

## The Kingship of Temair.

R. A. S. Macalister

1918

. . . previously to the conquests of Cormac mac Airt, Temair was of much greater importance as a religious sanctuary than as a political centre ; and we must now consider the religious rites of which the Ridge was the scene. The first question which meets us will be the nature of the kingship of Temair.

*The king of Temair was a god incarnate on earth.* This is the all-important fact which results from the study of the traditions of the early kingship that have come down to us, confused and misunderstood though these certainly are by the ancient historians who have recorded them. When a good king was on the throne, the gods condescended to take up their abode within him ; when the king was illegitimate, they withdrew themselves. In the former case the crops were plentiful ; in the latter case there was misery and famine. Contrast these two characterizations, from *Lebor Gabála*

Good was that king Eochlu mac Eirc ; there was no rain in his time, but only dew ; there was no year with-out its harvest, falsehood was expelled from Ireland in his time.

In evil case was Ireland in the time of that Coirpre, for the earth did not yield her fruit, because there was but one grain in the ear, one acorn on the oak, one nut on the hazel ; the creeks were unproductive, the cattle were dry, so that there was an intolerable famine throughout Ireland for the five years in which Coirpre was king.

We have seen in the last section that Eochu mac Eire was the great impersonation of Divine Wisdom, at the head of the " epic " pantheon ; and though the historians have made him into a king, he retains sufficient godhead to secure the blessings named for his people. Coirpre, on the other hand, surnamed Cenn-Chait, was the leader of the revolt of the serfs, that is, of the enslaved aborigines. He was alien in race, religion, [1] and probably in speech, from the ruling classes. Naturally the gods would not condescend to take up their abode in a creature so despicable, and naturally the country suffered from their absence. The same idea appears elsewhere in Celtdom. Livy has a reference to it in his priceless abstract of the saga of king Ambigatus. [2] As Dr. Baudis points out, this idea is also at the basis of the prohibition of the rule of a blemished king. [3] Evidently a chief function of the king was to offer his body as a receptacle for the divinity whose presence secured the boon of plentiful harvests ; and the body must be worthy of its divine occupant. A Christianized version of the divinity of the king appears in the story of the Battle of Mag Mucrime, [4] in which angels hovered over the head of king Art in the battle, " because he was a true prince."

It is extremely important to notice indications that, in the case of the king of Temair, the *marriage* of the king was essential to secure the boon which he was supposed to bring his people. This is probably the reason why the nobles of Ériu refused to countenance the unwedded king Eochu Airem and boycotted his assembly ; [5] and in the story edited by Mr. Best, under the title of *The Adventures of Art son of Conn*, [6] the men of Ireland enjoy three harvests of corn annually so long as Conn is wedded to his fitting spouse Eithne Taebfota ; but when she dies and he marries in her stead the disreputable Bécuma, there " is neither corn nor milk in Ireland." The exercise by the king of his marital functions acts sympathetically on the fertility of the land and of the cattle. It is to be noted in passing that when Eithne died she was buried in Tailltiu ; was this the normal cemetery of the *queens* of Ireland ? If so, the fact is of some importance.

The point is, that Bécuma had been banished from among the Tuatha Dé Danaian for her misdeeds. She was therefore not any more acceptable to the gods than was the foreigner Coirpre Cat-head. Probably we are to understand that the feminine principle of fertility refused to acknowledge her, as the masculine principle refused to acknowledge Coirpre. To avert the curse that had in consequence fallen upon the land, it had to be re-quickened *with the blood of the son of a sinless couple*. How such a youth was found, how he was condemned to be slain and was redeemed with the blood of a cow, and

how Bécuma was finally expelled from Temair, will be found in the original story, which is one of the most valuable, from the point of view of folk-lore, that we possess. Just as an elaborate ritual had to be gone through, as we shall see in a moment, in order to restore the continuity of the kingship when it had been broken by what we should call the *natural* death of the king, so the blood of a youth of miraculous birth had to be shed on the ground outraged by the king's marriage with a person forbidden.

In Christian times the saints appear to have entered on the heritage of the kings as earnest for the goodness of the crops. Thus St. Patrick, prophesying of St. Senán, promises this boon so long as the people shall be obedient to the saint. [7] We might explain this as a reminiscence of some thing that had been said of the fertilizing river-god, if we had not something analogous in the life of St. Findian. We there read that a barren patch of land was made fruitful by sprinkling it with water in which a eulogy of the saint had been steeped. [8]

The divine king has been studied fully by Sir James Frazer in his monumental work *The Golden Bough*. This study is based on the remarkable institution of the *Rex Nemorensis*, the priest-king of the sacred grove of Aricia at Nemi. It is not for nothing that *Rex Temorensis* differs by a single letter only from *Rex Nemorensis* ; [9] for the analogies which the two kingships present are so remarkable that it is impossible to escape from the conclusion that they belong to the same order of ideas, if indeed they are not more closely connected still.

The candidate for the priesthood of the grove at Aricia challenged the existing incumbent to single combat by the rite of breaking the "Golden Bough," and if in the combat he succeeded in killing the priest, he *ipso facto* succeeded to the office. Sir James Frazer has convincingly shown that this strange practice was based on the desire to have the strongest man available. One who from weakness or want of vigilance permitted himself to be killed was clearly unsuitable for the responsible office of royal deity.

It is perfectly obvious from the history, as it is enshrined in the works of the "official historians," that the king of Temair, like the king of the grove at Aricia, reigned by virtue of having slain his predecessor. This point, which Dr. Baudis seems to have missed, is one of the most important arguments in favour of the thesis which both he and I sustain.

Omitting the kings of the Fir Bolg and of the Tuatha Dé Danann, I find 110 kings enumerated in *Flaithiusa hÉrenn* as having reigned from Eremón down to Conn Cét-chathach, the grandfather of Cormac mac Airt. Of these, 80 are said to have been killed by their successors. As we have already seen, the "official historians" explained this as a blood-feud, going back to the time when Eremón, the first king, killed his brother Eber at the battle of Geashill. But this explanation will not serve at all. The whole scheme of relationships on which it is based is utterly irreconcilable with the data. Any group of the kings will show this ; the following series, selected at random, will serve as an illustration .

Finn	reigned 22	years and was killed by	Setna.
Setna	20	„	Siomón Brecc.
Siomón	6		Dui son of Setna.
Dui	reigned 10	years and was killed by	Muiredach son of Siomón.
Muireclach	1	year „	Enna son of Dui.
Enna	12	years and died of	plague.
Lugaid	9	and was killed by	Sírlám son of Finn.

