

THE HEIR-APPARENT IN IRISH AND WELSH LAW

IN a note on the name *Ghluieu Eil Taran* in *Branwen* Sir Ifor Williams assembled a number of examples which showed that the ordinal *eil* 'second' was used to mean 'son' or 'heir'.¹ Professor Binchy followed this up by showing that this use of *eil* could be compared with that of Irish *tánaise* which was used to mean both 'second' and 'heir-apparent'.² The etymology of *eil*—it is cognate with Latin *alius*—shows that the meanings, 'other', 'second' are the earlier ones and that the meanings 'son', 'heir' are a secondary development. It has recently been shown by Professor Greene that the opposite is true of *tánaise*. It is to be analysed as the past participle of *to-ad-ni-sed-*, and is to be translated as 'the awaited one', 'the expected one'. In this case the meaning 'second' is a development from the meaning 'heir-apparent'. This poses a problem of semantic history: why did the meanings of *tánaise* and *eil* change in opposite directions so that the secondary meaning of *tánaise* is the same as the primary meaning of *eil* and the secondary meaning of *eil* almost the same as the primary meaning of *tánaise*? Is there a connection between the two changes?

In the law tract *Crith Gablach* the term for the royal heir-apparent, *tánaise rí*, is explained by the sentence, 'because the whole tribe looks forward to his kingship without opposition to him'.³ The Irish verb for 'looks forward' is *fris-aicci*, a compound of *ad-ci* 'he sees'. *Ad-ci* forms its perfect from a different root **derk-*. In the Welsh lawbooks there are three terms for the royal heir-apparent, *edling* (< O.E. *æðeling*), *gwrthrych* and *gwrthrychiad*. The last two words are compounds of *drych*, a reflex of **derk-*,⁴ with *gwrth-* cognate with Irish *frith-*, pretonic *fris-*. The term for the heir-apparent, *tánaise rí*, is, therefore, explained by a verb which is closely related to two Welsh terms for the same person. Furthermore, all the corresponding explanations of personal titles in *Crith Gablach* are etymological. The jurist tries to explain not only the meaning of the term but also its linguistic formation. For these reasons, Professor Binchy suggests that Irish originally had another term for the heir-apparent, besides *tánaise rí*, corresponding to *fris-aicci* and the two Welsh words.⁵

¹ *Pedair Keinc y Mabnogi*, ed. Sir Ifor Williams (Cardiff, 1930) p. 213.

² D. A. Binchy, 'Some Celtic Legal Terms', *Celtica* III (1956) pp. 221 f.

³ D. Greene, 'Some Linguistic Evidence relating to the British Church' in *Christianity in Britain* 300-700 ed. Barley and Hanson (Leicester, 1968) p. 83. In the same way, Latin *secundus* ('*sequor*') did not originally mean 'second'.

⁴ *Crith Gablach*, ed. D. A. Binchy (Dublin, 1941) p. 17 ll. 434-5.

⁵ H. Lewis and H. Pedersen, *A Concise Comparative Celtic Grammar* (Göttingen, 1961) p. 4.

⁶ 'Some Celtic Legal Terms', p. 222.

Even if this suggestion is not correct, Irish and Welsh law contain two metaphors for the heir-apparent, one which may be called the 'looking' metaphor (**derk-*) and the other the 'sitting' metaphor (**sed-*). The looking metaphor is used both in Irish and in Welsh law but the sitting metaphor has only been found in Irish law. The words reflecting these two metaphors are *gwrthrych* 'the looked for one', 'the expected one', *gwrthrychiad* 'the one who looks forward to [the kingship]' and *fris-aicci* 'looks forward' on the one hand, and *tánaise* 'the awaited one' on the other.

The two metaphors for the position of the heir-apparent—that the people sit awaiting his kingship and that they look to or expect his kingship—reflect the same way of thinking about royal succession. These ideas, preserved in Irish and Welsh law, must be of Common Celtic date.

