 30-139, or in the two editions of TBC-LL: Ernst Windisch (ed. and trans.), *Die altirische Heldensage Táin Bó Cúalnge, nach dem Buch von Leinster*, in Text und Übersetzung mit einer Einleitung (Leipzig, 1905), Cecile O’Rahilly (ed. and trans.), Táin Bó Cúalnge from the Book of Leinster (Dublin, 1967); the abbreviations TBC-LL¹ (Windisch) and TBC-LL² (O’Rahilly) are used to refer to these.
Orthographie deutlich in zwei Partien: die erste von S. 55a bis etwa 78 ist im wesentlichen in der gewöhnlichen mittelir. Orthographie geschrieben, während von S. 78 bis Ende (104b) eine Orthographie einsetzt, welche die nur vereinzelt im ersten Teile auftretenden Abweichungen von der gewöhnlichen Orthographie fast zur Regel erhebt.5

More recently I have pointed out other differences between the first and second halves, for example in relation to style and diction, which confirm that a significant change takes place in the middle of the text.6 Quiggin offered no explanation for this change and most scholars ignored his observation or only referred briefly to it; for example, Windisch, referring to Quiggin’s ‘werthvollen Schrift’, mentions it in his edition of 1905.7 In a footnote in Die irische Helden- und Königsage (1921) Thurneysen goes a little further, offering a tentative suggestion regarding the increase in what he calls mainly ‘graphic’ peculiarities. He says it is as if the scribe was trying to use a more regular orthography but then ‘gave up the struggle with his exemplar’.8 What he means is that a similar concentration of these spelling peculiarities to that found in the second half of TBC-LL might have occurred throughout the exemplar in its entirety, that the LL scribe substituted standard forms in his text up to the midway point, and that from that point on he simply copied faithfully from his source.

The notion that a mid-12th-century scribe would standardize the unconventional orthography of an earlier text might seem implausible, but not if one assumes that standard Middle Irish orthography was still widely used at the end of the 12th century. It may be relevant to note that Thurneysen assigned the Interpolator of the early 12th-century manuscript Lebor na hUidre (LU) to the 13th century9 and that texts written by that scribe, such as the homily Scéla Lái Brátha,10 reflect no hint of deviation from standard orthography and contain no trace of Early Modern Irish orthography. Nobody has taken up the suggestion that the regular orthography of the first half of TBC-LL might be later than its non-standard spellings, although it appears to be central to Thurneysen’s dating of TBC II, which itself has influenced thinking on the chronology of 11th- and 12th-century Irish literature for almost a century.

What appears as a tentative afterthought in Thurneysen’s footnote is stated more boldly in the main text of his book, where he comments on the language of TBC II and appears to assume that the unconventional usage in TBC-LL was not just in the scribe’s exemplar but also in the text of the author. Referring to the language of TBC II, he says, it is not that of the author’s own time but is modelled on the language of the older sagas, with

5 Quiggin, Die lautliche Geltung, p. 6.
7 Windisch, Die altirische Heldensage Táin Bó Cúailnge, p. lxviii.
8 ‘Es ist als ob der Schreiber dieser Handschrift bis ca. Seite 78 eine geregeltere Schreibung hätte durchführen wollen, aber dann den Kampf gegen seine Vorlage aufgegeben hätte’: Heldensage, p. 114, n. 1.
9 Heldensage, 31.
10 R.I. Best, Osborn Bergin (eds.), Lebor na Huidre: Book of the Dun Cow (Dublin, 1929), pp. 77-81; = LU 2302-2493. Thurneysen rightly allows for the fact that the Interpolator’s exemplars were older: ‘… natürlich sind die Texte, die er benutzt hat, zum Teil weit älter’, Heldensage, p. 31.
frequent instances of irregular constructions or Mißformen. He gives no examples, but it seems safe to assume that he meant constructions such as the following, which are cited by Quiggin:

ra bert (verb do-beir, as-beir), LL 10016
for do-bert ‘(s)he gave, brought, put’, at-bert ‘(s)he said’

ba luid (verb téit), LL 8103
for ro luid ‘(s)he went’

barrecgaib (verb do-recmaing), LL 11349
for do-recmaing ‘they came’

condeochatar (verb do-tét), LL 8796
for ?Cia do ferend.

cia confirend (verb feraid), LL 12112

He may also have had such constructions in mind when remarking of the author that in attempting to give his text a more archaic appearance he repeatedly abuses the language.

In view of these comments, one could argue that when Thurneysen refers in the footnote on p. 114 of Heldensage to the LL scribe’s exemplar and its orthography, he in fact means the text of the author himself. This would mean that he saw TBC-LL as being largely the same as the author’s text, apart, that is, from the standard forms which the LL scribe may have substituted later.

Bearbeiter C

Thurneysen considered the author of TBC II, whom he calls Bearbeiter C, to be a figure of considerable importance in Middle Irish literature. We can, he says, piece together an accurate profile of his literary activity: in TBC II he moulded into a unified whole the coarse amalgam (‘Gemengsel’) of largely Old Irish material assembled in TBC I by the Kompilator, removing all its contradictions and doublets; he adopted the style of later sections of that compilation and took over unchanged a single episode, Breslech Maige Murthenme, whose wordy, alliterative style and whose exaggerations appealed to him and

---

12 Cf. rabert Cú Chulaind ra Láeg mac Riangabra ‘Cú Chulaind said to Láeg mac Riangabra’, TBC-LL 4609.
13 Quiggin, Die lautliche Geltung, pp. 42, 50.
15 ‘Im Bestreben altertümlich zu sein, hat er mehrfach die Sprache schlimm mißhandelt’, Heldensage, p. 33.
17 Bearbeiter C’s first objective is clear, he suggests: ‘Erstens will er aus dem bunten, widerspruchsvollen Mosaik der Fassung I (nebst den Interpolazionen von Kap. 8) eine Einheit schaffen. Alle Dubletten sind beseitigt, die lose eingesprengten Bestandteile fester eingefügt, manche Einzelheiten übersprungen und so ein einheitlicher Verlauf hergestellt. Neue Episoden hat er kaum hinzugedichtet außer einer Einleitung, die, wie oben bemerkt, dem älteren Werke völlig fehlt’, ibid., p. 113. On the Kompilator see pp. 24-7.
were the model for his restyling of the entire Táin;\(^{18}\) he composed one new episode, the introductory pillowtalk between Ailill and Medb and the Connacht envoys’ mission to Ulster; he went on to write in the same style a new version of another tale, Mesca Ulad (MU), and then composed a completely new tale, Cath Ruis na Ríg (CRR);\(^{19}\) he had enormous influence on his contemporaries, for example the 12th-century contributor to the Irish version of the story of Troy, Togail Troi; his distinctive style influenced Irish prose down to the 17th century;\(^{20}\) names and motifs borrowed from him for 12th-century Welsh tales show that he was known in Wales.\(^{21}\)

Thurneysen dated Bearbeiter C’s version of TBC to the first quarter of the 12th century.\(^{22}\)

He took Áed mac Crimthainn to have been the scribe of the text contained in the Book of Leinster and of the entire manuscript. Like Windisch and Best, he considered the following colophon to suggest this: \(^{23}\) *Aed mac meic Crimthaind ro scrib in leborso ra thinōil a llebraib imdaib 'Áed mac meic Crimthaind wrote this book which he assembled from numerous books'*.\(^{24}\) He concluded that Áed compiled the manuscript for the most part in the decade following 1160, the year in which the Annals of Ulster record the death of Find úa Gormáin, bishop of Kildare, who addresses Áed in a letter preserved in the manuscript as *[fër] lēigind ardrīg Leithi Moga … [prīm]senchaid Laigen ar gaes 7 eolas 7 trebaire lebur 7 fessa 7 foglomma ‘the fër lēigind [lector, man of learning] of the high-king of Leth Moga [the southern half of Ireland] … chief historian of Leinster as regards acuteness, information, cultivation of books, research and knowledge’.\(^{25}\)

*The LL Text of TBC II and the Stowe Text of TBC IIb*

According to Thurneysen, LL contains the best surviving texts of the works of Bearbeiter

---

\(^{18}\) This was his second objective: ‘Zweitens hat er die Vorlage stilistisch umgeformt. Auch hier ist sein Bestreben schon dadurch klar, daß der einzige Abschnitt, den er unverändert aufnimmt, §§56-61 …, ist’, ibid., p. 113.


\(^{20}\) ‘Er ist von sehr großem Einfluß nicht nur auf seine Zeitgenossen gewesen, wie z.B. der eine der Bearbeiter von Dares Phrygius eine Menge von Ausdrücken ihm entlehnt, sondern fast die ganze Prosa der Folgezeit bis ins 17. Jahrhundert richtet sich, so gut sie’s versteht, nach seinem Muster’, ibid., p. 33.

\(^{21}\) Ibid., p. 33, with a reference to ZCP 12 (1918), p. 281.


\(^{24}\) Cf. footnote marked * at LL 39896.

C. 26 But he refers to deficiencies in them, saying that the ‘beauty of the script and the age of
the manuscript’ are not always matched by a corresponding level of textual accuracy. For
this, he says, one should not hold Æd responsible but rather his sources, a remark which ties
in with the suggestion that the unconventional usage in TBC-LL was also in the exemplar,
and indeed in the author’s own text. 27

Whatever about deficiencies in the original text, some of those discernible in TBC-LL are
clearly late and may be attributable to the LL scribe. 28 In these cases TBC Stowe, a 17th-
century text of a modernised version of TBC II, known as TBC IIb, provides a better
reading, a fact which shows that it cannot be descended from TBC-LL. 29 For example,
O’Rahilly recommends reading airtem, in line with TBC Stowe 2329, rather than áirnem,
TBC-LL 2 2290. Similarly, the following readings are based on TBC Stowe:

-focera Mulchi forsin taulaig ‘Mulchi fell on the hill’, TBC-LL 2 1261, TBC Stowe 1303
-nì fìxair [in frecra] ‘He got not the answer’, TBC-LL 2 4013, TBC Stowe 3977
-ra airg[ser] ‘they pillaged’, TBC-LL 2 1146, TBC Stowe 1183. 30

TBC Stowe and TBC-LL correspond closely in many sections of the story. Although the
moderniser changed much, his version is in those sections a faithful representation of the
Middle Irish text from which it and TBC-LL are descended. 31 Comparison of TBC Stowe
and TBC-LL shows how the moderniser worked, for instance replacing archaic words,
particularly verbal forms. But sometimes he retains old constructions, for example the s-
flexion of the old compound verb con-midethar, connessed:

-Ni airge and connessed a áes …, TBC-LL 2 726
‘You do not find there one that could equal his age …’

-Ni fuigi ann fer connesedh a ais, TBC Stowe 751.

His text also shares with TBC-LL less unusual but nonetheless old forms which would also
have been obsolete in the period to which Thurneysen and O’Rahilly assign it, the 15th
century. These may be seen, like connessed, as survivals from the common source and,

26 ‘Es enthält unter anderem die beste, zum Teil einzige Überlieferung der Werke des in Kap. 11
besprochenen Sagenbearbeiters’, Heldensage, p. 36. Cf. also his remark, ibid., p. 113, that TBC II is best
preserved in LL and, with significant changes, in the later version of the Táin, TBC III. Cf. Max Nettlau,
‘The fragment of the Tain Bó Cuailenge in Ms. Egerton 93’, Revue Celtique 14 (1893), 254-66, Revue Celtique
15 (1894), 62-78, 198-208.
27 ‘Freilich ist oft bemerkt worden, daß der Schönheit der Schrift und dem Alter der Handschrift die Güte der
Textüberlieferung nicht immer entspricht; doch muß man dafür weniger Æd selber als seine Quellen
verantwortlich machen. Außerdem ist die Handschrift jetzt durch Ausfall mancher Blätter lückenhaft’,
Heldensage, p. 36.
28 Thurneysen appears to acknowledge this when referring to ‘das – schon manche Veränderungen zeigende
30 For ‘Is fir ãím,’ uile annaide, TBC-LL 2 4033 Cecile O’Rahilly appears to favour reading ‘As ãin emh’, ar
Ulla uile a n-ainfecht, TBC Stowe 3992. She prefers Laoch oircnech, TBC Stowe 4211, to LÁech
órainech, TBC-LL 2 4435. For barróega, TBC-LL 2 3770, she recommends reading do-rat, TBC Stowe
3690, etc.
31 Note Thurneysen’s reference to ‘einer LL unabhängig, aber ihm sehr nahestehenden Handschrift’,
Heldensage, p. 115.
probably, the archetype:32

donarfas, TBC Stowe 264, domarfas, TBC Stowe 4258, Tarthedar, TBC Stowe 587, Do-rocair, TBC Stowe 1820, forsa mboi, TBC Stowe 1825, [ro raid ...] ara ndicsedh, TBC Stowe 1760 etc.