—which means that fifty-eight years intervened between the death of Finn and the succession 'of his son Sírlámh. Improbabilities of this kind are too frequent in the list of kings to make it possible to accept it literally. On the other hand, it is not a mere paradox to say that the fact that such obvious improbabilities exist is the best possible argument in favour of the view that there is a genuine tradition underlying the list of kings. Mere forgers would not have tilled their work with so many difficulties. But in the light of the wealth of illustrative examples which Sir James Frazer has collected from all over the world, we must see in this organized slaying of the king by his successor something other

than a blood-feud extending through a large number of generations, and involving relationships spread over impossible lapses of time. Doubtless the “official historians” were puzzled by the regularity with which each king met his death at the hands of his successor, and felt obliged to explain it. Not knowing of the system of the Arician priesthood, they had to cast about elsewhere ; and they found a blood-feud as the easiest way of accounting for the perplexing fact. The genealogies were manipulated accordingly, the *slayer of a slayer* being assumed to be a relative of the first victim ; but the result only makes obvious the impossibility of the “blood-feud” theory.

If in the light of this we look back at what I have called the “epic” dynasty, we find an unexpected corroboration of these conclusions. For the practice of predecessor-killing does not begin till the fourth name in the Ultonian and the Fir Bolg lists ; the Tuatha Dé Danann version is not so clear, but does not contradict the observation. That is, the kings do not kill their predecessors until they cease to be gods by nature and become men.

There does not appear to be anywhere extant an indication of the process whereby a candidate for royalty challenged the reigning king. At Aricia the candidate for the priesthood broke what was called the Golden Bough, which Sir James Frazer has tried to prove was the mistletoe. This may be so ; and the description of the cutting of the mistletoe contained in an oft-quoted passage of Pliny may not inconceivably be in some way connected with the election of a new chieftain—Pliny has no information to give us as to the occasion on which, and the purpose for which, the remarkable rite which he described was performed. [10] The prohibition against bringing arms into Temair after sunset [11] was perhaps designed for the protection of the king against a *surreptitious* attack.

In the short list of kings quoted above it will be seen that one of them, Enna by name, died of plague. It is almost an invariable rule that when the kings do not die at the hands of their successors, there is something unexpected or sudden about the manner of their departure from life—battle, lightning, plague ; in the case of Slánoll, already mentioned, “an unknown disease, whereby he was found dead in Temair”; nearly always some exceptional accident is invoked to explain why he died without the assistance of an ambitious rival. Such an event as the *natural* death of the king was probably regarded as a direct interposition on the part of some god. This is actually so expressed in the case of king Eterscéle. From *Togáil Bruidne Dá Derga* we learn that he died naturally ; [12] the “official historians” tell us that he was killed by his successor Nuadu Necht. But Nuadu Necht is only a manifestation of the great god Nuadu ; [13] the king was therefore killed by the god.

When such an event took place, it became necessary to restore the succession. From Aricia we have, apparently, no answer to the question of what happened if the Rex Nemorensis should happen to die a natural death. [14] Probably the case never arose ; in a city full of slaves such as Rome was, there would always be someone who would prefer even the anxious life of the King of the Grove, to the hopeless toil of servitude ; for the Rex Nemorensis was always an escaped slave. But in Ireland the untoward event sometimes took place. I explain certain remarkable rites of which we have a record as being the means whereby in such a case the succession was restored.

Someone, presumably a druid, glutted himself with the flesh and broth of a white [sacred] bull, and then went to sleep, while four druids chanted over his body an *ór firindi*, or “spell of truth.” [15] The appointed king would appear to the sleeper amid the nightmares induced by his overloaded stomach. Doubtless it was understood that he had made himself one with the bull-divinity by eating as much of its flesh as was physically possible, and that in his dreams he was thinking the thoughts of the god. For inspiration by incubation we may compare the curious anecdote of the lazy pupil of Mael-Ruain of Tallaght, who was inspired with knowledge of his unlearned lesson by sleeping on the knee of Oengus, the author of the Féilire. [16] It is tempting to ask whether a story originally told of the deified hero, Oengus of the Brug, may not have been transferred to his saintly namesake, with such modifications as were necessary to adapt it to a monastic background : all the more so as we are told immediately before that Oengus was so diligent in his labours in the monastic cornstore that “the corn-blades grew through his hair.” This looks like an idea suggested by some picture of the Corn-spirit. To return, however, from these speculations to the subject before us, we learn next that the king, thus selected, had to pass through certain rites, which are enumerated in a tract called *De Shil Chonairi Móir* [17] It is not strictly correct to call these rites “ordeals,” which would imply that they

were primarily means of *selection*. If the new king failed to fulfil all the conditions of the rites, he would naturally be rejected, and as they are described in the text before us this would appear to be their main purpose. But it is evident that the primary intention of the rites was *initiation*. The king, having been already chosen by the incubation process just described, was now to be inducted to office. The ceremonies of initiation were four in number, and as described in the text quoted were as follows :

- (1). The candidate mounted on a chariot, which tilted under him if he were not legitimate, and the horses, which were new to harness, sprang at him.
- (2). The candidate put on a mantle, which would be too big for him if he were rejected.
- (3). The candidate drove in the chariot to the stones Blocc and Bluicne (Móel is not mentioned in the text) : these opened out wide enough to let him through if he were accepted, but closed before him if he were rejected.
- (4). The candidate, having passed these tests successfully, was led up to Fál, which uttered a shriek against the chariot-wheel if he were accepted, and was silent if he were rejected.

But surely all this impossible magic belongs to the region of fairy-tales ! Who ever heard in real life of screaming and moving stones, of knowledgeable horses, of elastic mantles ? A very reasonable criticism this, on the list of rites as they are set forth in the text before us. But the difficulty lies, not in the rites, which are simple and commonplace enough in themselves, but in the fact that the author who has transmitted the record of them to us was completely in the dark as to what they meant. If we are more fortunate than he was, the reason is because we have a large body of records of savage life and ceremonies at our disposal. In the corroborees of the aborigines of Australia, a country unknown to the ancient writer, lies the clue to the comprehension of the rites which he describes. Let us consider these initiatory rites in order, and see what we can make of them in the light of modern anthropological knowledge.