Professor Greene's solution for the problem posed by *tánaise* and *eil* is that *eil* acquired the meaning 'heir' as a borrowing from Irish. Welshmen came to be familiar with the use of the ordinal 'second' for the heir through contact with Ireland. The channel for the borrowing was the common Irish-Welsh ecclesiastical culture of the fifth and sixth centuries. The connection of the two ideas passed from Irish into the Latin used by both Irish and Welsh churchmen and so into Welsh. The Latin stage is reflected by Asser's statement that Alfred was the *secundarius* of his brother the king,⁷ and also by Irish and Welsh words for the prior, *secundap* and *segyrnab*, from Latin *secundus abbas*. These forms, *secundap* and *segyrnab*, are used by Professor Greene to support his thesis that it was from the Irish that the Welsh got the idea of using a word meaning 'second' for the heir. He gives two arguments. First, the Welsh word for the abbot, *abad*, comes from the Latin accusative *abbatem*, whereas the Irish *ap* comes from the nominative *abbas*. The Irish *secundap* and the Welsh *segyrnab* both correspond, therefore, to the Irish *ap* < *abbas* and not to the Welsh *abad* < *abbatem*. The implication is that this term for the prior was created by Irish churchmen, borrowed into Irish, and then borrowed by the Welsh. If true, this provides reasonable, though not conclusive, evidence for saying that the identity of the word for 'second' with the word for 'heir' was, in origin, a purely Irish development. Secondly, he argues that the terminology has a firm basis in Irish but not in Welsh institutions.

This explanation is attractive but not free from objections. First, Welsh sometimes borrowed from both the nominative and accusative of the same Latin word: *trined* < *trinitas*, *trindod* < *trinitatem*; *uned* < *unitas*, *undod* < *unitatem*; *ciudad* < *civitas*, *ciudod* < *civitatem*. There is, therefore, no obvious objection to supposing two Welsh borrowings from

⁷ Asser's *Life of Alfred*, ed. W. H. Stevenson (Oxford 1904) pp. 24, 29.

Latin, (*segynn-ia*) < *abbas* and *abad* < *abatem*. Secondly, in Irish *tánaise* 'deputy' is used in contrast to *toisech* 'leader'. The Welsh cognate of *toisech*, *tywysog*, is used both for the secular ruler and for the abbot.⁸ Since *tywysog* 'abbot' is not a borrowing from Irish this weakens the case for saying that its correlative term *segynnab*, 'prior', is a borrowing from Irish. Similarly, Welsh *prif* and Irish *prím*, from Latin *prímus*, are used with the meaning 'chief', 'main', and, therefore, correspond to the use of *secundus* for the deputy. There is, however, no reason for saying that *prif* in this sense was borrowed from Irish *prím*. Thirdly, *eil*, in the sense of 'son' or 'heir', is used in texts which one would not expect to show signs of Irish influence through ecclesiastical channels, in early Welsh poetry and also in one place in the oldest Welsh lawbook, 'Redaction A'. This is worth quoting for it has not hitherto been noticed, and the apparent absence of *eil* 'son', 'heir' from the lawbooks was a fact which could have been used to argue that it was not a native Welsh use of the term.⁹ *Eil* appears in a Latin disguise as *aluis* in the opening passage of a section describing old ritual procedures by which the eldest son claimed his father's land for himself and his brothers:

Si pater alicuius habuerit domum aut horreum aut siccarium aut *dynkat* aut *odryn* cum aratione in aliqua terra, vel si alius habuerit supradicta, et *dadanhat* postularerit, de iure debet mitti in possessionem paternam, id est, *dadanhat*, de his que patris sui prius exstiterant . . .¹⁰

If someone's father should have had a house or a barn or a *klm* or a *dynkat* or an *odryn* together with arable in a piece of land, or if *aluis* should have had the above-mentioned things, and should have claimed *dadanhat*, he should by right be put into hereditary possession, i.e. *dadanhat*, of those things which had previously belonged to his father.

The *aluis* is the person who is entitled to his father's property when his father dies, whether or not his father had previously handed over his property to him. The use of the word *aluis* for the son is only intelligible if it is remembered that *eil* can mean 'son', 'heir'. Just like *gwerthrych*, therefore, *eil* 'son', 'heir', survives vestigially in the Welsh lawbooks.

