

ÉIGSE

A JOURNAL OF IRISH STUDIES

EDITED BY LIAM MAC MATHÚNA

VOLUME XLII

PUBLISHED BY THE NATIONAL UNIVERSITY OF IRELAND

2025

BORD COMHAIRLEACH IDIRNÁISIÚNTA INTERNATIONAL ADVISORY BOARD

Dr Micheál Briody, University of Helsinki
 Professor Mícheál Mac Craith, University of Galway
 Professor Séamus Mac Mathúna, Ulster University
 Professor Aoibheann Nic Dhonnchadha, School of Celtic Studies,
 Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies
 Professor Máirín Nic Eoin, Dublin City University
 Professor Seán Ó Coileáin, University College Cork
 Professor Brian Ó Conchubhair, University of Notre Dame
 Professor Philip O'Leary, Boston College
 Professor Pádraig Ó Macháin, University College Cork
 Professor Roibeard Ó Maolalaigh, University of Glasgow
 Professor Pádraig Ó Siadhail, Saint Mary's University, Halifax
 Professor Erich Poppe, Philipps-Universität Marburg
 Professor Jan Erik Rekdal, University of Oslo
 Professor Gregory Toner, Queen's University Belfast
 Professor Regina Uí Chollatáin, University College Dublin

LUCHT COMHAIRLE EILE / OTHER PEER REVIEWERS

Dr George Broderick, Universität Mannheim
 Dr Charles Dillon, Royal Irish Academy
 Professor Raymond Hickey, University of Duisburg and Essen
 Dr Nioclás Mac Cathmhaoil, Ulster University
 Dr Uaitéar Mac Gearailt, Dublin City University
 Dr Kevin Murray, University College Cork
 Dr Siobhán Ní Laoire, Technological University Dublin
 Dr Tracey Ní Mhaonaigh, Maynooth University
 Dr Máire Nic an Bhaird, Maynooth University
 Máire Nic Mhaoláin, Dublin
 Dr Pádraig Ó Cearbhaill, Dublin
 Dr Proinsias Ó Drisceoil, Tipperary
 Dr Liam Ó hAisibéil, University of Galway
 Professor Tadhg Ó hÍfearnáin, University of Galway
 Dr Pádraig Ó Liatháin, Dublin City University
 Dr Nollaig Ó Muraíle, University of Galway
 Dr Geraldine Parsons, University of Glasgow

FÓGRA

ÉIGSE publishes articles in both Irish and English. All articles submitted for publication are tendered to peer review.

Articles for publication should be addressed to the Editor, ÉIGSE, National University of Ireland, 49 Merrion Square, Dublin 2, Ireland.

Treoir do Scríbhneoirí. For information on style contributors should consult the website www.nui.ie/eigse/ and recent volumes of the journal.

Subscribers receive new issues post-free. For sales and subscriptions consult the website. Enquiries may be addressed to the Registrar, National University of Ireland, at the above address.

Only books dealing with, or having reference to, Irish literary and linguistic studies (Léann na Gaeilge) should be sent for review in ÉIGSE.

ISSN 0013 2608
ISBN 978-0-90151-096-9

© None of the contents of ÉIGSE should be reproduced without the consent of the Editor.

Layout and printing by
CRM Design + Print Ltd., Dublin 12



CLÁR AN ÁBHAIR / CONTENTS

FACSIMILES AND TRANSCRIPTS: TWO CASES OF DECORATIVE SCRIBAL WORK	
<i>Pádraig Ó Macháin and Anna Hoffmann</i>	1
MANUSCRIPT CONTEXT AND POSSIBLE SOURCE OF <i>TOCHMARC MOMÉRA</i> <i>Ksenia Kudenko</i>	16
THE MEDICAL FRAGMENTS IN THE BOOK OF FERMOY: CONTEXT AND SOURCES	
<i>Aoibheann Nic Dhonnchadha</i>	31
ARAOIR DAM SEAL IS ME IM' AONAR: AISLING A SCRÍOBH EOGHAN RUA Ó SÚILLEABHÁIN	
<i>Máire Ní Íceadha</i>	60
MANX LEXICOLOGY AND ETYMOLOGY: FOUR CASE STUDIES	
<i>Christopher Lewin</i>	78
GENDER MARKING IN LATE MANX SPEECH	
<i>George Broderick</i>	105
TOWARDS A STUDY OF EPENTHESIS IN MUSKERRY IRISH, 1850–1950	
<i>David Webb</i>	124
GAOLTA NA GAEILGE SNA CANÚINTÍ ÉAGSÚLA: FIANAISE <i>LEAGAN CAINTE</i>	
<i>Kevin Hickey</i>	159
SEÁN Ó DÁLAIGH, <i>AISLING PHADRUIC CUNDUN</i> , AGUS DÁIBHIDH DO BARRADH	
<i>Tony Ó Floinn</i>	191
AN CRAOIBHÍN AOIBHINN IN TORONTO, BEALTAINÉ 1906	
<i>Pádraig Ó Siadhail</i>	216
THE <i>PRULL</i> ENTRY IN <i>SANAS CORMAIC</i> : VERSE-CAPPING AS THE VEHICLE OF CENSURE	
<i>William Sayers</i>	250

GAULISH <i>MĀROS</i> ‘BIG, GREAT’, ULSTER IRISH BY-FORM [MGRDN] ‘A LOT’: DEVIATION FROM MAINSTREAM <i>MÓRÁN</i> OR ARCHAISM? <i>Art Hughes</i>	259
CAS SIAR, CAITH(EAMH) SIAR? – TÉARMA TALMHAÍOCHTA <i>Conchúr Mag Eacháin</i>	273
VARIA I: A practical context for the land-changing feats in <i>Tochmarc Étaíne</i> <i>A. Joseph McMullen</i>	287
VARIA II: An Irish salamander <i>Máire Nic Mhaoláin</i>	295
VARIA III: Dán ar Bhás John Moore, le Charles Wolfe <i>Pádraig Ó Liatháin</i>	298

AILT LÉIRMHEASA / REVIEW ARTICLES

Bernadette Cunningham: CONALL MAG EOCHAGÁIN’S HISTORY OF THE KINGDOM OF IRELAND, 1627	303
Máirín Nic Eoin: LANGUAGE LEARNING IN NINETEENTH-CENTURY IRELAND	318
Noel Ó Murchadha: BEARTAS TEANGA NA GAEILGE SA LÁ INNIU AGUS SAN AM ATÁ CAITE	330

LÉIRMHEASANNA / REVIEWS

Bjorn Olaf Vatzlavik: *Book of Uí Mhaine* (Elizabeth Boyle, Ruairí Ó hUiginn) 343; Breandán Ó Cróinín: *Tintúd–Aistriú: papers on translation in Irish tradition* (Ó Donnchú) 345; Eilís Ní Dheá: *Séamas* (‘An Setter’) *Ó Caoindealbháin: amhráin agus dánta* (Ó Cearbhaill) 351; Liam Mac Mathúna: *Pádraig Ó Laoghaire (1870–1896): an Irish scholar from the Béarra Peninsula* (Ní Úrdail) 354; Máire Nic an Bhaird: *An óige agus an athbheochan* (Nic Congáil) 358; Róisín Nic Dhonncha: *Ludwig Mühlhausen, Séamus Ó Caiside agus Scéal Rí na Gréige: The Tale of ‘Three Golden Children’ (ATU 707) in 1937*

Donegal. (Fomin) 364; Máiréad Ní Loingsigh: *Snátha den seansaol / Strands of traditional life* (Ó Héalaí) 367; Tracey Ní Mhaonaigh: *Ó chleamairi go ceamaraí: drámaíocht agus taibhealaíona na Gaeilge faoi chaibidil* (Ní Mhuircheartaigh, Ní Ghairbhí, Ó Liatháin) 372; Róisín Ní Ghairbhí: *Setting the stage: transitional playwrights in Irish 1910–1950* (O’Leary) 375; Liam Mac Peaircín: *Seacht dtír seacht dteanga: scéal file agus fánaí ó Ghaillimh go Bucairist 1980–2020* (Johnson) 380; Liam Mac Mathúna: *Catalogue of Irish manuscripts in Houghton Library, Harvard University* (Buttimer) 383; Liam Mac Mathúna: *Niamh* (Ua Laoghaire, Webb), *Mo scéal féin* (Ua Laoghaire, Webb), *Aodh de Róiste* (Ó Céileachair, Webb) 388.

IN MEMORIAM

Gearóid S. Mac Eoin (1929–2023)

Séamus Mac Mathúna 391



THE MEDICAL FRAGMENTS IN THE BOOK OF FERMOY: CONTEXT AND SOURCES

Royal Irish Academy MS 23 E 29 (1134), otherwise known as the Book of Fermoy, contains three medical fragments, each in a different scribal hand, which are undated, but which are believed to have been written in the fifteenth century.¹

The fragments were noticed as follows by James Henthorn Todd (1805–1869) in the introductory remarks to his descriptive catalogue of the Book of Fermoy:

The volume concludes with some fragments of medical treatises in the usual exquisitely neat handwriting peculiar to Irish medical MSS. These fragments were certainly no part of the original Book of Fermoy; they probably belonged to the family of O’Hickey, who were hereditary physicians, and whose name occurs more than once inscribed in the margins and blank places of this portion of the MS.²

A detailed account of the fragments was given in the valuable catalogue description of the Book of Fermoy, prepared by Gerard Murphy, which appeared in fasciculus xxv of the Royal Irish Academy’s catalogue, published in 1940.³ As this description notes, the first medical item (RIA

¹ Thomas F. O’Rahilly, Kathleen Mulchrone et al., *Catalogue of Irish manuscripts in the Royal Irish Academy* i–xxviii, index I–II (Dublin and London 1926–70) [henceforth *RIA Cat.*] 3091–125; the scribal hands of the medical fragments, which are written in double columns, are distinguished *ibid.* 3092.33–7, where it is noted that the fragments are ‘perhaps of the 15th cent.’

² ‘A descriptive catalogue of the contents of the Book of Fermoy’, *Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy* (Irish MSS Series, volume I, part I, Dublin 1870) 1–65, at 5; in introducing his account of the individual fragments (*ibid.* 52–3, §§XVII–XIX), Todd notes that they are ‘in a very much injured condition’ and again remarks that they ‘do not appear to have formed any part of the collection now called the Book of Fermoy’ (*ibid.* 52). Todd’s catalogue was originally published as an independent item, *Descriptive catalogue of the contents of the Irish manuscript commonly called “The Book of Fermoy”* (Dublin 1868), the title page to which records: ‘Read before the Royal Irish Academy, November 30, 1867’.

The medical fragments were noticed briefly as follows by Eugene O’Curry in the catalogue of the Book of Fermoy (Royal Irish Academy [henceforth *RIA*] MS 12 W 27 (1428), ff 1–81; see *RIA Cat.* 3676–7) which he compiled for J. H. Todd in July 1858: ‘There is a fragment of eight folios of some old medical book in this box, at the end, but they were never any part of the Book of Fermoy’ (*ibid.* f. 81r); the box in question is referred to at *RIA Cat.* 3095.32–5.

³ Fasciculus xxv was prepared by Gerard Murphy and Elizabeth FitzPatrick; their descriptions are assigned as follows (inside front cover): ‘No. 1134 is described by G.M.; Nos. 1135–1191 by E.F.’ This catalogue description accompanies the images of the Book of Fermoy found on Irish Script on Screen (ISOS) (www.isos.dias.ie).

MS 23 E 29, pp 217–24) comprises a ‘fragment on diet’, which deals in particular with milk and its products; the second and third fragments (pp 225–8 and 229–32, respectively) each contain a physiological commentary. In describing these texts – all three of which are acephalous – Gerard Murphy detailed their contents and stylistic features and drew attention to resemblances they shared with a number of other treatises of similar design and subject-matter.

This essay seeks to supplement Gerard Murphy’s comprehensive description of the fragments by drawing attention to a previously unnoticed textual colophon in the first fragment and to the scribal colophon which follows it. An overview of the contents of the second and third fragments is also presented.⁴

FRAGMENT I

Order of leaves

The first fragment comprises four vellum leaves, pp 217–24, which contain a single acephalous treatise on diet.⁵ In its collation of the manuscript, *RIA Cat.* correctly notes that there is a chasm before p. 219;⁶ the catalogue errs, however, in stating that the ‘correct order’ in the four leaves is ‘217–218, 221–222, 219–220, 223–224’⁷ – the order in which it reads and describes the text; thus, having first discussed the text on pp 217–8, 221–2, it introduces the text in the remaining pages as follows: ‘On pp. 219, 220, 223, 224 is found what appears to be a second fragment of this treatise on diet’.⁸

It can now be shown on textual evidence that the correct order of leaves in this fragment is as follows: 219–20, 223–4; chasm; 217–18, 221–2, a sequence which – assuming an original gathering of eight –

⁴ The fragments formed the subject of a paper read by the present writer at ‘The medieval Book of Fermoy: content and context’, a conference held in Fermoy on 1–3 May 2015. I thank Eamonn Cotter and the Fermoy Heritage Group for their kind invitation to participate in the conference and for their gracious hospitality. I am particularly grateful to Dr Pádraig de Brún and to Prof. Pádraig Ó Macháin for their generous advice and their many helpful suggestions.

