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In the spoken language of to-day the idiom is a common one, especially in the noun tabhairt suas ( $=$ ' education'). Tugaim suas in this sense, it not directly modelled upon the English expression to bring up, must at least have been influenced by it. ${ }^{1}$

For kindred idioms in which suas appears one may compare the use of congbhalm suas, $=$ ' I support, sustain (life, or a burden)': e.g. chum a chongmhála suas, ' para su vida,' Desiderius, p. 55 ; congbhaid na smabinidhsi a spiorad súas, Sermons, 1711, p. 30, and similarly ibid., pp. 20, 24, 28, 149, etc.; Dowley's Catechism, p. 154 (quoted supra) ; Donlevy, pp. 144, 416. Compare also the use of suas $=$ 'alive, living,' common in the spoken language, e.g. an bhean ba bhreághtha a bhi suas le n-a linn; ni theacuig éinne atá suas a leithéid; cf. also táid na fallá suas fós (' are yet standing'), is geárr go mbeidh an tig suas (= curtha suas, 'erected').

In Scotland tighinn bed is used in a sense very similar to that of the Irish teacht $i$ dtir. Cf. famhair a bha a' tighinn bè air tuirc nimhe agus air feòil dhaoine, Tigh a' Bhlàir-Bhuidhe, p. 8; co air a tha e tighinn bed? 'What is he feeding on ? What can be his means of subsistence ?' MacLennan's Reader, p. 56.
T. F. O'RAHILLY.

## REVIEW.

Seanmóirí Muighe Nuadhad, an ceathramhadh imleabhar, i. Seacht Seanmór Deag do cumadh le Séamus Ua Gallchobhair Easbog Ráthabhoth. Ar n-a chur in eagar le Pól Breathnach, sagart. Muintir Ghoill, 1911.

Bishop Gallagher's ' Irish Sermons ' share with the later 'Pious Miscellany ' of Tadhg Gaedhlach the distinction of being the most popular and widelyread Irish book ever issued from the press. But though twenty or more editions of the 'Sermons' had appeared, they had all been for many years out of print; and students and readers will accordingly welcome the new edition which has been prepared by Father Paul Walsh, and is issued as the fourth volume of the 'Seanmóirí Muighe Nuadhad.'

The present edition is distinctive in that the Sermons for the first time appear in the so-called Irish character. Different people will hold different opinions as to the advantages of the retention in Irish of a set of ' ornamental' characters which other languages have long since discarded; but in the case of Gallagher's Sermons there are, I think, special reasons which would make the ordinary form of the Roman character the more appropriate. There are probably not a few among the older speakers in Donegal who, thanks to the former editions of the 'Sermons,' would be able to read Irish if printed in " letters which are obvious to all" (to borrow Gallagher's own words), but to whom the same Irish dressed up in ornamental lettering will appear strange and foreign.

[^0]So far as I have observed, from the edition of 1752 (the earliest I have seen) down to O'Reilly's edition of 1819, there was no attempt made to edit (in any strict sense of the word) these sermons ; each edition being, or at least endeavouring to be, a close reprint of a previous one. O'Reilly was the first to do more than give a literal reprint, but, unfortunately, he thought himself called upon to try to 'improve" the language as well, and he thus set up a misleading standard for subsequent editors. Canon Ulick Bourke (1877) went further still, with the result that a good deal of what was most characteristic in Gallagher himself was eventually thrown overboard. The latest editor, Fr. Walsh, has made good use of the early pre-O' Reilly editions; and an idea of the superiority of his text to that of his immediate predecessors may be formed by anyone who takes the trouble to compare with it the text of the two sermons of Gallagher's issued in pamphlet form in 1900.

To give anything like a verbatim reprint of the early editions would have been impossible. The misprints are so numerous, and the spelling so careless and inconsistent, ${ }^{1}$ that a fair amount of editing was indispensable in any new edition. And once liberty in matters of spelling is conceded to the editor of a text, the temptation is, no doubt, a strong one to go a step further and improve his author's grammar or vocabulary wherever he thinks fit.