The horse-test cannot be dissociated from the most interesting account of the inauguration of the chieftains of Cenél Conaill described by Giraldus Cambrensis, [18] to the righteous indignation of Keating and other worthy souls. Peace be with them it was simply impossible for Giraldus, with the limited knowledge of his time, to invent so charmingly complete an account of a savage totemistic initiatory rite. A white mare was led to the place of inauguration : the candidate entered on all-fours — in fact, he pretended to be a horse, as the kangaroo and emu and witchetty-grub totem-groups of Australia pretend on occasion to be kangaroos, and so forth, in action as in name. The mare was then killed, and the chieftain-elect bathed in its broth, while he and his people partook of a solemn feast of its flesh. Nothing could more clearly show that Cenél Conaill was a tribe with a horse-totem, and that the chieftain of the tribe was, on his initiation, admitted, as we may express it, to “ horse-ship.” [19] We need not, perhaps, infer that the rite was practised in its pristine perfection at the late date at which Giraldus wrote, even though he reports it as contemporary. But if not, he must have had access to some authoritative literary description of the custom, descended from the time at which it was in use. That it should have been an invention is a sheer impossibility.

So, at Temair, the king began with some kind of encounter with horses. But what was the nature of this encounter ? The description which we possess has been worn down to the lowest possible terms ; all that we are told is that if (for reasons unstated and to us obscure) the candidate was not to be king of Temair, the “ horses would spring at him” (*concligtis ind hich fris*).

Certain analogies presented by primitive Greek rites suggest that in the original form of the ceremony it was rather the king who sprang at the horses. M. Salomon Reinach, in his paper on Hippolytus, [20] has argued persuasively that the legend of the virtuous youth torn in pieces by his horses has arisen in a savage rite in which it was the horses that were torn in pieces ; and that, like Dionysos, Zagreus, Adonis, Pentheus, Orpheus, Actaeon, the tale told about his being thus dismembered had its origin in a custom wherein a totem animal suffered the treatment (*σπαραγμός*) and was devoured whole (*ωμοφαγία*) a rite is clearly to be seen in Giraldus’s account of the Cenél Conaill ceremonies. The purpose of the rite is to quicken the life of the clan by feeding on the totem animal : that the chief *par excellence* was to be steeped (literally as well as metaphorically) in the being of the totem is indicated by the custom which required him to immerse himself in the animal’s broth and to

drink of it without the intervention of any vessel, even his hand. If anything was wanting to confirm the substantial accuracy of Giraldus's account, it is this important detail. Just as in Greek legend the horse torn in pieces became the chaste youth Hippolytus, slain by his chariot-horses, so in Irish legend the horse torn in pieces became the unsuccessful candidate for monarchy, "at whom the horses would spring." The totem animal rejected the illegitimate aspirant. But it may perhaps be, that the report of the rite in the text before us is due to a confusion with another rite, probably (though not certainly) independent of inauguration ceremonies such as we are discussing. We must not omit to compare the Thracian rite of sacrificing men to secure fertility for the land, the victims being put to death by being trampled by horses. [21] Possibly a sacrifice of this kind took place on the occasion of the inauguration of a monarch, of Temair, and the author who reported the ceremony mixed the victim with the king. The king, having been chosen for office by the solemn incubation, would hardly himself be the victim.

The successful candidate, probably by devouring the flesh of the horse, passed into a state of "horse-ship"; and it is not for nothing that so many kings of Temair, in the official history, bore the name *Eochu*, a derivative from *ech*, "a horse." Eochu Oll-athair and Eochu Oll-flaith, who, as we have seen, are avatars of the founder of the monarchy, bore the name; we may perhaps conjecture that all the kings, as a matter of course, originally were called Eochu, as a sign of their partaking of the divine horse. Eremón himself appears later in the roll of kings as Eochu Airem.

Here again we have a most remarkable parallel between the worship of the Arician grove and that of Temair. For one of the divinities enshrined at Nemi was the ancient Italian god Virbius; and a legend had it that this Virbius was no other than the young Greek hero Hippolytus. [22] We may refer the reader to Frazer's discussion of this equation and its probable basis; but we cannot pass over the coincidence of a horse deity at Aricia and a totemistic horse-ritual at Temair.

There is another explanation of the chariot-rite possible. Mr. Cook has referred me to his valuable articles in the *Classical Review*, vols. xvii, xviii, in the course of which he brings evidence to show that the chariot-races at the Olympic games and at similar celebrations were originally intended as tests for the selection of a god-king. It might therefore be suggested that at Temair there was also a chariot-race, whereby the king was selected; or, preferably, that the king, already selected by the incubation, was required to prove his ability to control wild horses (sun-horses?). In the concluding section we shall see how the rites of Temair are linked to other rites recorded from elsewhere in Europe; and the analogies which the passages brought forward by Mr. Cook present must be accorded their full weight. We must also not forget the remarkable horse-racing, feasting, sacrificial, and military scenes represented on the well-known series of early iron-age Venetian *situlae*, which have every appearance of referring to similar celebrations. But the Cenél Conaill rite blocks the way to a complete acceptance of this alternative explanation. We here plumb a yet deeper stratum of primitive custom; and, perhaps, we see enacted before us the ceremonies which later developed into the Olympic horse-race—just as the gracious figure of Hippolytus may have developed out of a savage who tore a horse to pieces and devoured it raw and half alive!

The second rite, that of the magic mantle, can best be understood in the light of the third, which we accordingly shall consider first of the two.

The third rite was that of the stones Blocc and Bluicne. It will be remembered that these were two of three stones set over certain druids of the same names. Now there is a very remarkable expression used about these stones in PD 21, to which we have not yet referred. We there read of them *teora clocha roláithi forsna druidib*, "the three stones that were placed upon the druids." In the descriptions of other standing stones, such are called the *lecht* or gravestone of So-and-so; but this expression is not used here. VD iii 75, 76 uses an equally curious expression; *forru atáit na trí clocha dusfarlaic Mál mór-Macha*, "on them (i.e. on the three druids) are the three stones which Mál of great Macha flung." These passages point to some deed of violence; we may perhaps be not far wrong if we infer that Moel and his fellows were buried alive under the stones. [23] This is confirmed by what follows in PD: *hit é an ammand .i. Móel*, etc.; "these are their names (i.e. the names of the stones), Moel," etc. The personalities of the druids had passed into the stones erected over them; in fact, these stones *are* the druids, and as such they help to initiate the rightful king.