If Thurneysen is correct in attributing the Mißformen in TBC-LL to the author of TBC II, they would also have to have been in the common source of TBC-LL and TBC Stowe. One would also expect some to survive in the latter. However, we only find constructions with the apparently non-historical pretonic verbal particle con, a feature referred to briefly by Quiggin.33 Compare:

\[
\begin{align*}
  \text{consealgatar, TBC Stowe 293} & : \text{conselgatar, TBC-LL}^2 287 : \text{selgatar, TBC I} 121 \\
  \text{Concicer, TBC Stowe 435} & : \text{concicher, TBC-LL}^2 422 \\
  \text{congáirtis, TBC Stowe 2295} & : \text{congáiritis, TBC-LL}^2 2257.
\end{align*}
\]

Forms of this kind could in fact have been in the common source. O’Rahilly notes two instances in the version of Breslech Maige Murthemne found in TBC-LL, which is almost precisely the same as the version found in the LU text of TBC.34 The latter is in the hand of the original LU scribe referred to by Best as M, and identified by him as Máel Muire mac Céilechair, who died in 1106.35 The underlying common source containing these two instances of pretonic con could very well have been in existence in the 11th century:

\[
\begin{align*}
  \text{contescfad (gáirid), TBC I 2235, TBC-LL}^2 2252n.36 \\
  \text{congáirtis (tescaid), TBC I 2240, congáiritis, TBC-LL}^2 2257.37
\end{align*}
\]

Would the absence of all other TBC-LL Mißformen in TBC Stowe mean that the moderniser removed or replaced them? If it does, one would have to conclude that his treatment of such forms was more consistent than that of conventional old forms like conmessed. One could say that he identified them as a distinct type of form and systematically eliminated them, thereby correcting the common source of three hundred years earlier. Examples include the following:

\[
\begin{align*}
  \text{conscomarc, TBC-LL}^2 76 & \quad \text{fiafraigheas, TBC Stowe 81} \\
  \text{consodarc, TBC-LL}^2 142 & \quad \text{Ro fhiarfaigh, TBC Stowe 149} \\
  \text{Laigis, TBC-LL}^2 2369 & \quad \text{cuiris, TBC Stowe 2405} \\
  \text{rabert, TBC-LL}^2 2636 & \quad \text{it-bert, TBC Stowe 2633}
\end{align*}
\]

32 For a similar suggestion in relation to CRR, the LL version of which Thurneysen considered to be an original tale (see below), and on the relationship of the LL and Edinburgh texts of the Middle Irish recension of Mesca Ulad, see Uáitéar Mac Gearailt, ‘The Edinburgh text of Mesca Ulad’, Ériu 37 (1986), 133-80, at p. 133 f. On the TBC IIb manuscripts, see Heldensage, p. 115 f., TBC Stowe, pp. xlvii-liv, pp. xxix-xxx.
33 Quiggin, Die lautliche Geltung, p. 37 f. For an attempt to explain such forms see Mac Gearailt, ‘Verbal particles and preverbs’, pp. 153-84, at pp. 169-74.
34 Cf. in particular TBC-LL^2 2121-368, TBC I 2072-364.
35 John O’Donovan (ed. and trans.), Annala Rioghachta Eireann: Annals of the Kingdom of Ireland by the Four Masters, from the Earliest Period to the Year 1616, 7 vols. (Dublin 1848-5), s.a.; Best and Bergin, Lebor na Huidre, p. ix f.
36 This may not be an instance of con. The editors of the Diplomatic Edition read co tescfad, LL 9670; cf. LU 6432.
37 = LL 9695; cf. congáiritis, LU 6437.
He would thus have treated these forms in precisely the same manner as Thurneysen suggests they were treated by the LL scribe, except that he would have been much more thorough, eliminating not just those unusual forms but also the late orthography which is closely associated with them, for example spellings like *bar* ‘on’, for *for*; *ba* ‘under’, for *fo*; *ra* ‘against’, for *fri*; *badesta* ‘now’, for *fodechtsa*; *badéin* ‘himself etc.’, for *fadéin* etc.38 Given the rarity of such forms in his text, there are grounds for doubting that the *Mißformen* in TBC-LL were in the common source at all or that they originated in the author’s text.

**Thurneysen and the Date of TBC II**

What made Thurneysen think that such forms went back to the author of TBC II? For a likely answer we may go to an additional remark by Quiggin regarding the non-standard orthography in the later part of the LL *Táin*, namely that it is also found in the LL text of *Cath Ruis na Ríg*, CRR-LL:

> Weil ganz dieselbe Orthographie wie im 2. Teile sich noch in dem gewissermassen die Fortsetzung bildenden Sagentext Cath Ruis na Rig, wie er LL 171a-178a steht, vorfindet, habe ich diesen mehrfach in die Untersuchung mit hineinbezogen.39

Thurneysen’s conclusion that CRR and TBC II were composed by Bearbeiter C may have been prompted in the first place by this observation. At any rate, it seems likely that his conviction in this regard led him to the conclusion that the non-standard usage (*Mißformen*) in both tales must have originated in the text of the common author himself, and to the suggestion that the standard usage in the first half of TBC-LL was therefore later and was probably attributable to the LL scribe. As regards the identity and *floruit* of the common author, he could conclude – although he does not say so – that he was not Áed mac Crimthainn, for the man described by bishop Finn as ‘the *fer léigind* of the high-king of Leth Moga’ and ‘the chief historian of Leinster as regards acuteness, information, cultivation of books, research and knowledge’ would hardly have begun suddenly to use.

---


late non-standard orthography and unorthodox verbal constructions halfway through his own composition.

The common author, Bearbeiter C, would thus have to be earlier than 1160 and the Mißformen which Thurneysen attributed to him would become a key criterion in dating his work. If one assumes that by Mißformen Thurneysen meant non-standard forms like ra bert for do-bert or at-bert, ba luíd for ro luíd, barrecgaib for do-recmaing etc., which occur throughout TBC-LL, and in particularly large numbers in the second half of the text, he would have observed that there is nothing similar in texts which he himself assigned to the 11th century, including Breslech Maige Murthemne, which forms part of TBC-LL and which Thurneysen believed Bearbeiter C took over unchanged from the mid-11th-century Kompilator’s predominantly Old Irish Táin-compilation (TBC I), using its style as the model for his new version of the tale, TBC II.40 In attempting to date TBC II, he would thus have assumed that it is later than Breslech and the Kompilator because of Bearbeiter C’s Mißformen. These forms, preserved in large numbers in TBC-LL, would be unlikely to have occurred in the early 11th-century archetype of Breslech, although, as already remarked, the common source of the TBC-LL and TBC-LU versions contained at least one instance of the pretonic verbal particle con. That text also contained a small number of verbs with late, non-standard representations of preverbs of the kind found in TBC-LL as a whole. Thurneysen appears not to have taken these into consideration, but one imagines that if he had he would have classified them as Mißformen:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{fogníth} & \quad \text{TBC I 2236, TBC-LL}^2 2253 \quad \text{for} \quad \text{do-gníth} \\
\text{imthescad} & \quad \text{TBC I 2237, TBC-LL}^2 2254 \quad \text{for} \quad \text{?no thescad}^{41} \\
\text{Ro chress} & \quad \text{TBC I 2242, Ro chres} \quad \text{TBC-LL}^2 2259 \quad \text{for} \quad \text{Fo-cress}.
\end{align*}
\]

As regards the date of TBC II, the question would arise, how much time could reasonably be expected to have elapsed between the composition of Breslech and the rest of the tale with all its distinctive Mißformen. In assigning it to the first quarter or third of the 12th century, Thurneysen allowed for an interval of a full century. This would mean that its descendant, TBC-LL, might have been written by Áed mac Crimthainn as few as 25 years later, while the common source it shared with TBC-Stowe would have been written in the intervening period, possibly soon after the archetype was composed. It would not be unreasonable to imagine that that common source was a quite faithful copy of the very recently composed archetype, and since it was also very close to TBC-LL, as Thurneysen believed,42 one could imagine there being hardly any appreciable difference between the latter and Bearbeiter C’s original, apart from the effects of possible attempts by the LL scribe to standardize the first half of the text.43

Thus, Thurneysen assigned the Mißformen in TBC-LL to the first quarter of the 12th century. This dating seems reasonable, but usage of this kind, being probably attributable

---

40 For other texts assigned by him to the 11th century see Heldensage, p. 668.
41 The corresponding three forms in TBC Stowe are do-ghní (2291), no teascadh (2291), Ro cuiredh (2297).
42 Despite referring to the ‘many changes’ it reflects, Heldensage, p. 114.
43 These would have been among the ‘many changes’ referred to by Thurneysen.
to a small number of individuals and having few parallels otherwise, would normally be
difficult to date accurately. Conventional dating criteria, such as the use of compound
verbs, t- and reduplicated preterite forms, the relative sentence, infixed pronouns and so
on, were apparently not taken into consideration by him, although they might be expected
to offer good prospects of establishing a date, for they and their use in writing underwent
significant change between the early 11th and early 12th centuries. One would expect such
change to be reflected in Bearbeiter C’s original text of TBC II, that is one would expect
a linguistic contrast between *Breslech* and the rest of the text. This contrast should also be
reflected in TBC-LL, whose version of *Breslech*, as already noted, is almost precisely the
same as that found in TBC-LU, which means that in the TBC-LL *Breslech* we have a
very accurate reflection of a common source in existence before 1106, when the LU
scribe Máel Muire died,44 and, accordingly, of the version contained in Bearbeiter C’s
own text. If Thurneysen realised that the TBC-LL *Breslech* was thus a very faithful
representation of the version copied by Bearbeiter C for his original text of TBC II, then
it would not have been unreasonable for him to think that TBC-LL in its entirety was an
accurate reflection of the archetype.

The fact that *Mißformen* are found in all sections of what he considered to be Bearbeiter
C’s own original composition, the LL version of CRR, would have encouraged
Thurneysen in the belief that such forms were also found throughout the archetype of
TBC II, and that the standard usage in the first half of the LL text was due to the scribe of
that manuscript, Æed mac Crimthainn. Of course, in that case Æed’s usage in the first half
of the text would largely reflect that of the mid-12th century, in which case the remnants
of Bearbeiter C’s *Mißformen*, on the one hand, and Æed’s contribution, on the other,
should make that half thoroughly 12th-century in language and contrast sharply with
*Breslech*.45

However, Windisch does not note such a contrast.46 Nor do O Daly and O’Rahilly refer
to significant differences between *Breslech* and the rest of the text as regards
conventional dating criteria such as those listed above.47 In her detailed account of the
verbal system, O Daly, like most other scholars, accepted Thurneysen’s views on
Bearbeiter C, and his authorship of TBC II and CRR, and found no compelling reason to
propose an alternative date to that suggested by him.48 Thus the principal consideration
for her, as for Thurneysen, in dating TBC II appears to have been the TBC-LL.

---

44 If we accept Ó Concheanainn’s view that the LU scribe known as M was not Máel Muire and that the
latter was in fact the Interpolator, the common source could be earlier: Tomás Ó Concheanainn, ‘The
45 A qualification that could be included here is that Æed’s contribution represents a standard form of
Middle Irish that cannot be dated precisely and that could be assigned to the 11th century just as easily as to
the 12th. But there is no evidence to suggest that a fixed literary standard existed in Middle Irish that authors
were determined to preserve, such as that adhered to by professional hereditary poets of the Early Modern
Rolf Ködderitzsch, Arndt Wigger, Stefan Zimmer (eds.), *Akten des Zweiten Deutschen Keltologen-
46 Windisch, *Die altirische Heldensage Táin Bó Cúalnge*.
47 O Daly, ‘The verbal system of the LL Táin’; O’Rahilly, *Táin Bó Cúalnge from the Book of Leinster*.
Mißformen, that is non-standard orthography and unorthodox representations of pretonic preverbs and particles, which they agreed pointed to the first quarter of the 12th century.