As to the alterations which Fr. Walsh has introduced into his text, Gallagher's re, which to a large extent must have been a purely literary form in his day, has been changed to $l e$ throughout. On the other hand, the $-i b h$ of the dat. pl., which Gallagher rarely employs, and which is dead in threefourths of the Irish-speaking area and moribund elsewhere, has been affixed to every plural noun following a preposition ; thus osnaidh is turned into osnadhaibh, falsünaigh into feallsamhnachaibh, and so on. But surely to have retained ar na clocha and the like, would not have been one whit more 'unclassical' than to employ such verbal forms as nach gcreideann tú, mar a $n d e i r$, and so on. The particle do is carefully restored before verbs and verbal nouns where in Gallagher, as in the living speech, it is either omitted or represented by $a$. Mar, contrary to spoken usage, is made to govern an accusative; thus Gallagher's mur dhruithleoig is changed to mar dhruithleog, $27^{2}$; max an ärsuidh, to mar an t-arsaidh, 126. Forms savouring of dialect have in general been supplanted by more ' standard' ones; but in a number of instances they have been retained, e.g., caraid, namhaid, roghain, colainn (noms. sg.) ; pronnadh ; tlig ; mathara (gen. sg.) ; trid ( $=$ tré) ; aroimhe.

Coming more particularly to questions of declension and the like, one notes that, outside the first declension, Gallagher shows a strong tendency to make the gen. (and for that matter the dat.) plur. of nouns identical with the nom. plur. But Fr. Walsh in nearly every case substitutes the grammarians' form, thus an uile short pian (piannta, Gall.), 30 ; in ionad na locht (lochta, G.), 174 ; ar son do námhad (naimhde, G.), 28; ag clos na mbriathar (mbriathra, G.) so, 46 ; crith cos agus lámh (cosa agus lāmha, G.), 43 ; ceatha debr (deora, G.), 46. ${ }^{2}$

[^1]So the constantly recurring peacaidh, 'sins,' which Gallagher used for all cases of the plural, appears in Fr. Walsh's edition as nom. pl., peacaidh; gen. peacadh; dat. peacadhaibh. Gallagher's non-declension of phrase-nouns is usually recognised in the recent edition, e.g., le taobh cathair Ierusalem, 32 ; i n-aimhdheoin gach eagcoir, 170 ; leigthe chum cuid na comharsan, 40 . The verbal-noun in Gallagher is usually followed by the nom.-acc., which, however, Fr. Walsh almost invariably grammaticizes into the gen. ; thus, ag fagháil bháis obainn (bās obann, G.), 38 ; ag seinnm amhrán binn (abhrāin bhinne, G.), 3; ag ol domblais (domlus, G.), 3 ; ag caoineadh na bpeacadh (na peacaidh, G.), 59. The declension of adjectives also presents some difficulties. For instance, there is a strong tendency in modern Irish (which, of course, our grammarians ignore) to make the dat. sg. fem. of adjectives identical in form with the nom. sing. Thus, Gallagher writes a bparaluis mharbhthach, which his latest editor changes to $i$ bparailis mharbhthaigh (33a) ; and similar alterations occur all through the book.

On the last page of his edition Fr. Walsh gives a list (which is, however, far from complete) of the words occurring in the original which he has replaced by words of his own. Some of these substitutions are not very happy. Thus, se $\delta d$ is hardly a synonym of preasanta, a word which, moreover, has the authority of O Maolchonaire (1616) and of the author of ' Macaomh an Iolair.' Neither are baoghlach and dainséarach interchangeable; both are in use in the spoken language, but not as synonyms. Dathadoir which is made to replace Gallagher's peintēir, means only, so far as I know, ' a dyer.' The only authoritative word in modern Irish for 'painter' is pinnteoir, a word which has a history of five centuries behind it. ${ }^{4}$ Teistimhin, inserted by the editor in place of $t e \overline{x x t}$, is merely a twentieth-century resurrection of the Old-Irish borrowing of the Lat. testimonium; the modern Irish word is téx $(t)$, téacs. The word geinearalta has such authority ${ }^{5}$ behind it that one would fancy it secure from any puristic attack; but Fr. Walsh has rejected it as being "English." A word like devósion, too, has the authority of writers like Flaithrí O Maolchonaire, Gearnon, Molloy and Mac Cuarta; and in any case it has an equal right to recognition with the corresponding adjective devoideach, which, dressed up in an artificial spelling (deaghmhoideach), is allowed to slip through. Even a word like fts (Eng. 'fees') is sponsored by such respectable names as O Bruadair, Egan O'Rahilly, Tadhg O Neachtain, and Brian Merriman. Sometimes, too, one notices that a word which was rejected in one part of the book has been allowed to stand in another, thus pardún, armáilte, pléideárl, tiorantas, searbhónta, tréatürach, fallsa, are sometimes allowed to remain and sometimes discarded. Nor is it clear on what principle words were selected for expulsion ; if such words as réverens, instruimint, blaisbhéim, siúrailte, conclúid, were thought too un-Irish to be retained, then a host of other words (such as sparáil, cúirtéir, brimstón, pléisiur, clóca, etc.) should, with equal justice, have gone by the board.