⁵ Todd, ‘Descriptive catalogue’, p. 52 §XVII (‘This stave consists of four leaves marked on the lower margins E 1, E 2, E 3, E 4. The upper margins are greatly injured throughout, and no traces remain of any older pagination’); cf. *RIA Cat.* 3091 (‘Pp. 217–230’ [*sic*; leg. 217–228] ‘are foliated as E 1–E 6 in the lower margin (E 5 and E 6 also in the upper margin)’). This foliation is in the hand of Eugene O’Curry (Todd, ‘Descriptive catalogue’, p. 53 §XIX).

⁶ *ibid.* 3094.x–z.

⁷ *ibid.* 3095.2–4.

⁸ *ibid.* 3119.12–13.

suggests the loss of leaves 1, 4–5 and 8.⁹ The catalogue's oversight regarding the order of leaves clearly arose from the fact that a colophon found on p. 222 (see below) was overlooked in describing the fragment – a colophon in which the *De proprietatibus rerum* of Bartholomaeus Anglicus – the source of the text on pp 219–20, 223–4 – is acknowledged before the *De dietis universalibus* of Isaac – the source of the text on pp 217–18, 221–2.¹⁰

Content of colophon: summary

In describing the section of the treatise on diet contained in pp 217–18, 221–2 – leaves which, as previously noted, were believed at the time to comprise the first rather than the second part of the tract – the catalogue – having noted that the text in those leaves begins imperfectly – goes on to state that it also ends imperfectly: 'At the foot of p. 222, col. 2, after some lines which are illegible owing to wear and staining, the text ends imperfect owing to a chasm in the MS. The last easily legible sentence is on p. 222, col. 2, ll 28–31'.¹¹

The text in these leaves does not end imperfectly, however. It concludes formally with a colophon (p. 222b43–6), transcribed below, in which the text is referred to as a 'Chapter on milk' and in which the three Latin sources upon which it is based are identified; this colophon ends with the phrase 'Finit amen'. A scribal colophon immediately follows (p. 222b47–8 and lower margin), which is only partly legible. In it, the scribe identifies himself as Filib Ó Fearrghusa; he also refers to one Muiris Mac [? N]ighlais – presumably the scribe and/or owner of the exemplar from which he had copied the text; he ends the colophon with a prayer – some words of which are illegible – and states that the text was written in Rossmannagher [par. Feenagh, bar. Bunratty Lower, Co. Clare]. It seems that the sentence naming the place of writing ('a ros beanncair do sgribad') is followed by an *anno domini* date, but, if so, this too is illegible.¹²

⁹ The textual lacuna between pp 224 and 217 is consonant with the loss at this point of two leaves at most. For an outline of text wanting through loss of leaves 1, 4–5, see nn 61, 63–4 below.

¹⁰ The order in which source texts are cited in a textual colophon need not, of course, necessarily reflect the order in which they may have been consulted in the work itself; that it does so in this instance, however, is borne out by the textual evidence (see below).

¹¹ *RIA Cat.* 3118.y–3119.2.

¹² For the various forms of this placename, see *logainm.ie*, s.n. Ros mBeannchair ('Archival records', 'Historical references'). (My thanks to Nollaig Ó Muraile for confirmation of this identification.) For two deeds written in Rossmannagher in 1548, see James Hardiman, *Ancient Irish deeds and writings, chiefly relating to landed property, from the twelfth to the seventeenth century* Transactions of the Royal Irish Academy XV

Colophon: transcription

The textual colophon begins midline on p. 222b43 immediately following the end of the ‘Chapter on milk’ – which concludes with a passage (p. 222b28–43) in which different types of cheese are distinguished with particular reference to their digestibility.¹³ The scribal colophon follows the textual colophon with no spatial division between them. The colophons may be tentatively transcribed and translated as follows:¹⁴

*Item is crichnaig[? ti] / caibidil an bainne ann so do reir ipocraid
 7 gailen an aghfrismis do reir bartole[...] / a proprietatibus rerum
 7 isac de deitis uiniuersailibus 7 [...] / a increacaidh fai [? g]a[?
 ch] neach FINIT AME[? N] / filib o fearrghusa do sgrib so o
 muiris mac [? n]ighlais [...] / 7 gu duga dia damhsa a[? dha] rena
 mac no re n[...] / [in lower margin:] a ros beanncair do sgribad
 an[...] (RIA MS 23 E 29 (1134), p. 222b43–z)*

‘Item the chapter on milk is finished here according to Hippocrates and Galen in *Aphorisms*, according to Bartholomaeus in *De proprietatibus rerum* and Isaac in *De dietis universalibus* and ... of its criticism to everyone. Finit amen. It is Filib Ó Fearrghusa who has written this from Muiris Mac [? Nighlais]¹⁵ ... and may God grant me [...] with His Son or with / In Rossmanagher it was written in the year [the date which presumably follows is entirely illegible].’

(Dublin 1826) 3–95, at 62–4 (§§XXIII–XXIV); cf. Pádraig Ó Macháin, ‘Dhá théacs dlí’, in John Carey, et al. (eds), *Cin Chille Cúile* (Aberystwyth 2004) 309–15, pp 310–11. See also Deed 12 in ‘The Late Medieval Legal Deeds in Irish project, Department of Modern Irish, University College Cork’ (<https://sites.google.com/site/irishlegaldeeds/deeds/deed-12>) (reference courtesy of Pádraig Ó Macháin).

¹³ The final sentence in the passage reads: *Item foillsigid gurub / cruaid mall do reir naduire an sean caise rena dileagad* (RIA MS 23 E 29 (1134), p. 222b42–3) [= ‘Uetus ergo caseus naturaliter durus est: 7 ad digerendum tardus’, Isaac Judaeus, *De dietis universalibus* (in *Omnia opera Isaac* (Lyons 1515; USTC 144466), ff 11ra–103ra) [henceforth *De dietis universalibus*], f. 86va10–11]. See further Appendix 1(b) below.

¹⁴ Expansion of manuscript contractions is italicized and line-division is indicated by a forward slash preceded and followed by a space; hair-strokes are ignored in transcription; word-division is editorial; provisional readings are preceded by a question mark and placed within square brackets; entirely illegible text is indicated by ellipsis within square brackets.

¹⁵ Evidently a form of the surname Mac Niallghuis; see Patrick Woulfe, *Sloinnte Gaedheal is Gall. Irish names and surnames* (Dublin 1923) s.n. Mac Niallghuis, Mac Niallghusa (‘... the name of a West Ulster family, some of whom have settled in Mayo’).

Filib Ó Fearrghusa (fl.c.1450) and Uí Fhearghusa medical manuscripts

One of the most striking features of Fragment I is, of course, the occurrence in it of the signature of Filib Ó Fearrghusa, its scribe. Given that all three medical fragments are believed to be contemporaneous with the fifteenth-century sections of the ‘true Book of Fermoy’,¹⁶ Filib’s hand – which is currently known only from this fragment – may be tentatively dated to c.1450, the colophon by Uilliam Ó hÍceadha on p. 55b of the Book of Fermoy being dated 1457.¹⁷

Filib was a member of a well-documented medical family of Co. Mayo.¹⁸ As Diarmaid Ó Catháin has noted, the earliest recorded physician of the kindred is Macraith Ó Fearghusa, whose death in 1390 is commemorated as follows: ‘Macraith o feargusa liaigh lethe cuinn do écc’ (TCD MS 1301, f. 690r [second foliation]).¹⁹ Nothing of Macraith’s writing is known to have survived.

¹⁶ *RIA Cat.* 3092.4.

¹⁷ *RIA Cat.* 3093.5–7, 3100.x–3101.4; the catalogue also remarks (3096.6) that British Library MS ‘Eg. 92, ff 12–17, bear a date 1453’, leaves which, as Flower notes, ‘once formed part of the collection of MSS. known as the Book of Fermoy’ (Robin Flower, *Catalogue of Irish manuscripts in the British Museum* II (London 1926) 505–19, at 505–6; incidentally, for ‘I Mall–’ (ibid. 505.25), leg. ‘Í Niallain’).

With regard to Arabic numbers written in the Book of Fermoy, note that *RIA Cat.* 3101.12–13, errs in stating that Todd has misread the Golden Number given in the colophon found on p. 55b11–z of the manuscript: ‘[Todd, ... has misread the Golden Number of the year as 15. The scribe gives it as 14]’; the scribe wrote ‘15’ (p. 55b22), and the reason for his so doing is explained by Todd (‘Descriptive catalogue’, 21); this Golden Number was also correctly transcribed as ‘15’ by O’Curry in the translation of the colophon he made for Todd in 1858 (*RIA MS 12 W 27* (1428), ff 2r, 3r).

More importantly, the catalogue errs in stating that Todd has misread the date written on p. 153 of the manuscript: ‘“*Ando Domini 1461 ais an Tigerna in tan sin*” [date wrongly given as 1561 in Todd’s catalogue, p. 42]’ (*RIA Cat.* 3109.13–15). The date written on p. 153.z is, as Todd stated, ‘1561’ – a date so transcribed by O’Curry in the translation of the passage which he made for Todd (*RIA MS 12 W 27* (1428), ff 58r, 59r, 60r). Examples of Arabic ‘5’, identical to those occurring on pp 55b22 and 153.z of the Book of Fermoy, and in textual contexts that are unambiguous, are found in several contemporary medical manuscripts (e.g. National Library of Ireland [henceforth NLI] MS G 11, pp 158a11, 197b5 and 200b17; and TCD MS 1315, pp 149a46, 154a10 and 175b14).

¹⁸ Nollaig Ó Muraíle, ‘The hereditary medical families of Gaelic Ireland’, in Liam P. Ó Murchú (ed.), *Rosa Anglica: reassessments* Irish Texts Society Subsidiary Series 28 (London 2016) 85–113, at 108 (§32); to this list, add Feargach Ó Fearghusa (fl. 1596) (John Bannerman, *The Beatons: a medical kindred in the classical Gaelic tradition* (Edinburgh 1986) 104).

¹⁹ Diarmaid Ó Catháin, ‘Dr John Fergus M.D. (†1761) of Dublin and the cultural afterlife of a Gaelic learned kindred’, *Archivium Hibernicum* (forthcoming; my thanks to Diarmaid Ó Catháin and to the editor of *Archivium Hibernicum* for their kind permission to cite this article); Ó Catháin notes that the Ó Fearghusa obit of 1390 first appeared in print in John O’Donovan (ed.), *Annala Rioghachta Éireann. Annals of the kingdom of Ireland, by the Four Masters, from the earliest period to the year 1616 I–VII* (2nd edition, Dublin 1856), IV, p. 720, note g.

Filib is, accordingly, the earliest scribe of his kindred identified to date and the Fermoy fragment the earliest medical manuscript associated with them. His transcription of the ‘Chapter on milk’ is of importance in providing documentary evidence for the circulation of canonical medical textbooks of continental origin among Uí Fhearghusa physicians in the fifteenth century. Thus, as will be shown below, it is from two works of the *Ars medicine* (al. *Articella*) – the collection of texts of Greek and Arabic origin that formed the basis of the curriculum of medical studies in universities throughout Europe from the twelfth century to the sixteenth – that the ‘Chapter on milk’ was largely assembled, namely, the *Aphorisms* of Hippocrates accompanied by Galen’s commentary on them, and the *De dietis universalibus* of Isaac, the former being a core text of the *Ars* and the latter one of a group of subsidiary texts which supplemented the original *Ars*.²⁰

The transmission of medical learning through the study and exposition of authoritative texts continued among Uí Fhearghusa physicians into the sixteenth century and is reflected in particular in the treatises found in TCD MS 1357, a paper manuscript of rich and varied content written for and by Eóghan Ó Fhearghusa, who was its principal scribe, in 1563.²¹ Eóghan was also principal scribe of the second Uí Fhearghusa medical manuscript to survive from the sixteenth century,

²⁰ For the origin and development of the *Ars medicine*, see Cornelius O’Boyle, *The art of medicine: medical teaching at the University of Paris, 1250–1400* (Leiden 1998); for the *Aphorisms*, see *ibid.* pp 86–9, *et passim*; for *De dietis universalibus*, see *ibid.* 24 (n. 51), 109–111, 124–6, 178, *et passim*; the origin of the term ‘Articella’ is discussed *ibid.* 134 n. 19.