Móel, Blocc, and Bluicne became the stock names for druids at Temair; so important were the stones associated with them. They appear in the tale *Baile an Scail*, [24] as the persons who interpreted the scream of Fál to Conn Cet-chathach. And they appear in the story of St. Patrick's contention with druids of king Loeguire. For surely it is clear that

LOCHKU ET LUCETMAEL,

the names of the two druids with which the saint had to deal, are simply corruptions of

(B)LUICNE ET (B)LOCC ET MAEL,,

the same names, in the reverse order. [25]

But how did the stones open or close before the candidate? To this question there is but one possible answer. The stones were set close together though—we need not take an *piéd de la lettre* the assertion that they were normally so close together that “only the edge of a hand could pass between them” [26]—and the candidate had to squeeze between them. If he failed to do so, he was rejected.

Similar rites of squeezing through a narrow space a split tree, a hole in the ground, an opening in a rock, or a space between two objects set close together are found in many parts of the world. The custom is followed for a variety of purposes: as a curative act, in cases of disease; as a test of legitimacy of birth; [27] or, as in the present case, as a test of worthiness for some privilege. The rite has ramifications which here we cannot follow; they have been studied by Henri Gaidoz in a monograph. [28] The nearest analogue to the Temair rite is to be seen in a mosque at Jerusalem, and another at Cairo. In each of these places there is a pair of pillars, set close together, and the *ciceroni* inform visitors that only he who can squeeze between the pillars can obtain admission to heaven. At Cairo the space between the pillars has been appreciably widened by the attrition of the inner surfaces of the pillars; at Jerusalem an iron grille has been inserted to prevent the experiment being made—it is said because a certain fat man met his death by endeavouring to force himself through the narrow space.

Sir James Frazer, quoting the essay by Gaidoz, [29] says that its author “rightly rejects the theory that all such passages are symbols of a new birth” as though the patient were born into a new world of health, of legitimacy, of fitness for office, or what-not. This, however, does not exactly express the conclusion of the French scholar, as reference to p. 77 of his essay will show. [30] It is not the crude idea of physical re-birth which he rejects as explanatory of this rite, but the ethical ideas which for us form almost the exclusive sense of the word “regeneration.” In this he is no doubt right; but he does not, and so far as I can judge he should not, wholly reject the view that the rite is essentially an attempt to express the notion of a physical re-birth. If this idea be associated with the ceremony, it is doubtless not to the exclusion of others. For instance, the split tree through which a sickly infant has been passed is ever afterwards linked with the life of the child; we must therefore infer that the tree and the child have some physical connexion for which the re-birth theory would not wholly account. But in the study of folk-lore and folk-beliefs inconsistencies and complications of this kind are only what we may expect. Very few primitive rites and ceremonies are capable of a *simple* explanation. They all, as it were, possess tentacles to which other notions early attach themselves; and as these accretions vary considerably in different surroundings, the study even of the most rudimentary ceremony becomes a matter of extreme complexity.

Whether or not any additional ideas were associated with the rites of the stones of Móel, Blocc, and Bluicne, the most reasonable explanation of what we are told about them, in the light of other practices elsewhere, seems to be that the candidate for kingship, by squeezing between them, was regarded as having been born into a new life. And when we learn that before the ceremony a mantle was put upon him which was required to be close-fitting, we may fairly regard this as a confirmation of this explanation. For in re-birth ceremonies an essential part of the rite would be the reproduction of the prenatal life of the neophyte. He is tightly folded in a covering that represents the womb. [31] From this he shuffles his way out into the new life that awaits him. This is what appears to be the

meaning of the mantle-rite which we passed over just now. That the candidate went through the proceeding in a state of ceremonial nudity is implied, though not definitely stated, by the description of the horse-rite in Giraldus ; the nakedness of Conaire, which is emphasized at the beginning of *Togáil Buidne Dá Derga*, is perhaps a reminiscence of this.

But it will be objected that the document before us asserts that the king drove up to and between the stones *in his chariot*. If this is to be accepted, it is useless to attempt to explain the ceremonies which are at the moment occupying our attention. It is safe to say that whatever may or may not have happened at the inauguration of a monarch, he did not drive up to certain standing stones in his chariot, expecting them to open before him of their own accord. The writer who reports the ceremonies has misunderstood and naturally has garbled them ; it is only by comparison with similar rites that it is possible to reconstruct their original form. It is easy to understand why our author has introduced the chariot so awkwardly here. The ceremony begins with a chariot-rite ; the final test, at Fál, is against a wheel, supposed to be the chariot-wheel. The writer who is our authority naturally inferred that the king remained in his chariot the whole time.

As an alternative explanation it has been suggested to me that the robe might have been a sort of *ἱερός πέπλος* by means of which the king was symbolically invested with divinity. The theory is worth putting on record, though I find in it one serious difficulty—such an investiture would not be likely to have taken place *before* the passage through the stones, if only for the practical reason that it would very seriously hamper the neophyte's progress through the narrow space, and would be sure to get torn. Had the mantle been assumed *after* the passage through the stones, this would obviously have been the only reasonable explanation of the part which it played in the inauguration. Moreover the explanation offered above explains why the robe was meant to be close-fitting : a mere symbolic robe would be more likely to be full and flowing.

We have seen that the tract mentions only two stones, omitting Móel. Groups of two stones are on the whole commoner than groups of three ; and for the purpose of the squeezing rite two stones would be sufficient, and three a superfluity. It is hard to decide which version is correct. The Patrician documents reduce these three druids to two, but the way in which their names are stated shows that there were originally three separate names—otherwise we might reasonably suppose that I here were actually only two stones, called Móel-Bluicc and Bluicne. In such a case Blocc would necessarily have been the name of a god, otherwise unattested ; for the formula Móel- is essentially theophorous, like Fer-, Nia-, Mug-, and sometimes Mac-. On the other hand, the three names are cast into the formula usual in such triplicities. These are almost invariably in the form A,B,B', in which B' is an orthographical variant of B, or at least is connected with B by assonance or alliteration. Thus, the three sons of Tuiriu, otherwise called the “ gods of the Tuatha Dé Danann,” were Brian, Iuchar, Iucharba. The three guardian spirits of the sacred well of Sídh Nechtain were called Flesc, Lesc, and Luam. Even in the modern chapbook reprinted in Thackeray's *Irish Sketch-Book* we find the same formula, Hudden, Dudden, and Donald O'Neary. [32] In such cases it will generally be found that it is the individual with the singular name—A of the formula—that is the effective personality ; the other two, B, and B', being merely the chorus. Here, however, we have a remarkable exception to this rule: Blocc and Bluicne are the important stones, while Móel is in the background.