[^2]Gallagher himself well understood that the first essential of a preacher is to be intelligible, and, as he tells us, he chose his vocabulary accordingly. Since his time, in proportion as the language has grown weaker, so has it become less capable (though, perhaps, more desirous) of expelling the foreign elements incorporated in it. It is a delusion to imagine that we can make Irish, with nine-tenths of its vitality gone, more " pure" than it was in Gallagher's day ; and it is a waste of effort to attempt to do so. The danger that really threatens Irish is not "Anglicism" but death. Gallagher, when composing his Sermons, kept steadily in mind the fact that he was addressing, not the mouldering bones of his ancestors of several centuries previously, but the living men and women of his own day. But when words like oirgne, inghreim, altan, airmhidin, are substituted for some of his, there is a danger that, though a few purists may rejoice, the Irish-speaking congregation may begin to wonder what the sermon is all about. If a number of the words employed by Gallagher displeased his editor, the farthest he should in reason have gone would have been to suggest his own alternatives in footnotes. To attempt to decide by one's own prejudices what words are to form part of the language and what are not, is, to say the least, unsatisfactory. When the Irish writers of the last three centuries have been brought to light, and studied as they deserve, a good deal of what now passes for purism, whether in vocabulary, in grammar, or in idiom, will seem very foolish.

In comparing some portions of the text with the early editions, I have noticed some mistakes and omissions. a fhliuchadh, p. 16, 1. 8, should be a phlíchadh. tar an rotha, p. 137, should be i lár an rotha. seo 'n-a, p. 7, 1. 17, should be fo $n-a$. chum faoisdine, p. 41, 1. 5, read an thaoisidin. an parailise, p. 33, 1. 29, read na p. an thaoisidin, p. 33, 1. 30. read faoisidin. ar $\operatorname{sgath}(=$ ' as for,' maidir le), p. 39x, appears not to have been understood; the punctuation should be emended. For a déanamh, p. 36, 1. 27, read $a(=d o)$ dhéanamh, and join with the sentence following, The Northern reduplicated form of the prep. $a$ or $i$, viz. anna (ina), was sometımes misunderstood; e g., ' $n$-a dhá phoinnte, p. 2, read anna (=i) dhá bpoinnte; in-a gclú́ nó i $n$-a maoin p. 37, for $i$ gclú nó $i$ maoin. On p. 37, 1. 24, a ndúil i $n$-a chur should be a ndubhshlán (d)a chur. Gallagher's ar chunntar is wrongly altered to ar chuantar, pp. 24, 27, 175. Molloy, S. O Neachtain, and others use cunntar or conndar $=$ ' condition'; Dinneen's cuantar is a mistake for cúntar, with $u$ long by position. On p. 101 Fr. Walsh has arm lámhaigh where the second word is intended to be an improvement on the siutallta of the original, taken as if it were from a verbal-noun siutail, 'shooting.' But this word siutail has no existence in Irish, so far as I am aware ; and siutallta is an evident misprint for siurallta (=siurálta), -we find arm suraillte a few pages further on. On pp. 36. 61, the original amaol has been wrongly edited into athmhaol. The word apparently has the meaning 'remiss, indifferent' ; I have met the corresponding noun, a maoile, in a similar sense, in ' Macaomh an Iolair' ; deagla go ccoidebladis no go nimeochadh amabile ar bith orra, Reeves 826, p. 252 (cf. Ir. Texts Soc., x., p. 136, 1. 103). On p. 66, 1. 17, Fr. Walsh has cadhas where the old editions read cadhgus (ni thuramh cadhgus no cuideamh dhoibh). The word is really congas, 'medicine'; cf. Mac Aingil's Sgáthán etc. (1618), p. 398, lán do chongaisibh sdo cheirinibh; it is probably the same word as O'Clery's cunghas .i. coimhghniomh. A Donegal pronunciation is cûgas (Quiggin, pp. 65, 107), resembling Gallagher's cadhgus, and cf. the plur. cóguisidhe, 'medicines,' O'Doherty's 'Ceachta agus Comhradh,' p. 90 (given in Dinneen as if the $o$ were
short). Cf. also the Scotch cungaidh-leighis: e.g., an uair a sholair an Dia trodcaireach cungaidh-leighis duinn, eadhon an Tighearn Iosa Criosd, mar leigh d'ar n-anmaibh, Baxter's ' Gairm do'n tSluagh,' p. 35.