This suggests that this non-standard usage constitutes the only significant difference between Breslech and the rest of TBC-LL. But we have already had reason to doubt whether it was in the author’s text, in view of the fact that TBC Stowe has very few traces of the distinctive orthography and verbal forms found in TBC-LL, and the possibility that the common source of TBC Stowe and TBC-LL might therefore not have contained such usage. If one begins to imagine TBC-LL without such usage and disregards the suggestion that standard usage in the first half is due to scribal intervention, one envisions a text which is largely homogeneous in orthography and language and looks something like Breslech. The contrast between the latter episode and the rest of the text, as regards conventional dating criteria of the kind listed above, would be less significant. Dates of composition separating the two sections of the text by a century would not be justified and a date of composition closer to that proposed by Thurneysen for Breslech, the early 11th century, might seem reasonable. We therefore need to consider further whether Thurneysen’s TBC-LL Mißformen go back to the earliest stages of transmission of TBC II.

The Common Authorship of TBC II and CRR, and the Date and Origin of CRR-LL

The suggestion that those unorthodox forms in TBC-LL were in the original text of TBC II is probably based on Thurneysen’s conviction that that text and CRR are by the same author. For detailed evidence of the common authorship of TBC II, CRR, and the Middle Irish version of Mesca Ulad (MU II), all of which are found in LL, he refers the reader to the dissertation of his student Áine de Paor (Annie Power), which she completed before World War I. Some time after the appearance of Heldensage in 1921 de Paor published a paper on the subject that appears to be based on that dissertation. In this she first examines TBC I and TBC-LL, comparing their versions of three episodes of the story. She notes a number of distinctive characteristics in TBC-LL, for example fondness for detail and description, and for logical formality, a tendency to give reasons, to account for facts, to ‘classify’ things in groups of three, to repeat verbatim whole passages, and so on. The structure and style of passages is improved, she suggests, and the portrayal of Medb and Fergus is changed significantly. She also compares TBC-LL with MU II and CRR-LL and finds similarities pointing to common authorship, for example in wording, phrases, and descriptions, in the use of triadic combinations and narrative sequences, and in the portrayal of Medb.

49 I have not yet been able to see the dissertation.
50 Áine de Paor, ‘The common authorship of some Book of Leinster texts’, Ériu 9 (1923), 118-146, at pp. 122; 124; 145; 119; 129; 126-8. The volume in question may not have appeared until 1924, however the article was written some years earlier. Heldensage is not referred to but earlier publications by Thurneysen are, namely Zu irischen Handschriften und Litteraturdenkmälern II (1912) (at p. 118) and ‘Die Überlieferung der Táin Bó Cuailnge’, ZCP 9 (1913), 418-43 (at p. 146). It seems therefore that her article is based largely on her dissertation. However the author does take the same position as Thurneysen – in Heldensage – on the question of the relationship of CRR-LL to the later version, on which see below.
51 de Paor, ‘Common authorship’, pp. 132-43; 118, 136, 145; 144.
Already in 1905, Windisch had noted some parallels between TBC-LL and MU-LL. In *Zur irischen Handschriften und Litteraturdenkmäler II* (1912), Thurneysen had asked if such similarities might be due to common authorship or simply reflect a similar taste or approach in two different authors. By the time *Heldensage* appeared he seemed to be certain that those two compositions and CRR were by the same author. Any doubts he may have had about the matter may therefore have been removed by his student’s dissertation, to which he refers the reader.

However, verbal correspondences and similarities in diction between compositions belonging to the same literary category should not surprise us, especially when one of them represents an impressive literary achievement. In the case of CRR we also have to consider the differences. These come to light in the first place when we compare the LL version, of which no other text exists or is known to have existed, with another found in 17th- and 18th-century manuscripts. Both versions tell how Conchobor, king of Ulster, defeated Cairpre Nia Fer, king of Tara, in the battle of Ross na Ríg, in revenge for his part in the destruction inflicted on Ulster during the *Táin*. But there are significant differences between them, which led Hogan, in his edition of 1892, to believe that the later one could not be descended from CRR-LL. Although unaware of the later texts, Zimmer had already suggested as much in ‘Keltische Beiträge I’ (1888), referring in a partial analysis of the LL text to an older underlying version of the tale. Thurneysen ignored this view and attributed differences between the two versions to the later author, who, he said, based his version on CRR-LL, which was the original version of the tale, composed by Bearbeiter C. My own research, published in various papers, supports Hogan and Zimmer and shows that the tale already existed when CRR-LL was composed, that a common source underlies both versions, that the later version is a faithful if not perfect reflection of that source, and that CRR-LL diverges significantly from it.

---

55 Edmund Hogan (ed. and trans.), *Cath Ruis na Rig for Bóinn with Preface, Translation and Indices*, Todd Lecture Series 4 (Dublin, 1892). He edited and translated CRR-LL (pp. 2-59) and the 18th-century text (e.g. in British Library, Egerton 106; pp. 60-107). In the meantime, a text bearing similarities to the latter but with some significant differences, has come to light in the mid-17th-century Irish MS, National Library of Scotland, 72.2.9.
56 ‘from what is and what is not in the later version, it is clear that it cannot be derived from the *L.L.* story’, Hogan, *Cath Ruis na Rig for Bóinn*, p. xx. Later he lists the ‘Remains of the LL. Text in the Modern Version’ (p. xxviii) and ‘Grammatical Remains of a Middle Irish Version different from the LL. Version’ (p. xxix).
The divergences mainly concern the roles of the principal characters. The most important relates to the portrayal of the Ulster warrior Conall Cernach as the veritable leader of Ulster and a great ruler of foreign kingdoms. In the opening section of both versions Conchobor sends envoys to summon Scandinavian allies for the battle, but only in CRR-LL are they also sent to Conall. He is in fact the first ally to be named in that version and the only one the Ulster envoys meet. When they tell him about the Táin, he declares that if he had been in Ulster at the time, the cattle-raid would not have been carried out without due punishment. Thus, having given him a prominent role in this episode, CRR-LL now has Conall implying that the king of Ulster has done a bad job and that he himself would have done better. Conall then assembles a vast Scandinavian fleet and sets sail for Ulster, but, as Zimmer noted, he is absent from the festivities prepared by Conchobor at Dún Delga. His absence from the action in Ulster is brought about by having his fleet split into three parts by a storm and sea-monsters in the Straits of Moyle, so that a section led by Scandinavians is welcomed at Dún Delga by Conchobor – as in the later texts – while Conall arrives at a different location.

But Conall re-enters the story later, at the precise point where he makes his first entrance in the later texts. In both versions he rushes to the battlefield to defend the king, whose shield, the Óchaín, has signalled his distress. But in the later texts he fails a test of courage by declining Conchobor’s request to take command. In CRR-LL by contrast he is portrayed as the veritable hero: the sight of his countenance (gnúis) as he approached the battlefield causes warriors to halt their flight, for they are sure there will be no retreat from the place where that face is seen; on the other hand, the king retreats and puts the battle under Conall’s protection; in response the latter declares that it is a disgrace for the king of a province to be seen in retreat, he then draws his great sword, and its sound inspires the warriors to return to their battle positions with renewed courage. Later, after he has helped Ulster to victory, the king himself, Conchobor, declares that if Conall had not been present at Ross na Ríg Ulster would have been defeated. He thus more or less supports Conall’s own claim at the beginning of the text that the Táin would not have been carried out without due punishment if he had been in Ulster at the time.

---

58 The kingdoms named are the territories of Lewis (Western Isles), Orkney, Caithness, Scythia, Dacia, Gothia, and Northmannia. He is also said to be travelling the English Channel and the Mediterranean, and pillaging the roads of the Saxons; LL 22740; Hogan, Cath Ruis na Ríg for Bóinn, p. 10.
59 LL 22737 ff.; Hogan, Cath Ruis na Ríg for Bóinn, p. 10.
61 Sruthair na Maile Chind Tiri: LL 22785; Hogan, Cath Ruis na Ríg for Bóinn, p. 12.
62 LL 23101; Hogan, Cath Ruis na Ríg for Bóinn, p. 42.
63 Hogan, Cath Ruis na Ríg for Bóinn, p. 90.
64 LL 23116; Hogan, Cath Ruis na Ríg for Bóinn, p. 44.
65 LL 23256; Hogan, Cath Ruis na Ríg for Bóinn, p. 56.
Comparison of the two versions shows that the story already existed in the 12th century, as Hogan believed, and as Zimmer had earlier suggested. It also brings to light obvious flaws in the work of the author of CRR-LL. The long section concerning Conall’s Scandinavian fleet, which has no parallel in the later texts and most of which, as Zimmer observed, has no bearing on the rest of the tale, creates an obvious structural imbalance. There is nothing like Conall’s criticism of the king in the later texts, which probably preserve the episode in its original form. In that version the king turns with the same request – to take command – to each of his champions, including Conall, and one by one they all refuse except Cú Chulainn. He thus stands out, as the last champion in such a sequence might be expected to do, and goes on to change the course of the battle in favour of Ulster and to cause the defeat of Tara by killing its king, Cairpre Nia Fer, in single combat. He also appears in the last section of the same sequence in CRR-LL, and he kills the king of Tara, but the effect of the many changes introduced by the author to enhance Conall’s status in the story, of which his criticism of Conchobor is but one, is that the hero, Cú Chulainn, appears to be playing second fiddle.

Given the makeshift nature of the LL version of CRR, it seems unlikely that an earlier text existed and that if it did it can hardly have been much earlier. CRR-LL may therefore have been composed by the LL scribe. If so, he would have had good reason to depart from the existing story and change Conall Cernach’s role, being at work on a manuscript in or near the territory of the Laígsi, a Leinster people who claimed descent from Conall in their genealogies.

As already noted, both versions tell largely the same story, but the later one has no trace of CRR-LL’s flattering treatment of Conall at the expense of Conchobor and Cú Chulainn. Nor does it contain its narrative flaws, its irregular, non-historical verbal constructions, or its late orthography, all of which may be attributed to the author of the LL version. What it shares with the latter, for instance the basic storyline, characters, poems, diction, and similarly worded phrases at parallel points in the story, may be taken to reflect the Middle Irish forerunner, from which the author of the LL version departed in order to pursue his own particular goals.

TBC II and CRR-LL are clearly different kinds of composition. One is a new version of an Old Irish tale whose spirit and sense the author endeavours to preserve in full. The other is a new version of a more recently composed tale, in which the author sets out to change the portrayal of a particular character and in the process creates numerous inconsistencies and irregularities. Similarities between the two tales, such as those mentioned by Thurneysen and de Paor, may be put down to the influence of TBC II, which for six or seven centuries was regarded as the definitive version of the Táin.

---

66 Áed mac Crimthainn, according to O’Sullivan, ‘Notes on the scripts and make-up of the Book of Leinster’; see the collation table after p. 30.
67 Laegsech Cendmor mac Conaill Cernaig. Is uad atat Laigsi ‘Laegsech Cendmór son of Conall Cernach. The Laígsi are descended from him’, LL 40904. The Laígsi are referred to as cenél Conaill Chernaig ‘the people of, i.e. descended from, Conall Cernach’, LL 39715.
If TBC II and CRR-LL were composed by separate authors, distinctive non-standard orthography and verbal forms which Quiggin pointed out, including the following which are found in TBC- and CRR-LL, are less likely to have been in the archetype of TBC II:

- barrecgaib for dorecmaing ‘happened’
- faítti for faidid ‘(s)he sends’
- ra théigsetar for do-lotar/ tâncatar ‘came, went’/ ?ra éigsetar ‘roared’
- ra ‘roared’
- bar for ‘on’, ‘inquit’
- ra for fri ‘against’.

It is likely that such forms arose in TBC II during transmission. As for the features shared by TBC-LL and CRR-LL, they may reflect the influence of a text of TBC II very similar in language and date to TBC-LL, or the use of such forms in a particular school or region in the 12th century.