The evolution of the formula is easily understood. The Celtic gods originated in groups of shadow beings, of indefinite number and very feebly developed personality, who gradually crystallized into clear-cut individuals. Thus, the sun-god Lug is a condensation, so to speak, of a previous group of Lugoves, for whose existence we have epigraphic evidence. When attempts were made to form a conception, either mental or graphic, of these beings, it was natural to figure them in threes, three being the first number in which plurality can be expressed ; one figure represents θεός, θεώ, and three θεοί. Such symbolical groups of three figures inevitably suggest, groups of three independent personalities. When it comes to name these, one of them will be given a name in the singular number, derived from the plural by which the original group was known : and the other two will be titled with factitious names which will naturally tend to resemble one another. Such a group as Móel, Blocc, and Bluicne is therefore only what we might expect. Thus there were most probably three stones, not two ; but only two of them, set the more closely together, were used for the squeezing rite. It will not escape notice that what has been said above is fatal to Petrie's identification of these stones with the small stones in

the churchyard. Though described as *clocha becca*, these stones must have been at least as high as a man's shoulders.

Finally the candidate, thus "re-born," was led up to Fál, which uttered a scream if he were acceptable. *Dind-shenchas Érenn* says that it screamed under the new king, as though he stood upon it. The well-known quatrain of Cináed ó hArtacóin, beginning *an cloc, forstad mo dí sháil*, "the stone on which my heels stand," accords with this. The tract *Síl Chonairi Móir* says that it screamed "against the axle of the chariot."

The stone variously called Fál, or Lia Fáil, was the central "fetish" of Temair, and it becomes a matter of great importance to find out what it was. So important was it, that *Inis Fáil*, *Mag Fáil*, are familiar names for the whole of Ireland. Temair itself was *Temair Fáil*, Fál's Prospect-hill, to distinguish it from the other places called Temair in Ireland. [33] The personal name Fraech Fáil is also recorded. [34] The followers of Find mac Uamail are the "Fiana of Fál." [35]

Whatever the camp-followers of Celtic studies may suppose (be they mediaeval chroniclers or modern ecstasies of the Fiona MacLeod type), we may take it for granted that the signification of *Lia Fáil* is nothing so poetical as "Stone of Destiny." "Stone of the Fence," or "of the Hedge," would serve as a translation, with a possible reference to its use as a guardian of the fitness of the king. In such a case, however, we should have expected the definite article. The fact that it is omitted, and that the stone is frequently spoken of simply as "Fál"—which, indeed, appears to be its most legitimate name indicates that Fál is to be taken preferably as a proper name, either of a man or of a god. [36] As there does not appear to be any trace of a man of the name, we prefer to interpret it as the name of a god.

The stone Fál is called *Ferp Cluche* in the tract *Síl Chonairi Móir*. *Ferp* is a loan-word from the Latin *uerpa*; and Baudis infers (*loc. cit.* p. 106) that the stone was a phallus. This inference, however, is not justified. The fact that a loan-word is used is strongly against it, as indicating that we are to see an ecclesiastical denunciation of a pagan monument rather than a genuine tradition of the significance of the stone. [37] It is, in fact, one more of the spiteful nicknames given by the adherents of the one creed to the gods of the other. The modern name *Bod Fhergais*, which Petrie records, [38] cannot be cited in corroboration of the phallic theory. In the first place, it cannot be absolutely proved that the stone so denominated is the genuine original Fál, however likely this may be; and in the second place, that name is clearly nothing more than a piece of rough country humour. [39] Unhewn standing stones may be, and very probably are in many cases, rude substitutes for statues; but there is not the smallest evidence that they represent phalli, at any rate in Europe. Just as Móel, Blocc, and Blucne were the receptacles of personalities of the three druids buried underneath them, and acted under the inspiration of their superhuman intelligences, so Fál was the receptacle of the divinity whose name it bore.

Almost too tempting to be admissible is a suggestion which might be made, to the effect that *Ferp* does not represent *uerpa*, but *Virbius*, the name of the god of the grove of Nemi. The Master of Emmanuel College, whom I consulted on this possibility, writes as follows: "I agree with you that a connexion between *Ferp* and *uerpa* would probably be only a piece of virulent ecclesiastical hostility. I doubt if *uerpa* was a word in popular use at all. Nobody knows what its origin was, and so far as I know it has left no descendants in the Romance languages. On the other hand, *Virbius* also seems to have no cognates, in proper names at any rate. From a phonetic point of view I do not see any serious difficulty in connecting *Virbius* and *Ferp*, if we were sure that the *i* in the *Vir*-syllable was original (it would then be like *vir* and *fer*), and that the *b* was original. The lack of cognates makes this uncertain, and if *b* represents an original *dh*, which in the neighbourhood of *r* it very well might, the identity would not be possible. There is of course the further point that at Aricia the Latin would be strongly marked with dialect, in which case the *i* of the first syllable might represent an older *c*; or if it were a long vowel (as to that, we have no evidence) it might arise from early diphthongs. Thus, as generally happens with the etymology of rare words, the data are not sufficient to give a certain conclusion in favour of, but offer no serious obstacle against your view: and the other points you mention are certainly tempting enough to warrant you in going on." [40]

Another point of importance to notice about Fál is a constant tradition that it was not native to Temair ; coupled with an expectation that it was not destined to remain there for ever. As to the place from which it came, authorities differ ; but they agree in representing that it came from elsewhere.

Thus, Lebor Gabála enumerates it among the four treasures brought into Ireland by the Tuatha Dé Danann. It came, so we are told, from the city Fálías ; while Lug's invincible spear was brought from Gorias, Nuadu's sword from Finnias, and The Dagda's inexhaustible cauldron from Múrias. [41] Thus the stone is brought into association with three of the most important deities in the pantheon. The names of the cities are obviously factitious, formed by someone who had deciphered a name like *Ercias* on an Ogham inscription, and recognized the common name Erc, but was not very clear as to the meaning of the archaic genitive termination *ias*. Fálías is thus formed from the name of Fál ; and the apparent meaning of Fál (" wall") has suggested Múr, and thus given a foundation on which to base the city Murias. Some vague recollection of a legendary king Nuadu Finn-fáil has suggested Finnias, whence Nuadu obtained his sword ; and Gorias (*gor* = fire) is a suitable place for the sun-god Lug to find his destroying spear. Thus Fál lies at the base of three out of the four cities in which the Tuatha Dé Danann learnt their magic.

*Baile an Scáil*, the tale to which reference has already been made, tells a different story. According to this interesting text, the druids Móel, Blocc, and Bluicne explained to Conn Cét-chathach that the stone came from Inis Fo-ail, was set in Temair Tire Fáil, and was destined hereafter to find its way to Tailtiu.