Such omissions as I have noted for the most part consist of small words like air, úd, gach, chomh, etc., and are of no great importance. The only one I will mention is p. 24 x , where the following should be inserted after féin: Bheirid párdún dóibh pféin gan mhoill; acht párdún thabhairt don chomharsain, ni ar leith sin.

At the end of his text Fr. Walsh gives a useful list of words supplementary to Dinneen's Dictionary. I here append some notes on a number of these :
angadh, "i. mailís nó p:acadh nó olc." The correct meaning is 'festering matter.' Gallagher employs it thus (1752 edn., p. 73) : Tairgfe sibh mur Antiochus, plastar a chuir air an gcneadh an taobh muith, agus an tolc agus an tangudh an taobh stuith. Quiggin ('A Dialect of Donegal,' p. 106) gives angadh (pron. angguw) $=$ ' a festering sore.' The word is also used in Mayo, cf. d'at an luragan 7 tháinig eochar (leg. othar) 7 angadh (" inflammation") mór ann, Im. Oireachtais 1899, p. 119. It is likewise applied to a bitter mental feeling, much as rankle is in English: as in MI. MhagRuaidhri's ' Beatha Aodha Uí Néill,' p. 126, bhi angadh iarpuis (" a venemous hatred ") ina chroidhe i $n$-aghaidh na nGaedheal. The Southern anagar, 'corrupt matter, pus' (Sg. Ch. Mumhan, p. 89), appears akin not only to angadh but also to the Scotch iongar and O'Brien's ionghuir (" matter "), all these forms in $-\boldsymbol{r}$ being probably compounds of gor. The connection of angadh with the adj. aingidh is likely (cf. the meanings of olc), but requires to be proved. There is no authority, so far as I am aware, for angadh in the sense of the Mid. Ir. andach, 'evil, wrong, sin': though in the example quoted above angadh iarpuis is nearly synonymous with aingidheacht, 'malice, ill-feeling' (which is used by Gallagher in the spelling ainigiacht). An investigation into the various meanings of aingidh (M. Ir. andgid, from andach), viz. (1) 'sinful,' (2) ' malicious,' (3) ' fretful, peevish,' might help to throw some further light on angadh.
" aradhaln ": the 1752 edn. has arraid, which gives us the correct reading, earraid, and shows that in this case O'Reilly was right.
celste, cealste : in the phrase ar ch. go=ar eagla go. O'Growney heard the phrase ar cheasta go, 'for fear that', in the Irish of his native district in Meath, Archiv f. C. L., i., 158.
cosgraim, consgralm : Gallagher employs this word about seven times, writing it five times with the $n$, and twice without, and in all except two instances using it with an intrans. force, $=$ ' I tremble, quake with fear.' Fr. Walsh apparently assumes it to be a dialectic use of cosgraim, ' I slaughter,' and for the hesitation befween co- and con- he compares cofhra (recte comhra; cofra, cortha, is a distinct word, and is not nasalised) and conva, comhgar and comhngar. But these latter are only instances of the development of $c \delta m h$ - into con-, and consequently can have no bearing on cosgraim, ' I slaughter.' This latter word, O. I. coscraim (con-scaraim), appears in Donegal and Mayo as casgraim, with the Connacht-Donegal change of $o$ to $a$ seen in tosgadh and some other words. Cf. casgairt=' to strike; to thaw' (Quiggin) ; dā cheusamh agus dā chascaivt, Gall. 183 (ed. Walsh, p. 157); cascairt=Lat. 'clades,' in a Northern sermon, Seanm. M. N., ii., 206 ; tá an tir seo creachta casgartha, and bhi mé beagnach casgartha. Mícheál