As the small number traceable to the common source of the TBC-LU and TBC-LL versions of *Breslech* indicates, non-standard spellings and unconventional pretonic preverbs and verbal particles of the kind under discussion here were already appearing in manuscripts in the later 11th century. However, the distinctive forms found in all episodes of TBC-LL other than *Breslech*, and in CRR-LL, for example barrecgaib ‘happened’ and bar ‘on’, are not found in LU or Rawlinson B 502 – another manuscript of the first third of the 12th century. They are likely therefore to be later.

If CRR-LL was composed by its scribe, or even if it is a copy of a slightly earlier text, it may be assigned to the mid-12th century. Its unusual orthography and non-historical verbal forms may also be dated to that period. TBC-LL and its late non-standard usage, including distinctive pseudo-archaism like faítti ‘sends’ and ra théigsetar ‘came/ went’, which are also found in CRR-LL, may also be assigned to that period. If such forms are what Thurneysen meant by *Mißformen*, the date he assigns to them is likely therefore to be too early.

TBC II was earlier than TBC- or CRR-LL and in its original form it is unlikely to have contained *Mißformen*, that is, in all probability its author did not use such forms. Bearing in mind also that the common source of TBC-Stowe and TBC-LL probably did not contain such forms, we may assume that the mixed usage in TBC-LL arose at a late stage of textual transmission and that in its more conventional usage and older regular forms we see a reflection of the language of the earliest stage of transmission, rather than the effects of standardizing on the part of the LL scribe. We must therefore distinguish between the late forms and conventional older usage, for instance in the first half of the text, in which we see remnants of the language of an earlier stage of transmission.

---

69 CRR-LL: barécaim, LL 23214 etc. TBC-LL: barrecaibsium, LL 9957 etc.
Separating late and early forms, we see an earlier text of TBC II. Comparing the rest of TBC-LL with Breslech, which Thurneysen assigned to the early 11th century, it should be possible to date TBC II on a firmer basis and to see if it might have been composed as early as Breslech.

The greater part of the TBC-LU and TBC-LL version of Breslech, reflecting a common source earlier than 1106, has none of the obviously unconventional forms found in all other episodes of TBC-LL. If there was no significant difference in language between it and the early text of TBC II which can be postulated on the basis of the older usage in the rest of TBC-LL, the date of composition of both should be similar. It is to the older usage in TBC-LL therefore that we must turn our attention when attempting to date TBC II, taking Thurneysen’s date for Breslech as a guide, that is the early 11th century.

The Language and Date of CRR-LL

Let us therefore consider the linguistic features of these three texts, CRR-LL, for which we have proposed a date around 1160, Breslech, for which we have Thurneysen’s date, the early 11th century, and the rest of TBC II.

The most important feature of the language of CRR-LL is its unorthodox forms. Some, as already seen, are also found in TBC-LL but they are otherwise unknown or rare. There is no evidence in the later texts to suggest that anything similar occurred in the original version of CRR. These forms belong therefore to the period in which TBC- and CRR-LL were written, the middle to late 12th century.

It may be sufficient here to comment on three examples of similar meaning. Given the evidently arbitrary nature of their initial pretonic syllables, cond- and bat-, it is not surprising that the very similar forms condnoathatar and batnoath[atar], both meaning ‘they told, made known’, are otherwise unattested. However they are clearly related to the verb nóid ‘makes known, spreads the fame of, celebrates’. The form barridnachtatar-som appears also to be intended to mean ‘they told’. It matches Old Irish do-rindnachtatar, perfect pl. 3 of do-indnaig ‘bestows’, which is not otherwise known to have the meaning ‘tells’. All three forms appear therefore to have the same meaning as the form commonly used in 12th-century texts, ro innisetar, preterite pl. 3 of the Middle Irish simple verb innisid ‘tells’, which the author also uses:

73 According to O’Sullivan, these pages are by the finest of the LL hands, F, possibly Finn úa Gormáin himself but more likely to be his scribe: ‘Notes on the scripts and make-up of the Book of Leinster’, pp. 1-31, at p. 6 f. Once T, the principal scribe of TBC-LL, takes up the pen again, on p. 79a, ‘the clumsier style resumes’ (ibid., p. 6) and much greater concentrations of late orthography and unusual verbal forms than are found in the first half of the text begin to appear. Cf. Mac Gearailt, ‘The language of some late Middle Irish texts’, pp. 169-79; idem, ‘Verbal particles and preverbs’, p. 157.
75 On closely related forms in Recension III of TBC, see Mac Gearailt, ‘The relationship of Recensions II and III of the Táin’.
76 DIL, s.v.
77 On pretonic verbal con/ bai/ boi/ foi/ fa/ im and do/ bar in late Middle Irish texts see Mac Gearailt, ‘Verbal particles and preverbs’, pp. 166-80.
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& condnoathatar dano na scéla ro batar accu do Chonall, LL 22758
‘and they told Conall the news they had’
& batnoathar dóib na scélasain, LL 22935
‘and they told them those tidings’

Is and dano barridnachtarsom dósum Táin Bó Cualnge do breith ..., LL 22761
‘And it was then they told him that the Táin Bó Cualnge had been carried out …’

ro innisetarsom dó na comasain, LL 22911
‘they made known those terms to him’.

Other apparently pseudo-archaic forms used by him include the following:

ra tholathar (do) (verb tolnaithir), LL 22629, 22633, 22639
ni forulṅgither (do) (verb fo-loing), LL 23007
    nir brulṅgither (do), LL 23174, nir borulṅgither (do), LL 23192
ni ... barroeblangair (do) (verb do-ling), LL 23008
nach farroeblangatar (do) (verb for-ling/ do-ling), LL 22858
    Nad orgenamarni (verb do-gni), LL 22891
    barroebris (verb for-brissi/ brissid), LL 22654
    bognitha (verb do-gni), LL 23037
    bachotasum (verb ad-cota), LL 23238
    comterbts (verb?), LL 23277
    commnattacht (verb ad-teich/ con-dieig), LL 23237
    confaitī (verb fáidid), LL 22773,
        faitte (verb fáidid), LL 22768
    ros bae (verb baid/ benaid)78, LL 23270
    rodas cloe (verb cloïd), LL 23269
    robretha (verb do-beir), LL 22768
        dobrethasum (verb do-beir), LL 23238
        rabert (verb do-beir), LL 23169
    docuas (verb ad-fēt), LL 22888
        rocusas (verb ad-fēt), LL 2287179
    selais (verb ?sligid), LL 23132 etc.

In using these alternatives to forms in normal use, the mid-12th-century author of CRR-LL was hoping to give his composition an archaic appearance, as Thurneysen says of the person who introduced Missformen into TBC II.80 Had he known an old construction actually meaning ‘they told’, such as Old Irish ad-cuaid/ ad-cuaidetar, perfect of ad-fēt ‘tells, relates’, he would probably not have adapted the verbs nóíd and do-indnaig to create three pseudo-archaisms meaning ‘they told’. That he did so gives an indication of his knowledge of older verbs like nóíd and do-indnaig, and of his awareness of how they could be adapted.

He uses regular old forms of other verbs which were no longer in normal use. In one particular passage, for example, he uses the preterite sg. and pl. 3 of two different verbs

---

78 Taken as preterite sg. 3 of benaid, DIL, s.v. But ae for í is very unusual.
79 Cf. aitchias (verb ad-fēt) dóib na comadasain ‘those terms were told to them’, LL 22907, with sg. pass. aitchias and pl. subject (comada). This might be taken to suggest that the pl. passive, which would almost certainly have disappeared in speech by 1200, was in decline.
80 Heldensage, p. 33.
meaning ‘rose’: i) the older $t$-formation of the compound verb *at-reig* ‘rises’, 3 sg. *at-raacht* and 3 pl. *at-raachtatar*, from *éirgid*, the Middle Irish simple verb which developed from the proto-totic stem of *at-reig*. This is the important passage relating how Conall’s fleet was divided into three by a storm, causing him to land far from Dún Delga and the welcoming festivities arranged by Conchobor. It is entirely his own and it had no parallel in the existing tale. He would probably have felt that it was particularly important to have a few old forms in this passage. However, he begins with *ra érig*, which would have corresponded closely with the form he used in speech – although he might have said *do érigtar/ érigetar* rather than *ra érig*, that is, using the verbal particle *do*, which had emerged as the sole particle with affirmative forms of the preterite, the imperfect indicative and subjunctive, and the secondary future.\(^{81}\) He then uses *ra érig* and *atraacht* in separate sentences with the same subject, *anfud* ‘storm’, and then *atraachtatar*. It may be assumed that he would not have used these old forms in speech, any more than he would pseudo-archaic forms like *condnoathatar* and *barridnachtatar*.\(^{82}\)

Ra ergitar tra in tromchoblach, LL 22782
‘So the great sea-going heavy fleet set out/ rose’
*atraachtatar a róin 7 a rossail … dóib –sium*, LL 22786
‘its seals and walruses … rose to meet/ attack them’

*atraacht glass anfud in mara … dóib*, LL 22786
‘a fierce storm of the sea … rose to meet/ overtook them’

Is é tressi inn anfaid ra érig dóib, LL 22788
‘The storm that overtook them was so strong’

Like *atraacht/ atraachtatar*, the following features are likely not to have been in the spoken language in the mid-12th century and thus to have been used by the author to give his text a literary veneer:

| verb | LL reference | for ro/ do $v$-
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>ferais</em> (verb <em>feraid</em>), LL 22759(^{83})</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>fer</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>déchais</em> (verb <em>déchaid</em>), LL 23142</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>déch</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>dercais</em> (verb <em>dercaid</em>), LL 23142</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>derr</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>fégaïs</em> (verb <em>fégaid</em>), LL 23148</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>fég</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>cunnis</em> (verb <em>cuinnigid</em>), LL 23207 etc.(^{84})</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>chuinnig</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^{81}\) Likewise, he would have said *do innisetar*, rather than *ro innisetar*. Cf. Mac Gearailt, ‘Verbal particles and preverbs’, p. 156.

\(^{82}\) Otherwise he uses *ra érig* and *ra érigtar* twice (Ro érig immor ro Conchobor mochtrath annabarach ‘Now Conchobor got up early the next day’, LL 22843, ro ergitar iar tain rannair fri raind accu ‘Then carvers [leg. rannaireda] got up to serve them’, LL 22837) and *atraacht* once (atraacht Sencha mac Ailella ‘Sencha mac Ailella rose’, LL 23223).

\(^{83}\) $s$-preterite sg. 3 ending -$ais$. This survives in Early Modern Irish, mostly as -$as$, e.g. *gabhas*, but *ro/ do ghabh* etc. is the normal form and it and *gabh* are still used in present-day Irish. Cf. Mac Gearailt, ‘Leaganacha de Cath Ruis na Ríg’, pp. 182-4.
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*dobert/dobretha* (verb *do-beir*), LL 23220, 23237
*ro iarfa[ch]* (verb *iarmi-foich*), LL 22820
*co topacht* (verb *do-boing*), LL 23185

*ro mebaid/na cor mebaid* (verb *maidid*), LL 22826, 23095

*ro mebais* (verb *maidid*) LL 22714
*Mebais* (verb *maidid*) LL 22897

*ro lingestar* (verb *lingid*), LL 23010
*ro lenestar* (verb *lenaid*), LL 23225
*ro sceastar* (verb *scaid*), LL 22827
*ra dercastar* (verb *dercaid*), LL 23138
*tucastar* (verb *do-beir*), LL 23175

*Ro gabtha* (verb *gaibid*), LL 22889
*tuctha* (verb *do-beir*), LL 22651
*ro faitte* (verb *faidad*), LL 22887
*ro slemunchirtha* (verb *cúriad*), LL 22990

Being a man of learning, the author of CRR-LL would have known literary usage from the many texts with which he was familiar, including TBC II. He would also have found such usage in texts of the existing tale, as textual correspondences such as the following between his text and those of the 17th- and 18th-century show:

*dáig damriachtatar cethri ollchóiceda hÉrend*, LL 22650
‘for the four great provinces of Ériu came to me’
*óir domruachtatar ceithre hollchoígídh Ereann*.94

He would recognize forms like *da-m-ritatar* as marks of a literary style. Where he had a choice between such forms and those which were used in speech he chose the former. However, his knowledge of old forms was limited. Comparable texts from an earlier

86 *t*-preterite forms.
87 *Benaid* would have had some of the meanings and uses of *do-boing* and its preterite form *topacht*, which in the mid-12th century were probably long obsolete.
88 Reduplicated preterite.
89 Cf. TBC-LL: *da maid*, LL 12308, *goro maidset*, LL 10776, *ro maid*, LL 11324.
90 Two instances of *mebais*, as i) (Old Irish) *s*-future sg. 3 and ii) (Middle Irish) preterite sg. 3, for Old Irish *memaid* or late Middle Irish *ro/do maid*; the latter usage was preserved throughout the Early Modern period.
91 *s*-preterite sg. 3 deponent ending *-astar*.
92 Old preterite passive plural ending *-thai-the*.
94 National Library of Scotland, MS 72.2.9, 1r; Hogan, Cath Ruis na Rig for Bóinn, p. 60. For other textual correspondences between the two versions see Mac Gearailt, ‘Leaganacha de Cath Ruis na Rig’, pp. 176-91.
period have older forms which he might have used had he known them or had they come to mind, for example *geguin* and *gáet*, reduplicated preterite sg. 3 and pass. sg. of *gonaid* ‘wounds, kills’, and *do-rochair* and *do-rochratar*, preterite sg. and pl. 3 of *do-tuit* ‘falls’.