⁸ e.g. *Brut y Tywysogion*, *Pentworth Ms.* 20, ed. T. Jones (Cardiff, 1941) p. 5 'y bu waw Jonathal dywysawre abergeleu'. Compare *Annales Cambriae* ed. E. Phillimore, *Y Cymrodor* IX (1888), p. 166, 'Jonathau princeps abergelei mortuor'. Jonathan was abbot of the old *clas* of Abergele.

⁹ This idea may be behind Professor Greeno's argument that the explanation of *segynnab* is to be found in institutions and terminology which are purely Irish', *op. cit.* p. 83. In *The Latin Texts of the Welsh Laws*, ed. H. D. Emanuel (Cardiff, 1967) p. 130. *Dynkat* is probably formed from the *dyn* in *tyddyn*, *eiasyddyn* etc. (: *Ir. ánd*). Since *odryn* = *secrarium*, *dynkat* may = *domus*. *Dynkat* also occurs in the triad 'Fia sunt que memoriam servant', *Latin Texts of the Welsh Laws*, p. 128, and of p. 375 and *Llyfr Bleggyrd*, ed. Williams and Powell (Cardiff, 2nd ed. 1961), p. 118. The reason for the repetition involved in the inclusion of both *siccarium* and *odryn* in the list may be that Redaction A is a translation of a Welsh text and has retained the Welsh term alongside its Latin translation.

This makes it less likely that this meaning of *eil* and the corresponding meanings of *secundarius* and *segynnab* were borrowed from Irish.

The problem, therefore, remains: as well as one of the two metaphors, Welsh law uses the ordinal *eil* for the heir-apparent. At first sight, this usage cannot be explained in the same way as that of *tánaise* which developed the meaning 'second' from that of 'heir-apparent'. The contrast between the king, *rí*, and the heir-apparent, *tánaise rí*, was extended to a contrast between the leader, *toisech*, and the second-in-command, *tánaise*. In this way, *tánaise* acquired the meaning 'second'. The image with which this development started was that of the tribe sitting awaiting the heir-apparent's kingship. The problem would disappear, therefore, if this image could be shown to have existed in Welsh law and if the word *eil* was used in the context of the image. The difference between Irish and Welsh would then be that Irish developed a new word for 'second' from this image, whereas Welsh simply used the old ordinal. Evidence for the existence of this image would also show that Welsh law originally possessed both of the two metaphors for the heir-apparent, not only the 'looking' metaphor but also the 'sitting' metaphor.

There is just such evidence, but, unfortunately, it is not clear and indisputable. The Welsh laws contain rules for the seating arrangements of the court. These arrangements were probably for important ceremonial occasions and reflect the function and dignity of each permanent member of the court. The main officials are called in *Llyfr Iorwerth* the 'petwar cadeyrnau ar dec esyd yn llys', 'the fourteen seated members of the court'.¹¹ The lawyers were particularly concerned to define the relative dignity, privileges and functions of these men. One of the ways in which this was done was the ceremonial seating arrangement. As well as defining the positions of the officials, the seating arrangement also defined those of the king and the heir-apparent, the *gwerthrych* or *edling*. Here, if anywhere, therefore, one would expect to find traces of the 'sitting' image used together with the word *eil* 'second'.

The traces exist in the rules for the seating of the *barld teulu* 'poet of the warband' and the *meddyg llys* 'court doctor'; as they are given in the law-book usually called *Llyfr Cyfnerth*; but these traces can only be seen for what they are if the corresponding rules in two other law-books, the Latin Redaction D and *Llyfr Bleggyrd* are also examined. In *Llyfr Cyfnerth* the position of poet of the warband is given as follows:

'Eil nesaif yd eistedd y'r penteulu.' This might be translated, 'He sits second nearest to the leader of the warband.'¹²

¹¹ *Llyfr Iorwerth*, ed. A. Wiliam (Cardiff, 1960) p. 3, § 5, 1.

¹² *Welsh Medieval Law*, ed. A. W. Wade-Evans (Oxford, 1909) p. 22, ll. 24-5.