MhagRuaidhri (Mayo ; Mac Mic Iasg., p. 29, Lúb na C., p. 18) ${ }^{6}$; cosgairt $=$ to destroy, to spill (blood), to melt (of snow), M1. O Máille (Galway).

On the other hand the Donegal cosgraim, ' I terrify,' can, I think, be clearly shown to be a descendant not of O. Ir. coscraim (which has however influenced it in more directions than one), but of a quite distinct word, cumscaigim (cumhsguighim), 'I shake, move' (trans. and intrans.). The cumh- of cumhsguighim was first altered to comh- on the analogy of other compounds, e.g., go ndeachadar na dúile domhanda for comhsgughadh 7 for comhgluasacht, 23 M 10, p. 75 ; gur thás crioth 7 comhbogadh 7 comhsguth a ccnocaibh, etc., ibid., p. 76. An epenthetic $r$ was introduced, probably through the influence of casgraim, e.g., ag comhsgrudh agus ag méadughadh an chrábhaidh agus an teas-ghraidh, Seanm. M. N., iii., p. 28. Here comhsgruighim is used figuratively of causing mental emotion (much like gluaisim), = I excite, stir up.' Finally, comh- or cön- was shortened to co- or con-, probably on the analogy not only of casgraim but of such words as musglaim, brusgar in which the vowel before sg is kept short in Ulster, e.g., co nar fhag cuirt gan chrithneadh, no halla gan bhriseadh, . . . no sith (leg. sidh ?) gan chonsgradh, H. 2.6., R. na L., fo. 62 ro ; consgrudh $=$ gluasacht chum aithrighe, 'to move (sinners) to repentance,' Gall., p. 50 (ed. Walsh, p. 42) ; nach cosgróchthar le h-uathbhás an lae seo, Seanm. M.N., ii., 206. This last example is typical of present-day Donegal usage, in which the literal meaning of the word no longer survives and its figurative sense has for the most part been narrowed down to ' I move to fear, I terrify.' Cf. the following from Craig : chuir seo cosgradh agus crith-eagla ar an mhuilteoir, Sg. Sgiurtha, p. 36 (and cf. p. 40, 1. 2) ; budh truagh agus budh truacanta a gceobl an oidhche sin : chuirfeadh se cosgradh air chroidhe cloiche a bheith ag ésteacht leó, i.e. ' would move the heart of a stone (to pity),' Clann Lir, p. 26 (and cf. p. 23, 1. 22).
drulghill, only in the phrase mur bharr druighill air (ar mífhortún). Quiggin (p.46) gives mar bhary draoille $=$ " to cap all," and assumes that draoille $=$ Dinneen's dramhfhuigheall, which is most improbable. The real explanation is, I think, to be sought for in the expression dlaoi mhullaigh (cf. Quiggin, pp. 81, 131), lit. 'top wisp.' Mar dhlaoi mhullaigh is used figuratively as a synonym of mar bharr, e.g., mur dhluidh mhullaigh ar a uaisle (' por remate de su nobleza'), 23 M 3, p. 116. There would be a natural tendency to combine the two for greater emphasis, and it is but a short step from mar bhary dlaoi mhullaigh to mar bharr draoi mhullaigh, and thence to the stereotyped mar bharr draoille.
dulmhsidh occurs twice with $-m h$-, four times with $-m$-, and always in the phrase $\operatorname{duim}(h)$ sidh dorcha (once, dorcha duimsidh), applied to a prison or the grave or to hell. It is probably a petrified survival of an oblique case of duaibhseach, a word which would be a suitable companion to dorcha : cf. e.g., tres an $[c] c e \sigma$ nduaibhseach ndorcha, Ir. Texts Soc., i., p. 74 ; a-nduin bhroghach dhuaibhseach iffrinn, Rev. Celt., xxiii., p. 12. In Scurry's translation of Manni's ' Four Maxims' (p. ix., 1825) I find a bpriosun dhuimsighthe dhorcha ithfrinn, but Scurry was far from averse to using mere book-words, and the whole phrase was very probably plagiarised from Gallagher (cf. ed. Walsh, p. 168, 1. 12).