The most striking literary form in CRR-LL is Old and Early Middle Irish (*immar* *bíth*, LL 23248, preterite pass. sg. of *benaid*. Unlike *atraacht* and the other literary forms in the text, *bíth* and preterite sg. and pl. 3 *bí* and *béotar* are very rare in 12th-century texts. In CRR-LL, *bíth* occurs in a poem which is not found in the later version of the tale and which the author of CRR-LL is likely not to have composed himself. In an earlier prose passage he uses the later weak inflection, which of course he would also have used in speech, in preterite pl. 3 *ro* *benatar* (LL 23109). This confirms that *bíth* was a literary form in his time and that the preterite pass. sg. form in normal use in the mid-12th century would have been *ro*/*do* *benad*.

An author who uses three different forms of the latest and simplest form of the infixed pronoun in close proximity to refer to the same person is unlikely to have been familiar with an old form like *bíth* as a literary form:

…”cid donrat samlaid …? … in nech ros ail 7 ros n-irthócaib*, LL 22640
‘… what made him thus …? … the one who reared him and raised him’.

There is no such uncertainty or inconsistency in his use of the other kind of pronoun at his disposal, the new independent pronoun. This established itself in speech in the 12th century and rendered the infixed pronoun obsolete; nevertheless, the latter was still used as a literary archaism even in the 17th century, as an instance in Mathghamhain Ó hfearnán’s poem *Ceist! Cia do cheinneóchadh dán?* ‘A question! Who would buy a poem?’ shows: *is cás rom loisg* ‘a case which has tormented me’.95 As object, for example *Co rucatar leo é* ‘and they brought him with them’ (LL 23187), or as subject, with the copula, the passive, and the active verb, for example *corbdar comardda comchuibdi iat* ‘so that they were even and in line’ (LL 23169), *tucait iat* ‘they were brought’ (LL 22834), *dogebad sib* ‘you would get’ (LL 23182), he undoubtedly knew the independent pronoun best. If so, in speech he might have said … *cid dorat(?) samlaid é … in nech do ail (é) 7 do irthócaib é*, rather than … *cid donrat* ....

Inconsistent use of older features such as the infixed pronoun and recourse to otherwise unattested forms like *condnoathatar* and *barridnachtatar* show that the author’s productive knowledge of literary forms which are widely used in 11th-century texts was limited. Other mid-12th-century writers may have had a greater knowledge of such usage, but the evidence of the work of contemporary poets such as Gilla Mo Dutu úa Casaide and Gilla na Náem úa Duinn does not support this suggestion. The fact therefore that a scribe of the Book of Leinster, Æed mac Crimthainn, described as the *fer léigind* of the high-king of the southern half of Ireland and chief historian of Leinster, might use such

---

forms in a new composition, or even copy them, is an important indicator regarding literary usage in the mid-12th century.96

As a new composition which we can date with some confidence to the mid-12th century, a period of significant change in the use and form of the literary language, CRR-LL is therefore interesting and valuable, in that it gives us some insight into how the author juggled literary and spoken forms, and created his own constructions in order to maintain a veneer of literary respectability which he felt was required. It gives a clearer idea than most texts of what the author probably said in normal speech, and it brings us close to the end of literary Middle Irish and to the beginnings of Early Modern Irish, in which forms like *atraacht* and features such as the infixed pronoun would survive as fossils or slip completely into disuse.

*The Language, Date and Origin of* Breslech Maige Murthemen

When we turn to *Breslech Maige Murthemen*, which Thurneysen believed was composed in the early 11th century, we expect a quite different linguistic profile. As already said, the common source of the TBC-LU and TBC-LL version is likely to have been an 11th-century text. As the extant texts testify, it contained a few instances of late spellings, for example,

*ba thétaib* for *fa/ fo thétaib* ‘with (lit. ‘under’) strings’. 97

It also contained a few verbs with late forms of preverbs and verbal particles, which shows that there was variation in the representation of these already before 1100:

*con a bil aithgéir ... contescfad finna i n-agid srotha ..., TBC-LL² 2252* 98

‘with its very sharp ... rim ... which would cut a hair against a stream ...’

*is cumma congáiritis de bánaanaig ..., TBC-LL² 2257*

‘there used to cry from it alike goblins ...’ 99

*Inbaid fogníth in t-óclách fáeborchless di ..., TBC-LL² 2253*

‘When the warrior did the “edge-feat” with it ...’

*is cumma imthescad dia scíath ..., TBC-LL² 2254*

‘he would cut alike with his shield ...’

*Ro chres a cheltar chomga tharis, TBC-LL² 2259*

‘There was cast over him his protective dress of raiment’.

I have argued elsewhere that *fo-* and *im-* can represent the Old Irish preverb *do-* and that they reflect the pronunciation /ðə/, rather than /ə/, as Quiggin suggested. 100 The late

---

96 O'Sullivan, ‘Notes on the scripts and make-up of the Book of Leinster’; see collation tables following p. 30.
97 TBC-LL² 2234, TBC I 2217.
98 But, as noted earlier, this may not be an instance of *con*. Perhaps read as the conjunction *co n-*; *co tescfad*. Cf. Mac Gearailt, ‘Verbal particles and preverbs’, p. 169 f.
99 Cf. *congebethar* (*gaibid*), TBC-LL² 2221n., TBC I 2204; *con cuirend*; TBC-LL² 2347n., read as *co cuirend*, LL 9670, *co curend*; TBC I 2344.
100 Mac Gearailt, ‘Verbal particles and preverbs’, p. 163 f.
spelling bo-/ba- suggests that the preposition fo and the homophonous preverb fo-, which survived in writing only after 1000-1050, were pronounced /və/, while for and for-, spelt bar in TBC- and CRR-LL, were pronounced /vər/. The preposition fo merged with the preposition imm in certain meanings and uses, so that it, and later bo= (=/və/), are written for imm. By the mid-12\textsuperscript{th} century the verbal particle do had taken over from ro in the preterite and from older no in the imperfect indicative, imperfect subjunctive, and secondary future. It may have been pronounced with lenited d-, that is with an initial dental fricative (=/δ/), particularly in relative position, although the preverb do- written as fo- (e.g. fognith, TBC-LL\textsuperscript{2} 2253) and as ba- (e.g. barrídnachtatarsum, LL 22761, for do-ridnachtatarsum) would point to lenition in all cases. Its use in relative position may have caused it to spread to the present and future as a relative particle, for example present 3 sg. */δə/thescan ‘which cuts’. There might be resistance to it in writing, possibly because already in the 11\textsuperscript{th} century when it began to take the place of ro and no in speech it was considered to be inferior to them.\textsuperscript{101} It might also have been seen as giving rise to confusion, particularly after its lenited form became identified with fo/ fo-, but possibly also because it was associated with a development which had not been encountered in the written language before, namely its use in relative position in the present and future. The use of the pretonic particle con in relative position, for example in congáiritis, may have arisen as an attempt to disguise do (=/δə/), the result being a construction that looked similar to deuterotonic forms of old compound verbs with the preverb con-, which may in fact have been used only rarely in the written language after 1000. Thus, the relative con-form just cited may represent /δə/gáirtis. Similarly, imthescad above, in which im is likely to have been considered to be equivalent to fo (=/və/), may represent /δə/thescad, and marímat ‘say, mention’, TBC-LL\textsuperscript{2} 2442, may represent /δə/rimat etc.

Thus, while these forms may not have been commonly used outside texts like TBC, they may nevertheless reflect real developments in the language. Instances of what O’Rahilly refers to as ‘relative con-’ (TBC-LL\textsuperscript{2} 2221n, 2347n etc.), such as present 3 sg. Confrend (feraid), may therefore represent the leniting particle do /δə/. The choice of con as a scribal disguise for do /δə/ in relative position may reflect the influence of relative constructions expressing genitive and dative relation, of the kind found in 17\textsuperscript{th}-century sources, with the preposition oc and the nasalizing relative particle a n- (oca n-, ’ca n-),\textsuperscript{102} or constructions with the conjunction co n-. Leniting do (written con- etc.) would suggest that already in the 11\textsuperscript{th} century there was a distinction in speech between leniting relative clauses expressing nominative and accusative relation and nasalizing clauses expressing 101 Ro frequently replaces the preverb do. Cf. Ro chres (fo-ceird), TBC-LL\textsuperscript{2} 2259, for fo-cress, the form used earlier in the text: focress a shupall do Ailill ‘Ailill’s tent was pitched for him’ (298); note also the late forms rabertatar (do-bertatar), TBC-LL\textsuperscript{2} 2494, rabretha (do-bretha), TBC-LL\textsuperscript{2} 2402.

102 Compare the following relative sentences expressing genitive relation, cited by McManus from 17\textsuperscript{th}-century texts: an tí ag nach bí Dia táitte réna anam ‘the person who does not have God joined to his soul’; an tí ‘gá mbiodh an singin ’Táu ‘ na éadan ‘the person who was wont to have the sign “Táu” on his forehead’. Relative sentences expressing dative relation: on muicidhe aga raibhe i gcoimhedd aige ‘from the pigherd by whom he was being minded’; bid mórán do dhaoinibh agi mhi eagal na péine i nreanda amhain orra ‘there are many people who only fear the torment of hell’: Damian McManus, ‘An Nua-Ghaeilge Chlasaiceach’, in Kim McCone et al. (eds.), Stair na Gaeilge in Ómós do Pádraig Ó Fiannachta (Maynooth, 1994), pp. 335-445, at p. 424 f.
genitive and dative relation. It is therefore possible that a present relative construction with leniting /ðə/ (*/ðə/ thescann, */ðə/ fi rendre) emerged at that time as an alternative to the older relative form (t(h)escas) in the dialect spoken in the region where texts containing con/ fol/ im for do were written, for example in the part of Leinster corresponding with modern County Laois. In instances in which con + verb is introduced by cindas ‘how?’ or by the copula with a following adjective (is ferda ‘bravely, in a manly fashion’) lenition is not marked. In those cases the particle may therefore represent a nasalizing effect on the verbal stem. If so, the form intended may well be the conjunction co n-.103 and we may have to do with nasalization paralleling that described by Thurneysen in relative clauses, in which ‘the antecedent designates the manner … of the content of the relative clause’ and in which ‘a neuter adjective used in periphrasis with the copula defines the modality of the following clause’.104

\[ Cia \text{ confirend} \text{ (verb feraid)} ‘Who gives battle …’, TBC-LL² 4621n. \]

\[ Cindas \text{ confegaet} \text{ (verb fichid/figid)} ‘How do they fight?’, TBC-LL² 4622 \]

\[ (Is \text{ ferda}) \text{ confegaet} \text{ (fichid/figid)}, TBC-LL² 4623 \]

\[ (Cinnas) \text{ confegaet} \text{ (fichid/figid)}, TBC-LL² 4671 \]

\[ (Is \text{ ferda}) \text{ confegaet} \text{ (fichid/figid)}, TBC-LL² 4672 \]

\[ confirê \text{ (verb fo-fera)} ‘it will cause’, TBC-LL² 3028 \]

\[ con-deochatar \text{ (verb do-têt)} ‘they came’, TBC-LL² 1249 \]

\[ conscomarc \text{ (verb imm-comaire)} ‘she asked, requested’, TBC-LL² 76 \]

\[ fognith \text{ (verb do-gnî)} ‘he used do’, TBC-LL² 2253 \]

\[ fognî \text{ (do-gnî)} ‘he does’, TBC-LL² 3925, 3930 \]

\[ bogni \text{ (do-gnî)} ‘does’, TBC-LL² 3927 \]

\[ amgêna \text{ (do-gnî)} ‘will you do’, TBC-LL² 449 \]

\[ babeir \text{ (verb do-beir)} ‘gives’, LL 32594 \]

\[ Laigis \text{ (verb fo-luiigi)} ‘she hid’, TBC-LL² 2369 \]