²¹ T. K. Abbott and E. J. Gwynn, *Catalogue of the Irish manuscripts in the library of Trinity College, Dublin* (Dublin 1921) [henceforth *TCD Cat.*] 184–5, and the catalogue description on ISOS; the collation of the manuscript remains to be established. Eóghan’s surname is recorded only once in the manuscript, in a marginal note written by Cairbre [Ó Ceannamháin], one of two named scribes who wrote for Eóghan but neither of whom signs his own surname: ‘Misi cairbre do sgrioph sin túas deóghan ófhearghusa anocht oidhce fhéil míchil 7 is fada leam ata eóghan amuich’ (TCD MS 1357, p. 92, lower margin); Eóghan writes his forename and the date on p. 7.z (‘Eóghan [in cipher] 156°.3°.’) and pens line-fillers on pp 11.z (‘ego sum tristis’ [*Roman script*]) and 187.z (‘ego sum lassús’ [*Roman script*]); writing in Latin (in Roman script) and Irish, he gives his place of work on p. 165.z, as ‘Coill Néill’ in Ballyvicmaha [par. Crossmolina, bar. Tirawley, Co. Mayo], dating the entry 1563 (‘Finitur opus meum odie ar choill neill ambaile matha .156°.3°. an tan sin’) (for identification of ‘Baile Matha’, see Raymond Gillespie, ‘Scribes and manuscripts in Gaelic Ireland, 1400–1700’, *Studia Hibernica* 40 (2014) 9–34, p. 15 (and n. 22)); he dates the manuscript 1563 again at pp 173.14, and 174.z. Eóghan is addressed, indirectly and affectionately, by Cairbre [Ó Ceannamháin] in a note on p. 88.z (‘Sin drochlíter ó chairbre dathseisi críde .i. eógan 7 is diu doiligh leam a fad ata sé’); Saordhálach, the second named scribe in the manuscript, dedicates his writing to Eóghan in a line-filler on p. 120.z (‘sin o tsaordalach do eogan’).

NLI MS G 503, an undated and unsigned vellum copy of the *Aphorisms* of Hippocrates (bks I–VII) in Latin, with Irish translation, which he transcribed, according to a colophon in a later hand, in the house of his father, Macraith (mac Aodha), in ‘Bale na Uachamhala’ [i.e. Churchfield (‘An Nuachabháil’), par. Oughaval, bar. Murrisk], Co. Mayo.²²

It is fortunate that manuscript evidence has also survived for Uí Fhearghusa engagement with learned medical texts right into the second half of the seventeenth century, namely, RIA MS 23 A 4 (469), part ii (pp 140–77), a fragment written by Baothalach Ó Fearghusa (*al.* Boetius ffargus), who, in a colophon to the collection of texts it contains, records his transcription as having taken place while he was in Donegal in 1656.²³

Sources: Bartholomaeus and Isaac

The ‘Chapter on milk’ begins in the midst of a discussion on women’s milk (RIA MS 23 E 29 (1134), p. 219a 1–15).²⁴ Following this, the text

treats of various properties of milk, of the physiological effects of those properties of milk on the drinker, and of the different degrees in which human milk and animal milks (camel *etc.*) possess those properties. On p. 220, after camels’ milk, cows’ milk and goats’ milk are discussed. The text of p. 220 is continued without break on p. 223, where there are paragraphs on asses’, horses’, pigs’, and pregnant animals’ milk, followed by paragraphs on whey, butter, and (p. 224, col. 2, l. 4) cheese. The fragment ends incomplete at the foot of p. 224, col. 2.²⁵

²² For identification of this placename, see Gillespie, ‘Scribes and manuscripts’, 15–16; for NLI MS G 503, see Nessa Ní Shéaghda, *Catalogue of Irish manuscripts in the National Library of Ireland I* (1967) 47, and Pádraig Ó Macháin, *Catalogue of Irish manuscripts in the National Library of Ireland XI* (1990) 9–11. For evidence that Eóghan may have been ‘still active’ in 1582, see Ní Shéaghda, *Catalogue*, 47; and for a suggestion that he is to be identified with the Eóghan Ó Fearghusa who witnessed a land deed in 1597, see Gillespie, ‘Scribes and manuscripts’, 15–16 (and n. 24).

²³ *RIA Cat.* 1229 (and Appendix 4 below). Pádraig Ó Fiannachta has noted that St Patrick’s College, Maynooth MS C 38, section (k), comprises a copy of RIA MS 23 A 4 (469) part ii, made by Peadar Ó Conuill in Tulaig Bric [Tullabrack (s.n. An Tulaigh Bhreac, *logainm.ie*), par. Kilrush, bar. Moyarta, Co. Clare] in 1796: see idem, *Lámhscribhinní Gaeilge Choláiste Phádraig, Má Nuad: clár II–VIII* (Má Nuad 1965–73), V, pp 70–1. As noted in *RIA Cat.* 1227, Ó Conuill’s signature occurs in RIA 23 A 4 (469), p. 79 (lower margin), where it follows his transcription of the scribal text on p. 79.y–z of the manuscript.

²⁴ Beg. *cum a tic a mbainne cum taeb a cich [...] / dileagthar annsin e techtaigh se* [‘? am 7’] [...] / *an cich 7 attaidh* (RIA MS 23 E 29 (1134), p. 219a1) [= ‘quedam [sc. habent lac] in aliis partibus ipsarum [sc. mammillarum] et quando lac non bene digeritur coagulatur et mammlae indurescunt’, Bartholomaeus Anglicus, *De proprietatibus rerum* (Nuremberg 1483; ISTC ib00137000), f. 252va7–9].

²⁵ *RIA Cat.* 3119.33–3120.1.

Owing to the invaluable information given in the colophon regarding the Latin sources of the ‘Chapter on milk’, it can now be shown that the above text – RIA MS 23 E 29, pp 219–20, 223–4 – corresponds to Bartholomaeus Anglicus, *Tractatus de proprietatibus rerum*, ff 252va7–254rb2 (i.e. bk XIX, chs 61 (acephalous), 62–71, 72 (incomplete)).²⁶

The contents of the text in RIA MS 23 E 29 (1134), pp 217–18, 221–2²⁷ – the final part of the ‘Chapter on milk’ – are summarized as follows in *RIA Cat.*:

On p. 217 the uses of *meadhg* (whey) are discussed, milks are classified, and the milk of various animals fitted into those classes. On p. 218 there is a further classification of milks according to the foods on which animals feed. On p. 218, col. 2, the changes are discussed which the seasons, *etc.*, make in milk. After p. 218 the text is continued without break on p. 221. On p. 221, col. 1, *infra*, there is further division of milk into old and new, followed by a discussion of *cáise* (cheese). On p. 222 the effects of different sorts of cheese are discussed.²⁸

Again, owing to the information given in the colophon, it can now be shown that the text so described corresponds to Isaac Judaeus, *De dietis universalibus*, ff 83va33–86va11 [excluding commentary] (i.e. ch. 57 (‘De lacte in generali’), Lectiones 45 (acephalous), 46; ch. 58 (‘De caseo’), Lectio 47).²⁹

Sources: Hippocrates and Galen

The colophon to the ‘Chapter on milk’ records that the authority for its opening section – no part of which now survives due to the chasm before p. 219 – was ‘Hippocrates and Galen in *Aphorisms*’. The text so described may well have comprised an Irish rendering of Galen’s commentary on bk V.65 [V.64] of the *Liber aphorismorum* of Hippocrates, an aphorism (beg. *Lac dare caput dolentibus malum est*) which identifies patients for whom milk is contra-indicated – sufferers from headache and fever, for instance – and patients for whom it is beneficial – such as consumptives – with explanations for these observations being offered in the accompanying commentary. If so, the Irish text would

²⁶ For full details of the correspondence between the various sections of Irish text and their Latin counterparts, see Appendix 1(a) below.

²⁷ Beg. [f]eola dfas ibthur e maillere na tri foladaibh [MS *poladaibh* with *f* written above *p*] (RIA MS 23 E 29 (1134), p. 217a1); for the explicit, see n. 13 above.

²⁸ *RIA Cat.* 3118.30–y.

²⁹ For full details of the correspondence between the various sections of Irish text and their Latin counterparts, see Appendix 1(b) below.

have corresponded to *Aphorismi Hypocratis cum commento Galieni in Articella* (Venice 1493; ISTC ia01146000), ff 1–38 [second foliation], f. 29ra8–61.³⁰

On the other hand, there are reasonable grounds for speculating that the text referred to in the colophon may have comprised bk V.65 – or some part thereof – of the commentary on *Liber aphorismorum* composed by Aenghus Ó Callannáin and Niocól Ó hÍceadha in 1403, a work arranged in seven books, which was one of the most widely studied of Irish medical texts.³¹ Bk V.65 of this commentary – two complete copies of which survive, viz. NLS MS Adv. 18.2.11 (ff 159rb6–160rb41) and NLS MS Adv. 72.1.21 (ff 3ra1–4vb13) – begins with the Latin aphorism's opening words, *Lac dare caput dolentibus et cetera*, followed by a translation of its full text (Adv. 18.2.11, f. 159rb6–11). The commentary proper, which is introduced with the words *7 Laphraidh Ipocraid isin canoin so don bainne* (ibid. f. 159rb12), discusses the nature of milk and succinctly explains why it is contra-indicated for some patients and recommended for others (f. 159rb12–z); the remainder of the chapter (ff 159va1–160rb41) – the bulk of the text – is occupied by seventeen questions – several of them debated questions – relating to milk.³² Accordingly, this chapter of the Ó Callannáin/Ó hÍceadha commentary – one of the longest in the work – is entirely devoted to the topic of milk.³³

³⁰ The full text of the aphorism is as follows: *Lac dare caput dolentibus malum est: malum vero 7 febricitantibus: 7 quibuscunque hypocondria suspensa fugiunt: 7 siticulis. Malum vero quibus fellei secessus: 7 quibus sanguinis multa egestio facta est. Conuenit vero ptisicis non valde febricitantibus. Dare vero 7 in febribus longis nullo predictorum signorum presente: 7 extra rationem tabefactis* (*Articella*, V.65, f. 29ra); the aphorism is number V.64 in W. H. S. Jones (ed.), *Hippocrates IV* (Loeb Classical Library, vol. 150, Cambridge, Mass., and London 1979, 6th reprint; first ed. 1931) 176, 177.

³¹ Beg. *Est autem bonum ut huius libri plurimum sit apud unum quemque medicum 7 in meamoria eius* (National Library of Scotland [henceforth NLS] MS Adv. 72.1.10, f. 1ra1); see Donald Mackinnon, *A descriptive catalogue of Gaelic manuscripts in the Advocates' Library, Edinburgh, and elsewhere in Scotland* (Edinburgh 1912) 26–31.

³² The first question reads: *Et fiafraigh Isag an lenann an bainne naduir an ainmighe ó tig* (NLS MS Adv. 18.2.11, f. 159va1); the final question reads: *Item fiarfaighear cred do beir bainne ag na hainminntiph .iiii.chosacha talmaidhi 7 uighi ag na héniph éerdha 7 gan bainne* (ibid. f. 160rb27). On debated questions and their central role in higher medical education, see Nancy G. Siraisi, *Taddeo Alderotti and his pupils: two generations of Italian medical learning* (Princeton, New Jersey 1981) 237–51. For debated questions in the commentary on Galen's *Megategni* found in RIA MS 23 F 19 (473), ff 18ra1–24va16, see Aoiðheann Nic Dhonnchadha, 'Tráchtas leighis ón 14ú haois: lámhscríbhinn, téacs agus foinsí, in Aengus Ó Fionnagáin, Gordon Ó Riain (eds), *Léann na Sionainne* (Dublin 2022) 1–60, at 36–8.

³³ *RIA Cat.* 3119.8–11, notes the resemblance between the subject-matter of Fragment I and the text found in RIA MS '24 P 26, pp. 398–400' [= Séamus Ó Ceithearnaigh (ed.), *Regimen na sláinte: Regimen sanitatis Magnini Mediolanensis I–III* (Baile Átha Cliath, 1942–4), III, lines 6325–523].