[^3]fulleachtach, in nios fuileachtuidh no na leomhain, ' fiercer, crueller, than a lion.' Cf. an fial-fhear tuileachtach trean (" spirited, noble-blooded "), in a Donegal song, Cloich Cheann Fhaolaidh, 2nd edn., p. 14 ; Scotch fuileachdach, ' bloody, sanguinary.'
leannán peacaldh, ".i. lorg peacaidh." The correct meaning is ' favourite sin, sinful habit.' Besides the instances in Gallagher cf. Donlevy (1742), p. 296: do'n mhuintir ag a bhfuil droichchleachtadh agus leannán peacaidh, transl. " for those who are in habitual or customary sin." So leanain peacaidh, Sermons, 1711, p. 48. So in Scotch Gaelic: cf. Mac Eachen's Cath Spioradail, 2nd edn., p. 15, tha an giomh no leannan peacaidh a thug as an rathad $e a^{\prime}$ cur oillt air (in English: " he condemns that passion or criminal habit which occasioned his fall') ; nuair a bhitheas . . . leannan peacaidh ri smachdachadh, ibid., p. 13.
mi-staldh: Gallagher twice uses this word:-na srāidionna ghlanamh agus gan nī ar bith bheth ansa rōd chuirfiudh mīostäidh air an bprionsa so, ed. 1752, p. 89 ; (so far from thanking them) sē dubhairt sē leo, lān do mhiostäigh, gan è fēin, etc., id. p. 62. Seán O Neachtain also uses it twice in his translation of Segnari's 'True Wisdom'; 7 an duine na namhuid ag Dia et a miostadhagh ag Dia, 7 ag sluagh neimhe uile (H. 4. 23, p. 24), where the English version, as published in Cork, 1813, has: "while being an enemy to and hated by God, and all the heavenly host'" go ttiubhra so miostá co mór sin dhuit ar an uile ni nach bhfuidhe tú solás ionn ni ar bioth acht ionn, etc. (ibid., p. 100), which corresponds to the English : "which giving you an aversion for all other things, may make you find no delight henceforth but in," etc. In the Sermons primted in 1711 the word occurs at least once (p. 6): biaidh . . . ar nuile mhiósdaidh a naghaidh creidigh go hiomlán ar natharradh. The above instances, taken in conjunction with their contexts, show the meaning of miostaidh to be 'aversion, repugnance, dislike.' In Co. Mayo miostainnc has just the same meaning, and appears to be the local form of miostaidh : see Timony's ' Targaireacht Bhr. Ruaidh,' p. 13, 1. 19, and Mac Mic Iasg. etc., p. 29 w . The Scotch sta, 'good, profit, advantage,' and mi-sta, ' harm, evil,' may be connected.
sglúraim, pp. 76, 80, 95, 96 (these are the correct reff.). In only one of these instances has sgiuraim the meaning ' I scourge,' viz., p. 80, cia go sgiurann $\operatorname{sinn}, n i \operatorname{sgriosann} \operatorname{sinn}$. In the other three the meaning is 'to scour, cleanse,' e.g., p. 95, nigh agus sgiür a choinsias le trom-dheoraibh na haithrighe. Cf. for this sense sgiur, nigh, agus glan d' anam, Seanm. M. N., ii., 182. For the meaning ' scourge,' cf. ibid., pp. $214 \mathrm{w}, 216$ (1l. 9, 23). Ct. (in the v.n.) the forms sgiürsáil, ibid., p. 221; sgiursiudh, Gall., p. 204 (=W., p. 176).
tobhalm, pp. 20, 47, 89, 90, 115. (For thaoibhe óchadh, p. 47, read thoibheochadh). Dinneen's tobhaim, older toibhghim, 'I levy, I cause to be paid (to myself),' is unquestionably the same word; but Gallagher's usage (tobhaidh se onór damh, ='it merits honour for me' it causes honour to be paid to me') is uncommon. Exactly parallel is the double usage of the much commoner word tuillim: (1) tuillim onoir =' I earn, or merit, honour (for myself) ; (2) tuillean sé onoir dam, 'it merits (wins, earns) honour for me, brings me honour.' In the Sermons of 1711 tobhaim, or rather tabhuighim, is frequently employed in both senses, e.g., nac[h] ar thab[h]aidh aonduine riamh deaghainm dhó fein san tsaoghal, p. 19 ; nach bhtoigheonadh ni ar bioth lé na shiobthcháin do thab[h]ach dhuinn acht fuil a aónmhic-féin, p. 139, and so pp. 7, 16, 18, 21, 30, etc. Cf. also Rev. Celt., xxiii., p. 20, aithrisim dhuit go firinnech gur-ab tú as mó tabhadh na bpianta dhúinn where thabhuigh na pianta seems an obvious correction. Tabhuighim is still in use in both senses in Donegal (=(1) 'I earn'; (2) 'I cause, bring about'): see Dinneen, s.vv. tamhuighim, tamhughadh, and Quiggin, p. 57. T. F. O'RAHILLY.