Inis Fo-ail is merely a perversion of Inis Fáil, in the interests of an absurd etymology (*fó ail*, " under a king"). Thus, what the druids said was that the stone came to Te.air from Inis Fáil. This implies that Inis Fáil is not Ireland, but some other island. When we seek for mother island bearing this name, we have not far to look. The little islet in Wexford Harbour, [42] now called Beggery Island a corruption of Beg-Éire, Little Ireland), also bears the name of Inis Fáil.

Beg-Éire is the site of a very ancient ecclesiastical establishment, associated with the name of Ibar, traditionally said to have been one of the pre-Patrician saints of Ireland. Now it may be laid down as at least a working hypothesis, that the existence of an ancient Celtic monastery on such an island is presumptive evidence of the pre-existence of a pagan sanctuary on the same spot ; the missionaries and early fathers of the church in Ireland being desirous of diverting the sanctity of the island from the false to the true Faith. This is certainly the case of Inis Muiredaig in Sligo Bay; the church there, called *Teampull na Teineadh*, with its sacred fire-hearth (site of " one of the three sacred perennial fires of Ireland"), [43] preserves the memory of some fire-ceremony that assuredly was not Christian. It seems also to be the case at Inis Cealtra, where, as I have shown in my account of the site, there is very complete evidence for the former existence of a sacred tree. And the name of Inis Fáil affixed to the island of St. Ibarcan only mean that this island was a centre of rites similar to those which centred in the stone of Fál ; at least, that in some way or other the god immanent in the stone of Fál was there honoured.

Of the servant of Christ who founded and laboured in the church of Beg Éire, and who now enjoys his reward, nothing is known. For it is clear that the few facts recorded of him belong, not to him, but to his pagan predecessors. His very name is forgotten ; that of the sacred yew-tree (*ibar*) of the island has been substituted. Another island in Wexford Harbour had a sacred oak-tree upon it, from which it derived the name *Dair-inis*, " Oak Island." Probably Beg Éire had an alternative name analogous to this *Inis Ibar*, " island of the yew-tree." In time this was understood to mean " Island of Ibar." interpreted as referring to the forgotten founder of the monastery. In like manner, the unknown hermit of Inis Cathaigh has been tricked out incongruously with the name of the river-god Senan, who probably had a sanctuary in the conspicuous island at the mouth of the river.

Let it be clearly understood that the historicity of these saints is not in question. That is amply attested by the existence of the ruins of the religious houses associated with them. But their names have suffered the usual fate of names handed down by tradition, and have become confused with other names which by reason of a much longer history, stretching far back into the unknown abysses of pagan ages, had made a deeper impression on popular memory.

A case even more remarkable than the two above cited is that of the foundress of the nunnery of Kildare. There was doubtless here, in pagan times, a college of priestesses who tended a perpetual fire, and who (presumably with orgiastic rites resembling those of the Gaulish priestesses of Sena) honoured the fire-goddess Brigid, this divinity being immanent in sacred sun-oak which gave to the place the name that it still bears. Probably the head of the college was regarded as an incarnation of the goddess, and so bore her name, as the kings of Temair bore the name of Eochu. But one of the succession came under Christian influence, and, embracing the Faith of the Cross, she accomplished the tremendous feat of converting the pagan sanctuary into a Christian religious house a work in its way far more wonderful than the miracles with which her biographers credit her. It is no detraction from the honour due to her for this achievement, that she could not quite rid the establishment over which she presided of all its pagan vestiges ; “ the bright lamp that lay in Kildare’s holy fane” still “ burnt through long ages,” not, as Moore foolishly says, of “ darkness and storm,” but of Christian Faith and Works. And though it is most probable that she herself changed the official name “ Brigid” which hitherto she had borne (for no Christian lady would willingly continue to bear a name so heathenish while paganism was still a force), it was too deeply rooted in the folk-memory, and continued to be used locally to designate her.

To return to St. Ibar, we are told that he resented the coming of St. Patrick, [44] which would hardly be to his credit if he were a Christian, but would be intelligible if the story were first told of a pagan. His mother’s name Lassar (“ flame”) is suggestive in this connexion, [45] as well as her origin from the Dési of Breg. He is one of the saints to whom a life of portentous length is assigned by the Annalists (the Four Masters, for example, tell us that he died A.D. 500 at the age of 304 years; the Martyrology of Donegal adds another century). And a “ very ancient old book” cited by the Martyrology of Donegal states that in habits and in life he resembled St. John the Baptist a remark of great significance, as we shall see.

Beg Eire is situated in the estuary of the river Slaney. We have already seen that the god of the Slaney, under his two names. Slainge and (Mo-)Donn(os), appears as the leader of both the Fir Bolg and the Milesian invasion : and we have suggested that the latter is the original form of the story, the former a contaminated version. In Ptolemy’s time the south-east corner of the island seems to have been endowed with peculiar sanctity. We see in his map the *Sacred Promontory*, and names like *Birgos* (the river Barrow), and the tribe of the *Brigantes*, containing the same linguistic element as the name of the fire-goddess *Brigid*. It is suggestive in this connexion that the traditional Ibar is in his life brought into close association with Kildare. The same element enters into Bregna, a name for the Boyne preserved in Cormac’s *Glossary*. The enormous earthen ring-fort, called Ballytrent, one of the largest and finest earthworks in Ireland, a short distance north of Carnsore Point (The Sacred Promontory,), may well have been a sanctuary of some kind; indeed, there is at Carnsore Point itself a ring-wall, now consecrated by the ruined chapel that bears the name of Mo-bheóc. [46]

When we recollect further that the plain round Temair is called Mag Breg, after which Temair itself is named Temair Breg, and that in Ptolemy’s time Temair had not yet attained a sufficient general importance to obtain a place on his map ; that there was a tradition, *ualeat quantum*, that Fál had been brought thither from somewhere called Inis Fáil ; and finally, when we remember that it would be quite possible to imagine the names Éire and Inis Fáil being transferred by advancing conquerors from the smaller island to the larger, but that the reverse process is highly improbable, we see the inference stated above continued. And having thus concluded that the Slaney estuary saw the first landing of the incoming Celts, we look up the “ official histories” to see what they have to say on the subject. Here we find it stated that the Milesians first came to land in Inber Slainge—the Slaney estuary—though the druids of the Tuatha Dé Dannnn were able to keep them off by magically causing the country to disappear, so that they sailed round it three times without knowing what they were doing, and finally came to land in Inber Scene (supposed to be Kenmare Riven. Whatever we may make of the latter part of this episode, the first part certainly indicates a tradition which agrees with our deductions.