If the ‘Chapter on milk’ found in Fragment I was composed at some date after 1403, it seems not unreasonable to speculate that its author may have considered the commentary’s chapter on milk as a source worthy of inclusion in his own comprehensive treatise and that, having consulted it, he may have referred to it in his colophon as ‘Hippocrates and Galen in *Aphorisms*’.³⁴

Irish translations of De proprietatibus rerum

The translation of the chapters from Bartholomaeus, *De proprietatibus rerum* bk XIX, that is found in the ‘Chapter on milk’ is, apparently, unique. Apart from its intrinsic value, this translation is also of importance in providing further evidence for the popularity of Bartholomaeus’s work among medical writers in fifteenth-century Ireland.³⁵

The Irish translation of Bartholomaeus, *De proprietatibus rerum*, bk VIII (‘De mundo 7 corporibus celestibus’), which is found in the medical manuscripts TCD MS 1299 (pp 38–56) – a complete copy – and RIA MS 23 Q 10 (1233) (ff 1–10) – a fragmentary and incomplete copy – has been edited, with accompanying Latin text, by Gearóid Mac Niocaill; this translation, which encompasses the whole of bk VIII, had been completed by 1443, the date of the scribal colophon to the copy in TCD 1299.³⁶

The Irish lapidary found in the sixteenth-century medical manuscript British Library Arundel 333 (ff 124v7–127vz) has been edited by David

³⁴ For an instance of bk V.65 of the Ó Callannáin/Ó hÍceadha commentary being interpolated, in an abbreviated form, into a fifteenth-century copy of the herbal of Tadhg Ó Cuinn (1415), see Appendix 3 below. It may be noted that this commentary – of Munster provenance – was circulating in North Connacht by 1413, the year of transcription on Inch Island, Lough Gara (*ar Innis Tuaisgirt* [sic] *ar Loch Tethed*) by a scribe named ‘Gilla Padraig Albanach’ of the acephalous copy of bk 7 found in TCD MS 1318, cols 487.1–499a.24 (Robert Atkinson, *The Yellow Book of Lecan ... published from the original manuscript in the library of Trinity College, Dublin, by the Royal Irish Academy* (Dublin 1896) 24; *TCD Cat.* 102.8–13, 346.41–3).

³⁵ For *De proprietatibus rerum* (c.1245) of the English Franciscan, Bartholomaeus Anglicus (d. 1272) – ‘an encyclopedia of theology and science arranged in nineteen books; the number, the sum of the twelve signs of the zodiac and the seven planets, signified universality’ – see M. C. Seymour and Colleagues, *Bartholomaeus Anglicus and his encyclopedia* (Aldershot 1992) 11; ‘the major medical sources of *De proprietatibus rerum*’ are usefully listed and discussed *ibid.* 23–5.

³⁶ Gearóid Mac Niocaill, ‘Bartholomaei Anglici *De proprietatibus rerum* liber octavus. Leagan Gaeilge ó thús na 15ú aoise’, *Celtica* 8 (1968) 201–42, 9 (1971) 266–315. The scribal colophon is as follows: ‘Finid amen / Et isead do budh thshlan don tigearna an trath do sgribhadh an leabur / .i. mili bliadan 7 .4. cead 7 tri bliadna 7 da .xx.’ (TCD MS 1299, p. 56.x–z). The sources of bk VIII – ‘the most intensely dependent book in *De proprietatibus rerum*’ – are discussed in Seymour and Colleagues, *Bartholomaeus Anglicus*, 97–116.

Greene, who noted that its text, apart from a handful of introductory lines, is ‘simply an abridged translation of 38 items from book xvi (*de lapidibus*) of the *Proprietates Rerum* of Bartholomeus Anglicus’.³⁷

The ‘Chapter on milk’ may be regarded, therefore, as an important addition to what is currently known about the dissemination of Bartholomaeus’s encyclopaedia among Irish medical scholars. As Irish medical texts are more fully investigated, it is possible that translations of further sections of the work will be identified.

Irish translations of De dietis universalibus

With regard to the passages from Isaac’s *De dietis universalibus* that are found in the ‘Chapter on milk’, they may readily be compared with the version of the same passages that is found in TCD MS 1315 (‘Leabhar Riocaird Uí Challannáin’), pp 190–231, a copy – which is almost complete – of a translation of the full text of *De dietis universalibus*, which was composed at some time prior to 1496, the date of a scribal colophon on p. 121bz of the manuscript.³⁸

The section of the ‘Chapter on milk’ that comprises a translation from Isaac – RIA MS 23 E 29 (1134), pp 217–18, 221–2 – corresponds to TCD 1315, pp 227b42–230a30; the following short excerpts from the two translations will serve to provide a glimpse of some of the stylistic and lexicographical variations between them:

Excerpt 1: Latin source

Aliter autem lac quattuor modis diuersatur. aut secundum naturam animalis: aut pascue sue: aut ex temporibus: aut ex nouitate sui
7 vetustate. Ex natura animalis multis modis. vel enim ex

³⁷ David Greene, ‘Lapidaries in Irish’, *Celtica* 2/1 (1952) 67–95, at 68. The text of British Library [henceforth BL] MS Arundel 333 (ff 124v7–127vz) is edited *ibid.* as ‘Text II’ (lines 319–552). Incidentally, it may be noted that the translator’s reference to Ireland in the paragraph on pearls (*De margarita*) – *ansan Innia no a mBrethnuibh no a nErinn do gabar iat* (*ibid.* lines 489–90) – does not occur in the corresponding Latin text (‘Ab india autem 7 antiqua britannia nobiliores margarite transmittuntur’, Bartholomaeus Anglicus, *De proprietatibus rerum*, f. 161ra, bk XVI.62, ‘De margarita’). However, the reference to Ireland in the paragraph on prismatic crystal (*De iride*) – 7 *dogabar* [read with MS ‘7 dogabar i’] *isin Germain tair 7 a nErinn tshiar* (Greene, ‘Lapidaries’, lines 465–6) – is found in the Latin text (‘nunc autem in pluribus locis inuenitur scilicet in germania 7 in hybernia 7 in multis regionibus aquilonis’, *De proprietatibus rerum*, f. 160va, bk XVI.55, ‘De iride’).

³⁸ Beg. *Quoniam in primis coegit antiquos disputare de naturis ciborum .i. is ead adeir Ysac andsa leabar so do rinne sé dona dietaibh uilidi* (TCD MS 1315, p. 190a1). For TCD MS 1315, see *TCD Cat.* 88–90, 339, and the catalogue description on ISOS; cf. Ó Ceithearnaigh, *Regimen na sláinte*, I, xxv–xxviii.

temperamento animalis bene carnosī: 7 eius lac melius. maxime si ab vberibus nouiter emulgeatur. vel ex animalibus male complexionis: infirmo quoque 7 macro lac peius erit 7 illaudabilem sanguinem generabit si diu mulsum fuerit. (Isaac, *De dietis universalibus*, f. 84vb33–9, Cap. 57, ‘De lacte in generali’, Lectio 46)

Translation in ‘Chapter on milk’:³⁹

ITem foillsighear co nidirdeiligheann an bainne a ceitri [MS teitri] modaibh .i. An cead mod dib do reir naduire an ainmidhi o tic. An .ii. mod do reir a aileamna. An tres mod do reir aimsearach na bliadna. An .iiii. mod do reir oigi no arrsaigheacht an bainne. ITem is eigen naduir an ainmidhi o tig an bainne dfechain a modhaibh imdha oir ma ainmidhi focolmur [sic] measardha e is fearrdi an bainne 7 gac nuadhaidi tic o uth an ainmidhi is fearrdi; 7 da ti o ainmidhi drochcomplexa thruagh⁴⁰ as olc an bainne sin 7 gach fad teit o uth an ainmidhi as measa e 7 as olc an fuil geinis. (RIA MS 23 E 29 (1134), p. 218a20–9)

Translation in TCD MS 1315 (‘Book of Riocard Ó Callannáin’):

Eagsam[ail]tear a cuis ele an bainne a .4.ⁱ moduibh .i. do reir naduire an ainmidhi 7 do reir na beata caithis 7 do reir aimsiri na bliadna 7 do reir a nuaighidheachta no a arrsaideachta. Examailtear é o naduir an ainmidhi a modaibh imda oir mad slan focolmur measurda an tainmidhi o tic as e a bainne is fearr 7 a bleaghan go nua. 7 Madh ó ainmidhi droch coimplexamail truagh easlan tic is misti an bainne 7 cu hairigthi an tan bis co fada arna bleagan. (TCD MS 1315, p. 228b10–16)

Excerpt 2: Latin source

Lac inter hec duo [sc. nouiter mulsum aut iam diu] medium tardius quam dulce ad digerendum 7 velocius quam acidum. Ablata ergo butyrositate nutribilius erit alio lacte: 7 maxime vaccino. (Isaac, *De dietis universalibus*, f. 85ra43–6, Cap. 57, ‘De lacte in generali’, Lectio 46)

³⁹ Word-division, punctuation and capitalization in this and the following excerpt are editorial.

⁴⁰ with mark possibly intended for i written above between a and gh but without caret; perhaps read thruaigh.

Translation in ‘Chapter on milk’:

ITem is mailli teit an bainne inmeadonach cum dileagta na heit [sic] an leamnacht 7 is mailli teit an bainne goirt na theit an bainne inmeodonach. 7 Is fearr an aileamain an bainne deis a ime do buain de nan trath bis a im air 7 cu mor bainne na mbo. (RIA MS 23 E 29 (1134), p. 221b18–22)

Translation in TCD MS 1315 (‘Book of Riocard Ó Callannáin’):

An bainne inmeadonac eatura sin is moille dileagthar é na in bainne milis 7 is lúathi na in bainne goirt. Et an bainne da mbeantur a im is oileamnaigi é na in bainne ele 7 co hairigthi bainne na mbo. (TCD MS 1315, p. 229a35–7)

FRAGMENT II

The second Fermoy medical fragment comprises two vellum leaves, pp 225–8.⁴¹ The text in these leaves is acephalous and incomplete and comprises a copy of a physiological commentary, which is, apparently, otherwise unattested.

The fragment contains three chapters of text, which deal respectively with [1] the heart (pp 225a1–226a43), [2] the liver (pp 226a44–228a23) and [3] the testes (pp 228a24–bz) – the final three of the body’s four principal members. Given their subject matter, it may be reasonably assumed that these chapters were originally preceded by a chapter on the physiology of the brain, the first of the principal members.⁴²

Structure of commentary

As noted in *RIA Cat.* 3120–22, ch. [2] of the fragment begins with a Latin incipit (*De epate et de eius uaretate complexiones loquamur 7 cetera*, p. 226a44), which is immediately followed by a short passage

⁴¹ Todd, ‘Descriptive catalogue’, 53 §XVIII (‘A fragment in a small and beautiful medical hand, consisting of two leaves, marked both on the upper and lower margins, E 5, and E 6’); *RIA Cat.* 3091.

⁴² Nancy G. Siraisi, *Medieval & Early Renaissance medicine: an introduction to knowledge and practice* (Chicago, London 1990) 107–9. Cf. *Et adeir Gailen co fuilid .iiii. baill oireada ann .i. serebrum an incinn 7 cor an craidi 7 epar na hae 7 testicoli na huirgi 7 ataid a do dib so ina funnimint ag an corp .i. incinn 7 craidi 7 ataid a do eli ina nadbar an cuirp .i. ae 7 uirge 7 ata comaentugad acu so ris na duilib .i. teine a comaentugad risin craidi 7 aer a comaentugad ris na haeb 7 uisci a comaentugad risin incinn 7 talam a comaentugad ris na huirgib* (TCD MS 1299, p. 10a34–42).

of ‘direct exposition’ on the complexion of the liver (p. 226a45–b3);⁴³ the remainder of the chapter comprises a series of questions (pp 226b4–228a23) – mostly debated questions (*quaestiones disputatae*) – relating to the liver’s structure and functions.

Similarly, ch. [3] begins with a Latin incipit (*De membrorum generatiuorum operacionibus et eorum qualitatibus loquamur*, p. 228a24), which is immediately followed by a passage of ‘direct exposition’ on the testes (p. 228a28–44);⁴⁴ a series of debated questions relating to the testes follows (pp 228a45–bz), but breaks off incompletely with the final page of the fragment.

Given the structure of chapters [2] and [3], one may reasonably infer that ch. [1] – now acephalous – originally began with a Latin incipit, which was followed by a passage of direct exposition on the physiology of the heart and a series of debated questions relating to it;⁴⁵ thus, it is in the closing arguments of such a question – on the action of the pulse – that the fragment now begins (see Appendix 2, [Chapter 1] §1 below). In contrast to ch. [2], however, where the series of debated questions continues to the end of the chapter, the questions in ch. [1] (p. 225a1–b41) are followed by a passage of expository text – on uneven pulse patterns (pp 225b41–226a4) – which concludes the chapter.

As is clear from the foregoing summary, the bulk of the commentary text as represented by this fragment is comprised of questions – debated questions for the most part. Thus, ch. [1] contains 6 questions, the first of them acephalous; ch. [2] contains 11 questions – 8 debated questions, and 3 non-debated questions; ch. [3] contains 3 questions, the final one of which is incomplete. The 20 questions contained in this fragment are listed, with translation, in Appendix 2 below.