Other late features which may have been in the common source of the TBC-LU and the TBC-LL version of Breslech include the 3 pl. independent pronoun iat ‘them’ in connárbo léir do neoch issin dúnud iat ‘so that they were not visible to anyone in the

\[ \text{Cf.} \text{ (cia) coninfadar ‘will dare’, TBC-LL² 4782.} \]

\[ \text{Cf.} \text{ O'Rahilly’s footnote to the text. Cf. is cumma imthescad? is cumma congáiritis?, TBC-LL² 2254, 2257 (= is cumma co tescad? is cumma co ngáiritis?), Is cumma congonad ... congonand, LL 11056, 11064 (TBC) (= co ngonad ... co ngonand?). Similarly is cumma imthescad, TBC-LL² 2254, for is cumma co tescad etc.} \]

\[ \text{103 Note also Cinnas conconmégirget, TBC-LL² 4644, cinnas condricfam, TBC-LL² 2970. Cf. Mac Gearailt, ‘Verbal particles and preverbs’, pp. 174-80.} \]

\[ \text{104 Rudolf Thurneysen, A Grammar of Old Irish (Dublin, 1949), §498. Note the examples he cites: sechi chruth dond-rón ‘whatever be the manner in which I may be able to do it’, Wb. 5\textsuperscript{b}18, and arndip maith n-airlethar a muntir ‘so that he may well order his household’ or ‘that it may be good how he orders [his household]’, Wb. 28\textsuperscript{b}32.} \]

\[ \text{105 Cf. (cia) coninfadar ‘will dare’, TBC-LL² 4782.} \]

\[ \text{106 Cf. O’Rahilly’s footnote to the text. Cf. is cumma imthescad? is cumma congáiritis?, TBC-LL² 2254, 2257 (= is cumma co tescad? is cumma co ngáiritis?), Is cumma congonad ... congonand, LL 11056, 11064 (TBC) (= co ngonad ... co ngonand?). Similarly is cumma imthescad, TBC-LL² 2254, for is cumma co tescad etc.} \]


\[ \text{108 Is maith in chomairle babeir Nestoir dúib ar Agmennón (Togail Troí).} \]

\[ \text{109 Laigis appears to reflect a false analysis of the old compound fo-laig as preterite of a simple verb, i.e. as fo laig = do laig, i.e. /ðə/laig. On this see Mac Gearailt, ‘Verbal particles and preverbs’, p. 172.} \]
camp’, TBC-LL² 2225, which is not in TBC-LU (TBC I 2209), and infixed pronoun 3 sg. masc. -d- in a main clause, in 7 rod gonat ‘and they wound him’ (gonaid), TBC-LL² 2174; TBC-LU also has this but reads late s-preterite 7 rod gonsat ‘and they wounded him’ (TBC I 2152) – probably the better reading – which is for Old Irish reduplicated preterite ra ngennatar. Note on the other hand the independent pronoun in TBC-LU’s feib nachas faiced hé ‘as if no one could see him’ (TBC I 2098), for which the common source is likely to have had the old infixed pronoun in the TBC-LL version, feib nacha n-aicced (TBC-LL² 2147). The common source also had later forms of numerals, for example teóra catha, TBC-LL² 2169, TBC I 2147, with feminine teóra for masculine trí.

Like pretonic con, and fo- and im- for the preverb do-, the independent pronoun iat would not be likely to occur in an early 11th-century text of Breslech, but the infixed pronoun -d-, which is found in the 10th-century poem Saltair na Rann,111 might be that early, and also gonsat, for older gegenatar, which would only be used rarely after 1000.

The following features, mostly verbs, point more surely to the early 11th century as the time when Breslech was composed and they may have influenced Thurneysen’s dating:

**INTERNAL RO**
- co farggaib (fo-ácaib) ‘so that he left’, TBC-LL² 2317,112 similarly TBC I 2311, for later coro fácaib/cor fác (fácaid)
- Dosrimchell (do-immchella) ‘he went around them’, TBC-LL² 2317, TBC I 2310, for later ro/do thimchell (timchellaid)
- dorochair (do-tuit) ‘he fell’, TBC-LL² 2324, TBC I 2318, dorochratar (do-tuit) ‘they fell’, TBC-LL² 2192, TBC I 2174, for later ro/do thuit (tuitid), ro/do thuitetar

**REDUPLICATED AND T-PRETERITE**
- Sescei nga (sceinnid) ‘sprang out’, TBC-LL² 2275, TBC I 2258, for later ro sceinn113
geguin (gonaid), TBC-LL² 2409, similarly TBC I 2396, for later ro gon114
- co n-erbalatar (at-baill) ‘fell dead’, TBC-LL² 2135, TBC I 2086
- co n-ebairt ‘so that he said’, TBC I 2392

**PRETERITE PASSIVE**
- Sre ngtha (srengaid) ‘were stretched’, TBC-LL² 2270, TBC I 2253, for later ro srengait
- ro rimthé (rimid) ‘have been counted’, TBC-LL² 2325, TBC I 2319, for later ro rímit
- Atchessa (ad-cí) ‘were seen’, TBC-LL² 2283, TBC I 2265; cf. facessa, TBC-LL² 4153
táfás (do-adbat), TBC-LL² 2341, TBC I 2339 etc.

**S-SUBJUNCTIVES**
- acht ro sesed (saidid) ‘would have stayed’, TBC-LL² 2288, TBC I 2270
dáns tarsed (do-airicc) ‘could have reached’, TBC-LL² 2274, similarly TBC I 2257
dá risad (ro-icc) ‘would have reached’, TBC-LL² 2287, TBC I 2270

DEPONENTS
ardatuigethar (ar-tuigethar/for-tuigethar) ‘covers them’, TBC-LL² 2275, TBC I 2343
tarassair (do-airissedar) ‘stopped’, TBC-LL² 2301, TBC I 2293 etc.

COMPOUND VERBS
focheird ‘casts’, TBC-LL² 2224, TBC I 2208,¹¹⁵ for later cuirid etc.
frisócbat (fris-ócaib) ‘climb up’, TBC I 2367,¹¹⁶ for later töcbaid etc.
fordringis (for-dríng) ‘climbed on’, TBC I 2367¹¹⁷
dofánic (do-icc) ‘came’, TBC-LL² 2128, TBC I 2079, for tánic
dorroeblaiṅg (do-ling) ‘sprang, jumped’, TBC-LL² 2296,¹¹⁸ for later do ling
Follaig (fo-luig), TBC I 2368¹¹⁹
Imstoic (imm-stoic), TBC-LL² 2273, TBC I 2256

MISCELLANEOUS EARLY FEATURES
The stressed form of the possessive pronoun sg. 3, aí, in cach n-aí … díb ‘each of them’, TBC-LL² 2356, TBC I 2352,¹²⁰
the equative form of the adjective without the preposition frí, as in late Middle Irish, comba méithír moltcracand … ‘as wide as a ram’s skin’, TBC-LL² 2280, similarly TBC I 2262, comba … remithír áirnem n-ócláig … sithíthír seólchrand prímluṅgí ‘… as thick as a hero’s fist … as long as the mast of a ship’, TBC-LL² 2290, TBC I 2272;
the dative pl. adjective with the old ending -ib, cona erraib iarnaibid, cona fáebraib tanaibid ‘with its iron points, its thin edges’, TBC-LL² 2296, TBC I 2280;
the phrase is ed mod, in iss ed mod dáns tarsed fiachchorr … is ed mod dá risad ubull díb dochum talman ‘a wild crane could hardly have reached it … scarcely one apple would have reached the ground’, TBC-LL² 2274, 2287, TBC I 2256, 2270;
Old Irish it é … rather than late Middle Irish is iat …, It é in so sís a n-anmand-side ‘Here follow their names’, TBC-LL² 2325, TBC I 2319.

This brief survey of the language of Bresleich shows that it is older than CRR-LL. Old verbal forms occur more frequently and with greater consistency than in the latter. Interchangeable variant forms reflecting different stages in the development of the language are less frequent. Pseudo-archaic or artificial verbal constructions of the kind seen in CRR-LL are not found. It seems clear on linguistic grounds that this section of TBC II might have been composed in the 11th century. This is also suggested by the fact that the common source of the TBC-LU and TBC-LL version can be assigned to the period before the death of the LU scribe Máel Muire, in 1106. It may, as Thurneysen believed, be as early as the first quarter of the 11th century, but for the moment it seems safer to assign it to the middle of that century.

¹¹⁵ Cf. also cé focheirded-som, TBC-LL² 2226, TBC I 2210, focherdditis, TBC-LL² 2239, similarly TBC I 2222.
¹¹⁶ Not in TBC-LL, which is quite different; cf. TBC-LL² 2371. But note forthóchat ‘raise’ (for-tócaib) in the poem which follows, TBC-LL² 2293, for which TBC-LL reads dofócrat, TBC I 2384.
¹¹⁷ Not in TBC-LL, which is quite different; cf. TBC-LL² 2371.
¹¹⁸ Cf. doreblaing, TBC I 2279. Note also CRR-LL’s probably pseudo-archaic ní hed barroeblaṅgair dosom, LL 23008.
¹¹⁹ Cf. Laigis, TBC-LL² 2369.
¹²⁰ Thurneysen, Grammar of Old Irish, §443.
Thurneysen does not explain how he arrived at his date. As already seen, he assigned TBC I to the mid-11th century and argued that the author of TBC II, Bearbeiter C, took *Breslech* from that compilation. The main concern of the compiler of TBC I, the Komöpilator, was to preserve the Old Irish *Táin*.121 His work was largely compilatory in nature, and it seems unlikely that in the course of this work he would have thought of supplementing the Old Irish material with a new Middle Irish episode composed by himself.122 *Breslech* being therefore an earlier composition (early 11th century), TBC I could be assigned to a slightly later period (mid-11th century), and TBC II, for which Bearbeiter C borrowed *Breslech* from TBC I, would be later still. We have seen however that there is no compelling evidence to support a date for TBC II in the early 12th century, as proposed by Thurneysen on the basis of the *Mißformen* in TBC-LL. It may be significantly earlier, possibly as early as *Breslech*, which Thurneysen assigned to the early 11th century but which may date from the middle of the century. If so, TBC II may have been the version of TBC for which *Breslech* was composed or borrowed in the first place, rather than TBC I.