[^0]:    ${ }^{1} \mathrm{O}$ Mellan has togail suas in the same sense: lethtenont general na harmala fuair togbhail suas a narm in righ Pilip, $23 \mathrm{H} 7, \mathrm{p} .10$. Togaim had acquired the sense of 'I rear' at least as early as Carswell : bhur gcland do thogbhail adteagasg thoirfe thior Chriosdaidhe, Cars., p. 108.

[^1]:    ${ }^{1}$ Gallagher's inconsistency is seen not only in matters of spelling (as where he uses chum and an indiscriminately), but also in the duplication of certain verbal and other forms such as chonnacadar and chonnarcadar; dean and deanann; leanamaois and leanamaoid; nios mo and niosa mho.
    ${ }^{2}$ The reff. are to the pages of Father Walsh's text. G. (or Gall., or Gallagher) stands for the text of the edition of 1752.
    ${ }^{3}$ But occasionally the original declension is inconsistently retained, e.g., tuile deora, 164; tri sort lamha, 166; fear na bhfiacha, 35; lucht na mionna móra, 160.

[^2]:    ${ }_{4}$ Cf. pinntéil, pinntiúracht, Maundeville (ZCP., ii.) ; pintéireacht, Rev. Celt., xxiii., 36; pinteoir, pinteālaim, Stapleton, 68, 66; pindeáil, O.T., Ezec., xxiii., 14 ; pinnteoirecht, pinnteoireachd, Molloy, Luc. Fid., 33, 95; pinnteālta, Seán O Neachtain, H. 4. 23, p. 82; pintéil, pinntéaracht, etc., O'Begley, s.vv. ' limn,' ' paint.'
    ${ }^{5}$ It is used, e.g., in Harl. 546 ( 15 th cent.), in 'Macaomh an Iolair,' and in the N.T. of 1602, as well as by the Four Masters, MacAingil, Keating, Stapleton, Gearnon, Dowley, Molloy, O Neachtain, Donlevy, and others.

[^3]:    "In Mayo casgairt has also the meaning " sleet" (Mac Mic Iasg.). This I take to be a variation of clasgairt, ' heavy rain,' under the influence of casgairt $=$ 'thawing.' Clasgairt itself is a form of clagairt, clagar; for a similar interchange between -s- and -sg-, cf. O'Begley's glinsgar (s.v. 'gingle'), for gliogar.