FRAGMENT III

The third Fermoy medical fragment comprises two vellum leaves, pp 229–232.⁴⁶ These leaves contain an acephalous physiological

⁴³ This passage synthesizes Galen, *Tegni* (in *Articella seu Opus artis medicinae*, Venice 1483; ISTC ia01143000), ff 167v^m–169r^m (‘Tractus de epate’, §§1–5, 11–12).

⁴⁴ This passage synthesizes Galen, *Tegni*, ff 169r^m–170r^m (‘Tractus testicularum’, §§1–7).

⁴⁵ That the heart was the chapter’s primary focus is alluded to in the chapter’s concluding sentence (*7 is mar sin fagmaid cuid in craide don trachtad so*, p. 226a43) and in the introductory remarks to ch. [2] (*o da labramur don craide co nuigi sin Labram anois dona haeibh 7 dexamlacht a noibrighi*, p. 226a45–6).

⁴⁶ These leaves ‘bear no traces of an older numeration’ (*RIA Cat.* 3091); Todd, ‘Descriptive catalogue’, 53 § XIX (‘A fragment imperfect at beginning and end, consisting of two leaves, in a good medical hand. Mr. O’Curry did not put any paging on these leaves, nor are the remains of any former pagination now visible’).

commentary which is incomplete, and which has suffered further loss due to a chasm before p. 231.⁴⁷

As noted in *RIA Cat.*, the most complete copy of this commentary identified to date is in TCD MS 1299, pp 1–34 [order of leaves: 1–20, 33–4, 21–32] – a copy containing the prologue (beg. *Vita humana est triplex et cetera*), the introduction (beg. *Cum totcius pater sciencia generalitas tres principales partes habet 7 cetera*) and the opening six chapters of the commentary, breaking off incomplete in ch. [7] and accordingly lacking the end of the text and the scribe's colophon, in which he may have identified himself and the title of the tract.⁴⁸ As regards their subject-matter, these seven chapters deal respectively with [1] the brain, [2] the heart, [3] the liver, [4] the virtues, [5] the spirits, [6] the generative organs and [7] disease.

In describing Fragment III, Gerard Murphy noted that the previously unidentified treatise found in the fifteenth-century composite manuscript, RIA 23 H 19 (446) [henceforth H], ff 4–8 [correct order of leaves: 6; chasm; 7–8, 4–5], also comprises a fragmentary copy of this same commentary⁴⁹ – a copy that contains chapters [3]–[4] of the text in full, and chapters [1]–[2] and [5] in part.⁵⁰

⁴⁷ *RIA Cat.* 3094.z.

⁴⁸ *RIA Cat.* 3122.14–3124.25. For TCD MS 1299 – a manuscript already in the college by 1781 (William O'Sullivan, 'The Irish manuscripts in case H in Trinity College Dublin catalogued by Matthew Young in 1781', *Celtica* 11 (1976) 229–50, p. 236) – see *TCD Cat.* 81 and the catalogue description on ISOS.

An incomplete copy of ch. [7] of the commentary is found in TCD MS 1302 (ff 1–7) (see *TCD Cat.* 81 and 83) – a copy which continues the text for some paragraphs beyond the point at which TCD 1299, p. 32 breaks off; thus, the text of TCD MS 1302, f. 1ra1, begins at the start of ch. [7], i.e. at a point corresponding to TCD 1299, p. 25b46, while the text of TCD 1299, p. 32 breaks off at a point corresponding to TCD 1302, f. 6rb1. The text of ch. [7] (beg. *Morbus est cum membra accionis sue naturalis temperamenta egrediuntur* [sic] 7 cetera) has been edited, with translation, from TCD 1299, with variants from TCD 1302, by Lilian Duncan [*al.* Lil Nic Dhonnchadha], 'A treatise on fevers', *Revue Celtique* 49 (1932) 1–90 (available in digital format at www.celt.ucc.ie). Miss Duncan did not have access to the copy of ch. [7] that occurs as an independent item in RIA MS 23 N 16 (449), ff 61v–73v – a copy which is mainly in the hand of the Ossory physician, Cathal Ó Duinnshléibhe (*fl.* 1592–1611), principal scribe and owner of the manuscript, and which ends incomplete at a point corresponding to TCD MS 1302, f. 7vb26, being followed by a scribal line-filler, 'do choimhlinadh' (RIA 23 N 16 (449), f. 73vz); cf. *RIA Cat.* 1191–4, p. 1192.

⁴⁹ For H, see *RIA Cat.* 1186–8 (note, however, that f. 3 belongs to 'part (i)' of the manuscript [i.e. ff 1–3], rather than to 'part (ii)' [i.e. ff 4–8]).

⁵⁰ The text of H, ff 4–8, corresponds to TCD 1299, pp 3a5–5a22, 8a14–z; 11a16–20bz, 33a1–34b18. The contents of H may be detailed as follows: chs [1] (acephalous) [i.e. H, f. 6ra1–va5]; [2] (in part) [i.e. H, ff 6va5–bz (with a major textual omission (corresponding to TCD MS 1299, pp 5a22–8a14) following H, f. 6vb28, the omission being due, apparently, to this copy having been made from a defective exemplar, and with a lacuna after f. 6 due to a chasm in the manuscript), 7ra1–25]; [3] [H, ff 7ra26–8vbz, 4ra1–16]; [4] [H, f. 4ra17–vbw]; and [5] (incomplete) [H, f. 4vbw–5vbz].

Fragment III comprises parts of three chapters of the commentary, viz. **1** (acephalous and incomplete) [RIA 23 E 29, pp 229–30], **3** (acephalous) and **4** (incomplete) [pp 231–2]; thus, the text of RIA 23 E 29, pp 229–30 and 231–2, corresponds to that of TCD 1299, pp 2b7–4a12 and 17a29–19a12, respectively.⁵¹

Manuscript evidence suggests that this treatise was identified by scribes as comprising a commentary on the *Megategni* of Galen. Thus, in a colophon to a large collection of proverbs excerpted from various treatises found in BL MS Arundel 333, ff 29ra1–35vb29, the scribe – writing in Killinaboy [par. Killinaboy, bar. Inchiquin], Co. Clare, on 18 March 1514 – refers to the sequence of proverbs (ibid. ff 34rb1–35vb19) excerpted from this commentary in particular as comprising ‘texts of Galen in Megategni’ (‘Finit and so ar thexannaibh gailen a metegni’, f. 35vb20–1).⁵² While the *Megategni* (al. *Ars magna*; al. *De ingenio sanitatis*) of Galen is indeed mentioned in the prologue to the commentary (*do tuicsin na mbriatar so Gailen a tosach a leabair fein danadh ainm Megotegni*, TCD 1299, p. 1a30–1), the commentary itself shares no close structural or textual links with the Galenic work. Galen is, however, the single author – and *De ingenio sanitatis* the single authority – it most frequently cites, confirming that the work was intended as a commentary on *Megategni*.⁵³

⁵¹ *RIA Cat.* 3122.14–3124.25.

⁵² For the colophon to the full collection, with translation, see Standish Hayes O’Grady, *Catalogue of Irish manuscripts in the British Museum I* (London 1929) 245.22–246.9 (for ‘Me[gra]tegni’ and ‘Microtechne’, ibid., read ‘Metegni’ and ‘Megatechne’, respectively). The sequence of proverbs comprising ‘texts of Galen in Megategni’ begins *Contrariorum contrari sunt effectus* (BL MS Arundel 333, f. 34rb1) [= TCD MS 1299, p. 6b26] and ends *Eadem est intencio in cibando sanos 7 egros* (BL MS Arundel 333, f. 35vb14) [= TCD MS 1299, p. 30b51]. Of the 76 items in the sequence, 73 can be shown to have been excerpted from the commentary, with items [57] (beg. *Non queratur in omni fractura ut accipiat os totum*, BL MS Arundel 333, f. 35rb33), [58] (beg. *Non incidatur ex osse nisi quod infirmum est*, ibid. f. 35rbz) and [59] (beg. *Tucius est uti inuentis et aprobatis quam uti nouis exprementis*, ibid. f. 35va2) having been evidently interpolated into this copy from an unidentified source. Other copies of this proverb collection – which vary in both the number and order of items they contain – are found in RIA MS 23 N 17 (1996), pp 177–8, 187–8 (incomplete; 62 items); NLI G 453, ff 3v19–4vz (69 items); Edinburgh University Library, Laing MS III.21, ff 61va1–64rb21 (86 items); and NLS MS Adv. 72.2.10, pp 193.5–198.z (68 items).

⁵³ For a fourteenth-century commentary on *Megategni* found in RIA MS 23 F 19 (473), see Níc Dhonnchadha, ‘Tráchtas leighis’. Latin translations of Galen’s *Methodus medendi* (al. *Megategni*; al. *De ingenio sanitatis*) are discussed in Michael McVaugh, ‘The lost Galen’, *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies of the University of London: Supplementary papers* 77 (2002) 153–64; the Latin text is printed as *De ingenio sanitatis* in Claudius Galenus, *Opera I–II* (Venice 1490; ISTC ig00037000), II, ff 168ra–222rb. On the structure of scholastic medical commentaries and their pedagogical importance, see e.g. O’Boyle, *The art of medicine*, 189–231; Roger French, *Canonical medicine: Gentile da Foligno and scholasticism* (Leiden 2001) 51–68.

THE MEDICAL FRAGMENTS IN THE BOOK OF FERMOY:
CONTEXT AND SOURCES

47

O'HICKEY FRAGMENTS

Two of the scribes of the Book of Fermoy, Uilliam Ó hÍceadha and Domhnall Ó Leighin, are identified by their surnames as members of hereditary medical families.⁵⁴

In tracing the ownership of the manuscript, *RIA Cat.* notes:

The MS. may once have been in the possession of the O'Hickeys, "who were hereditary physicians" (Todd, pp. 5, 53): the name of the scribe of the item beginning on p. 45, and the jotting on p. 204, lend colour to this belief, suggested to Dr. Todd by the medical nature of the last section, concerning which "we may fairly conjecture that this is a fragment of one of their professional MSS. which has got mixed up with the Book of Fermoy" (Todd, p. 53).⁵⁵

Some further support for an O'Hickey provenance for the medical fragments may be derived from the place of writing of Filib Ó Fearrghusa – Rossmanagher, in the barony of Bunratty Lower, Co. Clare.

In discussing the provenance of RIA MS 24 P 26 (474), an O'Hickey medical manuscript written in 1469 – which was at Ballina, in the parish of Templeachally, Co. Tipperary, in 1641, where it was recorded as being owned by Ruaidrí Ó hÍceadha, and which was owned by 'Donatus Hickie M.D.', evidently of the same parish, in 1700 – James Carney drew attention to the names of O'Hickey physicians in the townlands of 'Ballycorrigan and Ballymolloy' in 'the United parishes of Killmestully and Tample ically' [Co. Tipperary] occurring in the Civil Survey of 1654, linking them to the named owners of the manuscript and identifying them as members of a medical family which had flourished under the patronage of O'Brien of Arra.⁵⁶ Having traced the origins of the O'Briens of Arra – an 'offshoot of the O'Brien family'

⁵⁴ For the Uí Íceadha, see n. 58 below. For the Uí Leighin, see Todd, 'Descriptive catalogue', pp 39, 41, 42; Tomás Ó Concheanainn, 'The scribe of the Irish astronomical tract in RIA B II 1', *Celtica* 11 (1976) 158–67 (and n. 6 in particular); Ó Muraíle, 'The hereditary medical families', 109 §41; Gerard J. Lyne, 'Dr Dermot Lyne: an Irish Catholic landholder in Cork and Kerry under the penal laws', *Journal of the Kerry Archaeological and Historical Society* 8 (1975) 45–72 (reference courtesy of Pádraig de Brún).

⁵⁵ *RIA Cat.* 3095.11–18.

⁵⁶ Ó Ceithearnaigh, *Regimen na sláinte*, I, xxviii–xxx ('Provenance of P (and the O'Hickeys of Arra)'). For the townlands in question, see *logainm.ie* s.nn Ballycorrigan, Ballymalone More, Ballymalone Beg. For a note on the extent of the territory of Arra, see O'Donovan, *Annala Rioghachta Éireann*, V, p. 1298 note b; cf. *logainm.ie* s.n. Owney and Arra. For RIA MS 24 P 26 (474), see *RIA Cat.* 1239–41.

which ‘sprang from *Brian Bán* (d. 1350), who fled across the Shannon to *Dúthaigh Ara*, following his defeat ... at the battle of Dysert O Dea (1318)’, Carney then drew attention to a branch of the O’Hickey family that flourished in Bunratty Lower as follows:

On the other side of the Shannon, at Clonloghane in the Barony of Lower Bunratty, Co. Clare, lived another branch of the O’Hickey’s, also a medical family,⁵⁷ and presumably under the patronage of the premier branch of the O’Briens: the connection between the O’Hickey families of Bunratty and Arra is doubtless analogous to that of their lords, a junior branch moving across the Shannon in the wake of the founder of the Arra branch of the O’Briens.⁵⁸

It is now known that Filib Ó Fearrghusa was in Bunratty Lower while transcribing Fragment I – perhaps some time about the year 1450. If one supposes his work there to have taken place in an O’Hickey *milieu*, this would, of course, lend support to Todd’s suggestion that the medical fragments in the Book of Fermoy comprise remnants of that kindred’s ‘professional MSS’.⁵⁹

⁵⁷ Carney here references O’Grady, *Catalogue*, p. 221, where O’Grady transcribes a ‘draft of a bond in English’ found in BL MS Eg. 89 (f. 194r) in which ‘Charles Hickey of Clonloghane in the Countie of Clare gent.’ acknowledges a debt, the bond being dated 2 January 1616; for ‘Charles Hicky’, owner of Egerton MS 89, in 1680, see O’Grady, *Catalogue*, p. 220.