### The Language and Date of TBC II

Let us now consider the language of TBC II to see if indeed it might have been composed in the 11th century. Regarding the contrast observed by Quiggin between the first and second halves of TBC-LL, I have argued that that text reflects different strata in the transmission of TBC II and that the later orthography, language, and style of the second half represents significant modernisation in the mid- to late 12th century.123 We may take here a single example, the use of the equative. In the second half we find this used with *frí*, as in later Middle Irish, and in the first without, as in Old and Early Middle Irish:

**Second half:**
- métíthir ri cend meic míis, TBC-LL² 3232
  ‘as big as the head of a month-old child’
- métíthir ra fomóir ná ra fer mara, TBC-LL² 3319
  ‘as big as a fomóir or pirate’
- ba bíníthir lim ra fogor, TBC-LL² 4339
  ‘sweeter I thought than the sound’
- Síthíthir ri crúimthír meóir míled, TBC-LL² 4507
  ‘as long as a warrior’s finger’
- métíthir ra stúaig ními i n-aeór, TBC-LL² 4776
  ‘as big as a rainbow in the air’124

**First half:**
- métíthir ... óen na prímshílab, TBC-LL² 1579

---

121 On the Komöpilator see *Heldensage*, pp. 24-7.
122 The process of composing the bulk of the old text he assembled, which involved conditions and challenges particular to the time of the original author (for instance in relation to compositional matters), and a special creative energy, was approximately two centuries earlier, if we accept Thurneysen’s date for TBC I, the mid-11th century.
123 On this and on the ways in which the first and second halves differ, in orthography, morphology, and style, see Mac Gearailt, ‘The language of some late Middle Irish texts’, pp. 186-90.
124 Cf. *ba métíthir sliab* (verse), TBC-LL² 3582, *remíthir fer*, TBC-LL² 4436, which reflect older usage and an earlier stratum of textual transmission.
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‘as big as one of the greatest mountains’
métithir ... òen na prímbili, TBC-LL² 1581
‘as great as [the foliage of] one of the tall trees’
métithir muldorn miled, TBC-LL² 2269
‘as big as a warrior’s fist’
méithir melc, TBC-LL² 2271
‘as large as the skin of a three-year-old sheep’
remíthir áirmen n-óclaíg, TBC-LL² 2290
‘as thick as a hero’s whetstone’
Aírdíthir remíthir tidchithir sithíthir sithíthir seólchírand prímlu, TBC-LL² 2290
‘As high, as thick, as strong, as powerful and as long as the mast of a great ship’.

TBC-LL represents therefore the usage of different contributors, not that of a single person, as Thurneysen supposed, or someone, as O Daly suggested, who used archaisms on the one hand and unorthodox, artificial constructions on the other, reflecting dialectal usage.\(^{125}\) The use of \textit{fri} with the equative may be assigned to a later period, perhaps the mid-12\(^{\text{th}}\) century. The older equative without \textit{fri} may be taken to reflect usage at an earlier stage of transmission. Removing \textit{fri} from the equative phrases in the second half will probably bring us close to the earlier stage reflected in instances without the preposition, in the first half.

Similarly, emending non-standard verbal constructions in line with conventional usage should restore the underlying forms. For example:

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textit{barraffind} (verb \textit{do-seinn}) ‘which hunted’, TBC-LL² 4181 < \textit{doraffaind}
  \item \textit{bacóistís} (verb \textit{téit}) ‘they could have gone’ TBC-LL² 1368 < \textit{docóistís}
  \item \textit{Forréccaig} (verb \textit{do-éccai}) ‘she looked’, TBC-LL² 197 < \textit{dóóréccait}
  \item \textit{baluid} (verb \textit{téli} \textit{do-téli}) ‘he came’, TBC-LL² 540 < (\textit{do-})\textit{télaid}
  \item \textit{focera} (verb \textit{do-tuít}) ‘he fell’, TBC-LL² 1261 < \textit{docer}
  \item \textit{Forairngertsa} (verb \textit{do-airngír}) ‘I foretold’, TBC-LL² 536 < \textit{dóraíngertsa}
  \item \textit{fogníthi} (verb \textit{do-gní} ‘that was played’, TBC-LL² 834 < \textit{dógníthi}
  \item \textit{fogníd} (verb \textit{do-gní}) ‘she used to do’, TBC-LL² 582 < \textit{dógníd}\(^{127}\)
  \item \textit{fóircmangaid} (verb \textit{do-ecmaing}) ‘there met’, TBC-LL² 1767 < \textit{dóircmangaid}\(^{128}\)
  \item \textit{Forecmæng} (verb \textit{do-ecmaing}) ‘it landed’, TBC-LL² 1781 < \textit{dóercmaing}
  \item \textit{Fochurídar} (verb \textit{do-cuirethar}) ‘it landed’, TBC-LL² 1814 < \textit{docuirítheach}
  \item \textit{condeochatar} (verb \textit{do-tét}) ‘they came’, TBC-LL² 1249 < \textit{dódeochatar}
  \item \textit{conmebda} (verb \textit{maidid}) ‘had been broken’, TBC-LL² 1260\(^{129}\) < \textit{ro méindatar}
  \item \textit{concuredsom} (verb \textit{cuirid}) ‘he would throw’, TBC-LL² 841 < \textit{no chuired}\(^{130}\)
  \item \textit{congebed} (relative; verb \textit{gaibid}) ‘he would catch’, TBC-LL² 766 < \textit{no gebed}\(^{131}\)
  \item \textit{congeibed} (verb \textit{gaibid}) ‘he would catch’, TBC-LL² 835 < \textit{no gebed}
\end{itemize}

\(^{125}\) O Daly, ‘The verbal system of the LL Táin’; see, for example, p. 139.
\(^{126}\) Cf. \textit{forréccaig} (do-éccai) ‘he scanned’, TBC-LL² 4183 < \textit{dóorécaig}.
\(^{127}\) \textit{dógníd} ‘he used to do’, TBC-LL² 1839; cf. \textit{fogní ... bogní ... fogní-seom (do-gní)} ‘he makes’, TBC-LL² 3925, (cíd) \textit{amgéna} ‘what will you do’, TBC-LL² 449.
\(^{128}\) Or \textit{dóercmaing}; cf. TBC-LL² 1772.
\(^{129}\) Cf. \textit{dámhad forro conmebsad (maidid)} ‘if it were they who were overcome’, TBC-LL² 4690.
\(^{130}\) Cf. \textit{no chuired (cuíthid)}, TBC-LL² 837.
\(^{131}\) Cf. \textit{no gebed ... no geibed ... no geibed (gaibid)}, TBC-LL² 765.
congabad (verb gaibid) ‘which covered’, TBC-LL^2 2237
< no gabad
congabsa (relative; verb gaibid) ‘that I took’, TBC-LL^2 988
< ro gab-usa
congabais (relative; verb gaibid) ‘that you took’, TBC-LL^2 987
< ro gabais
congab (relative; verb gaibid) ‘that he took’, TBC-LL^2 985
< ro gab
condránic (relative; verb ro-icc) ‘went, came’, TBC-LL^2 891, 1244
< ránic\(^{132}\)
contirfe (verb fo-fera) ‘it will cause’, TBC-LL^2 3028
< fotirfe
concichre (verb fo-ceird) ‘he will cast’, TBC-LL^2 4456
< focichre\(^{133}\)
lilis (verb lenaid) ‘he followed’, TBC-LL^2 1757
< lil
dothuc (verb do-beir) ‘he gave’, TBC-LL^2 1749
< douc, tuc
Laigis (verb fo-luigi) ‘she hid’, TBC-LL^2 2369
< fo-ltaig.

Similarly, forms such as barrecaib (do-ecmaing) ‘met, happened’ and atfócht/imfacht/confóchta (iarmi-foich) ‘asked, requested’ appear to be later, while the corresponding standard old forms, dorecmaiṅ, Ro iarfacht etc., which are also found in TBC-LL, reflect an early stage of transmission, as do old forms like ro ort, -immart, memaid, -éirsed, while the corresponding late forms ra airg, ra immir, da maid, and -éirged represent a late stage:

barrecaib (verb do-ecmaing) ‘met, happened’, TBC-LL^2 3930
for dorecmaiṅ\(^{134}\)
confóchta/imfacht/atfócht (verb iarmi-foich) ‘sought, requested’\(^{135}\)
for Ro iarfacht
ra airg (verb oirgid) ‘ravaged, pillaged’, TBC-LL^2 1793
for ro ort\(^{136}\)
ra immir (verb imm-beir) ‘took advantage of’, TBC-LL^2 4878
for -immart\(^{137}\)
da maid (verb maidid) ‘fled’, TBC-LL^2 4816,
for ro memaid\(^{138}\)
(mad da n-)éirged (verb at-reig/éirgid) ‘if he rose’, TBC-LL^2 2838
for go n-éirsed\(^{139}\)
ritacaemnacair (verb do-ecmaing) ‘he was’, TBC-LL^2 3996, similarly 4301 for atacaemnacair\(^{140}\)

\(^{132}\) ránic, TBC Stowe 923, 1281.
\(^{133}\) Cf. Congeltat ... Fogeltat ‘cropped ... cropped’, TBC-LL^2 445.
\(^{135}\) Cf. TBC-LL^2 315, 1539, 4240. The verb is followed by the object scéla ‘tidings’ and the preposition de ‘of, from’, referring to the person from whom tidings are sought (atfócht/imfacht/confóchta scéla de x), or by the object fiss ‘information’ (ra iarfacht fiss 7 fástini de, TBC-LL^2 176). In such cases the appropriate literal translation would be ‘requested, sought’. More frequently there is no object and the meaning is ‘asked’, e.g. ra iarfacht Ailill do Fergus ‘Ailill asked Fergus’, TBC-LL^2 691. Compare Conscodarc Medb scéla dib (imm-comairc), TBC-LL^2 142, but conscomarc Meidb de, TBC-LL^2 76.
\(^{137}\) co ndasrimmartatar ‘they urged them on’, TBC-LL^2 1798, Ram immart ‘have hemmed me in’, TBC-LL^2 3391, condianmart ‘forced them’, TBC-LL^2 4726.
\(^{138}\) Coro maid ‘they were victorious’, TBC-LL^2 4725. Cf. goro memaid ... goro memaid ‘broke ... broke out’, TBC-LL^2 3334, 3336, ro mebtatar ‘they broke’, TBC-LL^2 1227, conmebdatar ‘had been broken’, TBC-LL^2 1260.
\(^{139}\) ‘he recovered’, TBC-LL^2 3850.
\(^{140}\) Cf. atachomnnaic (do-ecmaing) ‘I am’, TBC-LL^2 201, similarly, TBC-LL^2 203, atatchomnaic ‘you are’, TBC-LL^2 52.
Non-historical (*dia*) condrísam ‘if we meet’, TBC-LL\(^2\) 1243, conarnic ‘touched, went’ etc. (TBC-LL\(^2\) 891n., 1245n., 947,\(^{141}\) 1785n.), condrístais (TBC-LL\(^2\) 1255n.) etc. appear to be late substitutes for (*dia*) comairsem (con-ricc), co comarnic (ro-icc etc.), co rístais (ro-icc; ?co comarsitis [con-ricc]) etc., and to be due to scribal misinterpretation of the original forms or, in view of the corresponding forms in TBC Stowe, to pseudo-archaization.\(^{142}\)

Restored forms like *doraffaind*, *docoístis*, *dorécacha*, conventionally spelt old forms like *Ro iarfacht*, and old variants like *ro ort* and *memaid*, all represent a language profile similar to that of *Breslech*. They therefore point to a date of composition for the rest of TBC II in the 11\(^{th}\) century. In addition, there are many instances of old verbal constructions spelt in accordance with standard Middle Irish orthography – the dominant orthography in TBC-LL – which fit in with what we have seen in *Breslech* and which therefore also point to a date of composition in the 11\(^{th}\) century, that is preterites of compound verbs with internal *ro-, t-*preterites, reduplicated preterites, old preterite passives, *s*-subjunctives and -futures, old compound verbs:

*co tormalt* (verb *do-meil*) ‘he ate’, TBC-LL\(^2\) 527
*go toracht* (verb *do-roich*) ‘it closed over (it)’, TBC-LL\(^2\) 1074\(^{143}\)

*co n-ebailt* (verb *at-baill*) ‘died’, TBC-LL\(^2\) 1387
*ni érracht-saide* (verb *at-reig*) ‘did not rise’, TBC-LL\(^2\) 527
*doridnacht* (verb *do-indnaig*) ‘who gave it’, TBC-LL\(^2\) 2110
*In n-ébairt* (verb *as-beir*) ‘did he make known (say)?’, TBC-LL\(^2\) 1541
*ni ehairt* ‘he did not invite (say)’, TBC-LL\(^2\) 123, 124

*ro geuguin* (verb *gonaid*) ‘has wounded’, TBC-LL\(^2\) 2062
*co comarnecgatar* (verb *con-ricc*) ‘and they met’, TBC-LL\(^2\) 3710
*dorochratar* (verb *do-tuit*) ‘they fell’, TBC-LL\(^2\) 3819
*dorochair* ‘he fell’, TBC-LL\(^2\) 888

*ra gáet* (verb *gonaid*) ‘has been wounded’, TBC-LL\(^2\) 4026
*foress* (verb *fo-ceird*) ‘was pitched’, TBC-LL\(^2\) 298

*dofaíthaisiu* (verb *do-tuit*) ‘you will fall’, TBC-LL\(^2\) 3766
*dofaíth* ‘he will fall’, TBC-LL\(^2\) 1243
*gia dofaíthe-ste-su* ‘that you should fall’, TBC-LL\(^2\) 3684
*atré* (verb *at-reig*) ‘he grows’, TBC-LL\(^2\) 845
*atrésat* ‘they will increase’, TBC-LL\(^2\) 846
*nít ainset* (verb *aingid*) ‘they will not save you’, TBC-LL\(^2\) 4716
*mad dia comairsem* (verb *con-ricc*) ‘if we meet’ TBC-LL\(^2\) 2759
*co n-érsat* (verb *at-reig*) ‘until they recover’, TBC-LL\(^2\) 650
*go n-eirsed* ‘until he recovered’, TBC-LL\(^2\) 3850
*acht meni dleissed* (verb *dligid*) ‘unless he was due/ owed’, TBC-LL\(^2\) 2594
*conmessed* (verb *con-midethar*) ‘that it could equal’, TBC-LL\(^2\) 729

\(^{141}\) *co rainic*, TBC Stowe 979. On these forms see Mac Gearailt, ‘Verbal particles and preverbs’, p. 177 f.