But in Redaction D and *Llyfr Bleggyryd* the rule is:

'Iuxta *penteu* sedebit proximior.'¹³ 'Yn nessaf y'r *penteu* y dyly eisted',¹⁴ 'He ought to sit next to the leader of the warband.'

This might be treated as a simple disagreement but for three things. First, *Llyfr Cyfnerth* does not mention anyone else who should sit next to the *penteu*. Second, on general grounds the version of Redaction D and *Llyfr Bleggyryd* is certainly the correct one. Third, exactly the same discrepancy occurs in the rules for the court doctor. According to *Llyfr Cyfnerth*, he sits '*eil nessaf*' 'second nearest', to the *penteu*, according to Redaction D, *proximior*, according to *Llyfr Bleggyryd*, *nessaf*, 'nearest'.¹⁵ Two of these three lawbooks, therefore, have the leader of the warband sitting with the poet of the warband and the court doctor on either side of him, but the third leaves two unfilled places on either side of him and only then the poet and the doctor.

Before I suggest a solution it should be pointed out that Redaction D is not here dependent on either of the two earlier complete Latin lawbooks, Redactions A and B. The chances, therefore, are that both Redaction D and *Llyfr Cyfnerth* depend ultimately on a common source in Welsh, which may be called 'a', and that *Llyfr Bleggyryd* is, as usual, a translation of Redaction D. The existence of 'a' and the fact that it was written in Welsh can, I believe, be shown from an analysis of the sections on dividing the patrimony and on *dadannudd*. The evidence of these three law-books must, therefore, be examined on its own. The problem is self-contained and consists essentially of two questions: what version of the rule did 'a' give? And how did Redaction D and *Llyfr Cyfnerth* come to diverge? I shall first give my answer to these two questions and then, to support and clarify my answer, a similar case of textual change.

The original version of the rule was, I suggest, in essence as follows:

'Eil yd eisted y'r *penteu*', 'He sits second [in respect of dignity] to the leader of the warband.'

In 'a' *eil* was glossed by *nessaf* 'nearest'. This was an accurate gloss, since *nessaf* is used in rules about kinship and could, therefore, be used together with *eil* 'son, heir'. In this usage *nessaf* means 'closest kinsman', and the son or heir would be correctly described as *nessaf*.¹⁶

¹³ *The Latin Texts of the Welsh Laws*, p. 329, l. 4.

¹⁴ *Llyfr Bleggyryd*, ed. S. J. Williams and J. Enoch Powell (2nd ed. Cardiff, 1961) p. 23, ll. 4-5.

¹⁵ *Welsh Medieval Law*, p. 24, l. 26; *The Latin Texts of the Welsh Laws*, p. 331, ll. 10-11; *Llyfr Bleggyryd*, p. 26, l. 12.

¹⁶ e.g. *Llyfr Bleggyryd*, p. 75, l. 14.

This is the version of the rule preserved in *Llyfr Cyfnerth* but with the gloss inserted into the text:

'Eil nessaf yd eisted y'r *penteu*'. 'He sits second (nearest) to the leader of the warband.'

The version preserved in Redaction D and *Llyfr Bleggyryd* was reached by omitting *eil*, keeping the gloss, *nessaf*, in its stead, and also by slight changes in the wording:

'Iuxta *penteu* sedebit proximior.' 'Yn nessaf y'r *penteu* y dyly eisted.' 'He should sit nearest to the leader of the warband.'