⁵⁸ Ó Ceithearnaigh, *Regimen na sláinte*, I, xxx. The O’Hickeys were ‘seated at Ballyhickey, in the parish of Clooney [bar. Bunratty Upper], Co. Clare’ (Woulfe, *Sloinnite Gaedheal is Gall*, s.n. Ó hÍceadhá, Ó hÍcidhe). Cf. J. Hickey, ‘The O’Hickeys: hereditary physicians to the O’Briens of Thomond and some of their descendants’, *North Munster Antiquarian Journal* 8/1 (1958) 38–41; Ó Muraile, ‘The hereditary medical families’, 108–9 §38; Luke McNerney, ‘The West *Clann Chuiléin* lordship in 1586: evidence from a forgotten inquisition’, *North Munster Archaeological Journal* 48 (2008) 33–55; idem, *Clerical and learned lineages of medieval Co. Clare: a survey of the fifteenth-century papal registers* (Dublin 2014) 147, 163, 173, 176; idem, ‘Six deeds from early seventeenth century Thomond’, *Eolas: Journal of the American Society of Irish Medieval Studies* 10 (2017) 33–76; Martin Breen, Risteárd Ua Cróinín, ‘Ballyhickey: home of the O’Hickey, medieval physicians of Thomond – and the castle that never was’, *The Other Clare* 46 (2022) 34–7. Cf. Elizabeth FitzPatrick, *Landscapes of the learned: placing Gaelic literati in Irish lordships, 1300–1600* (Oxford 2023) 60–3, 116–18, 208–9, 291 (reference courtesy of Diarmaid Ó Catháin).

⁵⁹ For the activities of the medical family of Uí Nialláin, physicians to the O’Briens of Thomond, in the sixteenth century, see Ó Muraile, ‘The hereditary medical families’, 110 §46; Aobheann Nic Dhonnchadha, ‘The medical school of Aghmacart, Queen’s County’, *Ossory, Laois and Leinster* 2 (2006) 11–43, p. 16, n. 18; Luke McNerney, *Clerical and learned lineages*, 17, 57, 169–73, 179; idem, ‘“Goeth over onely to obtaine breeding”: William O’Neylon’s certificate of passage to Spain, 1652’, *North Munster Antiquarian*

APPENDIX 1

(a)

The following list details the correspondence between the text of RIA MS 23 E 29 (1134), pp 219–20, 223–4, and Bartholomaeus Anglicus, *De proprietatibus rerum* (Nuremberg 1483; ISTC ib00137000) liber XIX ('De coloribus odoribus saporibus et liquoribus'):⁶⁰

p.

219a1–bw (acephalous). Beg. here *cum a tic a mbainne cum taebh a cich* [...] / *dileagthar annsin e techtaigh se* [? ann 7] [...] / *an cich 7 attaidh*⁶¹ [= cap. 61, 'De lacte', f. 252va7–b42]

219bw–220a14. Beg. *7 ar bainne an camaill na diaigh*⁶² [= cap. 62, 'De lacte camelino', ff 252vb43–253ra4]

220a15–b32. Beg. *Labrum anois do bainne na mbo* [= cap. 63, 'De lacte vaccino', f. 253ra5–b6]

220b33–z, 223a1–14. Beg. *Labrum anois do bainde na ngabar* [= cap. 64, 'De lacte caprino', f. 253rb7–27]

223a15–23. Beg. *Labrum anois do baindi na caerach* [= cap. 65, 'De lacte pecorino', f. 253rb28–37]

223a24–9. Beg. *Labrum anois do bainne na neasal* [= cap. 66, 'De lacte asinino', f. 253rb38–y]

Journal 58 (2018) 95–110. For the activities of the learned family of Ó Maoil Chonaire in Bunratty Lower – in Ard Kyle, Cappagh, Rossmanagher and Smithstown – in the sixteenth century, see Ó Macháin, 'Dhá théacs dlí', 310–11 (and references); Brian Ó Dálaigh, 'The Uí Mhaoilchonaire of Thomond', *Studia Hibernica* 35 (2008–2009) 17–68. Cf. FitzPatrick, *Landscapes of the learned*, 159 and 256.

⁶⁰ Three digital reproductions of this edition are listed at ISTC (<https://data.cerl.org/istc/ib00137000>). The foliation followed here is that of the reproduction in Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, München.

The 'component sections' of bk XIX are listed in Seymour and Colleagues, *Bartholomaeus Anglicus*, 232–49, who note that Bartholomaeus's account of milk and its products is based for the most part 'on Aristotle, *Historia animalium*, and on Isaac, *De dietis universalibus* 'De lacte in generali' and *De dietis particularibus* 'De lacte' (ibid. 240).

⁶¹ As noted above (p. 2), the opening section of the 'Chapter on milk', which was based on 'Hippocrates and Galen in *Aphorisms*', is entirely wanting due to the chasm before RIA MS 23 E 29 (1134) p. 219. It may be estimated, however, that the text immediately preceding p. 219 corresponded to *De proprietatibus rerum*, f. 252rb14–va6 – i.e. to the opening part of cap. 61 ('De lacte'), the first in Bartholomaeus's series of chapters (61–74) on milk.

⁶² Note that in the manuscript this chapter is presented as a continuation of that immediately preceding it, being in no way distinguished or marked off from it.

- 223a30–5. Beg. *Labrum anois do bainne na capall* [= cap. 67, ‘De lacte caballino’, f. 253rbz–va8]
 223a36–41. Beg. *Labrum anois do bainne na muc* [= cap. 68, ‘De lacte porcino’, f. 253va9–16]
 223a42–b18. Beg. *Labrum anois do bainne* [na] *nainmidhi torrach* [= cap. 69, ‘De lacte animalium [partui valde vicinum]’, f. 253va17–y]
 223b19–29. Beg. *Labrum anois don meadhg* [= cap. 70, ‘De sero’, f. 253vaz–b11]
 223b30–224b3. Beg. *Labrum anois don im* [= cap. 71, ‘De butiro’, f. 253vb12–254ra21]
 224b4–z (incomplete). Beg. [Labrum a]nois *don caisi* [= cap. 72, ‘De caseo’, f. 254ra22–b3]⁶³

(b)

The following list details the correspondence between the text of RIA MS 23 E 29 (1134), pp 217–18, 221–2, and *De dietis universalibus*:

p.

- 217a1–218a19 (acephalous). Beg. here [f]eola *dfas ibtur e maillere na tri foladaibh* [= cap. 57, ‘De lacte in generali’, Lectio 45, f. 83va33–vb54]⁶⁴
 218a20–bz, 221a1–b35. Beg. *Item foillsigtear co nidirdeiligheann an bainne a teitri* [leg. *ceitri*] *modaibh* [= cap. 57, ‘De lacte in generali’, Lectio 46, ff 84vb32–85ra53]
 221b36–222b43. Beg. *Abrum anos don caisi oir ata se arna chorugad a tri foladaibh* [= cap. 58, ‘De caseo’, Lectio 47, f. 86ra65–va11].

APPENDIX 2

The following register of questions compiled from the commentary in Fragment II – RIA MS 23 E 29 (1134), pp 225–8 – is intended to assist

⁶³ The text immediately following RIA MS 23 E 29 (1134), p. 224, probably corresponded to *De proprietatibus rerum*, f. 254rb3–5 (i.e. the final lines of cap. 72, ‘De caseo’), 254rb6–va8 (cap. 73, ‘De veteri caseo’) and 254va9–y (cap. 74, ‘De coagulo’), respectively, the latter chapters being the final two in the Bartholomaen series on milk.

⁶⁴ The text immediately preceding RIA MS 23 E 29 (1134), p. 217, probably corresponded to *De dietis universalibus*, ff 81vb40–82rby and 83rb46–va33, respectively – i.e. to Lectio 44 and to the opening part of Lectio 45 respectively of cap. 57, ‘De lacte in generali’, this chapter being the first – and longer – of Isaac’s two chapters on milk.

in the identification of further copies of the commentary and/or of excerpts from it.⁶⁵

The bulk of the questions in the commentary are debated ones, but the text also includes three non-disputed questions – ch. [2], nos. 2–3 and 6 below. The questions are numbered here according to their order of occurrence within each chapter of text. The following information is provided for each question: page and line number in the manuscript; number of manuscript lines occupied by question; and number of arguments on each side of the debate.⁶⁶

Quaestiones in medical commentaries provide an insight into the subjects that were of primary interest to medieval physicians in their teaching and academic discussions. It is not surprising, therefore, that the same question-topics should often occur in different texts.⁶⁷ This register provides cross-references to parallel discussions in two widely-studied medical commentaries which, though based on Latin sources, are of Irish composition, viz. a fourteenth-century commentary on *Megategni*, a unique copy of which is found in RIA MS 23 F 19 (473), ff 18ra1–24va16 [henceforth F], and the roughly-contemporary commentary on the same Galenic text found in TCD 1299, pp 1–34 (see Fragment III above) [henceforth T]; occasional references to similar discussions in other texts are also provided.⁶⁸

[Chapter 1]

1. (acephalous). [Fiarfaigtheann ann so in lairdi an brig 7 in puls isin fonn te fliuch na in gach fonn ele] (p. 225a1–11)⁶⁹
[‘It is asked here whether the virtue and the pulse be stronger in a hot wet land than in every other land?’]

⁶⁵ Debated questions in Irish medical commentaries frequently contain in their arguments Latin quotations or proverbs from canonical authors such as Galen and Avicenna. No such Latin quotations are found in the questions listed in this appendix.

⁶⁶ The scribe writes the abbreviation for *quaestio* (MS q^o) as appropriate – either in the margin or between columns – facing the opening line of each question in the text; when occurring in the margin, however, such symbols have been occasionally lost due to damage.

⁶⁷ Siraisi, *Taddeo Alderotti*, 237–51. On the technique employed in questions, see Boyle, *The art of medicine*, 192–5 (and n. 8 in particular).

⁶⁸ In transcribing questions, manuscript spelling has been retained throughout and expansion of manuscript abbreviations italicized; hair-strokes are ignored in transcription; word-division and punctuation are normalized; initials of names, invariably written in lower case in the manuscript, are capitalized; tall *e* preceding a broad consonant is transcribed as *ea*; MS .p. representing the word for ‘pulse’ (nom. acc. sg.) has been transcribed as ‘puls’.

⁶⁹ The title of this question is inferred from the response to it which occurs on p. 225a10–11: *Fregurthar cum na ceasta sin 7 adearmaid gurab lairdi an brig 7 in puls isin fonn te fliuch na in gach fonn ele*. Of the pro-arguments in the debate, only the final two survive (p. 225a1–3), the first of them being acephalous; three counter-arguments (p. 225a3–10) follow.

2. *Fiarfaigthea* ann so in comtrom bís an *puls* isin laim deis 7 isin laim clí (p. 225a12–27) (16 lines; 2/2)
(‘It is asked here whether the pulse be equal in the right hand and in the left hand?’)⁷⁰
3. *Fiarfaigthea* ann so an laidir dligeas *puls* [na macamh] beith no [a]n anbann (p. 225a28–38) (11 lines; 2/2)
(‘It is asked here whether the pulse [of youths] should be strong or weak?’)⁷¹
4. *Fiarfaigthea* ann so an dligeann an *puls* beith anbann sa collad no laidir (p. 225a39–b2) (24 lines; 3/2)
(‘It is asked here whether the pulse should be weak in sleep or strong?’)⁷²
5. *Fiarfaigthea* ann so da ndecha neac⁷³ [a]⁷⁴ fothragad usci milis an laigdigthea no an meadaigthea an *puls* (p. 225b2–17) (16 lines; 2/1)
(‘It is asked here if one enter a bath of fresh water whether the pulse be reduced or increased?’)⁷⁵
6. *Fiarfaigthea* ann so an laidiri an *puls* isna mnaibh torra no isna mnaibh gan beith torrac (p. 225b18–41) (24 lines; 1/1)⁷⁶
(‘It is asked here whether the pulse be stronger in pregnant women or in women who are not pregnant?’)⁷⁷

[Chapter 2]

1. *Fiarfaigthea* ann so ca coimplex tigearnaigeas isna haeibh (p. 226b4–21; 18 lines) (3/2)
(‘It is asked here what complexion rules in the liver?’)⁷⁸

⁷⁰ Topic also debated in T (*Fiarfaigthea* ann [so] an comtrom buailis an *puls* in gac laimh, pp 5b45–6a17).