\(^{142}\) For the TBC Stowe readings corresponding to (*dia*) condrísam etc. see the notes in TBC-LL\(^2\) on the forms referred to above.

\(^{143}\) *domrecuiscse* ‘who advised me’, TBC-LL\(^2\) 957, *dotrecoisc* ‘has advised you’, TBC-LL\(^2\) 932, *darrecoisc* ‘who advised him’, TBC-LL\(^2\) 953 appear to be back-formations based on *tecoiscid* (< *do-inchoisc*); see DIL, s.v. *tecoiscid*. 
The following features point to the early 11th century as the date of composition of TBC II: a single instance of the nasalising relative pronoun, *ní h’opair chóir dombiurt-sa fort-su* ‘it was not a labour befitting you that I imposed on you’, TBC-LL² 1236; an instance of the old genitive sg. fem. form of the article, *(céimm) inna (hechraide)* ‘the pace of the horses’, TBC-LL² 1171; the old neut. n-stem dat. sg. *(fán)* *congraimmim*(sin), TBC-LL² 3683; nasalisation following an old neuter in *leth ñgliad*, TBC-LL² 4431, *cend n-imresna*, TBC-LL² 4492, *congraimm n-écside*, TBC-LL² 3735.

One cannot attribute such features, or old verbal forms like *co comarnecgatar*, TBC-LL² 3710, to the LL scribe, as Thurneysen suggested. The poems of contemporary poets such as Gilla Mo Dutu úa Casaide, for example *Ádam oenathair na ndoene* (written in 1147), and Gilla na Náem úa Duinn (*obit. 1160*), principally *Cúiced Lagen na lecht ríg*, give no indication that such usage was known in the first half of the 12th century. It is therefore unlikely that a 12th-author would use such features. It is also unlikely that the person using them would have recourse to non-standard forms like *barrecgaib*, *atfócht*, *faítti* (= *faídid*), *ra bert*, *condnoathatar*, or late orthographical features such as *ra* for *fri*, *bar* for *for*, *ba* for *fo* etc. As already remarked, the latter features occur in very high concentrations in CRR-LL, which we have had reason to assign to the mid-12th century. Instances in TBC-LL of the same features may therefore, as noted earlier, be assigned to that period also and be seen as part of a stage in the transmission of TBC II close in date to LL and CRR-LL.

**Conclusion**

The language profile of the earliest stages of TBC II which is reflected in the older features listed above points to a date of composition for TBC II about a century before

---

146. This is very rare after *Saltair na Rann*; cf. Breatnach, ‘An Mheán-Ghaeilge’, p. 249.
147. LL 16428-17396.
148. LL 4176-4426.
CRR-LL was composed. It is noteworthy however that all instances of the preterite pass. pl. in *Breslech* have the Old/ Early Middle Irish ending -tha/-the, while all 15 in the introductory story of Medb and Ailill’s pillowtalk and the Connacht envoys’ mission to Ulster have the Middle Irish ending -it. A factor to be considered in relation to such variation is that some sections of the text are based directly on older, probably Old Irish, material and will therefore tend to be more conservative, and also to inherit older forms, while others, such as the opening section, are new Middle Irish compositions with no old forerunner.\(^{150}\) It is also possible that some of the latter episodes were composed later, for example *Comrád cind cherchaille* (‘The Pillowtalk’) and, possibly, *Comrac Fir Diad* (‘The Encounter with Fer Diad’).\(^{151}\)

Among the episodes based on an old text like TBC I are those concerning the assembling of the Connacht army, the prophecy of the *banfíle* Feidelm, and the army’s journey to Ulster, TBC-LL\(^2\) 147-441; Cú Chulainn’s tryst, his withe, and his forked pole, TBC-LL\(^2\) 441-737; his boyhood deeds (*macgnímrada*), TBC-LL\(^2\) 738-1217; the death of Etarcumal and Nath Crantail, TBC-LL\(^2\) 1565-755 etc. Comparison of parallel episodes of TBC-LL with TBC I shows that while the author of TBC II followed the older text closely his version is a completely new composition with its own independent verbal system and its own distinctive style and narrative method. The differences between his text and TBC I suggest, among other things, that one of the reasons he composed TBC II was to provide a new version of the old tale in language that his contemporaries could understand. If we follow him in sections of his work in which we can be relatively sure he had an older text before him that was similar to TBC I, we can see that he frequently encountered difficulty with his source. Old Irish verbal forms in TBC I, which are likely to have been in his source, are frequently omitted along with the sentence in which they occur. Thus it appears that he did not have a knowledge of 9\(^{\text{th}}\)-century Irish comparable to the knowledge of 11\(^{\text{th}}\)-century Irish that his 15\(^{\text{th}}\)-century moderniser had.

Thurneysen’s date for TBC II is linked to a number of assumptions that are not supported by evidence: that the late forms in TBC-LL were in the author’s text; that TBC II and the LL version of CRR are by the same author; that the LL version of CRR is the original version of that tale; that *Breslech* is an early 11\(^{\text{th}}\)-century composition and that the author of TBC II took it from TBC I; that the latter was compiled in the mid-11\(^{\text{th}}\) century. Although he does not say so, it is clear that Thurneysen also assumed that the distinctive late usage in both TBC- and CRR-LL is derived from the archetype. This was almost certainly the basis on which he concluded that both compositions were written by the same author and on which he accepted without question the evidence for this presented by his student, de Paor. The original basis for this assumption was undoubtedly Quiggin’s observation that the second half of TBC-LL and all of CRR-LL contain similar orthography and distinctive verbal forms. But if TBC-LL’s late orthography and verbal forms were in the author’s text they would also have been in the common source of TBC-LL and TBC-Stowe, and the latter provides little evidence to suggest this, although it frequently preserves readings from the common source and

\(^{150}\) On the differences between 5 sections of TBC-LL see Mac Gearailt, ‘The language of some late Middle Irish texts’.

\(^{151}\) TBC-LL\(^2\) 1-146 (including the account of the Connacht envoys’ mission to Ulster), 2606-3596.
The more conservative orthography and usage in the first half of TBC-LL, to which Quiggin drew attention, would also have to be explained. Thurneysen attributed this, as already noted, to revision carried out by the LL scribe, Aed mac Crimthainn, 30 years or more after Bearbeiter C composed the text. Here Thurneysen shows his dependence on Quiggin, for while the first half of TBC-LL is indeed more conservative than the second, it also contains many late spellings and non-historical verbal forms, for example consmocarc (imm-comairc), TBC-LL 176, conscodarc (imm-comairc), TBC-LL 142, arrecaim (do-ecmaing), TBC-LL 3, dorécaim (do-ecmaing), TBC-LL 105, atféta (ad-féir), TBC-LL 740, fogab (gaibid), TBC-LL 760, congebed (gaibid), TBC-LL 766, configfed (fichid), TBC-LL 1195, focera (do-tuit), TBC-LL 1261, (dia) condhrísam (con-ríce), TBC-LL 1243, condránic (ro-icce), TBC-LL 1244, conarnic (ro-ricce), TBC-LL 1245 etc. In view of these forms one wonders what precisely Thurneysen imagined the LL scribe did by way of standardizing his exemplar, and why he did not standardize all non-standard forms. Their frequency and the presence of numerous non-standard spellings such as for do (focera [do-tuit]) and fo for do (fogab [gaibid]), alongside numerous conventional forms and spellings, suggests that there was in fact no revision. Since both halves contain large numbers of non-standard spellings and non-historical verbal forms, the difference between them observed by Quiggin may be described as follows: the first half represents a stratum of transmission in which earlier non-standard spellings such as for do were found alongside standard old spellings (do-, for etc.), the second half represents a later, probably mid-12th-century, stratum in which later spellings such as bo-/ba-, for do-, and bar(r), for do-r-, are predominant, in which the earlier non-standard spelling fo-/fo etc. is rare, and in which conventional old spellings from an earlier stratum are much less frequent.

Thurneysen’s belief in the common authorship of TBC II and CRR-LL led him to ignore the approach which we may presume he adopted in dating Breslech Maige Murthmeine, that is to identify the older linguistic features as a guide to the date of composition. Instead he assumed that the text could be dated exclusively on the basis of Mißformen in a late text, TBC-LL. If he had dated Breslech on the same basis, that is on the basis of its late non-standard forms (congáirtis, inthescad, fogníth etc.), he would have had to assign it too to the first quarter or third of the 12th century. Taking account of the older linguistic features in the rest of TBC-LL, one sees that a date closer to that for the latter episode is not unreasonable.

TBC II was the version of the Táin with which most scribes and scholars engaged actively from its earliest stages. The non-standard orthography and unorthodox verbal constructions in TBC-LL probably reflect the distinctive usage of a particular 12th-

152 Cf. the following, all in the first half: Forrécacha (do-éccai), TBC-LL 197, Forairngertsa (do-áirngír), TBC-LL 536, fogníthi (do-gní), TBC-LL 834, fogníd (do-gní), TBC-LL 582, forecmaingaid (do-ecmaing), TBC-LL 1767, Forecmaing (do-ecmaing), TBC-LL 1781, Fochuridar (do-cuirethar), TBC-LL 1814.

153 Barróisc, LL 10006, 10015, barroega, LL 10578, barranrigerta, LL 10319, bheadhertaid LL 10556, bheadhird, LL 10709, bacear, LL 10898, barasfynad, LL 11085; similarly badesin ‘(him-/her-)self’, passim, badesa ‘now’, passim (for fadessin, fodessin, fodechtsa, fodeda [first half]).
century school or milieu, in which the tale was copied and modernised. It probably
represents the influence of pronunciation, as Quiggin assumed, possibly as a result of the
practice of reading aloud, by one scribe to another as they shared the task of copying.
Alongside this usage one finds remnants of the language of earlier scribes and scholars,
including the author, to whom, for example, one might attribute the oldest features. The
latter may point to ca. 1050 as the date of composition, but features such as the
nasalizing relative clause may point to an earlier date, around 1000, and the existence of
an earlier textual stratum of TBC II which was developed stylistically at later stages in
transmission.

For almost a century Thurneysen’s date for TBC II has been accepted without question
and has been used as a guide in dating other Middle Irish texts, even though he based it
on assumptions for which he cited not a single form as supporting evidence. The mixed
nature of the language of the extant texts makes TBC II one of the most difficult to date
precisely, and many questions remain before it can be dated with certainty, for instance
regarding the non-historical forms found throughout the LL text and the kind of text in
circulation a century before the latter was written. Belief in a date which was not
supported by evidence has been a hindrance rather than a help and has contributed in no
small measure to the view that Middle Irish texts are almost impossible to date.
Questioning that date may stimulate renewed interest in dating Middle Irish texts.
Further research, for example on the work of 11th- and 12th-century poets whose floruits
are known, may increase our understanding of how the literary language evolved in
those centuries, and bring us closer to a satisfactory relative chronology of Middle Irish
literature.
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