True, there is another explanation for the island in the Slaney estuary being called “ Little Ireland.” We are told that Ibar and Patrick having quarrelled, the latter pronounced sentence that “ Ibar should

never be in Ireland.” “Ireland shall be the name of the place wherever I shall be,” retorted Ibar; so that he called the island of his exile “Little Ireland.” [47] This reminds us of the curious statement already referred to, that “Cenannus was the name of every place where Fiachu built his house”; perhaps the record of an advancing host ever establishing a sanctuary for its culture-hero when it reaches a fresh stage of its march. Hogan’s *Onomasticon* records only two places of the latter name in Ireland (Kells in Meath and Kells in Ossory), and one in Scotland (Kells in Galloway.) There are other places now called Kells in Antrim, Clare, Kerry, and Limerick. These data, however, are scarcely sufficient to enable us to trace the spread of the cult of Fiachu.

There seems to be a further reminiscence of the importation of the Fál cults into Temair from somewhere else, in the legend of Tea and Tephí. Tephí, as we are told, was buried in Spain, the traditional land or origin of the Milesian people. Tea saw her monument there, and built Temair in imitation of it. That is to say, the structure of Temair was modelled on the pattern of some other structure, in the place (not necessarily Spain) where the worshippers of the gods of Temair came from. When the incoming Celtic-speakers had spread inland, and had established their domination over the whole country, they took over the ancient sanctuaries, Temair among them, and there established their new gods, amid the sacred waters, animals, and trees of their Bronze-Age predecessors.

Such, then, appears to be the meaning of the statement in the prophecy called *Baile an Scáil*, that Fál came from Inis Fáil. The Celtic conquest was still comparatively recent when that story was first told. It was still remembered that the cult of Fál had not been indigenous at Temair, but had been imported from an island that bore this name. We need not suppose that the stone itself came from Inis Fáil; it may have been already on the spot, and have been adapted as the representation of the deity.

But *Baile an Scáil* has something more to say about the stone, which is less easy to explain. It may be remarked parenthetically that this story of the “Spectre’s Ecstasy” is to the effect that Conn Cétchathach stepped one day by hazard on the stone of Fál; that it uttered its scream; and that the druids Móel, Blocc, and Blucne explained its meaning to the king. The historical background of the occurrence, the essential point of which is Conn’s ignorance of the properties of the stone, is probably the fact that Conn, as grandfather of Cormac, was the founder of a new dynasty under which a new order was fated to hold sway in Temair; but the story itself is completely mythical, being full of impossible magic and mystery. After the druids had prophesied of the virtues of the stone, a theophany of Lug appeared and marshalled before Conn in a prophetic vision the kings that were to reign after him: a sort of anticipation of the procession of kings in *Macbeth*.

Now the druids told Conn that the stone was fated to remain perpetually in the Land of Tailltiu; and that there should be a field of games (i.e. periodical religious festivals, with sacred games, &c.) at Tailltiu so long as there should be a monarchy in Temair. Also, that the king who on the last day of the feast should not see the stone would be a doomed man (trú) that same year. [48]

There is a remarkable variant of this story in the Book of Leinster (facs. 9a). According to this passage, the properties of the stone were tested by Cu-Chulaind and by his foster Lugaid, and the stone remained obstinately silent under both of them; nor did it scream thenceforth till Conn stood upon it, when its heart burst from it and Hew to Tailltiu, where it still remained, called by the name Cride Fáil, “Fál’s Heart.”

Tailltiu was the special sanctuary of Lug, the sun-god, and the games there held had been instituted by him. There must have been some stone there called by the name “Fal’s Heart,” which was supposed to have come from Temair in some such way. It is quite likely that the king who was responsible for the growth and fruitfulness of the crops might have to repair to the sanctuary of the sun-god periodically to renew his strength; and it may be that the rite which was transacted at his inauguration at the “Stone of Fál” was renewed from time to time for this purpose at the “Heart of Fál.” That is the best attempt at an explanation of these two extremely difficult passages which occurs to me. The possibility, referred to on a previous page, that the *queens* of Temair were buried at Tailltiu may be recalled in this connexion.

But the new king is waiting for the god to accept him by means of a scream. This scream requires a section to itself. We may, however, note here the naive explanation of the scream given by Keating and other late writers, that the stone contained a demon which lost its power at the birth of Christ. This is additional testimony in support of the interpretation that sees in Fál a deity. The gods of the older faith are the demons of the new. [49]