⁷¹ Topic also debated in T (*Fiarfaigthea* [ann so] an treisi an *puls* isna macamaibh na isna daibh oga, p. 6a17–36).

⁷² Topic also debated in T (*Fiarfaigthea* ann so an dlighinn an *puls* beith anbann ann sa collad, p. 6b13–43).

⁷³ MS I–c

⁷⁴ MS illegible.

⁷⁵ Topic also debated in T (*Fiarfaigthea* annso an laighdigthea an *puls* o fotraagad [MS fotraagad] an uisci milis, pp 6b44–7a14).

⁷⁶ The response (p. 225b26–41) to this question – which sets out the development of the embryo and the strength of the pulse in each of the three trimesters of pregnancy – is particularly detailed.

⁷⁷ Topic also debated in T (*Fiarfaigthea* [sic leg.; MS *Fiarfartar*] ann so an dlighinn an *puls* beith laidir isna mnaimh torra, p. 6b4–13).

⁷⁸ Topic also debated in F (*Fiarfaigthea* annso ca coimplex tigearnaigeas isna haeib, f. 20va28–63); and in T (beg. *Fiarfaigthea* ann so ca coimplex tigearnaigeas isna haeib, p. 11b18–47).

2. *Fiarfaigthea*r ann so ca[d] do beir na cuisleanna mora ar na haeib co himillac 7 na cuisleanna beaca co hin[m]eadonach (p. 226b22–7)⁷⁹
(‘It is asked here why the large veins are on the liver externally and the small veins internally?’)
3. *Fiarfaigthea*r ann so ca[d] do beir a tirmacht na nae an fuil co reamur 7 an fual co seim 7 gurab eadh is fual ann .i. sitlogh na fola 7 co ndligeann taisgelta na fola 7 na nae do tabairt leis (p. 226b28–35)⁸⁰
(‘It is asked here in dryness of the liver why the blood is thick and the urine thin given that urine is the filtrate of the blood and that it [sc. urine] should carry with it the symptoms of the blood and of the liver?’)
4. *Fiarfaigthea*r ann so an iad na hae no an craide is tosac don flicideacht (pp 226b36–57) (22 lines; 4/2)
(‘It is asked here whether the liver or the heart be the source of moisture?’)⁸¹
5. *Fiarfaigthea*r ann so an dligid na hae f[olmaigeacht do beith inntu leath asdigh]⁸² (pp 226b58–227a5) (9 lines; 1/1)
(‘It is asked here whether the liver ought to contain a cavity within?’)⁸³

⁷⁹ A non-debated question, to which the following reply is given: *Et is ead do beir sin .i. in brig nadurda follamhnaigheas fuil dearg 7 dordaigh na cuisleanna fairsinga co himillac co nimcuidis fuil dearg cum na mball 7 na cuisleanna caela co hinmeadonac cum an dileagta do calmugad 7 co hairigthe cum an t[s]imais dullmugad noc is adbar dona .iiii. leannaibh* (p. 226b23–7). For *simas*, unattested in DIL, a borrowing from Lat. *chymus* (‘(bodily) fluid, chyme (med.), partly-digested food’, R. E. Latham, E. R. Howlett and R. K. Ashdowne (eds), *Dictionary of Medieval Latin from British sources* (Oxford 1975–2013) s.v.), see also King’s Inns MS 16, f. 20rb46–7: ‘bidh da reir sin silus acu co neimd[i]leagta oir ní inntaigid he a ngne simais co maith’ [= ‘ideo remanet chylus indigestus non conuersus in bonum chimum’, Johannes de Gaddesden, *Rosa Anglica* (Pavia 1492; ISTC ij00326000) f. 91rb1–3, lib. 1.15 ‘De discrasia calida epatis’]. Cf. *oir genid sin lenna mailiseca gera re nabar simus* (W. Wulff, ‘A mediaeval handbook of gynaecology and midwifery’, *Irish texts* V (1934) i–xxvii, 1–99, p. 80.2).

⁸⁰ A non-debated question, to which the following reply is given: *7 Fregurthar cuigi sin 7 adearmaid co fuilid da folad isna leannaibh .i. folad do leith an cumaisg 7 folad do leith na digbala no na heasbadha O[n] folad do leith in cumaisc dligid fuil dearg beith remur a tirmacht na nae On folad do leith na digbala no na heasbadha dligid an fual beith seim tana a tirmacht na nae* (p. 226b30–35).

⁸¹ Topic also debated in T (*Fiarfaigthea*r ann so an e an craidi is bun don flichideacht no an iad na hae, p. 15a20–b6).

⁸² The final words in p. 226b58 are illegible; bracketed text above inferred from response to question, which is as follows: *Fregurthar cuigi so 7 adearar nac ricthea a leas folmaigeacht do beith isna haeibh leath asdigh mur bis isin craide oir atait cuisleanna beaca tesaidi isna haeib co hinmeadonac noc o ndentar an dileagad* (p. 227a2–5).

⁸³ Topic also debated in T (*Fiarfaigthea*r ann so an eigin cabain do beith isna haeb, p. 14a40–b7).

6. Et da fiarfaidi *neac*⁸⁴ cad [d]o *beir* gan *folmaigeacht* do *beith* *leath* as/sdig *dona haeib amail ata isin gaile* (p. 227a5–10)⁸⁵
(‘And if one ask: why is there no cavity within the liver as there is in the stomach?’)
7. *Fiarfaigthea*r ann so an *feadann* gac aen linn dul a *naicnead leanna duib* (p. 227a11–30) (20 lines; 4/2)
(‘It is asked here whether every humour can assume the nature of melancholy?’)⁸⁶
8. *Fiarfaigthea*r ann so ca *coimplex* is *mo o slanaigthea*r an *beathad* (p. 227a30–58) (29 lines; 4/3)⁸⁷
(‘It is asked here by which complexion is life most preserved?’)
9. [*Fiafraigthea*r ann so] an *fuil*[id oibrigthe na *mba*]ll⁸⁸ *oiridha doibh fein co contrarda?* (p. 227a59–b23) (26 lines; 3(?) / 3)⁸⁹
(‘It is asked here whether the functions of the principal members are contrary to themselves?’)⁹⁰
10. *Fiarfaigthea*r ann so da *mbia* an *craide* *maille re flicideacht* 7 na *hae maille re tirmaideacht* an *gabaid na hae flicideacht cucu* on *craide* (p. 227b24–47) (24 lines; 3/2)
(‘It is asked here if the heart be wet and the liver dry whether the liver acquire moisture from the heart?’)⁹¹
11. *Fiarfaigthea*r annso da *mbia neac*⁹² *deidhbesac inn o na haeibh ata sin no on craide* (pp 227b48–228a23) (38 lines; 5/6).⁹³
(‘It is asked here if a person be well-mannered whether that be from the liver or from the heart?’)⁹⁴

⁸⁴ MS I–c

⁸⁵ A non-debated question, arising from the response to the previous question; the reply given is as follows: *Et is e is adbar do sin dileagad an gaile ar na neithib reamra neamglana bis ann 7 is ime sin is eigin gleann 7 folmaigeacht do beith isin gaile Dileagad na nae ar na neithibh seime glana oibrigheas .i. ar sughuibh na mbiadh 7 ní heigin folmaigeacht co follus do beith isna haeibh amail ata isin gaile* (p. 227a6–10).

⁸⁶ Topic also debated in T (beg. *Fiarfaigthea*r ann so an *feadtar* gac linn *dona leannaib dinnntogh* [sic] a *naicnead leanna duib*, pp 11b48–12a17) [= RIA 23 H 19 (446), f. 7r8–35 (includes two arguments omitted in T)].

⁸⁷ Topic also debated in TCD 1436, pp 324b3–325a13 (*Fiarfaigthea*r ann so ca *coimplex* is *faidi a connmaithear an beatha*).

⁸⁸ First half of line (p. 227a59) illegible; bracketed text conjectured.

⁸⁹ Opening argument largely illegible due to damage on p. 227a59–61 (= z).

⁹⁰ Topic also debated in F (*Fiarfaigthea*r annso an *fuil contrardacht idir na ballaib oireada fein*, f. 21ra6–18); and in T (*Fiarfaigthea*r ann so an *mbind contrardacht eidir na ballaib oireada fein*, p. 10a2–34).

⁹¹ Topic also debated in T (*Fiarfaigthea*r ann so an *feadann flicideacht imurcrach an craidi tirmaideacht imurcrach na nae do cosg*, p. 9a31–b4).

⁹² MS I–c

⁹³ While the contrast posed in the question is one between the liver and the heart, that debated in the arguments is one between the heart and the brain.

⁹⁴ Topic also debated in F (*Fiarfaigid Comentatur annso an o na huirgib atait na beasa*, f. 21vb26–33; and *Fiarfaigthea*r annso *ce dona ballaib oireada da taburthur tigeamrus*

[Chapter 3]

1. *Fiarfaigtheann ann so an baill oireada na huirgi*⁹⁵ (p. 228a45–b7) (21 lines; 3/3 (?))⁹⁶
(‘It is asked here whether the testes be principal members?’)⁹⁷
2. *Fiarfaigtheann ann so an cuirid na huirge na baill uile a tesaideacht na in cuirinn easbaid na nuirgi*⁹⁸ na baill uile a fuaraideacht (p. 228b8–37) (30 lines; 3/3)
(‘It is asked here whether the testes warm all the members or whether a lack of testes cool all the members?’)⁹⁹
3. (incomplete). *Fiarfaigtheann ann so an cuis do cur duine a fuaraideacht a spocad* (p. 228b38–z) (22 lines; 4/2)
(‘It is asked here whether his castration cause a person to become cold?’)¹⁰⁰

APPENDIX 3

This appendix identifies the source of a chapter on milk interpolated into the copy of the herbal (1415) of Tadhg Ó Cuinn (*fl.* 1400–15) found in John Rylands University Library Manchester MS Irish 35.

John Rylands University Library, Manchester, Irish 35 is a vellum manuscript of 124 folios, which has been tentatively dated to the fifteenth century.¹⁰¹ The first and principal text in the manuscript (ff 1r1–57v4) comprises a fragmentary copy of the herbal of Tadhg Ó Cuinn, a work which, in its fullest form, comprises more than three hundred chapters, of varying length, arranged in alphabetical order according to the Latin headwords of the plants or substances they describe.¹⁰²

ar na beasaib, f. 22ra5–20); and in T (*Fiarfaigtheann ann so an on craidi theagaid na besa maithi no in a ballaib eli*, pp 9b4–10a1).

⁹⁵ MS with suspension stroke written otiosely over *g*.

⁹⁶ p. 228a58–60 (= z) largely illegible.

⁹⁷ Topic also debated in F (*Fiarfaigtheann annso an dona ballaib oireada na huirgi*, ff 20vb52–21ra5); and in TCD MS 1436 (*Fiarfaigtheann annso an coir na huirgidh dairimh eidir na ballaib oirdha*, pp 323b28–324a21).

⁹⁸ MS with suspension stroke (?) written otiosely over *g*.

⁹⁹ Topic also debated in T (*Fiarfaigtheann ann so an iad baill na geineamna do beir tes dona ballaib* [co huilide], p. 22a35–b8).

¹⁰⁰ Topic also debated in F (*Fiarfaigtheann annso an cuis do cur an cuirp a fuaraideacht na huirgi do buain ass*, ff 21vb61–22ra4); and in T (*Fiarfaigtheann ann so an cuirid easbaid na nuirgeadh an curp co huilide a fuaraideact*, p. 22b8–34).

¹⁰¹ N. R. Ker, *Medieval manuscripts in British libraries* III (Oxford 1983) 456–8.