The two essential changes in this development are the inserting of a gloss and the omission of the original term leaving the gloss standing by itself. A similar development occurs in the text of the story of *Culhwch and Olwen*.¹⁷ The two versions belong to the *White Book of Rhodderch* and the *Red Book of Hergest*, the *White Book* being the earlier MS. of the two. In the *White Book* Arthur, welcoming Culhwch to his court, says that there will be 'breint edling arnat gwrthrychiad teyrnas', 'the dignity of the edling for you, the one who expects the kingdom'.¹⁸ In the *Red Book* this has become 'breint teyrn arnat gwrthrychiat teyrnas', 'the dignity of a ruler for you, the one who expects the kingdom'.¹⁹ The *White Book* does not preserve the original version. *Edling* (< O.E. *ædelling*) is a more recent term than *gwrthrychiad* which purports to explain it. *Gwrthrych* and *gwrthrychiad* were already archaic survivals by the time the earliest Welsh law-books were composed, one to two centuries before the date of the *White Book*. *Edling* is the current term in the law-books. This being so, it is unlikely that the *White Book* has the original reading. In the *White Book* text *gwrthrychiad teyrnas* serves as an explanation of *edling*. Though they are equivalent terms, *gwrthrychiad* can never have explained the meaning of *edling*, for it had itself become a word which needed to be explained before the time of the earliest Welsh lawbooks, and, therefore, long before *edling* needed to be explained. *Llyfr Iorwerth* (§ 4) for example, explains *gwrthrych* by *edling* and not the other way round: 'gwrthrych, i.e. edlyg, yr hwn a dely guledychu guedy y brenhyn', 'the *gwrthrych*, i.e. the *edling*, the one who is entitled to rule after the king.' When, therefore, we find a manuscript version which seems to explain *edling* by *gwrthrychiad*, we may be sure that we do not have the original text. In the case of the *Red Book*, *teyrn* and *gwrthrychiad* are not even equivalent terms, so it is even clearer that something has been changed.

¹⁷ The legal and historical interest of this development was pointed out to me by Professor I. Ll. Foster.

¹⁸ *White Book Mabnigion*, ed. J. Gwenogvryn Evans (Pwllheli, 1907) col. 459.

¹⁹ *Red Book of Hergest*, ed. J. Rhys & J. Gwenogvryn Evans (Oxford, 1887) p. 105.

The changes, which were probably responsible for the texts as we have them in the *White* and *Red Books*, were similar and parallel. First, the *White Book*. The original version was 'breint gwrthrychiad teyrnas arnat.' When *gwrthrychiad* went out of use it was glossed by *edling*, the new term for the heir-apparent borrowed from England. Next, the gloss was inserted into the text displacing *gwrthrychiad teyrnas*, which was then in the position appropriate to an explanation or gloss on *edling*. We therefore have three stages in the evolution of this text: the original version, 'breint gwrthrychiad teyrnas arnat'; the original version glossed, either interlineally or in the margin, 'breint gwrthrychiad teyrnas (i. edling) arnat'; and finally, the *White Book* version in which the gloss has displaced the phrase glossed, 'breint edling arnat gwrthrychiad teyrnas.' The *Red Book* version was also produced by means of a gloss which was then copied into the text, but in this case the glossator knew less law than his counterpart who helped to produce the *White Book* version. The original text, 'breint gwrthrychiad teyrnas arnat', was glossed by the word *teyrn* 'a prince', 'breint gwrthrychiad teyrnas (i. teyrn) arnat.' *Teyrn* then displaced *gwrthrychiad teyrnas* to give the *Red Book* version, 'breint teyrn arnat gwrthrychiad teyrnas.' Since *edling* is still used by the *cywydd* poets it is unlikely that the *Red Book* scribe was copying from the *White Book* and replaced *edling* by *teyrn*. The two manuscripts appear to be independent and to contain texts which have diverged from the original by the same process, but with the aid of different glosses.

If this argument is correct, the position established so far is this: the word *eil* 'second' had a special use by which it expressed subordination in respect of dignity and function among the chief men of the king's court, and it did so in connection with the ceremonial seating of the king's court which was itself an expression of a hierarchy of dignity and function. The clear example, which the examination of these brief rules has uncovered, is that of the chief of the warband and the poet of the warband, the *pentulu* and the *bardd teulu*. The *bardd teulu* is linked to the *pentulu* in function and subordinated to him in dignity by the rule that he should 'sit second' to him in court.