- [1] Cóir Anmand, a tract which tries to do for biography what *Dindshenchas Érenn* does for geography, accounts for Coirpre's nickname 'cat-head' in a singular way. It says. *fuath cait robhai fora dea*, "his god had the shape of a cat." Obviously this does not explain why a person should be called "cat-headed." We must therefore see once more an adaptation to etymological needs of a sentence already in existence. It is not difficult to see in it a contemptuous reference to some form of animal worship among the aborigines, an early manifestation of *odium theologicum*, this time between the creeds of rival pagan races in the country.
- [2] Livy, v, 34.
- [3] This rule was not universal : from the story of Aithirne we learn that the Connacian king Guaire had but one eye, which did not interfere with his reigning.
- [4] *Revue Celtique*, xiii, 456.
- [5] *Irische Texte*, i, 118. It is evidently wrong to explain this, with Nutt, as a fear of the excessive use of the *droit du seigneur* (Voyage of Bran, ii, 51). The marriage of the king would not necessarily interfere with such a practice, which in any case is mythical : see the discussion in Frazer, *Folklore in the Old Testament*, vol. i, p. 485 ff.
- [6] *Ériu*, iii, 149.
- [7] *Lismore Life of St. Senan*, ed. Stokes, line 1855.
- [8] *Lismore Lives*, ed. Stokes, 2675.
- [9] Surely no one will lie so prosaic as to take this remark for anything but a *jeu d'esprit* !
- [10] Pliny, *Nat. Hist.*, xvi, 95.
- [11] Labor Aicle, in *Ancient Laws of Ireland*, iii, 82.
- [12] *Revue celtique*, xxii, 22.
- [13] See Rhys, *Hibbert Lectures*, pp. 122-124, where this is clearly shown.
- [14] Sir James Frazer has kindly continued this in a private letter to me.
- [15] See *Serglige Con-Chulaind* in *Irische Texte*, i, 213 ; *Revue celtique*, xxii, 22 ; and analogies in Frazer, *The Magic Art*, i, 381-383. For many analogies to this custom of electing a ruler by divination, see Mr. Hartland's essay, *The Voice of the Stone of Destiny* (*Folk-lore*, xiv, 28-60).
- [16] *Féilire Oengusso*, Bradshaw ed., p. 12.
- [17] Edited by Mr. Lucius Gwynn in *Ériu*, vi, 130.
- [18] *Topographia Hiberniae*, iii, 25.
- [19] That delightfully naive person, Lynch, the author *Cambrensis Eversus*, after expending himself in a denunciation of the shamelessness of Giraldus for reporting this ritual, gives his whole case away by Adding *nullibi certe tam fueda, alibi ludicra initiatione aliqui principatum auspicantur*, and then quoting two examples of parallel rites which afforded the best possible continuation of Giraldus available in the literature at his disposal. Could he have lived to read some modern compilations of savage practices, it is to be feared that he would have had to strike out the words *nullibi tam fueda*
- [20] *Hippolyte* in *Cultes, Mythes, et Religions*, iii, 54.
- [21] See Cook's *Zeus*, vol. i, p. 75, and references in foot-note 7 on the same page.
- [22] Frazer, *The Magic Art*, i, 19.
- [23] Like the hostages of Fiachra. *Revue celtique*, xxiv, 184. Compare also the sentence passed upon the daughter of the Ulidian king in *Togáil Bruidne Dá Derga*, *ibid.*, xxii, 18, 19. Mr. Cook suggests to me a comparison with the myth of the invulnerable Kaineus, crushed into the earth by Centaurs under a heap of fir-branches. Indeed the representation of the scene on the broken frieze of the Theseion (Baumeister, *Denkmäler* fig. 1868) seems to show the Centaurs pressing him into the ground under the weight of a great stone. The burial of the druids might have taken place to secure luck, at the original establishment of the sanctuary : cf. the well-known Iona story.
- [24] O'Curry, *MS. Materials*, p. 618.
- [25] For these druids see *Tripartite Life*, p. 273. Móel was also the name of a druid at Cruachu ; *ibid.*, p. 92.
- [26] *Ériu*, vi, 1H4.

- [27] See Doubdan, *Le voyage de la Terre Sainte* (Paris, 1660), p. 57, or Morison. *Relation historique d'un voyage nouvellement fait au Mont de Sinaï et au Jerusalem* (Toul, 1704), p 347, for a rite of this kind observed in the seventeenth century at the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, as a test of legitimacy. For similar rites carried out for other purposes, reference may be made to the brochure by Gaidoz, mentioned in the following foot-note.
- [28] *Un vieux rite medieale. Opuscule offert à Anatole de Barthélemy, Paris, 1892.*
- [29] *Balder the Beautiful*, ii, 171, note.
- [30] “ Nous admettons bien,— pour quelques-uns des cas que nous avons citiés, la théorie de la nouvelle naissance, parce qu'il s'agit là d'une image matérielle et en quelque sorte d'une idée matérialiste.”
- [31] See some examples in Frazer, *Taboo and the Perils of the Soul*, p. 113 ; *The Magic Art*, i, 80.
- [32] Other examples of triplicities similarly constructed will be found in a list of the Tuatha Dé Danann in *Irische Texte*, iii, 58. The assonance of the added names (B, B') is analogous to the assonance frequently observed in the names of twins : on which see Rendel Harris, *The Cult of the Heavenly Twins*, chap, viii.
- [33] See Rhys, *Hibbert Lectures*, p. 207, and references there.
- [34] *Revue celtique*, xxix, 138.
- [35] *Festschrift Whitley Stokes*, p. 9.
- [36] Cormac explains *fál* as *rí* (king). O'Davoren says *rí no muir*, “ king, or sea.” The expression “ *lia Fail*” is used in the poem by Cináed ó hArtacáin entitled *Aided a forni do hUaislib Erenn* simply in the sense of “ a big-stone”: see *Revue celtique*, xxiii, 306, line 3, and the note on the passage, p. 333.
- [37] Compare *Cenuerbe*, the name given to Cenn Crúaich in Colgan's *Secunda Vitu Patricii*.
- [38] *Tara*, p. 159.
- [39] Similarly, M. Salomon Reinach (*Cultes*, iii, 371), after citing an analogous name attached to a French standing stone, adds : “ C'est le seul exemple que je counaisse d'une dénomination phallique ; elle résulte évidemment d'une comparaison rustique, et ne peut être alléguée a l'appui de la thèse qui voit des emblèmes de la génération dans les menhirs.”
- [40] It is a further curious coincidence that we have a stone of Maine at Temair, and that the name Manius is closely connected with Aricia : see Cook, in *Folk-lore*, xvi 291-293.
- [41] *Book of Ballymote*, facs. 32 a 15-25.
- [42] No longer an island, owing to land reclamation.
- [43] *Silva Gadelica*, i, 42 ; ii, 41 : Wakeman, *Inismurray*, pp. 51-56.
- [44] *Féilire Oengusso*, Glosses, Bradshaw ed., p. 118 ; *Life of St. Declan* (Irish Texts Society), p. 36.
- [45] But see Kuuu Meyer's note, Todd Lect., xvii, 109, note on p. 6, line 10.
- [46] I have to acknowledge the kindness of my friend the Rev. R. Fitz. Henry, P. P., of Broadway, for guiding me over these sites and also over Beg Éire. There is nothing, however, now to be seen at the latter spot having any direct bearing on the subject of this paper.
- [47] *Féilire Oengusso*, Bradshaw ed., p. 118.
- [48] See O'Curry, *MS. Materials*, p. 618 ; also *Zeitschr. celt. Phil.*, iii, 459.
- [49] So St. Mochutu of Raithin conjured Satan into a neighbouring pillar-stone : see *Féilire Oengusso*, Bradshaw ed., p. 94.

Temair Breg : a study of the remains and traditions of Tara (1919)

Author : Macalister, Robert Alexander Stewart, 1870-1950 ; Macalister, Robert Alexander Stewart, 1870-1950

Subject: Tara (Ireland) ; Ireland — Antiquities

Publisher : [Dublin : Royal Irish Academy]

Language : English

Digitizing sponsor: MSN

Book contributor: Kelly — University of Toronto

Collection: kellylibrary; toronto

Source : Internet Archive

<http://www.archive.org/details/temairbregstudyo00macauoft>

Edited and uploaded to [www.aughty.org](http://www.aughty.org)

February 28 2011