¹⁰² Whitley Stokes, ‘On Lord Crawford’s Irish medical MS.’, *Academy* 49 (1896) 405–7; Ker, *Medieval manuscripts*, 456 §1 (chasms occurring after ff 48 and 56 have been overlooked in the catalogue description). For references to various catalogue descriptions of the Ó Cuinn herbal and to listings of manuscript copies, see Aoibheann Nic

This copy of the herbal is unusual in that it contains several interpolations, some of which are inserted into chapters already existing, and others of which comprise whole new chapters of text. Of such new chapters, the two longest are those two that occur within the letter F, viz. ff 31r1–32vz – a chapter on milk (beg. *Foghailtear in bainde a dtri rannaib do reir na tri folad ata aige .i. caise 7 im 7 meadg Lac dare caput dolentibus malum 7 cetera*) – and ff 33r1–34r28 – a chapter on rosemary (beg. *Foircetul cumair tarbhach ann so neoch do frith o seinliaigh do Sheirristineachaib ar brigaib in rois marina neoch adubairt nach incubaidh luibh ele do comurdadh ria*).¹⁰³

The new chapter on milk (ff 31–2) can be shown to have been mainly (ff 31r1–32v23) excerpted from bk V.65 of the commentary on the *Aphorisms* of Hippocrates composed by Aenghus Ó Callannáin and Niocól Ó hÍceadha. The short final section (f. 32v24–z) of the new chapter, however, comprises an abbreviated version of the herbal's own original chapter on milk – a short chapter, which, beginning with the words *Lacc .i. don bainne*, properly belongs, of course, to the letter L – the letter under which it is found in other copies of the herbal, being that letter's opening chapter.¹⁰⁴

As previously noted, bk V.65 of the Ó Callannáin/Ó hÍceadha commentary, as represented by NLS MS Adv. 18.2.11, ff 159rb6–160rb41, comprises three distinct parts of disparate length, namely, the aphorism itself (f. 159rb6–11), the commentary proper (f. 159rb12–z)

Dhonnchadha, 'Michael Casey's medical transcripts in Gilbert MS 147', *Éigse* 40 (2019) 43–114, pp 63–4 (and nn 15–16). An interim edition of the herbal – from TCD MS 1343 (pp 47–106) – with English translation, prepared by Mícheál P. S. Ó Conchubhair (1926–93), has been available on CELT since 2018: see <https://research.ucc.ie/celt/document/G600005>.

¹⁰³ This chapter is derived from a tract on rosemary of which the earliest extant copy identified to date is that found in NLI MS G 11 (pp 269b33–270b40) (beg. *Incipitur hic .i. do buadaibh in rosa marina amail bfhuaramur iad o seinliaigh do Sheirristineacaibh oir adeir nac incubaid en luibh eile do coimeas fria*; cf. Ní Shéaghda, *Catalogue* I, 77–8); thus, the text of Rylands Irish 35, ff 33r1–34r28, corresponds to that of NLI G 11, pp 269b33–270b40. For an edition of this tract from the copy of it found in a 16th–17th century vellum and paper manuscript, NLS MS Adv. 72.1.2 (f. 93r1–v28), see Mícheál Ó Conchubhair, 'Uisce beatha', *Studia Hibernica* 25 (1989–90) 49–75, at 61–3 (Téacs 3); for a transcription of the Latin treatise upon which the first part of the Irish tract [= Ó Conchubhair, 'Uisce beatha', Téacs 3, pp 61.1–5, 62.1–45] is based, see *ibid.* 69–70 (Téacs 8). The Latin source of the second part of the Irish tract [= *idem*, 'Uisce beatha', Téacs 3, pp 62.46–63.z] remains unidentified.

¹⁰⁴ The herbal's chapter on *Lac* – found, for example, in TCD MS 1343, p. 83a16–33 [= NLI G 11, p. 39b12–36] – is entirely derived from Avicenna, *Canon medicinae* (Venice 1489–90; ISTC ia01423000) [without foliation] bk 2, tract 2, chapter 444 ('De lacte'), an authority it acknowledges in its concluding sentence ('... amail adeir Auicenna', TCD MS 1343, p. 83a33).

and a series of seventeen *quaestiones* (ff 159va1–160rb41) on milk. In importing this chapter into the Rylands copy of the Ó Cuinn herbal – or its exemplar – the interpolator retained the aphorism and almost all of the commentary, but he discarded the bulk of the *quaestiones*, incorporating into the new chapter only selected passages from questions [1], [2] and [5].

The following, then, is the correspondence between the text of Rylands Irish 35, ff 31r1–32v23 [= R] and bk V.65 of the Ó Callannáin/Ó hÍceadha commentary on the *Aphorisms* of Hippocrates as represented by NLS MS Adv. 18.2.11, ff 159rb6–160rb41 [= A]: **R**, ff 31r1–3, 4–12, 12–16, 16–32r8 [= A, f. 159rb16–17, 6–11, 14–16, 17–z, respectively]; **R**, f. 32r9–26 [= A, f. 159va7–20] (i.e. *Quaestio* [1], in part); **R**, f. 32r27–8, 29–z [= A, f. 159va20–1, 27–30] (i.e. *Quaestio* [2], in part); **R**, f. 32v1–15, 15–23 [= A, f. 159vaw–b7, b10–17, respectively] (i.e. *Quaestio* [5], in part).

With regard to the final section of the new chapter, the following is the correspondence between the text of Rylands Irish 35, f. 32v24–z, and the herbal's own original chapter on *Lac* as represented by NLI MS G 11, p. 39b12–36 [= G]: **R**, f. 32v24–6, 26–7, 27–9, 29–31, 31–2, 32 [= G, p. 39b12–16, 21–2, 19–21, 22–6, 33–5, 28–9, respectively].

Because of a chasm in the manuscript, the letter L is wanting in the Rylands copy of the herbal; accordingly, it is impossible to now know whether the chapter on *Lac*, having appeared in an abbreviated form as part of a new and interpolated chapter under the letter F, re-appeared – in its full and original form, and in its proper place – under the letter L.¹⁰⁵

Finally, one may note that it is also unclear whether the composition of the new chapter on milk found in the Rylands manuscript, and/or its interpolation into the herbal, are due to the scribe of the Rylands manuscript, or to his exemplar.

APPENDIX 4

The Uí Fhearghusa fragment, RIA MS 23 A 4 (469), part ii, pp 140–177, is described in *RIA Cat.* 1229. This appendix seeks to supplement that description by indicating the boundaries of the individual medical texts contained in the fragment and by identifying the texts' sources.¹⁰⁶

¹⁰⁵ Note that notwithstanding the occurrence of the new chapter on rosemary under the letter F in the copy of the Ó Cuinn herbal in Rylands MS Irish 35 (see n. 103 above), the herbal's own original chapter on that plant – the second chapter in the letter R – appears in its proper place later on in the text, beg. *Ros marinus .i. in ros marina ata se te tirim* (ibid. ff 44v29–45r17).

¹⁰⁶ The religious material found in the final leaves of the fragment (pp 172–7) is not considered here; see *RIA Cat.* 1229.18–20 (for 'O Fearghus' ibid., leg. 'O Fearghusa').

p.

140. On the aetiology and treatment of epilepsy. Chapter excerpted from COLLIGET, a tract on pathology compiled from Latin sources by Tadhg Ó Cuinn (*fl.* 1400–15). Beg. *Epelientia est humiditas currens uentriculos cerebrum implenss.* Ends (p. 143.14) *ar son gurb leo is minica leigistear in easlainti só 7rl.* Corresponds to King's Inns MS 18, ff 10v30–11r4. Bottom of page, originally left blank, bears scribal signature 'Boetius ffargus' (transversely in later ink).
144. On the threefold classification of medicines. Excerpt from a treatise attributed to Johannes de Sancto Paulo (*fl.* 1180) – which is mainly based on the *De modo medendi* of Gerard of Montpellier (*fl.* 13th cent.) – a complete copy of which (beg. *Omnis medicina* [sic leg.; MS *siua*] [est] *aut laxatiua aut con[s]trictiua aut alteratiua et cetera*) occurs in NLI G 11, pp 304a32–331b4. Beg. *Ataid tri herna<ile ar> an leigeas a rad genearalta do rer Iohannes de Sancto [Paulo] .i. leigeas claoclaigteach 7 leigeas fosduightheac 7 leigeas lacách.* Ends with p. 144 *7 daorgalur ita 7 disinter<ia> 7 sgeathrach 7 fasd<...>.* Corresponds to NLI MS G 11, p. 304a33–y.
145. Dispensatory comprising a synopsis of the Irish translation of Valerius Cordus (†1544), *Dispensatorium* (1546). List comprises mainly oils, powders, ointments and pills; neither ingredients nor method of preparation given, but each item followed by statement of therapeutic indication. Beg. *[O]leum ex ligno iuniperius glanaidh salcur <an croic>inn mur atá serpigo 7 cancer 7 <creacht>a mailiseacha 7 go mor mor creachta na sliasat 7 na lorgan* [= TCD MS 1437, p. 115.1; and Valerius Cordus, *Dispensatorium* (Antwerp 1580; USTC 406492), p. 302.1]. Chasm in text after p. 169 which breaks off (in *Pilulae de sárca colla*) *gurb uime sin do beirid socamlacht* [= TCD MS 1357, p. 146a21; and TCD MS 1437, p. 100.19]. Resumes with p. 170 (in *Unguentum mirabile Domini Mesuae*) [al. *Unguentum mirabile relatum ad Nicodemum*] *creachta morgaighthe 7 lionaidh dfeoil iad* [= TCD MS 1357, p. 152b14]. Ends (p. 171.6) (in *Unguentum sandalinum Domini Mesue*) *7 do ní an bel deaghbhalaídh 7 an crocinn deahdhatha* [= TCD MS 1357, p. 153b9]. Note that in addition to the interpolations that are an inherent part of the original Irish translation of Cordus, *Dispensatorium*, the following short passages in this synopsis can also be shown to derive from extraneous sources, viz.: (a) acephalous; beg. here *creachta morgaighthe 7 lionaidh dfeoil iad* (p. 170.1); ends (p. 170.5) *uiniment an aoil na ceann só foiridh iad.* Corresponds to

- Joannes Mesue Damascenus, *De re medica libri tres* (Lyons 1548; USTC 149981), p. 364.23–5, 28–9 (*Unguentum mirabile relatum ad Nicodemum*); (b) beg. *Unguentum scerasios glanuidh na creachta mailiseacha* (p. 170.6); ends (p. 170.8) *ina mbhi feoil marbh*. Corresponds to Mesue, *De re medica libri tres*, p. 365.7–8 (*Unguentum magnum craseos*). Note that the remainder of this par. (i.e. p. 170.8–13) is not an interpolation but corresponds rather to TCD MS 1437, p. 140.1–3 [= Cordus, *Dispensatorium*, p. 365.23–z (*Unguentum de arthanita maius Domini Mesuae*)]; (c) beg. *Unguentum sandalinum Domini Mesue* (p. 171.1); ends (p. 171.6) *7 an crocinn deadhdhatha*. Source unidentified.¹⁰⁷
- 171.7. The foll. aphorism: *Apostema melancholicum quod fit in leprosi melancholicam non curatur .i. da tteagmad neascoid leanna duib a lubra leanna duib ní leigeastur*.¹⁰⁸
- 171.11. The foll. scribal colophon: ‘A cCoige Uladh damh a cConndáe / Dhún na nGhall ar sgribadh inn / cholleccion bhig so 7 tabradh / gach aon leighfis so beannacht / ar anum in te do sgriob so / aois an Tiagarna 1656. / Baothalach O Fearaossa’.

AOIBHEANN NIC DHONNCHADHA

School of Celtic Studies, Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies

¹⁰⁷ An acephalous copy of the synopsis of Cordus's *Dispensatorium* found in this fragment occurs in TCD MS 1357, pp 143a1–153b9; thus, the text of TCD MS 1357, pp 143a1–146a21 and 152b14–153b9 corresponds to that of RIA MS 23 A 4 (469), pp 163.11–169.z and 170.1–171.6, respectively. In addition to the interpolations designated (a)–(c) above, the copy of the synopsis in TCD MS 1357 contains a further interpolation at p. 150ax–b19 (beg. *Uinnimint an chait annso*; ends *furtacht dá gach uile adhbúr fuar*) [= de Gaddesden, *Rosa Anglica*, f. 83vb21–34 (lib. 1.12 ‘De paralesi’); and W. Wulff (ed.), *Rosa Anglica seu Rosa medicinae Johannis Anglici: an Early Modern Irish translation of a section of the mediaeval medical text-book of John of Gaddesden* (London 1929) 264.5–12]. The copy of the synopsis in TCD MS 1357 (pp 143a1–153b9) is in a scribal hand which is unidentified, but perhaps contemporary with that of Eóghan Ó Fearghusa (fl. 1563), principal scribe of the manuscript.

¹⁰⁸ This aphorism, accompanied by this same Irish translation, also occurs in TCD MS 1357, p. 153bi. The aphorism occurs, with independent Irish translation, in a disputed question in the commentary on *Megategni* found in RIA MS 23 F 19 (473), ff 18ra1–24va16, where it is attributed to Avicenna: *ITem adeir Auicenna na briathra so Apostema melangcolicum quot fit in liproso melangcolico non curatur .i. an tan tuismidhtear neascoid leanna duib a lubri leanna duib ní tearnaigtheat uaithe as a haithle* (ibid. f. 18vb38–40).