We may now turn to the heir-apparent. Apart from the word *edling*, of English origin, he had two titles, *gwrthrych* and *gwrthrychiad*, 'the expected' and 'the expector'. He also had a particular seat in the king's court. This is given in the four earlier Latin lawbooks, Redactions A, B, C and D, by *Llyfr Cyfnerth* and *Llyfr Blegnyrd*,²⁰ in other words by

²⁰ *The Latin Texts of the Welsh Laws*, pp. 110, 104, 277, 318; *Llyfr Blegnyrd*, p. 4, ll. 21-2; *Welsh Medieval Law*, p. 4, ll. 6-7.

the unanimous testimony of all the early south Welsh lawbooks. A different account is given by *Llyfr Iorwerth* but none of the other early lawbooks support it.²¹ According to these six lawbooks, the heir-apparent sat on the opposite side of the fire to the king. That this had any particular meaning is not obvious. It only emerges if the example of *eil* under the guise of *ains* is recalled. This was in the *dadanudd* section of the earliest Welsh lawbook, Redaction A. The context is the right of the eldest son to be put in possession of his father's property when his father dies. This property he held for a short period. It was then shared among his brothers including himself. The word *dadanudd* means 'to re-uncover' and refers to a symbolic act performed by the eldest son as a proclamation of his hereditary right to his father's property. This was the uncovering of the fire burning on his father's hearth. The fire burning on the hearth was, as in Roman custom, a symbol of family continuity. The son who uncovered the fire, the eldest son, and he alone, is called the *ains*, the *eil*. It is not difficult now to see what was meant by the rule that the heir-apparent sat on the other side of the fire to the king. The fire symbolized the kingship, which was originally hereditary within the same four generation agnatic kindred as any ordinary patrimony.²² Like the eldest son, the heir-apparent was the *eil*, 'second', to the king; as for the father and the eldest son, the fire was the symbol linking king and heir; like the *bardd teulu*'s, the heir-apparent's subordination was expressed by the position of his seat in the court.

How old is the seating symbolism? It is contained in the first section of the lawbooks, the Laws of Court. There is nothing corresponding to this section among the Irish law-tracts and it reflects a more developed royal administration than existed among the Celts. It has been compared to the Anglo-Norman *Constitutio Domus Regis* and Hincmar's *De Ordine Palatii*.²³ It may well be no older than the latter.²⁴ On the other hand, it incorporates many earlier legal ideas. A clear example is the idea of the *nauid* of a particular man, his capacity to grant legal immunity to another man for a specified period or distance, a capacity varying according to rank. This is exactly the Irish *suáid*, and the two words are cognate.²⁵ The idea, therefore, goes back to the Common Celtic period. The symbolism of the fire is another old idea. It is found in the Irish tract on the proce-

²¹ *Llyfr Iorwerth*, p. 2, § 4, l. 4.

²² 'Some Celtic Legal Terms', pp. 226-7.

²³ *The Latin Texts of the Welsh Laws*, p. 32, and Sir Gwynn Edwards' Presidential Address to the Royal Historical Society, *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 5th series, XIII, 163-76.

²⁴ Cf. D. A. Binchy, 'The Linguistic and Historical Value of the Irish Law Tracts' from the *Proc. British Academy* XXIX pp. 23-4.

²⁵ *Cyfr Ghablach*, p. 106.

due for laying claim by hereditary right to an estate. To express his hereditary right, the heir, among other things, kindles a fire in the house on the estate which he is claiming.³⁶ The rule for the position of the heir-apparent's seat, however, combines both the seating symbolism and the fire symbolism. Since the fire symbolism is Common Celtic and the seating symbolism is combined with it in one complex symbol, the seating symbolism may also be Common Celtic. But much the strongest reason for regarding it as Common Celtic is the history of the Irish word *tánaise*. This is not just because it contains the sitting metaphor, but because the hypothesis that the Irish heir-apparent like his Welsh cousin was made to sit in a place which symbolized his relationship to the kingship (the fire) and the king explains why *tánaise* could come to mean 'second in respect of dignity and function'.

The reason for this can be seen if we examine the two terms *gwthrtrych* and *gwthrtrychiad*. Both contain the 'looking' metaphor but the people doing the looking are different. *Gwthrtrych* corresponds to the explanation of *tánaise rí* in *Críth Gablach*, 'because the whole tribe looks forward to his kingship without opposition to him'. It also corresponds to the primary meaning of *tánaise* which is the past participle of *to-ad-ni-sed*, 'the awaited one'. *Gwthrtrychiad*, however, contains the agent suffix, *-iad*. Whereas the *gwthrtrych* is looked at, the *gwthrtrychiad* does the looking himself. There is a passive and an active form of the looking metaphor. In contrast to the explanation of *tánaise rí* in *Críth Gablach*, there is the explanation of *edling* in Redaction B, 'qui in disumbendo collocatur in loco ex quo dignitas regia expectatur', 'who when resting is put in the place from which the royal dignity is expected'.³⁷ This explanation combines the looking metaphor in its active form with the seating symbolism: from his seat the *edling* expects the *regia dignitas* represented by the fire. This could also be expressed by saying that the heir-apparent 'sits second' to the fire. He is the royal *eil*, the *secundarius*. For *tánaise* to come to mean 'second in respect of dignity', in other words for it to become a synonym of *eil*, the sitting metaphor also had to acquire an active form alongside the original passive one. As the 'second' to the *toísech*, the leader, the *tánaise*'s relationship is to his leader and not to the tribe as a whole. He now corresponds to the *gwthrtrychiad* rather than to the *gwthrtrych*. He expects the kingship himself, whereas originally the tribe expected his kingship. The changes from *gwthrtrych* to *gwthrtrychiad* and from *tánaise* 'the awaited one' to *tánaise* 'second', are parallel.

³⁶ *Ancient Laws of Ireland*, Vol. IV, ed. Richey & O'Mahony (Dublin & London, 1879) p. 20.

³⁷ *The Latin Texts of the Welsh Laws*, p. 207.

A similar development of meaning can be seen in the case of Welsh *eil*. *Eil* and Irish *aile* are from Celtic **alios*, cognate with Latin *alius*. They belong to a group of IE. demonstratives characterized by the phoneme *l*, which were used to refer to distant objects, for example, Latin *ultra* as opposed to *citra*. In Latin there is a further distinction between the demonstrative pronoun which refers to another when speaking of only two, *alter*, and the one which refers to another when speaking of more than two, *alius*. The same distinction in a slightly different form occurs in Gothic between *anþar* and *aljis*. From this one would have expected *aile* and *eil* to refer to another when speaking of more than two, since they have the same suffix *-jo-* as *alius*. This is not, however, the case, and assuming, as is probable, that the Latin situation is the one which reflects the Indo-European use of these suffixes *-jo-* and *-tero-*, then it follows that *aile* and *eil* came to mean 'another'; 'the other' in the senses both of *alius* and *alter*. This made possible the further development of *aile* and *eil* to mean 'second'.

When *eil* is used for the heir, it corresponds to *alter* and not to *alius*. In the *dadanudd* section of Redaction A it is used of the eldest son only and not of the other sons. When it is used of someone 'sitting second' to his superior, it is also a relationship between two people. It corresponds to *tánaise* when the latter means second-in-command to the *toísech*. This does not necessarily mean, however, that the meaning 'heir' is a late one for *eil*. The meaning 'heir' could have developed from the meaning 'other (speaking of more than two)'. When *tánaise* meant 'the awaited one' the relationship was not between the present king and his heir, two persons, but between the whole tribe, the heir-apparent and his future kingship. More than two elements were involved. The **alios* would then be the person 'over there' both in relationship to the people expecting his kingship and that kingship itself.

Granted that the seating symbolism preserved in the Welsh Laws is Celtic in origin, then the use of the word *eil* which is an integral part of it must also be Celtic: **alios* (> *eil*) must have been used to mean 'second in respect of dignity and function'. It has also been shown that the

	Heir-apparent in Celtic	Heir-apparent in Irish Law	Heir-apparent in Welsh Law
Looking metaphor	*derk-	fris-aicoi	gwthrtrych, gwthrtrychiad (*derk-)
Sitting metaphor	*kweis- *sed-	(*kweis-) tánaise, (*sed-)	---
Seating symbolism	*alios	(= 'the awaited one')	eil (gwthrtrychiad)
Fire symbolism	*alios	tánaise (= 'the second')	---

looking metaphor and the sitting metaphor are both Common Celtic as well as the fire symbolism. A whole conglomeration of ideas and images has left traces both in Irish and Welsh Law which are sufficient to enable them to be reconstructed. In Irish *tánaise* for the most part supplanted *áile* (< **altios*) in the meaning 'second', but in Welsh *eifl* remained and there was no specific title for the heir-apparent from the root **sed-* like *tánaise*. A diagram (on p. 189) will best show the position.

T. M. CHARLES-EDWARDS.

IRISH *PÚIRÍN* 'HEN-HOUSE'

Reading the Introduction to the *Corpus Poeticum Boreale* pp. lviii-lix, I came across the Old Norse word *búr* 'womens' room' which in Icelandic merely means the pantry or storehouse', and I recalled *púirín* 'hen-house' in the Irish of Inishmaan and Carna. The word puzzled me when I first heard it, but it is cognate with English 'byre.' The simple noun *púir* is attested only in Conn. Y 1063, where it may mean 'store-house' or 'privy', and should have a separate lemma in the Contributions. Matstrander gives this among other examples of Irish *p* < ON *b*, *Bidrag* 96.

It is not clear to me whether there is any connection with *púir deataighe* 'a stream of smoke' and *púirín* 'a flue conducting heated air under a . . . kiln', both given by Dinneen.

MYLES DILLON.

IONMHAIN AN TRIÚR THEID SAN LUING

AN tAthair Dómhnaill (mac Taidhg an Gharáin) Ó Súilleabháin is known as the author of a poem to Piaras Feiritéir which Rev. Fr. P. Dinneen published in *Dánta Piarais Feiritéir*, pp. 40-1. Five other poems are ascribed to him in *RIA Cat. Ir. MSS.*, General Index, p. 1196. Three of these, however, are apparently nineteenth-century compositions and may be by the author of *Seanc-leanmhain Chríosa*, a translation of à Kempis's *De Imitatione Christi*. Of the remaining two poems one, beginning *Créad as nach caoinfeann Éoghán*, consists of twenty stanzas (of which thirteen are in *deibhídhe* metre and seven in *caoineadh*) on a certain Éoghán Ó Súilleabháin of Beare and Bantry and his wife Eibhlinín. There seems no reason to doubt the manuscript ascription (23 G 20, p. 162): 'An Sagart .i. Dómhnaill Ó Súilleabháin ó nGarán cct.'

The second poem, which is printed here, is found in three manuscripts in the Royal Irish Academy and one in St. Patrick's College, Maynooth. These are:

- (1) 23 N 12, pp. 1-2 (N), written by Mícheál (mac Peadair) Ó Longáin about 1763,
- (2) F vi 2, pp. 568-70 (F), written by Mícheál Óg Ó Longáin in 1813,
- (3) F iv 4, pp. 123-9 (P), written by Pól Ó Longáin in 1820,
- (4) Mayn. Murphy 2, pp. 280-1 (M), written by Mícheál Óg Ó Longáin in 1818.

In the oldest manuscript the poem is ascribed to 'An sagart suaire .i. Dómhnaill mac Taidhg an Gharáin'. Mícheál Óg Ó Longáin gave the poet's surname in M: 'An sagart suaire .i. Dómhnaill Ó Súilleabháin'; but his heading in F is 'An sagart .i. Dómhnaill mac Taidhg an Gharáin do thriúr combsgoláirtheadha dho do bhí agdul don Fhrainc'. The ascription in P is to 'Taidhg an Gharáin'.

From the poem it appears that the three travellers, whose names are given as Conn Ó Dómhnaill, Dálach Ó Dálaigh and Uilliam Ó Críodáin, were clerics, and furthermore, despite the heading in F, it seems that they were setting out on the homeward journey to Ireland. Since the author of the poem was a contemporary of Piaras Feiritéir, who was hanged about 1653, it is likely that the trio about whom he wrote were returning to minister in their native country after studying in some European seminary in the first half of the seventeenth century. As is shown below it is possible that at least two of them had studied in Lisbon.

Among the documents in the archives of the Sacred Congregation de Propaganda Fide in Rome there is a letter concerning alumni of the Irish